

Coordinated CB Fish Stock Monitoring

Re-examination of the 2006 bi-state management-
scientist meeting relative to EBFM & the EO



Background

- FI surveys provide critical estimates of abundance and biological information.
- These FI programs are essential for stock assessment activities and single-species management.
 - How can they / Can they be used to support EBFM?
- Responsibility of managing fisheries resides with individual states and multi-state compacts.
- Both coastal *AND* baywide information is required for effective and coordinated management.



Management Data and Information Needs for Effective Management

- Foundational information for assessments
 - Adult indices
 - YOY indices
 - Life history (growth, migration, sex ratios, etc.)
 - Trends in age composition
- Multispecies / Habitat requirements
 - Environmental
 - Essential / critical fish habitat
 - Trophic interactions (diet)
 - Natural mortality estimates



March 2006 Workshop

- Chesapeake Research Consortium and NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office convened a workshop to:
 - Review the existing FI surveys (particularly in Chesapeake Bay); and
 - Provide recommendations on how to best ensure these surveys support management needs.
 - Additional surveys
 - Modifications to existing surveys
 - Institutional and infrastructure needs to support



Workshop Format

- Day 1
 - What managers need to know to manage sustainably (i.e., control rules, BRPs);
 - Detailed information on existing surveys (what is currently collected);
 - What other agencies collect to manage their resources (Florida, New Foundland, SC, NMFS, etc.)
- Day 2-3
 - Development of conceptual monitoring plans and consensus recommendations.



Consensus Recommendations

- General Surveys – development and implementation of coordinated, cross-jurisdictional surveys conducted on a regular and dependable basis (deep, shallow, littoral, longline platforms).
- Special Surveys – additional need for regular and dependable special surveys of key species either not available to standard gear or mandated by interstate management agencies (winter dredge survey for blue crab, mandated spawning surveys for anadromous species).
- Coordinating Committee – monitoring program oversight; assess development of and cost of survey elements, data Q&A.
- Administration and Survey Management – administration, management, funding, coordination



Recommendations – Surveys

- General Purpose Surveys
 - Deep mainstem and tributary: Deep (>~20 ft) mainstem and tributary sampling with large bottom trawl(s) for both juveniles and adults;
 - Shallow (~8 ft to ~20 ft) mainstem and tributary sampling with small bottom trawl(s) for both juveniles and adults;
 - Littoral zone (<8 ft) mainstem and tributary sampling with a small mesh seine and possibly a large haul seine; and
 - Longline surveys in appropriate areas for large and uncommon fishes not vulnerable to trawl and seine gears (e.g., elasmobranchs, drums, cobia).
- Special Surveys
 - There is a need for regular and dependable special surveys of key species that are inaccessible or vulnerable to standard survey gears. In some cases, specific mandates from interstate management agencies require particular survey methodologies and sampling platforms.



Recommendations (science)

- Coordinating Committee

- Establishment of a **Chesapeake Bay Fish Stock Monitoring Coordinating Committee** for monitoring program oversight should be established. Initially, a **Coordinating Panel for Survey Design (CPSD)** —a panel of national and regional experts and regional managers — would shape the Bay-specific monitoring program. Since the CPSD would *design the core survey elements*, the panel should consist of experts in survey design from across the nation, regional experts on the Chesapeake fishery ecosystem, and regional managers. The CPSD would be charged with assessing the development and cost of each core survey element along with recommendations for data management.
- Once the regional administrative fisheries body (the Sustainable Fisheries Goal Implementation Team) has adopted the survey design, a long-standing committee (**Chesapeake Bay Fisheries Stock Monitoring Coordinating Committee**) would be established and charged with ensuring that the fish survey is conducted according to rigorous specifications. Because the *goals of the survey and data collections are to provide managers with high quality information*, this committee of regional scientists and managers would exercise oversight and advise the survey programs on *data needed, data quality, data products, and adequacy of program designs*. The coordinating *committee also would advise on the need for new surveys, new survey designs, and survey modifications*. Additionally, this committee would assure that Chesapeake Bay fish surveys and monitoring are complementary to and linked with federal and other coastal fish surveys.



Needed Administration?

- Administration and Survey Management – designated administrative body is required to assure that the surveys are dependably administered, managed, funded, and coordinated across jurisdictions. The Coordinating Committee would report to the administrative body, which would approve survey designs and standards, implement personnel training, purchase gear, certify and maintain sample processing procedures, manage the data and data distribution, and provide jurisdictional coordination of fishery management bodies, public outreach, and finance.



NCBO Proposed Next Steps

- NCBO Fish team to discuss options paper and agree on next steps, initially to include brief update and discussion of the current monitoring issue with the Fisheries Goal Team Executive Committee (11/15).
- Coordinate with the Fish Stock Monitoring Workshop Steering Committee to assess whether consensus recommendations from workshop (March 2006) are still appropriate (Mid-late November).
- Bring 'current' recommendations to full Sustainable Fisheries Goal Team members (December) for agreement. Full Goal Team should assist in identifying Coordinating Committee.
- Expand discussions to include additional members as needed to develop consensus recommendations for moving forward – 3+ years post-workshop. This should include state monitoring representatives as well as others with links to multiple management and science initiatives.
- Organize meeting of the Coordinating Committee (late January) to identify core survey design elements and then develop steps forward for implementation.
- Pending funding appropriations, move forward with identifying mechanisms for funding core survey elements.