Industry-funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment

Portside and Electronic Monitoring Alternatives for the Midwater Trawl Fleet

By Aja Szumylo and Carrie Nordeen

Observer Policy Committee Meeting

April 16, 2015

Purpose and Need

- Allow Councils to implement IFM programs with available Federal funding
- Allow Councils and NMFS to prioritize available Federal funding among FMPs
- Establish monitoring coverage targets for the Atlantic herring and Atlantic mackerel fisheries

Herring Alternatives

- Herring Alternative 1: No coverage target specified for industry-funded monitoring programs (No action)

- Herring Alternative 2: Coverage target specified for industry-funded monitoring programs (waiver and no waiver options)
  - *Permit-based alternatives (would apply to Category A + B vessels)*:
    - 100% NEFOP-equivalent coverage target
    - 100% At-sea monitor coverage target
    - 75% At-sea monitor coverage target
    - 50% At-sea monitor coverage target
  - *Fleet-based alternatives:*
    - NEFOP-equivalent coverage on MWT Fleet to achieve a 30% CV on river herring and shad catch
    - 100% NEFOP-equivalent coverage on MWT Fleet in Groundfish Closed Areas
  - *Other alternatives*:
    - Wing vessel exempt from coverage; vessels prohibited from carrying fish

Cost Responsibilities Associated with NEFOP Coverage

Industry Cost Responsibilities	Cost per observed sea day (FY2013)
Salary and per diem for travel, deployments and debriefing	• Sea day charges paid to providers: $640/day • Travel: $71/day • Meals: $22/day • Other non-sea day charges: $12/day
Equipment	$11/day
Costs for cancellation without notification	$1/day
Provider overhead and project management costs	Training: $61/day
Other costs	TBD – depends on implemented program
Total (not including other costs)	$818/day

Electronic Monitoring (EM) and Portside Sampling

- May be a more cost effective way to monitor herring and mackerel fisheries
- Coverage would initially focus on MWT fleet
  - Fewer than 20 vessels
  - ME to NJ
  - Harvests majority of herring (73%) and river herring and shad in herring and mackerel fisheries (57%)
  - Discard less than 5% of catch at sea

EM Alternative

- Electronic Monitoring used to:
  - Verify retention of catch for portside sampling
  - Possibly used to verify compliance with discard reporting requirements (i.e., released catch affidavits)
- Sampling design
  - Carry EM for duration of fishing year
  - EM video footage recorded throughout entire trip or around haulback
  - EM video footage sampled (either 100% or less than 100%) to verify retention

EM Alternative Responsibilities

Vessel	• Obtain/operate cameras and software • Contract with service provider to ensure proper operation, data review, and summary • Transfer hardrives to/from NMFS
Service Provider	• Install, troubleshoot, remove EM systems • Sample/review EM video footage and produce summary reports for NMFS
NMFS	• Review and validate/cross-check provider's EM summary data reports • Develop EM type approval, provider approval, data and report standards

Individual Vessel Monitoring Plans

- Approved by NMFS as part of EM installation process
- Plan includes:
  - Equipment operation and configuration
  - Catch handling protocol
  - Data storage/sampling/transfer protocols

Retention Requirements

- Upon implementation, MWT fishery continues to operate as it has in the past
- Through VMPs, NMFS can develop and modify retention requirements
- NMFS can regulate/define retention, if necessary, after NMFS determines camera capabilities

EM Operational Details

- When does camera collect video footage?
  - Only around haulback
  - For the duration of the entire trip
- How much of video footage is reviewed?
  - NMFS determines appropriate level
  - Council selects level for NMFS to apply

EM Operational Details (continued)

- Equipment malfunctions
  - Sensors - manual operation
  - Camera - results in trip termination?
- Compliance incentives
  - Require vessel to pay for higher level of video review
  - Lose EM privileges and require human observer/at-sea coverage

Exempted Fishing Permits

- Traditionally used to exempt vessels from existing requirements
- EFP likely not necessary provided that alternative requirements are flexible and adjusted during rulemaking/implementation
  - Vessel monitoring plan
- EFP likely not necessary because NMFS can learn from Pacific whiting EFP and HMS

Future Uses for EM

- Tracking reason for slippage events
- Tracking compliance with proposed slippage consequences
- Quantify amount of discarded catch
- Applicability for other gear types
- Identify interactions with protected species

Portside Sampling Alternative

Portside sampling used to:

- Verify amount/species composition of catch in the herring and mackerel fisheries
- Help track catch against caps for RH/S and haddock

Portside Sampling Alternative

Sampling design

- Sample MWT trips in port
- Methodology consistent with NEFOP protocols
- Basket samples at 5-min intervals
- Baskets sorted and weighed by species
- Species composition of sub-samples extrapolated to total catch based on vessel hail weight
- Actual weights verified against VTR

Portside Sampling Alternative

- Initially 100% of MWT trips sampled
- For 2013, MWT ports included:
  - ME (Portland, Rockland, Vinalhaven, Prospect Harbor, Jonesport, Milbridge)
  - NH (Newington)
  - MA (Boston, Gloucester, New Bedford)
  - RI (Point Judith, North Kingston)
  - NJ (Cape May)

Portside Sampling Alternative Responsibilities

Vessel	• Contract with service provider for sampler to sample entire offload
Service Provider	• Manage portside sampling program • Training/scheduling samplers • Data collection/storage/processing • Providing data/summary reports to NMFS
NMFS	• Review and validate/cross-check data and/or summary data • Develop sampling/data quality standards, provider approval, training standards

EM/Portside Issues to Resolve

To be resolved before Councils select preferred alternatives

- Portside program structure (States as service providers? State/Federal partnership?)
- Better definition of how the prioritization process would break out based on data need
- Percent coverage for EM (when camera is on, digital image review)
- Cost estimates for coverage and completed economic analysis
- Description of how various components of IFM programs (i.e., observer coverage/ASM, portside sampling, EM) for herring/mackerel fisheries can be combined to create a comprehensive monitoring program
- Interaction with existing/recommended slippage requirements

EM/Portside Issues to Resolve

To be resolved before Councils take final action

- Data flow (harddrive transfer, provider submissions to NMFS, etc.)
- Vessel, service provider and NMFS responsibilities (in flux due to national policy and regional coordination)

To be resolved during rulemaking/implementation

- Data and training standards
- EM type approval
- Service provider standards (EM/Portside)
- Available NMFS funding

Structure of Herring Alternatives

- Plan to develop packages of alternatives to address different fleets/gear types
- Alternatives vary by:
  - How coverage meets monitoring objectives
  - End use of data (quota monitoring, stock assessments)
  - Cost

Timeline

Dates	Meeting/Deadline	Action
June 8, 2015	Joint Herring/Observer Policy Committee Meeting	
September 11, 2015	NEFMC Briefing book deadline	Revised EA complete for release
September 29 – October 1, 2015	NEFMC Meeting	NEFMC selects preferred alternatives
October 6 – 8, 2015	MAFMC Meeting	MAFMC selects preferred alternatives
October/November 2015		30-day comment period on draft EA
January 2016	NEFMC Meeting	NEFMC takes final action
February 2016	MAFMC Meeting	MAFMC takes final action
March - June 2016		EA finalized, proposed rule and final rulemaking
July 2016		Final rule effective