MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 27, 2016

TO: New England Fishery Management Council
Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council

FROM: Industry-Funded Monitoring Plan Development Team/Fishery Management Action Team

SUBJECT: Industry-Funded Monitoring (IFM) Omnibus Amendment Development

1. The PDT/FMAT met by via teleconference on May 4, 2016, to consider the motions made at the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Council meetings held in April 2016 and discuss revisions to the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA). PDT/FMAT participants included: Brant McAfee, Brett Alger, Carly Bari, Carrie Nordeen, Dan Luers (NMFS GARFO); Dr. Andrew Kitts, Amy Martins (NMFS NEFSC), Jason Didden (MAFMC); Dr. Jamie Cournane, Maria Jacob, Dr. Rachel Feeney (NEFMC).

2. The New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) recommended that the Draft EA include additional narrative descriptions for the box plots used in the economic impacts section to help the public interpret these figures. PDT/FMAT members had provided three sets of language to help better describe these figures. The group selected one alternative as the language to use as an illustrative example for the first figure and make highlight statements for the following figures in the EA.

3. A member of the Herring Advisory Panel requested that we investigate the economic impacts based on trip declaration as opposed to landings data. Drew was able to do some preliminary analysis to present to the group. The PDT/FMAT reviewed this analysis and discussed some of the improvements and modifications that could be made for inclusion in the Draft EA.

4. Andrew Kitts provided an explanation to the group on why it is not appropriate to use herring return-to-owner (RTO) in the economic analysis. In order to properly apportion RTO to a particular fishery in instances where a vessel participates in more than one, both revenues and costs (the two components of RTO) must be apportioned among the different fisheries. Revenues can be easily apportioned because the data on revenue is tracked by fishery. However, some types of costs cannot easily be allocated to a fishery due to the nature of these costs. For example, insurance costs don't correspond with the

amount or type of fishing being done and so methods for apportioning such costs (they could be apportioned based on the value gained from each fishery or by the weight or effort in each fishery) are arbitrary. Other types of costs (e.g., fuel costs), could be apportioned to each fishery if those costs were collected at the trip level. The survey used in the RTO analysis did not use trip level cost data, but instead used data at the annual level. In the previous attempt to calculate a herring RTO (vs. total RTO), revenue shares were used to apportion all costs to each fishery. In retrospect, this method should not have been used due to its arbitrary nature. And so it was decided that a separate herring RTO analysis should not be provided. Instead, the Draft EA will describe in detail the different sources of revenue for each of the vessel types examined.

5. Brant McAfee provided the group an update on the CV analysis he is working on for inclusion in the Draft EA. This analysis was done previously, but following motions made at the April Council meetings to adjust the at-sea monitoring (ASM) sampling design, this analysis has been updated (the draft analysis will be provided as a supplemental document to the Draft EA). Also, based on suggestions made by the NEFMC, the update will include CV analysis for the No Action alternative. Brant also notified the group of varying limitations on the analysis primarily due to lack of data.

6. GARFO staff clarified that the Draft EA will provide language that is more explicit on having 50% or 100% as options for the electronic monitoring (EM) and portside sampling alternatives.

7. In April both Council made motions that would extend slippage reporting requirements, restrictions (i.e., allowable slippage events include mechanical failure, excess catch of dogfish, or safety concerns), and consequence measures to all types of industry-funded monitoring. The PDT/FMAT discussed the ability of EM to determine and verify the cause of a slippage event which would be required to extend the slippage consequence measures. At this time, there is confidence that EM can detect whether or not a slippage event occurs, therefore making it reasonable to extend the slippage reporting requirements and restrictions to EM. However, it is unknown if EM can detect the cause of a slippage event, therefore making it difficult to extend the slippage consequence measures to EM. The Herring/Mackerel EM Project may provide more information on the capability of EM to determine the cause of a slippage event, but we will not know those results until 2017.

   There was additional discussion about alternative consequence measures that could potentially be considered for EM trips. One idea was that if EM can generally identify slippage events, then a uniform consequence that does not differentiate between causes may be feasible. Another idea included altering the video review rate, per vessel, based

on compliance with slippage restrictions. For example, if a vessel had been found to out of compliance with the slippage restriction, their video review rate would be increased. Alternatively, good behavior in regards to the slippage restrictions could be rewarded with a lowered video review rate. However, the overall sentiment was that it would be best to consider slippage consequence measures on EM trips after the conclusion of the EM pilot.

The PDT/FMAT recommends that the Council not apply consequence measures to EM at this time, but that applying the slippage consequence measures to different types of industry-funded monitoring be made frameworkable.

8. In April the NEFMC made a motion that would require at-sea monitors to collect length data, but not age data (i.e., scales or otoliths from fish) or biological samples (from marine mammals, sea birds, and sea turtles). Some PDT/FMAT members would like to investigate if there are data utility links between collecting age and length data together. GARFO staff will be reaching out to NEFSC staff in the Population Dynamics Branch to verify there are no data utility concerns for this change in sampling design.

9. The PDT/FMAT discussed the differences in sampling design between NEFOP-level observers and portside samplers. They are collecting baskets for sampling at different rates and applying them differently, either by the haul or by the trip. However, both sets of data are extrapolated for the entire trip, therefore the results won't necessarily be different despite using different sampling intensities.

10. In April the NEFMC made a motion that would require ASM through the IFM alternatives to obtain a high volume fisheries (HVF) training. The PDT/FMAT verified that are no technical concerns with this change and that the Fisheries Sampling Branch can develop HVF training tailored for ASM.

11. In April both Councils made motions to clarify that the coverage targets in the IFM alternatives should be calculated using a combined method to take into account SBRM observer coverage. It is understood that there are some technical challenges to calculating the coverage targets using this approach. The PDT/FMAT clarified that the methodology used to calculate the coverage targets in the herring and mackerel fisheries would need to be simplified from the methodology used in the groundfish fishery, to feasibility issues regarding timing difference in the herring and mackerel fishing year and workload.

    The PDT/FMAT recommends that the Council specify the combined coverage target be calculated using the previous year's SBRM coverage in the herring and mackerel

fisheries as a proxy for determining the amount of industry-funded monitoring needed to reach the desired coverage target. Therefore, this methodology would always operate on a one-year lag.

The PDT/FMAT discussed some of the timing challenges in obtaining the finalized SBRM coverage for the previous year and how that coordinates with the herring and mackerel fishing year. Additionally, it was suggested the additional coverage would be calculated by NMFS, based on the Councils target and the SBRM coverage on the previous year.