

# Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment

## *Omnibus and Mackerel Coverage Target Alternatives*

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council  
Baltimore, Maryland  
December 12, 2016

# What is the Purpose of this Amendment?

- Allow industry funding to be used to increase monitoring above current levels
- Allow Councils to implement new IFM programs with available Federal funding
- Allow Councils and NMFS to prioritize available Federal funding among IFM programs
- Specify IFM coverage *targets* for Atlantic herring and Atlantic mackerel fisheries
- Allow NMFS to approve new IFM programs

# Key results if adopted

This amendment would...

- Establish a standardized structure for new IFM programs

This amendment would not...

- Impact existing IFM programs, including groundfish and scallop programs

# Opportunity for Public Comment?

- Public comment period from September 23 – November 7
- Comments were accepted electronically, by mail, or during public hearings
- Public hearings were held
  - October 4 - Gloucester, MA
  - October 17 - Webinar
  - October 20 - Portland, ME
  - October 27 - Cape May, NJ
  - November 1 - Narragansett, RI

# Amendment Timeline

Dates	Action
January-February 2016	NEFMC and MAFMC selected preliminary preferred omnibus alternatives
June 2016	MAFMC and NEFMC approved Draft EA for public comment
September- November 2016	Public comment period and public hearings EM pilot project began
December 2016	MAFMC considers taking final action
January 2017	NEFMC considers taking final action
February –July 2017	EA finalized and proposed and final rulemaking
August 2017	Final rule publishes
November 2017	EM pilot project is completed
January 2018	Amendment implemented

# **OMNIBUS ALTERNATIVES**

# Which Alternatives Apply to all FMPS?

- Omnibus Alternative 1: No Standardized IFM Programs (No action)
- Omnibus Alternative 2: Standardize New IFM Programs
  - Standardize cost responsibilities
  - Framework adjustment process for IFM programs
  - Standardized IFM service provider requirements
  - Prioritization process
  - Option for Monitoring Set-Aside

# Omnibus Alternative 2: Prioritization Process

Alternatives	Description
Alternative 2.1: NMFS-Led	NMFS develops process and consults with the Councils
<b>Alternative 2.2: Council-Led</b> <i>(Preliminary Preferred Alternative)</i>	<b>Councils develop process and consult with NMFS and initially use equal weighing scheme</b>
Alternative 2.3: Proportional	Allocate funding equally across new IFM programs
Alternative 2.4: Lowest Coverage Ratio	Allocate funding to IFM programs with low coverage needs and active fleets
Alternative 2.5: Highest Coverage Ratio	Allocate funding to IFM programs with high coverage needs and less active fleets



# Omnibus Alternative 2.6: Monitoring Set-Aside

- Allows FMPs to establish a monitoring set-aside via framework adjustment
- For example:
  - Set aside percent of ACL
  - If a vessel is selected for monitoring, then vessel may harvest a certain amount above the possession limit
  - Revenue from sale of extra fish helps offset cost of monitoring
- This amendment does not implement monitoring set-asides for individual FMPs

# Impacts of Omnibus Alternatives

Alternatives	Biological Impacts	Economic Impacts
Alternative 1: No Action	Low Negative	Low Negative
Alternative 2: Action Alternative	Low Positive	Low Positive
Alternatives 2.1 – 2.5: Prioritization Processes	Low Positive	Low Positive
Alternative 2.6: Monitoring Set- Aside	Negligible	Negligible

# 70 Comments Supporting Omnibus Alternative 1 (No Action)

- Was not aware amendment involved all FMPs
- NMFS should fund additional monitoring
- IFM does not account for affordability
- IFM will use funds needed for vessel upkeep/safety
- IFM will increase tension with observers
- Observer data not used, why collect more
- Concern that amendment is not consistent with MSA
- Inadequate notice/locations for public comment and hearings

# 14 Comments on Omnibus Alternative 2

Alternatives	Comment
Alternative 2.1: NMFS-Led	<b>0</b> Support, <b>1</b> Against
Alternative 2.2: Council-Led <i>(Preliminary Preferred Alternative)</i>	<b>6</b> Support, <b>2</b> Against
Alternative 2.6: Monitoring Set-Aside	<b>5</b> Support, <b>0</b> Against

# \*\*\*Council Decision\*\*\*

- Select Omnibus Alternative 1 (No Action) or Omnibus Alternative 2 (Standardize New IFM Programs)
- If selecting Omnibus Alternative 2, then select prioritization process (Alternatives 2.1-2.5)
  - Alternative 2.2 – Preliminary Preferred
- If selecting Omnibus Alternative 2, then consider selecting monitoring set-aside (Alternative 2.6)
  - Alternative 2.6 – Preliminary Preferred

# **MACKEREL ALTERNATIVES**

# Goals of Industry-Funded Monitoring

Increased monitoring in the mackerel fishery should address the following goals:

- Accurate estimates of catch (retained and discarded),
- Accurate catch estimates for incidental species for which catch caps apply, and
- Effective and affordable monitoring for the mackerel fishery.

# Comparison of IFM Types

	NEFOP-Level Observer	At-Sea Monitor (ASM)	Electronic Monitoring (EM)	Portside Sampling
Retained Catch	Fishing Effort and Species Composition Data	Fishing Effort and Species Composition Data	Verify Retention of Catch	Species Composition Data
Discarded Catch	Fishing Effort and Species Composition Data	Fishing Effort and Species Composition Data	Frequency of Discarding Events	None
Biological Sampling	Age and Length Data	Length Data	None	Age and Length Data



# Mackerel Alternatives

## Mackerel Alternative 1 (No Action)

## Mackerel Alternative 2 (IFM Coverage Targets)

- Sub-Option 1: Waiver allowed if IFM coverage is not available
- Sub-Option 2: Wing vessel exempt from IFM requirements
- Sub-Option 3: IFM requirements sunset in two years
- Sub-Option 4: IFM requirements are re-evaluated in two years
- Sub-Option 5: IFM requirements only apply on trips that land more than 25 mt of mackerel

# Mackerel Alternatives

Gear Type	MWT	SMBT	SMBT	SMBT
Permit Categories	All Tiers	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Mackerel Alternative 1:	SBRM			
Mackerel Alternative 2:	Includes Sub-Options: 1) Waiver Allowed, 2) Wing Vessel Exemption, 3) 2 Year Sunset, 4) 2 Year Re-evaluation, and 5) 25 mt Threshold			
Mackerel Alternative 2.1:	100% NEFOP		50% NEFOP	25% NEFOP
Mackerel Alternative 2.2:	25%-100% ASM		SBRM (No Action)	
Mackerel Alternative 2.3:	50% or 100% EM/PS	25%-100% ASM	SBRM (No Action)	
Mackerel Alternative 2.4:	50% or 100% EM/PS	SBRM (No Action)		
Mackerel Alternative 2.5:	25%-100% ASM or EM/PS	SBRM (No Action)		

All slippage requirements would apply under Alternatives 2.1-2.5., with the exception that the Council will evaluate whether slippage consequence measures should apply to vessels using EM in a future framework.

# Mackerel Alternative 2.5

- Initially, ASM coverage (25%, 50%, 75%, or 100%) would be required on limited access vessels (all tiers) using midwater trawl gear
- If the Council determines that EM/Portside coverage (25%, 50%, 75%, or 100%) is an adequate substitute for ASM coverage, then midwater trawl vessels would be able to choose ASM or EM/Portside coverage
- Conditions on vessels being able to choose include:
  - Vessels be limited to choosing one monitoring type per fishing year
  - Vessels declare their preferred monitoring type six months in advance of the fishing year
  - After consulting with NMFS, the Councils establish a minimum participation threshold for ASM and EM/Portside

# Industry Cost Responsibilities

- NEFOP-Level Observer = \$818 per sea day
- ASM = \$710 per sea day
- EM = \$172 - \$325 per sea day (*plus estimated \$15,000 in startup costs during Year 1*)
- Portside Sampling = \$3.84 - \$5.12 per mt

# Summary of Median Potential Reduction in RTO From Monitoring Costs

- Mackerel Alternative 2.1 – 11.9% to 4.3%
- Mackerel Alternative 2.2 – 10.3% to 1.4%
- Mackerel Alternative 2.3 – 35.1% to 1.4%
- Mackerel Alternative 2.4 – 35.1% to 1.6%
- Mackerel Alternative 2.5 – 10.7% to 0.6%

# Conclusions of Economic Analysis

- Single MWT and Tier 1 SMBT vessels have highest monitoring costs as a percentage of RTO
- Mackerel revenue comprises only a portion of total revenue for vessels participating in the mackerel fishery
- Exempting trips that catch < 25 mt of mackerel reduces monitoring costs
- EM/Portside coverage is generally less expensive than comparable levels of ASM coverage, but not during Year 1 with startup costs for EM equipment
- Mackerel Alternative 2.5 may reduce some of the economic impact by allowing midwater trawl vessels to choose ASM or EM/Portside coverage

# Impacts of Mackerel Alternatives

Alternatives	Mackerel Resource	Non-Target Species	Protected Species	Physical Environment	Fishery-Related Businesses and Communities
Mackerel Alternative 1	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Low Positive
Mackerel Alternative 2	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Negative
Mackerel Alternative 2.1	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Negative
Mackerel Alternative 2.2	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Negative
Mackerel Alternative 2.3	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Negative
Mackerel Alternative 2.4	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Negative
Mackerel Alternative 2.5	Low Positive	Low Positive	Low Positive	Negligible	Negative

# Comments on Mackerel Alternatives

Alternatives	Comments
Alternative 1: (No Action)	40 Support
Alternative 2.1: (NEFOP-Level Observer Coverage)	2 Support, 2 Against
Alternative 2.2: (ASM Coverage)	0 Support, 1 Against
Alternative 2.5: (ASM or EM/Portside Coverage)	3 Support, 2 Against



# Comments on Mackerel Sub-Options

Alternative 2 Sub-Options	Comments
Sub-Option 1: (Waivers)	4 Support, 3 Against
Sub-Option 2: (Wing Vessel Exemption)	5 Support, 1 Against
Sub-Option 3: (2 Year Sunset)	0 Support, 1 Against
Sub-Option 4: (2 Year Re-Evaluation)	5 Support, 1 Against
Sub-Option 5: (Exempt trips less than 25 mt)	3 Support, 2 Against

## \*\*\*Council Decision\*\*\*

- Select Mackerel Alternative 1 (No Action) or Mackerel Alternative 2 (IFM Coverage Target)
- If selecting Mackerel Alternative 2, then select coverage target alternative (Alternatives 2.1-2.5)
- If selecting Mackerel Alternative 2, then consider selecting sub-options (Sub-Options 1-5)

## \*\*\*Council Decision\*\*\*

- If selecting Mackerel Alternatives 2.1-2.5
  - Consider specifying that combined coverage targets would be calculated by NMFS, in consultation with Council staff
- If selecting Mackerel Alternative 2.5
  - Consider specifying that Council would send its determination on whether EM/Portside coverage is an acceptable alternative to ASM coverage for midwater trawl vessels to NMFS in a letter