

# **DECISION DOCUMENT**

**for**

**Framework Adjustment 10**

**to the**

**Monkfish**

**Fishery Management Plan (FMP)**

**Monkfish Committee Meeting**

**November 14, 2016**

The following decision tables in this document appear in the same order as the sections in the Draft Framework 10 document; page numbers are provided for reference.

## Section 4.1.1 – Revised Annual Catch Limits (p. 24)

### Monkfish Committee Motion:

- To select Option 3 (Section 1.1.1.3) Revised annual catch limit for the NFMA as the preferred alternative
- To select Option 4 (Section 1.1.1.4) Revised annual catch limit for the SFMA as the preferred alternative

Alternatives/Options Under Consideration	Description
Option 1	No Action
Option 2	Updated Discard Rate for Northern and Southern Fishery Management Areas
Option 3	Revised Annual Catch Limit for the NFMA
Option 4	Revised Annual Catch Limit for the SFMA
<b>Decisions/Questions to Consider</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For clarity, the PDT is now recommending to modify the titles of Options 3 and 4 to reflect that the options update the discard rate and modify the management uncertainty buffers – the ACL is not being revised, as per the SSC recommendation.</li> </ul>	
<b>Monkfish Committee Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To select Option 3 (Section 1.1.1.3) Revised annual catch limit for the NFMA as the preferred alternative (9/1/0)</li> <li>To select Option 4 (Section 1.1.1.4) Revised annual catch limit for the SFMA as the preferred alternative (10/0/0)</li> <li>The Committee was in favor of updating the discard rate and reducing the management uncertainty buffer to 3% in both areas, which Options 3 and 4 achieve.</li> </ul>	
<b>Monkfish AP Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quorum was not met at the October 12, 2016 AP meeting, however, the AP members present supported reducing the management uncertainty buffers to 3% in both areas.</li> </ul>	
<b>MAFMC Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD at their December 2016 meeting</li> </ul>	
<b>Other Important Considerations/DEA References</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biological impacts: p. 102</li> <li>Habitat impacts: p. 117</li> <li>Protected resources impacts: p. 120</li> <li>Economic impacts: p. 127</li> <li>Social impacts: p. to be completed</li> </ul>	

## Section 4.2.1 – Modify the DAS allocation and/or trip limits in the NFMA (p. 28)

### Monkfish Committee Motion:

•

Alternatives/Options Under Consideration	Description
Option 1	No Action
Option 2	Increase the DAS allocation in the Northern Fishery Management Area
Option 3	Increase the trip limits in the NFMA
<b>Decisions/Questions to Consider</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing the incidental limits on a NE multispecies DAS could remove the need to use a monkfish DAS in the NFMA, depending on the level of increase. Is that the intent of the Committee?</li> </ul>	
<b>Monkfish Committee Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyze an alternative that would set a monkfish possession limit of 1500 lbs tail weight/DAS for category C vessels, and 1250 for category D vessels, for vessels fishing under a <u>multispecies DAS</u> in the NFMA. (9/0/1)</li> <li>Analyze an alternative that would set a monkfish possession limit of 900 lbs tail weight/DAS for category C vessels, and 750 for category D vessels, for vessels fishing under a <u>multispecies DAS</u> in the NFMA. (9/0/1)</li> <li>The Committee didn't make any recommendations on changes to DAS allocations in the NFMA at their last meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>Monkfish AP Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AP did not discuss modifications to the incidental limits when on a NE multispecies DAS or increasing DAS in the NFMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>MAFMC Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD at their December 2016 meeting</li> </ul>	
<b>Other Important Considerations/DEA References</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biological impacts: p. 109</li> <li>Habitat impacts: p. 118</li> <li>Protected resources impacts: p. 123</li> <li>Economic impacts: p. 133</li> <li>Social impacts: p. to be completed</li> </ul>	

## Section 4.2.2 – Modify the DAS allocation and/or trip limits in the SFMA (p. 30)

### Monkfish Committee Motion:

•

Alternatives/Options Under Consideration	Description
<b>Option 1</b>	<b>No Action</b>
<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Increase the DAS allocation in the SFMA</b>
<b>Option 3</b>	<b>Increase the trip limits in the SFMA</b>
<b>Option 4</b>	<b>Increase the DAS allocation and trip limits in the SFMA</b>
<b>Decisions/Questions to Consider</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PDT is recommending moving Options 2 and 3 to considered but rejected, if the Committee intends to increase both the DAS and trip limits in the SFMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Monkfish Committee Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To analyze an increase in the DAS allocation and trip limit alternatives by 15% in the SFMA (10/0/0)</li> </ul>	
<b>Monkfish AP Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quorum was not met at the October 12, 2016 AP meeting, however, the AP members present supported a 15% in both DAS allocation and trip limits in the SFMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>MAFMC Comments/Recommendations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD at their December 2016 meeting</li> </ul>	
<b>Other Important Considerations/DEA References</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biological impacts: p. 113</li> <li>Habitat impacts: p. 119</li> <li>Protected resources impacts: p. 124</li> <li>Economic impacts: p. to be completed</li> <li>Social impacts: p. to be completed</li> </ul>	