

**APPENDIX I**  
Monkfish FMP Amendment 2  
Summary Table of Amendment 2 Alternatives, Impacts and Issues



**Summary of Monkfish Amendment 2  
Alternatives and Issues/Impacts**

***NOTE: Preferred Alternatives are underlined.***

Decision 1	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b><u>DAS Alternative 1</u></b> – Category C and D vessels may decouple MF DAS from Scallop or Multispecies DAS usage requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two alternatives (see Alt. 1a and 1b below)</li> <li>Annual declaration – vessels may elect to fish under Alt. 2 (no action) rules</li> <li>Enrolled vessels may combine DAS usage on trip-by-trip basis</li> <li>When on MF-only DAS, Category C &amp; D vessels would fish as Category A &amp; B</li> <li>Applicable measures under MF only, Multispecies only, or combined DAS summarized in Table 1.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allows for MF specific gear requirements on directed trips – minimize bycatch and EFH impacts</li> <li>Could result in overall increase in fishing effort (vessels could fish MF and Scallop or Multispecies DAS allocations separately)</li> <li>Reduces opportunity cost for vessels targeting monkfish</li> <li>Requires establishment of trawl exempted fishery in NFMA for MF only DAS – or vessels may shift to SFMA to use MF only DAS</li> <li>Economic impact likely to be positive or neutral on affected vessels (Category C &amp; D)</li> <li><b>Goal II, Objectives 2 &amp; 3; Goals III &amp; IV</b></li> </ol>
<b><u>DAS Alternative 2</u></b> – Category C and D vessels on a MF DAS must also use a Scallop or Multispecies DAS	No action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MF vessels with multispecies permits fish under gear regulations set by MS FMP</li> </ol>

***The following decisions 1a-1d pertain only to Alternative 1.***

Decision 1a	Details	Impacts/Issue s
<b><u>DAS Alternative 1a</u></b> – Area-based de-coupled DAS (SFMA only) by annual declaration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Category C &amp; D vessels annual declaration to have option of MF only DAS in the SFMA</li> <li>Vessel not declaring could fish for monkfish in either area on combined DAS only</li> <li>Vessels declaring may only fish for monkfish in the SFMA, and under incidental limit in NFMA (could not be issued NFMA exemption letter)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vessels declared in may retain the option to fish MF-only or combined DAS in the SFMA</li> <li>Applicable measures under MF only, Multispecies only, or combined DAS summarized in Table 1, SFMA section only</li> <li>Options below for gear requirement on MF only or combined DAS</li> </ol>
<b><u>DAS Alternative 1b</u></b> – Annual declaration for de-coupled DAS, not area based	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Category C &amp; D vessels annual declaration to have option of MF only DAS (not limited by area)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicable measures under MF only, Multispecies only, or combined DAS summarized in Table 1.</li> <li>Requires establishment of trawl exempted fishery in NFMA for MF only DAS – or vessels may shift to SFMA to use MF only DAS</li> <li>Options below for gear requirement on MF only or combined DAS</li> </ol>

Decision 1b	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>DAS Alternative 1 Option 1a</b> – Fleet MF DAS <i>(MAFMC preferred alternative)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 40 DAS to all limited access permit holders</li> <li>2. Trip limits/DAS based on current (Framework 2) formula</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Same allocations as under original FMP</li> <li>2. Inherent allocation of latent MF effort</li> <li>3. Option to have variable Fleet DAS and uniform trip limits not practicable</li> </ol>
<b>DAS Alternative 1 Option 1b</b> – Individual MF DAS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vessels would have individual share of a pool of DAS based on relative proportion of monkfish landings 1997-2001</li> <li>2. Allocation based on individual share X total DAS pool</li> <li>3. Total DAS pool based on portion of TAC available to directed fishery divided by average catch per DAS</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DAS allocations range from 0 (145 vessels) to more than 145 (average on 40 vessels holding 20% of the total pool)</li> <li>2. Vessels would have 40 DAS pending appeal of individual allocation</li> <li>3. Effort allocations based on past performance (minimize latent effort)</li> <li>4. Some vessels that qualify for a limited access permit would not have DAS allocation but could lease DAS (if adopted)</li> </ol>

Decision 1c	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>DAS Alternative 1 Option 2a</b> – Implement transferable MF only DAS under Amendment 2 rule	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Program would take effect upon implementation of Amendment 2</li> <li>2. DAS transfer program to be based on Multispecies Amendment 13 program with monkfish specific consideration</li> <li>3. Two options, plus no action, for lease or sale of DAS (see Decision 1d, below)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uncertainty about outcome of Amendment 13 decisions and final program details</li> <li>2. Would allow for potential activation of latent effort under Fleet DAS (Option 1a above)</li> </ol>
<b>DAS Alternative 1 Option 2b</b> – Include transferable DAS in list of possible actions under framework adjustment process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Program details and implementation would take place under a future Council action</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would allow for development of DAS transfer consistent with program (if adopted in Multispecies Amendment 13 with monkfish-specific considerations)</li> </ol>

<b>Decision 1d</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Impacts/Issues</b>
<b>Transferable DAS Option 1 – No action</b>	1. Transfer of DAS prohibited	1. No impact compared to current program under Fleet DAS 2. Under Individual DAS, if adopted, inactive vessels would have no DAS or reduced DAS allocations and be unable to activate
<b>Transferable DAS Option 2 – DAS Leasing</b>	1. Based on alternatives under consideration in Amendment 13, with MF specific considerations 2. Options for conservation equivalency, limitations on number of DAS leased, and program expiration, detailed in Section 4.1.1.1.5.2	1. Could result in activation of latent effort under Fleet DAS 2. Would enable vessels with low individual DAS allocations (if adopted) to increase effort to profitable levels, at a cost, while providing high allocation vessels with flexibility to use or lease DAS 3. Effectiveness of conservation neutrality provisions are uncertain
<b>Transferable DAS Option 3 – Sale of DAS</b>	1. Based on Multispecies Amendment 13 proposals 2. Options for restricting proportion of transferable DAS and reactivation of sold DAS.	1. Could result in activation of latent effort unless safeguards are developed to maintain conservation neutrality. 2. Amendment 13 formula for defining active/effective effort not directly applicable to monkfish fishery 3. Practicability may depend on outcome of Amendment 13 decision regarding permit splitting.

<b>Decision 2</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Impacts/Issues</b>
<b>Incidental Catch Alternative 1 – No action</b>	1. 50 lbs. tails per trip (possession limit) on small mesh trips	1.
<b>Incidental Catch Alternative 2 –</b>	1. 50 lbs. tails/day; 150 lbs. maximum	1. Intended to reduce discards, especially as stocks rebuild 2. Would benefit small mesh trips up to three days 3. Would have minimal impact on total incidental catch of monkfish 4. Committee's preferred alternative 5. <b>Goal II; Goal V, Objective 2</b>
<b>Incidental Catch Alternative 3 –</b>	1. 50 lbs. tails/day; 500 lbs. maximum	1. Intended to reduce discards 2. Would benefit small mesh trips up to 10 days (freezer boats) 3. Would have minimal impact on total incidental catch of monkfish

Decision 3	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>GC Scallop/clam dredge Alternative 1</b> – No action	1. Prohibited from possessing monkfish	1. No evidence these vessels are discarding monkfish
<b>GC scallop/clam dredge Alternative 2</b> –	1. Would include vessels in the incidental catch category under Decision 2 above	1. Would minimize bycatch if monkfish discarding becomes a problem as stocks rebuild 2. <b>Goal II; Goal III; Goal IV; Goal V, Objective 2</b>

Decision 4	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Incidental catch limit west of 72°30' Alternative 1</b> – No action	1. Incidental limit on fluke vessels east of 74° is 50 lbs. possession limit (tail wt.)	1. Multispecies interim rule changed monkfish limit from 5% of total wt. on board as a result of shifting Mid-Atlantic Reg. Mesh Area boundary
<b>Incidental catch limit west of 72°30' Alternative 2</b> –	1. 5% of total weight of fish on board on large mesh (fluke) trips	1. Would restore limit to pre-interim rule level 2. Committee's preferred alternative 3. <b>Goal II; Goal IV; Goal IV; Goal V, Objective 2</b>

Decision 5	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Minimum mesh size Alternative 1</b> – No action	1. 10" sq./12" dia. codend on trawl Category A & B, and Category C & D Scallop/MF vessels. Category C & D Multispecies/MF vessels use groundfish regulated mesh. 2. 10" mesh on gillnets	1. Rationale for preferred alternative being no action is uncertainty about effectiveness of larger mesh versus efficiency and cost.
<b>Minimum trawl mesh size Alternative 2</b> –	1. 12" sq. codend; 12' dia. belly and wings 2. Apply on Category A & B, and Scallop C & D vessels on scallop/MF DAS. Option to require on multispecies/MF DAS	1. Reduces bycatch of regulated species and small monkfish, but selectivity characteristics not quantified 2. Increases yield per recruit 3. Regulation to be based on nearest metric equivalent of stock mesh size
<b>Minimum trawl mesh size Alternative 3</b> –	1. 12" sq. codend; multispecies mesh in body and wings. 2. Apply on Category A & B, and Scallop C & D vessels on scallop/MF DAS. Option to require on multispecies/MF DAS	1. Reduces bycatch of regulated species and small monkfish, but selectivity characteristics not quantified 2. Increases yield per recruit 3. Regulation to be based on nearest metric equivalent of stock mesh size

Decision 6	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Minimum fish size Alternative 1 – No action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11" tail or 17" whole, NFMA</li> <li>14" tail or 21" whole, SFMA</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimum size cited as primary reason for MF discards in trawl and scallop fishery</li> </ol>
<b>Minimum fish size Alternative 2 –</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uniform size both areas</li> <li>Two options: 11" tail/17" whole, or 10' tail'/15" whole</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces discards of small monkfish in the SFMA</li> <li>Does not eliminate regulatory discards due to minimum size</li> <li><b>Goal II; Goal III; Goal IV; Goal V, Objective 2; Goal VII</b></li> </ol>
<b>Minimum fish size Alternative 3 –</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No minimum size</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminates regulatory discards due to minimum size (not market cull)</li> <li>PDT recommendation</li> <li>Improves data on commercial catch-at-age used in assessments</li> </ol>
<b>Minimum fish size Alternative 4 –</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applies only on monkfish-only DAS, if DAS are de-coupled. Councils would select from options above for multispecies/monkfish DAS</li> <li>14" tail/21" whole in both areas</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Works in conjunction with increased minimum mesh size on monkfish-only DAS; allows for retention of smaller monkfish caught with groundfish gear on combined multispecies/monkfish DAS</li> <li>Selectivity characteristics of large mesh not quantified; impact on reducing discards uncertain</li> </ol>

Decision 7	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Closed Season Alternative 1 – No action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Category A &amp; B vessels: 20-day block out of the fishery April – June; Category C &amp; D/Multispecies vessels: 20-day block March-May; Category C &amp; D/Scallop vessels: no requirement</li> <li>Option to include Category C &amp; D/Scallop vessels, if DAS are de-coupled (4.1.5.4 in SEIS)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not effective at shifting effort away from spawning period due to relatively short closure</li> </ol>
<b>Closed Season Alternative 2 –</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminate time out requirement</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ol>
<b>Closed Season Alternative 3 –</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase time out requirement to 40-day block</li> <li>Option to include Category C &amp; D/Scallop vessels, if DAS are de-coupled (4.1.5.4 in SEIS)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May provide improved spawning protection, although benefits not certain or well understood for monkfish</li> </ol>

Decision 8	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Offshore SFMA Fishery Alternative 1 – No action</b>	1. All SFMA vessels within gear and permit categories treated equally	1. Offshore fishery not profitable for most vessels due to trip limits and, for some vessels, requirement to use multispecies or scallop DAS
<b>Offshore SFMA Fishery Alternative 2 –</b>	1. Annual declaration, Oct. – April season, two area options, trip limits/DAS based on ratio to allocations for other SFMA vessels (2 options), gear and VMS requirements.	1. Could be implemented with or w/o de-coupled DAS 2. Would provide opportunity for vessels to target monkfish offshore, shifting some effort from inshore stocks 3. Vessels would be subject to gear conflict regulations in place, and any EFH measures adopted in this amendment 4. <b>Goal II, Objectives 2 &amp; 3; Goal III</b>

Decision 9	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Modification of permit qualification for vessels fishing south of 38°N.</b> Landings criteria are the same in all alternatives as current permit requirements. Four alternatives differ on qualification period, <b>four years prior to date shown below</b> . If sea turtle closures severely restrict fishing opportunity, area may be expanded to 38°20'N. All other regulations applicable to vessels fishing in the SFMA would apply. Preliminary estimate of number of new permits is given; all would be in Category B & D (lower landings threshold)		
<b>Permit Qualification Alternative 1</b>	1. June 15, 1998, full year landings	1. est. new permits: 7
<b>Permit Qualification Alternative 2</b>	1. June 15, 1997, full year landings	1. est. new permits: 3
<b>Permit Qualification Alternative 3</b> <i>MAFMC preferred alternative</i>	1. June 15, 1998, landings during March 15 – June 15	1. est. new permits: 5 2. <b>Goal II, Objective 1;</b>
<b>Permit Qualification Alternative 4</b>	1. June 15, 1997, landings during March 15 – June 15	1. est. new permits: 3
<b>Permit Qualification Alternative 5 – no action</b>	1. vessels that have not qualified under original FMP provisions would not be issued limited access permit	1. est. new permits: 0

Decision 10	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>NAFO Area Exemption Alternative 1</b>	1. Letter of Authorization 2. Allows vessels to transit EEZ and land monkfish caught outside EEZ 3. Subject to NAFO regulations, including VMS 4. No federal monkfish permit required	1. Consistent with Multispecies FMP exemption 2. Provides economic opportunity for vessels 3. Goal II, Objective 4
<b>NAFO Area Exemption Alternative 2 – no action</b>	1. no exemption, must use DAS and comply with trip limits and other FMP regulations.	1.

Decision 11	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Essential Fish Habitat Alternatives. Except for no action, alternatives are not exclusive, that is, Councils may select more than one preferred alternative.</b>		
<b>EFH Alternative 1 - no action</b>	1. Measures that would be in effect if the Councils took no action on this or other (Multispecies, Scallop) amendments	1. Monkfish fishery has a low impact on monkfish EFH but high impact on EFH of other species
<b>EFH Alternative 2</b>	1. No specific action on EFH	1. Other actions in Amendment 2 to be analyzed for EFH benefits
<b>EFH Alternative 3</b>	1. Actions taken under Multispecies Amendment 13 and Scallop Amendment 10	1. Action taken under other FMPs to be analyzed for EFH benefits
<u>EFH Alternative 4</u>	1. Two trawl gear configuration options, plus no action 2. Option 2 includes six elements that could be taken together or separately. See Section 4.1.9.4.2 3. Option 3 could be considered if Option 2 not adopted and DAS are not de-coupled. Would set maximum disc diameter at 6 inches in the SFMA	1. Option 2 designed to minimize ability and incentive to fish in complex bottom. Would also minimize bycatch of regulated species. 2. Option 2 as a package not tested and not in commercial use. Could be part of trawl experimental fishery adopted under this amendment 3. Option 3 already used by most vessels in the SFMA
<b>EFH Alternative 5ab –</b> Oceanographer Canyon and Lydonia Canyon closure	1. Does not close waters shallower than 200 meters. 2. Two options: close to trawl gear or all gears, on a MF DAS	1. While corals are not part of EFH, impacts to deepwater corals could have an indirect adverse impact on EFH. 2. Data from 2001 show no overlap with directed MF fishery
<b>EFH Alternative 5c –</b> Major steep-walled canyons closure	1. Up to twelve identified canyons from Norfolk Canyon to Heezen Canyon (at the Hague Line) 2. Two options: close to trawl gear or all gears, on a MF DAS 3. Closure of waters deeper than 200 m. (~100 fathoms)	1. some overlap with reported monkfish effort, particularly Atlantis, Oceanographer and Hudson Canyons

Decision 12	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Cooperative Research programs funding.</b> Two alternatives, not including no action, could both be adopted. Four options for DAS set aside/exemptions under consideration: 50, 100, 200, or 500 DAS. Research could be to minimize bycatch, minimize impacts on EFH or other habitat, research to establish exempted fisheries, biology or population dynamics of monkfish, cooperative surveys and gear efficiency, among others.		
<b>Research Alternative 1</b> – DAS set aside	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vessel allocations would be reduced by equal contribution to pool for research/surveys</li> <li>2. NMFS would award DAS to vessels conducting research/surveys based on proposals' requests.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would streamline research program review and provide cost-reductions through allowing monkfish landings</li> <li>2. Vessel contributions to be less than 1 DAS for the largest proposed pool of DAS (500)</li> <li>3. <b>Goal III; Goal V, Objectives 1 &amp; 2; Goal VI</b></li> </ol>
<b>Research Alternative 2</b> - DAS Exemption	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vessel allocations would not be reduced</li> <li>2. NMFS would issue exemption upon approval of Experimental Fishery Permit application</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. see item 1 above</li> <li>2. Committee preferred alternative</li> </ol>
<b>Research Alternative 3</b> – no action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vessels conducting research under EFP or NMFS' RFP may not land monkfish unless they complete an Environmental Assessment to analyze the impacts of a DAS exemption</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> </ol>

Decision 13	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>Vessel Upgrading Baseline Alternative 1</b> – no action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vessel has baseline of vessel when issued its limited access permit; may have two different baselines for permits issued under different FMPs if permit was transferred between issuance</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vessels with dual baselines may have to forego a limited access permit in order to upgrade or transfer another limited access permit..</li> </ol>
<b>Vessel Upgrading Baseline Alternative 2</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Baseline would be set at characteristics of permit when vessel was issued its first federal limited access permit.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Applies a single vessel upgrading baseline to each vessel</li> <li>2. <b>Goal II; Goal VII</b></li> </ol>

Decision 14	Details	Impacts/Issues
<b>NFMA trawl experimental fishery Alternative 1 – no action</b>	1. Trawl experimental fishery, for purposes of establishing a monkfish exempted fishery in the NFMA would require researchers to complete EFP application and possibly an EA to conduct the research. If proposed by NMFS, vessels would have to undergo an RFP or grants administrative process	1. EFP/EA process may reduce the number of groups interested in conducting trawl experiments.
<b>NFMA trawl experimental fishery Alternative 2</b>	1. Vessels would operate under a Letter of Authorization from NMFS. 2. Vessels could operate under the DAS set aside or exemption, if adopted under the previous section 3. Three area/seasons identified in the GOM	1. Primary purpose is to determine if a trawl exempted fishery can be established (under the 5% multispecies bycatch rule), and under what gear/area/season restrictions 2. Would also provide opportunity to test the proposed trawl configuration under commercial conditions for reducing bycatch and EFH impacts. 3. <b>Goal II, Objective 3; Goal III; Goal V, Objectives 1 &amp; 2</b>

Decision 15	Details		Impacts/Issues
<b>Change the fishing year.</b> Three alternatives plus no action. Based on alternatives under consideration in Multispecies Amendment 13, but Councils could choose independently from what is adopted in Amendment 13. Would require prorating of DAS during transition period; alternatives provided in next section.			
<b>Fishing Year Alternative 1 – no action</b>	1. May - April		1. Same as Multispecies. 2. Results in shortest gap between fall survey (used to set TAC and trip limits) and start of fishing year while allowing for proposed rule 3. Rationale for preferred alternative is item 2 above and issues identified below with other alternatives.
<b>Fishing Year Alternative 2</b>	1. Jan. – Dec.		1. Aligns fishing year with stock assessment data 2. Not as important in monkfish as in multispecies. 3. Could create staff/administrative workload issues if many plans start simultaneously
<b>Fishing Year Alternative 3</b>	1. Oct. – Sept.		1. Fishing year would start at the beginning of the peak monkfish landings and price cycle
<b>Fishing Year Alternative 4</b>	1. July - June		1. Fishing year would start at the low point in monkfish landings and price cycle

<b>Decision 16 – no preferred alternative</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Impacts/Issues</b>
<b>DAS Prorating alternatives. One of the following two alternatives is only necessary if the Councils select a different fishing year under the previous set of alternatives. They do not apply if the Councils take no action on the fishing year question.</b>		
<b>DAS Prorating Alternative 1</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transition period is from May 1, 2005 to start of new fishing year.</li> <li>2. Allocations based on # months in transition period divided by 12, times Amendment 2 DAS allocations</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Shorter transition period</li> </ol>
<b>DAS Prorating Alternative 2</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transition period is from May 1, 2005 through the next full fishing year</li> <li>2. Allocations based on # months from May 1, 2005 to new fishing year start date divided by 12 times the Amendment 2 DAS allocations, plus Amendment 2 DAS allocations</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Longer transition period, may provide greater flexibility for vessels</li> </ol>

<b>Decision 17</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Impacts/Issues</b>
<b>Modify Framework Adjustment procedure</b> – Alternative 1 - No action	Take no action on both of the following two proposals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taking no action would require the Councils to adopt either of the following (protected species measures or bycatch reduction devices only through the amendment process).</li> </ol>
<b>Include measures to minimize impact on protected species</b> – Alternative 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would enable Councils to adopt through the framework adjustment process gear-specific time/area closures and/or gear modification rules to minimize protected species interactions</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimize the time and administrative burden required to implement these rules.</li> </ol>
<b>Include bycatch reduction devices</b> – Alternative 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would enable Councils to adopt through the framework adjustment process gear requirements to minimize bycatch</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minimize the time and administrative burden required to implement these rules.</li> </ol>