



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*

Monkfish PDT MEETING SUMMARY

Mariners House, Boston, MA
November 1, 2016

The PDT met to discuss the updated DAS allocation and trip limit analysis and biological, EFH, and protected resource impacts for Framework 10.

1. The PDT reviewed the alternatives under consideration for Framework 10. The PDT recommended the following:
 - Changing the headings of Options 3 and 4 for specifications to reduce confusion as these alternatives reduce the management uncertainty buffers in the respective management areas.
 - Adding an additional alternative under the DAS allocation and trip limit for the SFMA that would adjust both the DAS allocation and trip limits as directed by the Committee. This would help streamline further analysis of the alternatives. Options 2 and 3 could be moved to the considered but rejected section by the Committee.
2. The PDT discussed the results of the updated DAS allocation and trip limit analysis (Hermesen, 2016). The analysis was run for the proposed combined changes of 15% increase in both the SFMA DAS allocation and trip limits. The projected landings that could be achieved under this change were estimated to be 12,345,092 lb (5,600 mt).
3. The fishing pattern in FY2015 in the NFMA indicated that the incidental trip limits when vessels were on a NE multispecies DAS were not restricting for the majority of trips (Hermesen, 2016). If the incidental limits were increased to 1,500 lb and 1,250 lb. for category C and D vessels, respectively, there would likely be no need to declare a monkfish DAS in the NFMA as the majority of trips landed less than these proposed limits. The lower limits of 900 and 750 lb for C and D vessels would reduce the need to use a monkfish DAS in the NFMA with a small number of trips landing more monkfish than these limits. This would not be expected to increase fishing effort or landings in the NFMA. The majority of trips are landing less than the existing incidental trip limits so this would not be expected to increase landings by converting regulatory discards into landings. If the majority of effort was transitioned to a NE multispecies DAS, only a few trips would be expected to continue on a monkfish DAS. Therefore, under the current

fishing pattern, if incidental trip limits are increased to the highest level then increases in NFMA monkfish DAS could be made without increasing landings in the NFMA. The PDT did not have any recommendations at this time that would increase landings in the NFMA.

4. The PDT reviewed the draft biological, EFH, and protected resource impacts for the draft alternatives under consideration in FW10. Overall, negative biological and EFH impacts were not expected for the alternatives. Negative impacts could be expected for increases in DAS allocations and trip limits in the SFMA for protected resources if it resulted in more interactions with protected resources. Low negative protected resource impacts would be expected for the other FW10 alternatives. A number of edits were suggested to the draft impact sections and would be included in the documents sent to the Council and Committee.
5. More time was needed for economic impacts to be written. The PDT intended to provide a draft in time for the Council mailing with further edits to be provided in advance of the November 14, 2016 Committee meeting. Social impacts were dependent on the results of the economic impacts and would be provided as soon as possible.