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Problem Statement

1. Legal constraints prevent NMFS from sharing monitoring costs with the fishing industry.
2. Limited Federal funding for NMFS’s costs prevents NMFS from approving proposals for industry-funded monitoring programs it cannot guarantee funding to support.
3. Need to remedy disapprovals of Herring Am. 5 and Mackerel Am. 14.
   Need to enhance monitoring of herring, mackerel, river herring, shad, haddock, and other species.
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
Omnibus Alternatives

• Alternative 1: No Standardized Industry-Funded Monitoring Programs (No action)
• Alternative 2: Standardized Industry-funded Monitoring Programs
  • Standardize cost responsibilities for NMFS and the fishing industry
  • Establish framework process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring programs
  • Standardize administrative requirements for industry-funded monitoring service providers
  • Establish process to prioritize available Federal funding for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs
Omnibus Alternative 1: No action

- No standardized cost responsibilities for NMFS and the fishing industry
- No framework process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring programs
- No standardized administrative requirements for industry-funded monitoring service providers
- No process to prioritize available Federal funding for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs
- Industry-funded monitoring programs established on a case-by-case basis
Omnibus Alternatives

• Alternative 1: No Standardized Industry-Funded Monitoring Programs (No action)

• Alternative 2: Standardized Industry-funded Monitoring Programs
  • Standardize cost responsibilities for NMFS and the fishing industry
  • Establish framework process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring programs
  • Standardize administrative requirements for industry-funded monitoring service providers
  • Establish process to prioritize available Federal funding for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs
Omnibus Alternative 2: Standardized cost responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMFS Costs</th>
<th>Industry Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and labor for training and debriefing</td>
<td>Program management and provider overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS-issued gear</td>
<td>Salary and per diem for training and debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel selection</td>
<td>Deployments and sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing</td>
<td>All other costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and safety liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Omnibus Alternative 2: Standardized cost responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMFS Cost Responsibilities</th>
<th>Annual Cost (FY2013)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Data Processing Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and labor for training and debriefing</td>
<td>$805,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing</td>
<td>$2,057,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>$2,244,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and executing vessel selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance and safety liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,107,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Omnibus Alternative 2: Standardized cost responsibilities

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

• Alternative 1: No Standardized Industry-Funded Monitoring Programs (No action)

• Alternative 2: Standardized Industry-funded Monitoring Programs
  • Standardize cost responsibilities for NMFS and the fishing industry
  • Establish framework process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring programs
  • Standardize administrative requirements for industry-funded monitoring service providers
  • Establish process to prioritize available Federal funding for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs
Omnibus Alternative 2: Framework Adjustment Process

• Details of any industry-funded monitoring program (at-sea, dockside, or electronic monitoring) would be specified/modified in a framework to the relevant FMP.

• Details may include, but are not limited to:
  1. Level and type of coverage target
  2. Rationale for level and type of coverage
  3. Minimum level of coverage necessary
  4. Consideration of coverage waivers
  5. Process for vessel notification and selection
  6. Process for payment of industry cost responsibilities
  7. Standards for monitoring service providers
  8. Any other measures necessary
Omnibus Alternatives

• Alternative 1: No action
• Alternative 2: Industry-funded Monitoring Programs
  • Standardize cost responsibilities for NMFS and the fishing industry
  • Establish framework process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring programs
  • Standardize administrative requirements for industry-funded monitoring service providers
  • Establish process to prioritize available Federal funding for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs
Omnibus Alternative 2: Monitoring Service Providers

• Expanding SBRM observer service provider to at-sea observer and dockside service providers for all New England and Mid-Atlantic FMPs.

• Would not implement any new observer or dockside monitoring programs, only a process to approve and certify monitoring service providers.

• If the Councils implement any industry-funded monitoring programs through a future action, the process to develop those monitoring programs would be streamlined.
Omnibus Alternatives

• Alternative 1: No Standardized Industry-Funded Monitoring Programs (No action)

• Alternative 2: Standardized Industry-funded Monitoring Programs
  • Standardize cost responsibilities for NMFS and the fishing industry
  • Establish framework process for FMP-specific industry-funded monitoring programs
  • Standardize administrative requirements for industry-funded monitoring service providers
  • Establish process to prioritize available Federal funding for industry-funded monitoring across FMPs
Omnibus Alternative 2: Prioritization Process

General Approach:

• Individual FMPs specify coverage *targets*
• A prioritization process used to determine actual coverage rates for each FMP based on available Federal funding
• Allows NMFS to approve industry-funded monitoring programs contingent upon funding
• Process addresses both New England and Mid-Atlantic FMPs
Omnibus Alternative 2: Prioritization Process

• Discretionary
  • Alternative 2.1 – NMFS-led
  • Alternative 2.2 – Council-led

• Formulaic
  • Alternative 2.3 – Proportional
  • Alternative 2.4 – Coverage Ratio-based
  • Alternative 2.5 – Coverage Ratio-based
Omnibus Alternative 2: Prioritization Process

• Discretionary (Alternatives 2.1 and 2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretion over funding priorities</td>
<td>Requires rulemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes objectives and context into account</td>
<td>Timeline &gt; 1yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Omnibus Alternative 2: Prioritization Process

• Formulaic (Alternatives 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shorter timeline</td>
<td>No discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive to budget changes and timing</td>
<td>Blunt instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Range of Alternatives for IFM Coverage in the Mackerel Fishery

• Alt 1 – No Coverage Targets Specified for IFM (No Action)

• Alt 2 – Coverage Targets Specified for IFM (Action)
  
  • 100% MWT; 100% Tier 1 SMBT; 50% Tier 2 SMBT; 25% Tier 3 SMBT
    
    – Alt 2.1 -- No waivers
    – Alt 2.2 -- Waivers issued

• Percent Coverage Target (51% – 61%) for MWT Fleet
  
  – Alt 2.3 – No waivers
  – Alt 2.4 – Waivers issued
Differences Between Mackerel Alternatives

• How observer coverage is allocated
• Specified amount of the observer coverage target
• Whether or not observer coverage is waived if an observer is not available
• What happens to the observer coverage target after 2 years (expire or re-evaluated)
How Coverage is Allocated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit-Based Coverage</th>
<th>Fleet-Based Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councils manage fisheries by FMP and vessel permit</td>
<td>Consistent with how SBRM allocates observer coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resulting data can be used to monitor FMP-specific quotas and catch caps</td>
<td>Resulting data may be used for quota/catch cap monitoring, stock assessments, and total removals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not consistent with how SBRM allocates observer coverage</td>
<td>Fleets typically extend across FMPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resulting data may not suitable for stock assessment or estimating total removals</td>
<td>Not consistent with how Councils manage fisheries by FMP and vessel permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Mackerel Alternatives

• Biological – Low Positive
  – Additional information to track catch against quota and cap (Alts 2.1 and 2.2)
  – Additional information to track catch against harvest limits and use in stock assessments (Alts 2.3 and 2.4)
  – No waivers would likely limit fishing effort and harvest

• Economic – Negative
  – Increased trip costs associated with paying for an observer on a trip
  – No waivers would likely limit fishing effort and harvest
  – Additional information to track catch against quotas and caps (Alts 2.1 and 2.2)
  – Additional information to track catch against harvest limits and use in stock assessments (Alts 2.3 and 2.4)
January NEFMC Motions

• Motion 1 in Feb 4 Letter:
  – Alternative for third party at-sea monitor to document slippage on Category A + B herring vessels
  – 50%, 75%, or 100% coverage
  – Portside and electronic monitoring to be phased-in as they become available, with at-sea monitoring coverage adjusted
January NEFMC Motions

• Motion 3 in Feb 4 Letter:
  – Alternative to exempt wing vessels from observer coverage
  – Wing vessel would be prohibited from carrying fish
January NEFMC Motions

• Motion 5 in Feb 4 Letter:
  – Expand discussion of impacts of herring mackerel alternatives (particularly economic)
  – Analysis of costs of Portside and Electronic monitoring to allow FW
  – Cost comparison of observers vs at-sea monitors
  – Expansion of impacts of herring/mackerel options on other fisheries (groundfish)
  – Impacts of coverage requirements for midwater trawl vessels in groundfish closed areas
Next Steps...

• Aiming for document approval/selection of preferred at June NEFMC meeting
• Additional guidance from Mid-Atlantic Council
  – Goals for at-sea monitors for mackerel?
  – Additional analysis not referenced in NEFMC motions?
Questions?