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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
Mackerel Alternatives

• Mackerel Alternative 1: No action

• Mackerel Coverage targets specified for industry-funded monitoring programs (waiver and no waiver options)
  – Permit-based alternatives:
    • 100% NEFOP-equivalent coverage on limited access MWT and Tier 1 SMBT; 50% coverage on Tier 2 SMBT; 25% coverage on Tier 3 SMBT
    • 100%, 75%, and 50% At-sea monitors (w/ RH/S sampling) on MWT and Tier 1 SMBT
  – Fleet-based alternatives:
    • NEFOP-equivalent coverage on MWT Fleet to achieve a 30% CV on river herring and shad catch
  – Other alternatives:
    • Wing vessel exempt from coverage; vessels prohibited from carrying fish
# Cost Responsibilities Associated with NEFOP Coverage

<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>
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

**EM 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 |
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

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

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

Variety of Issues to resolve...
## Timeline

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

- Add EM/Portside Alternative (MWT)
- Add fleet-based 100% alternative
- Timeline issues
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 (hardrive 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