

MEMORANDUM

DATE: Dec 7, 2015

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 Omnibus Amendment Development

1. The PDT/FMAT met at the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office on November 30, 2015, to continue development of the Industry-funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment. PDT/FMAT participants included Carly Bari, Carrie Nordeen, Katie Richardson, Dan Luers, Brant McAfee (NMFS GARFO), Wendy Gabriel (voting member of the NEFMC Observer Policy Committee), Amy Martins, Sara Weeks (NMFS NEFSC), Jason Didden (MAFMC), Maria Jacob (NEFMC), and several members of the public, including Observer and Herring Committee member MaryBeth Tooley.
2. The PDT received updates on the status of the IFM Omnibus Alternatives option. These included:
 - a. Current status of Omnibus Alternative 2 options.
 - b. Discussion on adding a Monitoring Set-Aside Provision as an option for Omnibus Alternative 2.
 - i. Details for development and management of Set-Aside program
 - ii. Is it economically viable in a low profitability/low value fishery seeking high monitoring coverage?
 - c. Review prioritization process. Can it be used to consider differential impacts of permit/gear modification requirements?
 - d. Issues to be addressed:
 - i. Where to evaluate concept that higher number of vessels in same area is easier for a monitoring service provider to service (versus few vessels in scattered locations)?
 - ii. Where to evaluate vessels switching between gear types during a season, which may subject them to different monitoring requirements (one vessel has switched between MWT and purse seine gear this year.)

3. The PDT received updates of the status of the IFM Herring and Mackerel Coverage Target Alternatives. These Included:
 - a. Current status of Herring and Mackerel Coverage Alternative Options
 - i. Presented comprehensive monitoring package alternatives for the herring fishery providing a range of data collection options and program costs.
 - ii. Present current range of options for mackerel.
 - b. Discussion of Alternative 2, sub-option 1, which would allow a waiver if coverage was not available due lack of funding or logistics. If no waiver granted, then fishery effort will be reduced to match monitoring availability.
 - c. Process of getting an observer or monitor would involve first calling NEFOP for SBRM observer, then call service provider. Observer may not be provided if:
 - i. No monitor is available from any service provider (possible waiver)
 - ii. If the vessel has outstanding balance, the service provider can reject the trip for coverage and vessel cannot fish without violating observer coverage requirements (No waiver)
 - d. Issues to Address
 - i. Describe what data are used for herring and mackerel stock assessments
 - ii. Indicate that NEFOP observer has a national policy of a minimum education requirement (bachelor's degree)
 - iii. Revision of data tables to include updated information including
 1. RTO as a percentage of herring catch value.
 2. Inclusion of standard deviation and (possibly) median into data tables. Drew will provide median data before Christmas.
 3. Edit data attributes table (gear, area, total catch, discards, economic data) to include cells with only yes/no values.
 4. Consolidate and simplify Data Interest Tables, and indicate that non-target species may include marine mammals and seabirds.
 5. Separate self-reporting and independent reporting into two tables.
 6. Standardize cell text
 7. Combine total catch with catch cap rows in table or combine scientific information and total catch rows.
 8. Change "discard estimates" to "discard rates."
 9. Provide rationale in data utility tables for low/medium/high meeting of data interest
 - iv. Edit HER Alternatives 2.5 and 2.6. Possibly make these sub-options of other alternatives. (Sub-option only applicable to 2.6, will not work for 2.5) Carrie and NOAA SFD will look at how to change this.
 - v. Evaluate whether a CV analysis can be done for the different coverage levels to help compare and contrast alternatives (Brant)

- vi. Analyze potential for behavioral change (shorter trips, consolidate companies, drop target species) to avoid monitoring costs

MEMORANDUM

DATE: Dec 16, 2015

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 Omnibus Amendment Development

1. The PDT/FMAT met by webinar on Dec 14, 2015, to continue development of the Industry-funded Monitoring Omnibus Amendment. PDT/FMAT participants included: Brant McAfee, Carly Bari, Carrie Nordeen, Katie Richardson, Dan Luers (NMFS GARFO); Dr. Wendy Gabriel (voting member of the New England Fishery Management Council Observer Committee), Andrew Kitts , Amy Martins, (NMFS NEFSC), Jason Didden (MAFMC); Maria Jacob , Rachel Feeney (NEFMC); and several members of the public, including Observer Policy Committee member Jeff Kaelin.

2. The PDT received updates on the status of the IFM Omnibus Alternatives and Herring and Mackerel Alternatives. These included:
 - a. Presented updated Data Utility Tables which addressed previous comments
 - i. Table 1 updated to reflect national policy for NEFOP education requirement.
 - ii. Changed Tables 2&3 to yes/no for monitoring types
 - iii. Table 4 updated to reflect national policy for NEFOP education requirement. Clarified that this table contains what responsibilities are being considered for each monitoring type (but reflects current NEFOP responsibilities). Noted that increase in responsibilities for certain monitoring types also increases training costs, although there still may be some realized savings in cost.
 - iv. Discussion ensued over whether both Table 1 and Table 4 were both necessary. Both were deemed necessary as Table 1 (along with Tables 2&3) would be in the Omnibus Alternative section, while Table 4 would be in the Herring and Mackerel Alternatives.
 - b. Presented Matrix Data Utility Tables (most PDT-recommended revisions from November 30, 2015 would be made at a later date)

- i. Condensed and simplified data presented in Herring Matrix and Mackerel Matrix tables. Comments that would be addressed in future table edits include:
 - 1. Box for Catch Cap Monitoring should not be black (N/A) for dealer data (recommended to be white/light grey (High/Medium)).
 - 2. Possible reorganization of retained/discarded catch for herring and haddock (e.g. split cells in Data Interest column?). NMFS SFD will look into best way to clarify this.
- ii. Clarified that the color codes contained in these tables mostly represent how well each meets the needs of coverage.
- iii. Look at adding (fishing) area into tables.
- c. Presented updated Herring and Mackerel Alternative Tables which addressed previous comments.
 - i. PDT thought that these tables were useful and informative and should be included.
 - ii. Version II was seen as preferable to Version I by the PDT.
 - iii. Comments still to be addressed in these tables include:
 - 1. Recommend getting rid of “Fishery Dependent Data” column. It infers that there is also pertinent fishery independent data, which does not apply here.
 - 2. Clarify what “No Action” means, and that current monitoring protocol would be “No Action”. Clarify that all Alternative 2 items are in addition to “No Action”.
 - 3. Affidavits have low ability to meet data needs; add to table.
 - 4. An updated table with narrative to provide context for the tables will be provided for PDT review at a later date.
- d. Presented updated economic summary tables for herring coverage target alternatives.
 - i. PDT thought vessel and fleet summary tables were useful and decided to include mean, standard deviation, and total monitoring costs in the tables.
 - ii. Reviewed box plots and agreed to include box plots following summary tables for each alternative. Drew agreed to incorporate box plot means into summary tables.
- e. PDT discussed impacts of 25 mt thresholds (sub-option 5) and behavior changes as a result of IFM monitoring requirements.
 - i. Jason will draft text on threshold impacts, thresholds and behavior changes (shorter trips, consolidate companies, drop target species) and will have Drew and Rachel provide feedback on the draft text on behavior changes.
- f. PDT discuss potential qualitative analysis of coverage levels

- i. Brant mentioned CV analysis of coverage levels for ASM and NEFOP coverage levels may be possible. CV analysis not possible for EM or portside because there is no baseline to compare. Brant estimated needing more than two weeks to complete analysis, and did not feel comfortable setting a specific timeframe for completion because analysis may take longer than expected.
 - ii. Several PDT members expressed interest in the CV analysis, which can help inform deliberations for an appropriate level of monitoring to meet FMP goals. The Council would consider a balance between the utility of the data and the additional monitoring needs. Therefore, informed discussion on the changes in data precision (CV) at each interval of coverage (25, 50, 75, and 100) would inform Committee and Council deliberations.
 - iii. PDT discussed that the relative data utility of ASM just collecting information on discards could be qualitatively compared to other monitoring types and coverage levels.
- g. PDT discussed timeline for IFM Amendment and whether the updated analysis for the herring and mackerel alternatives would be complete for January NEFMC meeting. The information regarding the CV analysis would be beneficial for the herring and mackerel discussions at the Committee and Council level. Council staff would discuss with the Committee Chairman and other Council staff. In addition, Council staff expressed concern with a January Committee meeting date to discuss the herring and mackerel alternatives due to time conflicts with other Council meetings.