

Industry-Funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Avalon, New Jersey
April 12, 2017

Amendment Updates

- Both Councils selected preferred omnibus alternatives in early 2016
- NEFMC selected preferred herring alternatives at its January 2017 meeting
- NEFMC recommended taking final action on this amendment at its April 2017 meeting

Amendment Timeline

Dates	Action
January-February 2016	NEFMC and MAFMC selected preferred omnibus alternatives
June 2016	MAFMC and NEFMC approved Draft EA for public comment
September-November 2016	Public comment period and public hearings EM project began
December 2016	MAFMC considered selecting preferred mackerel alternatives
January 2017	NEFMC selected preferred herring alternatives
April 2017	NEFMC and MAFMC consider taking final action
May-November 2017	Finalize EA and rulemaking
December 2017	Final report on EM project
2018	Amendment implemented

OMNIBUS ALTERNATIVES

What is the Purpose of the Omnibus Alternatives?

- 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
- Allow NMFS to approve new IFM programs before funding is determined to be available

Goals for Discussion of Omnibus Alternatives

- Review the preferred omnibus alternatives
- Consider clarifications to the preferred omnibus alternatives recommended by the NEFMC

Preferred Omnibus Alternatives

Omnibus Alternative 2

- Standardized structure for new IFM programs
 - Standard cost responsibilities
 - Standard process for new IFM programs to be implemented via framework
 - Standard requirements for IFM service providers
 - Standard process to implement monitoring set-asides via framework

Preferred Omnibus Alternatives

Omnibus Alternative 2.2

- Council-led prioritization process to allocated available Federal funding
 - Equal weighing approach to allocate available Federal funding

Omnibus Alternative 2.6

- Ability to develop monitoring set-aside in a future framework

NEFMC Recommended Clarifications

Omnibus Alternative 2

- No new IFM programs implemented via a framework
 - Standard process for new IFM programs to be implemented via amendment and revised via framework

Omnibus Alternative 2.2

- Equal weighing approach would be re-adjusted on an as-needed basis

Meeting Outcomes

- Do you want to adopt the clarifications to the preferred omnibus alternatives recommended by the NEFMC?
- Do you want to take final action on the omnibus alternatives?

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.

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.				

Goals for Discussion of Mackerel Alternatives

- Review the preferred herring coverage target alternatives
- Consider selecting preferred mackerel alternatives
- Consider clarifications and adjustments to the preferred herring alternatives recommended by the Herring Committee
- Consider adopting similar clarifications and adjustments for the mackerel alternatives

Preferred Herring Alternatives

Herring Alternative 2

- IFM coverage targets for herring fishery

Herring Alternative 2.5

- 100% observer coverage on midwater trawl vessels fishing in Groundfish Closed Areas

Preferred Herring Alternative

Herring Alternative 2.7

- Initially 50% ASM coverage on Category A and B vessels
- If NEFMC determines EM/PS is adequate substitute for ASM, vessels can choose between 50% ASM and 50% EM/PS coverage
- Once vessels can choose monitoring type
 - Choose 1 monitoring type per year
 - Declare monitoring type 6 months in advance
 - Minimum participation level for monitoring types

Preferred Herring Sub-Options

- Sub- Option 1: Waiver allowed if IFM coverage is not available
- Sub-Option 2: Wing vessel exempt from IFM requirements
- 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 herring

Meeting Outcomes

- Do you want to select preferred mackerel alternatives and sub-options?

Herring Committee Recommended Clarifications for Herring Alternative 2

- Clarification 1B - Federal funding prioritized to ASM and EM/PS coverage (Alternative 2.7) before MWT vessels fishing in GF Closed Areas
- Clarification 1C – Combined coverage targets calculated by NMFS, in consultation with Council staff
- Clarification 1D - If herring and mackerel coverage targets do not match, the higher coverage target applies on trips declared into both fisheries

Herring Committee Recommended Clarifications for Herring Alternative 2.7

- Clarification 3A – NEFMC initially evaluates EM/PS suitability for MWT vessels, but it may evaluate EM/PS for other gear types in the future
- Clarification 3B – Alternative specifies general process for NMFS to consult with NEFMC to approve EM/PS
 - Similar process implemented in GF Amendment 16
- Clarification 3C – Minimum participation threshold clarification is still being developed, but may specify number of vessels required for NMFS to operate a monitoring program or generate adequate catch cap estimates

Herring Committee Recommended Clarifications for Herring Sub-Options

- Clarification 4A – Sub-Option 1 allows coverage waivers to be issued on a trip-by-trip basis to vessels using ASM and EM/PS
- Clarifications 5A and 7A – NMFS issues waivers for trips identified in PTNS as “wing vessel” or “less than 25 mt of mackerel” trips
 - Vessel must adhere to the conditions of the exemption, otherwise it will be out of compliance with IFM coverage requirements

Herring Committee Recommended Adjustment for Herring Alternative 2.7

- Issue 1 – Delaying ability of MWT vessels to choose between ASM and EM/PS until 2019 may be a disincentive for MWT vessels to use EM/PS
- Recommendation – Adjust timing of IFM Amendment implementation so that MWT vessels choose (if appropriate) between ASM and EM/PS in 2018
- EM projects ends December 2017
- Vessels limited to one monitoring type per year
- If there is a full year between the end of the EM project and when MWT vessels can use EM/PS, then vessels may not expend time and money to re-install EM equipment

Herring Committee Recommended Adjustment for Coverage Targets

- Issue 2 - How coverage targets are calculated may affect a vessel's ability to choose the more cost effective monitoring type and may discourage a vessel from using EM/PS
 - NEFMC recommended combined coverage targets for observer and ASM coverage and additive coverage targets for EM/PS
- Recommendation – Specify that coverage targets for observers, ASM, and EM/PS are calculated by combining SBRM and IFM coverage
- Using combined coverage targets may help reduce the cost of IFM for vessels
- Using both combined and additive coverage targets may be a disincentive for vessels to use EM/PS

Herring Committee Recommended Adjustment for Slippage Requirements

- Issue 3 – Compliance burden may be higher on trips with EM compared to ASM, but the sampling rate on EM/PS and ASM trips would be the same (50%)
 - NEFMC recommended slippage requirements (prohibition and reporting) apply on all trips with ASM (50%) and EM (100%)
 - MAFMC recommended slippage requirements (prohibition and reporting) apply on all trips with ASM and EM
- Recommendation – Specify that slippage requirements (prohibitions and reporting) apply on all trips sampled portside (50%)
- Potential inequity in compliance burden between trips with ASM and EM/PS
- May be a disincentive for vessels to use EM/PS

Herring Committee Recommended Adjustment for Slippage Consequence Measures

- Issue – If EM cannot verify the reason for slippage, it may not be an appropriate tool to verify compliance with consequence measures
 - NEFMC recommended slippage consequence measures apply on all trips with ASM (50%) and EM (100%)
 - MAFMC recommended slippage consequence measures apply on all trips with ASM but not EM
- Recommendation – Specify that a 15-mile slippage consequence measure applies on all trips sampled portside (50%)
- Unknown if EM can verify the reason for slippage
- NMFS may have difficulty approving EM as a tool to verify compliance with slippage consequence measures
- Potential inequity in compliance burden between trips with ASM and EM
- May be a disincentive for vessels to use EM/PS

Meeting Outcomes

- Do you want to adopt any of the clarifications recommended by the Herring Committee?
- Do you want to adopt any of the adjustments recommended by the Herring Committee?
- Do you want to take final action on the mackerel alternatives?