



Gear Innovation Initiative and Fishing Effects Model

What We Know Now, What Will Be Ready When, and What Will Change in the FE Model



Brad Harris, Ph.D.

Fisheries Aquatic Science & Technology Laboratory





Three things to cover ... in 30 minutes

What we know now, what will be ready when, and what changes in FEM



1 · Research progress

291

Trawls cataloged

- Gear catalog, FPPs, haul logs, simulations, and field validation are now aligned.
- CP foundation is complete and directly useful for bottom-contact estimates.

2 · GII timeline

2027

FE analysis / SSC review gate

- Gear parameter tables move toward model-ready estimates on the EFH review timeline.
- Use source-tiered estimates where validation is still catching up.


3 · FEM changes

4

Major FEM input updates

- The model framework remains stable.
- Inputs are being updated: fishing events, gear, habitat, and impact/recovery parameters.

Emphasis is on decision-readiness



Bottom-Tow Fisheries Sustainability Roadmap



Public concern is part of the sustainability process

Sethi et al. 2026

Challenges and Opportunities for Strengthening Bottom-Tow Fisheries Sustainability

Fish and Fisheries

WILEY



2026
Publication

32
Participants

30 gaps
28 recs

4
Solution Themes

ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Challenges and Opportunities for Strengthening Bottom-Tow Fisheries Sustainability

Suresh A. Sethi^{1,2} | Robert D. Murphy Jr.³ | Matthew R. Baker^{2,4} | Anlita C. Kroska^{2,5} | Haraldur A. Einarsson⁶ | Owen S. Hamel⁷ | Shelton J. Harley⁸ | Pinguo He⁹ | James Ianelli¹⁰ | Stan Kotwicki¹⁰ | Robert A. McConnaughey¹⁰ | Chris McGonigle¹¹ | Max V. Mossler¹² | Brent Paine¹³ | Felipe Restrepo² | Leslie A. Roberson¹⁴ | Craig S. Rose¹⁵ | Maritza S. Saldarraga¹⁶ | Marija Sciberras¹⁷ | T. Scott Smeltz² | Petri Suuronen¹⁸ | Mary Beth Tooley¹⁹ | William Twit^{5,20} | Sarah R. Webster²¹ | Chris Wilcox²² | Qiang Wu²³ | Nöelle Yochum²⁴ | Ray Hilborn¹² | Bradley P. Harris²

¹Aquatic Research and Environmental Assessment Center, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York, USA | ²Fisheries, Aquatic Science, and Technology Laboratory, Alaska Pacific University, Anchorage, Alaska, USA | ³Northeast Fisheries Science Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, USA | ⁴North Pacific Research Board, Anchorage, Alaska, USA | ⁵North Pacific Fisheries Management Council, Anchorage, Alaska, USA | ⁶Marine and Freshwater Research Institute, Hafnarfjörður, Iceland | ⁷Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, Seattle, Washington, USA | ⁸Fisheries Consultant, Wellington, New Zealand | ⁹School for Marine Science and Technology, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, New Bedford, Massachusetts, USA | ¹⁰Alaska Fisheries Science Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Seattle, Washington, USA | ¹¹School of Geography and Environmental Sciences, Ulster University, Belfast, UK | ¹²School of Aquatic and Fisheries Science, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA | ¹³United Catcher Boats, Seattle, Washington, USA | ¹⁴Centre for Biodiversity and Conservation Science, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia | ¹⁵FishNext Research LLC, Des Moines, Washington, USA | ¹⁶Instituto del Mar del Perú, Callao, Peru | ¹⁷The Lyell Centre, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK | ¹⁸International Seafood Consulting Group (ISCG), Helsinki, Finland | ¹⁹O'Hara Corporation, Rockland, Maine, USA | ²⁰Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Seattle, Washington, USA | ²¹Alaska Seafood Cooperative, Seattle, Washington, USA | ²²Wilco Analytics, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia | ²³Yellow Sea Fisheries Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Fishery Sciences, Qingdao, China | ²⁴Trident Seafoods Corporation, Seattle, Washington, USA

Correspondence: Suresh A. Sethi (suresh.sethi@brooklyn.cuny.edu)

Received: 27 December 2025 | Revised: 9 April 2026 | Accepted: 8 May 2026

Keywords: animal sourced foods | cooperative science | groundfish | living marine resources | ocean management

How the synthesis was built

Convene
2024 World Fisheries Congress • Seattle



Deliberate
Day 1: Gaps
Day 2: Recommendations



Synthesize
Gap-to-recommendation map review + editing

Who was at the table
Science • Management + Policy
Fishing Sector • Conservation Organizations

Geographic representation
United States • Australia • China • Finland
Iceland • New Zealand • Northern Ireland
Peru • Scotland

Public perception + communication are sustainability challenge area - recognize concern, then respond with transparent evidence and tradeoff reporting.
Food-systems reporting + key performance metrics that allow managers to weigh tradeoffs, compare conservation options, and communicate performance transparently.

ABSTRACT
Bottom-tow gear fisheries (trawls and dredges) produce ~24 million mt of harvest annually, representing a globally important animal-sourced food system. While many are currently sustainably managed, growing concern over the potential for ecosystem impacts from bottom-tow gears has increased pressure to improve these fisheries. We assembled an international working group of > 30 contributors, including fishing industry participants, managers, non-governmental ocean conservation organization representatives, and scientists to synthesize obstacles to bottom-tow fisheries sustainability and to develop expert-based recommendations to operationalize sustainability advancements moving forward. We identified 30 key gaps impeding bottom-towed fisheries sustainability spanning 6 core challenge areas including: seafloor disturbance, bycatch and discards, management design and implementation, fishing operations, cross-sector conflicts, and public perception and communication. We generated 28 priority recommendations to address bottom-tow fisheries sustainability obstacles with themes including: addressing data gaps, advancing mechanistic understanding and modelling tools, strengthening management processes, and improving knowledge sharing and communication. Cross-disciplinary and diverse system experience among fisheries and marine ecosystem stakeholders will be critical for operationalizing bottom-tow fisheries sustainability advancements. As the global human population approaches 10 bn in the next 30 years, ensuring sustainable wild capture fisheries is an imperative for feeding the world. Outputs




A Different Approach




Public concern + Council decision need → evidence requirements → GII/FEM analysis → reviewable outputs

GII Evidence



FEM Decision Support



Public concern

“What gear is on bottom - where, how much, and how do we know?”

Council need

Transparent inputs and review timing before EFH decisions.

GII – FEM

Document gear → estimate contact → show model effects and uncertainty.

Transparent, traceable evidence for decisions

01

RESEARCH PROGRESS

*From representative gear assumptions to
fleet-scale empirical evidence.*

1000.0


862.0

690.0

517.0

345.0

172.0






The evidence pipeline is now field-scale

Gear catalog + FPPs + haul logs + simulations + tank validation



291

Trawls cataloged




85

Fishing Practice Profiles



115

Fishing simulations




252

Haul logs collected

| | |
|---|--|
| Vessel: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A Season <input type="checkbox"/> B Season | |
| Trawl in use: | |
| Doors in use: | |
| Hullup: | |
| Bridle length: <input type="text"/> meters/meters/feet | |
| Sweep length: <input type="text"/> meters/meters/feet | |
| Sweep weights per side: <input type="text"/> Bar/ft | |
| Haul Information: | |
| Haul Number: <input type="text"/> | |
| Date: <input type="text"/> | |
| Start time: <input type="text"/> Start Lat, Lon (dd dddd) | |
| Bottom Depth: <input type="text"/> Vessel Speed: <input type="text"/> Main wire payout: <input type="text"/> | |
| Headrope Height: <input type="text"/> Door Spread: <input type="text"/> Door height (above water): <input type="text"/> | |
| Vertical Opening: <input type="text"/> Fishing circle width IF AVAILABLE | |
| Seastate: <input type="text"/> Notes: <input type="text"/> | |
| Tension on main winches IF AVAILABLE | |
| Tension on third wire IF AVAILABLE | |
| Time of entry: | |
| Bottom Depth: <input type="text"/> Vessel Speed: <input type="text"/> Main wire payout: <input type="text"/> | |
| Headrope Height: <input type="text"/> Door Spread: <input type="text"/> Door height (above water): <input type="text"/> | |
| Vertical Opening: <input type="text"/> Fishing circle width IF AVAILABLE | |
| Seastate: <input type="text"/> Notes: <input type="text"/> | |
| Tension on main winches IF AVAILABLE | |
| Tension on third wire IF AVAILABLE | |

3

CP scale models for tank validation



Gear catalog
What is fished



FPPs
How it is fished



Simulations
How gear behaves



Haul logs
How it looked in practice




Tank / sensors
How we validate contact

This year the project moved from “*what generic pelagic trawls might do*” to “*what documented gears do under documented fishing scenarios.*”



Gear catalog + FPPs: no more generic “pelagic trawl”

Actual gear design and actual fishing practice now drive nominal width and contact estimates



What the catalog captures

- Design and individual net plan
- Materials, including footrope chain dimensions
- Configuration: doors, bridles, setback, wing weights
- Modifications, including salmon excluders

What FPPs add

- Speed, warp length, scope
- Bridle length, setback, door roll
- Target headline depth, vertical opening, wing spread

12/12

CP vessels with complete FPPs

85

CP individual trawls

14

CP trawl models



Why it matters

Supports move from broad assumptions toward gear- and scenario-informed parameter values.




CP Field Study: closing the loop between model and reality

The CP fleet is the strongest near-term foundation for contact estimates



- Purpose built fishing gear research facility
- 1.7-million-liter (450k gallon) recirculating tank
- 8m x 4m test section
- 22m long observation chamber
- Flow speeds up to 1 m/s
- Moving seabed simulation system
- Underwater force measurement capability
- Controlled trawl-geometry experimentation
- Real-time underwater gear observation



A flume is an engineered channel of flowing water used to study how water interacts with objects.

CP foundation

12/12 vessels · 85 trawls · FPPs complete. This gives the cleanest path from cataloged gear to gear-table parameters.

Validation focus

Three common CP trawl models A/B/C represent ~55% of CP trawls and are targeted for tank validation.

Haul-log bridge

Vessel haul logs and net-sensor data provide the realized geometry used to check simulations.

Sensor reality check

Tank tests probe practical footrope clearance/contact sensors: attachment, fouling, vibration, and noise.

What the Council gets from this

- A CP gear parameter FEM package built from cataloged gear and observed fishing practice.
- A validation path for simulation-derived width and contact estimates.
- Clear separation between model-ready estimates and research-continuing sensor work.



Detailed GII status numbers



MENU ☰

PELAGIC TRAWL GEAR RESEARCH SUMMARIES

Gear catalog

- 291 trawls cataloged
- BS CP: 12 vessels, 85 trawls
- BS CV: 58/59 vessels, 116 trawls
- GOA CV: 37/39 vessels, 64 trawls
- BS/GOA crossover: 12 vessels, 26 trawls

Fishing Practice Profiles

- 85 FPPs completed/developed
- BS CP: 12/12 complete
- BS CV: 43/59 complete
- GOA CV: 38/38 complete
- BS/GOA crossover: 12/13 complete

Haul-log sheets

- 2025 A: 38 haul logs, 101 entries, 8 vessels
- 2025 B: 73 haul logs, 265 entries, 21 vessels
- 2026 A: 141 haul logs, 400 entries, 27 vessels
- Door height added on updated sheets for 2026 A



GII Insights

From a gear label to the expected contact area under real fishing scenarios



“Pelagic trawl” is not one contact condition

Bottom contact varies with design, rigging, fishing practice, and operating conditions.

How gear is fished matters as much as what gear is fished

Operator decisions shape trawl geometry, vertical position, and expected seabed contact.

Simulations are now useful management tools

Simulation performance is strong enough to support updated FEM gear parameters.

The fleet is more diverse than assumed - and now quantifiable

Cataloging shows real gear diversity, but also that it can be systematically characterized.

Bottom contact is driven by geometry, not width alone

Vertical opening, footrope shape, and trawl position appear central to contact estimates.

Bottom line

Fishing effects emerge from gear × rigging × fishing practice × operating context.

Key Insight: Fishing effects are not fixed properties of a gear type - they emerge from the interaction of gear design, rigging, fishing practice, and seafloor proximity.



FAQ → FEM parameter

A project audit path



| Concern | Scientific question | Evidence stream | FEM output |
|---|--|--|---|
| “Are pelagic trawls fishing on the bottom?” | Which components touch under real gear, rigging, depth, and speed scenarios? | FPPs + haul logs + simulations + tank validation | Bottom-contact adjustment |
| “Are impacts hidden by broad averages?” | How much do gear designs and fishing practices vary across the fleet? | Gear catalog + FPPs + scenario runs | Gear/scenario-specific nominal width and contact |
| “Is FEM a black box?” | Can each estimate be traced to a source and QA step? | Parameter table metadata + bridging analyses | Audit trail and uncertainty notes |
| “Will this be ready for EFH?” | Which parameters are model-ready vs validation-pending? | Readiness board + SSC review gates | Review-ready FE analysis package |

Public-facing “audit path”: concern → scientific question → evidence stream → parameters.

02

GII TIMELINE

What will be ready, when, and how it enters the FEM gear tables.

1000.0


862.0

690.0

517.0

345.0

172.0





GII delivery timeline: model-ready by review gate

The gear parameter package is aligned with EFH review and SSC gates




Spring–Summer 2026
Finalize QA on 2026 A-season haul logs; flume/tank geometry and contact-sensor study.

Late 2026 – early 2027
Simulation refinement, overlay/bridging analyses, and draft gear parameter tables.

Feb–Mar 2027 SSC gate
Draft FE analysis and FE evaluation methods, including updated gear parameters and recovery inputs.

Sep/Oct 2027 review gate
Plan Team and SSC review of Component 2 FE evaluations and SSC EFH analysis.



Gear tables can be source-tiered — use simulation/validation where complete and catalog-based estimates where refinement is still underway.



Parameter Readiness

What is complete, what is being validated, and what enters FEM



| Parameter / input | Readiness | Source tier | FEM use |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Nominal width | High / draft-ready | Catalog + net plans + simulation geometry | Gear footprint |
| Bottom-contact (adjustment) | In validation | FPPs + simulations + haul logs + tank | Adjusted contact area |
| Fishing-practice scenarios | High for CP; ongoing for CVs | FPPs + haul-log distributions | Scenario-specific contact |
| Uncertainty notes | Under construction | Simulation-field-tank comparison + source metadata | Interpretation + SSC review |
| Other FEM inputs | Updated / QA | CIA, sediment data, literature updates | Full FE analysis |

GII source – tiered approach



03

FEM UPDATE

The model framework is stable; the evidence base is being systematically updated.

1000.0


862.0

690.0

517.0



345.0

172.0



What is changing in the Fishing Effects Model

Continuity in model logic; stronger inputs and QA



Updated FEM inputs

- **Fishing events** *Catch-In-Areas database rebuild/QA, including current reconstruction for FE analyses.*
- **Gear parameters** *Nominal widths and bottom-contact adjustments updated with GII outputs.*
- **Habitat substrate** *Sediment/habitat data refreshed for the Habitat Module.*
- **Impact & recovery** *Literature-derived susceptibility and recovery tables updated with new papers.*





What stays stable

The core FEM workflow remains a spatial, monthly decision-support model connecting fishing effort, gear contact, habitat disturbance, and recovery.



One tow through the model

An audit trail for how FEM turns fishing activity into habitat disturbance and recovery



Every output can be traced back to an effort source, a gear/contact source, a habitat source, and an impact/recovery source.



How we will show what the updates changed

Bridging Analyses



Maps

Where footprint/contact changes occur.

Time series

How disturbance and recovery change through time.


Sensitivity

Which inputs drive differences in results.

Uncertainty

What is measured, modeled, assumed, and still being validated.

The Council will not only see updated results; it will see how input updates influenced results.






Takeaways

Decision-readiness • Transparency • Traceability



Concern without decision support → Precaution without precision
Decision support gives precaution discipline, aim, and accountability



- 1 Sustainability → public concern deserves transparent evidence and tradeoff reporting.
- 2 GII: an empirical gear/fishing-practice foundation for pollock trawl contact estimates.
- 3 Gear parameter tables are on the EFH review track, with source-tiered information structure and SSC review.
- 4 FEM changes are input updates that preserve continuity while improving precision.
- ? Food System Metrics - pair harvest outcomes with quantitative ecological metrics such as seabed disturbance and bycatch.

Next deliverable: review-ready gear parameter package + FEM bridging analyses for the EFH review cycle.



Acknowledgements



Thanks to the vessels, companies, gear manufacturers, agency staff, SSC reviewers, students, and collaborators who made the gear catalog, FPPs, haul logs, simulations, field work and FEM analyses possible.

- FAST Lab staff and student researchers
- NMFS Alaska Region Habitat Division and Catch Accounting partners
 - NPFMC SSC, Plan Teams, and Ecosystem Committee
 - Memorial University / Marine Institute
 - Trawl Gear designers/ manufacturers
- Pollock industry collaborators and participating vessels




Thank you!

Questions?



Impact – Recovery: Fishing Effects Literature

Example: State of the Science → Traceable FEM input



NPFMC-filtered retained records: n=312 • years 1973–2025




Impact – Recovery: Fishing Effects Literature

Example: State of the Science → Traceable FEM input



Biological-feature susceptibility and recovery information-support





Impact – Recovery: Fishing Effects Literature

Example: traceable model input

