



## New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116

John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

# DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

## Monkfish PDT Conference Call

October 4, 2016

The Monkfish PDT met via conference call to review the draft management alternatives for Framework 10 and the results of the DAS allocation and trip limit analysis.

**MEETING ATTENDANCE:** Dr. Fiona Hogan (Chair), Mr. Greg Ardini, Dr. Trish Clay, Ms. Sarah Gurtman, Dr. Jay Hermesen, Dr. Tammy Murphy, Dr. Anne Richards, Keri Stepanek, and Dr. William Whitmore. Vincent Balzano and approximately 3 members of the public listened as well.

### **KEY OUTCOMES:**

- The PDT discussed edits to the draft management alternatives for Framework 10.
- The PDT reviewed the DAS allocation and trip limit analysis and is awaiting feedback from the AP and Committee before further refinement.

### **AGENDA ITEM #1: DRAFT MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR FRAMEWORK 10**

The PDT reviewed and discussed the draft management alternatives for updates to annual catch limits and DAS allocation and trip limits for both the Northern Fishery Management Area (NFMA) and Southern Fishery Management Area (SFMA). The PDT had no major revisions before the upcoming AP (October 12, 2016) and Committee (October 18, 2016).

### **AGENDA ITEM #2: DAS ALLOCATION AND TRIP LIMIT ANALYSIS**

The PDT reviewed the results of the DAS allocation and trip limit analysis (Hermesen, 2016). The analysis works by taking accounting for the incidental limits and then allocating the remaining quota to the directed fishery based on the pattern of fishing in the most recent complete fishing year. Key assumptions of the analysis include that landings from permit category E and state-only permitted vessels, limited access vessel landings and effort, and fishing and landing patterns will all be the same as in FY2015. These assumptions have not been violated throughout the history of using this model configuration so the PDT considered the assumptions to be valid. One caveat of the analysis is that it doesn't include other factors, such as price, when it estimates the number of DAS or potential daily landing limits that would achieve the TAL. It is important to

acknowledge that additional factors may need to be considered when selecting an appropriate DAS allocation and/or daily landing limit for both management areas.

The monkfish fishery operates differently between the 2 management areas. The NFMA is dominated by incidental landings in permit categories, A, B, C, and D (TABLE 4, Hermesen, 2016). The NFMA fishery is not limited by DAS allocations or the daily landing limit. The number of DAS used in the NFMA is low (Figure 1, Hermesen, 2016). The number of permit holders using their full allocation is low in the NFMA.

The majority of landings in the SFMA come from directed trips. Because more directed trips occur in the south, the southern fishery is restricted by DAS allocations and trip limits. Some vessels in the SFMA are using their entire DAS allocations (Figure 2, Hermesen, 2016). Therefore we would expect to see a larger impact on landings in the SFMA rather than the NFMA if the DAS allocations or daily landings limits were increased.

Five model runs were conducted for each management area (Table 7, Hermesen, 2016). The runs solved for maximum value for either the DAS allocation or the daily landing limit that would be needed to achieve the TAL. The runs indicated increases could be made to the DAS allocations and daily landing limits for both management areas. The PDT acknowledges that the Council may want to implement a combination of DAS and daily landing limit changes. The current model runs do not account for that. A final model run indicating how much of the TAL could be achieved from the Council's recommendations for DAS allocations and/or daily landing limits may not be available by the time of final action.

Feedback from the public strongly supported an incremental approach to increasing the DAS allocations and daily landing limits that the model runs suggested. A member of the public also recommended examining the amount of skates being landed on monkfish trips to determine whether skate were limiting monkfish landings. It was also recommended that winter skate be managed in conjunction with the monkfish FMP.

The PDT intends to begin analyzing impacts of the draft management alternatives but guidance from the AP and Committee will help refine the alternatives and subsequently the impacts.