

APPENDIX I
Monkfish FMP Amendment 2

Summary Table of Amendment 2 DSEIS
Alternatives, Impacts and Issues

&

Summary Table of
Advisory Panel and Oversight Committee
Recommendations and Comments

TABLE 1 - Summary of Monkfish Amendment 2 DSEIS Alternatives and Issues/Impacts

NOTE: This table shows the alternatives as presented in the DSEIS. Preferred Alternatives identified in the DSEIS are underlined.

Decision 1	Details	Impacts/Issues
<p><u>DAS Alternative 1</u> – Category C and D vessels may decouple MF DAS from Scallop or Multispecies DAS usage requirements</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two alternatives (see Alt. 1a and 1b below) 2. Annual declaration – vessels may elect to fish under Alt. 2 (no action) rules 3. Enrolled vessels may combine DAS usage on trip-by-trip basis 4. When on MF-only DAS, Category C & D vessels would fish as Category A & B 5. Applicable measures under MF only, Multispecies only, or combined DAS summarized in Table 1. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allows for MF specific gear requirements on directed trips – minimize bycatch and EFH impacts 2. Could result in overall increase in fishing effort (vessels could fish MF and Scallop or Multispecies DAS allocations separately) 3. Reduces opportunity cost for vessels targeting monkfish 4. Requires establishment of trawl exempted fishery in NFMA for MF only DAS – or vessels may shift to SFMA to use MF only DAS 5. Economic impact likely to be positive or neutral on affected vessels (Category C & D) 6. Goal II, Objectives 2 & 3; Goals III & V
<p>DAS Alternative 2 – Category C and D vessels on a MF DAS must also use a Scallop or Multispecies DAS</p>	<p>No action</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MF vessels with multispecies permits fish under gear regulations set by MS FMP

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

Decision 1a	Details	Impacts/Issues
<p>DAS Alternative 1a – Area-based de-coupled DAS (SFMA only) by annual declaration</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Category C & D vessels annual declaration to have option of MF only DAS in the SFMA 2. Vessel not declaring could fish for monkfish in either area on combined DAS only 3. Vessels declaring may only fish for monkfish in the SFMA, and under incidental limit in NFMA (could not be issued NFMA exemption letter) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vessels declared in may retain the option to fish MF-only or combined DAS in the SFMA 2. Applicable measures under MF only, Multispecies only, or combined DAS summarized in Table 1, SFMA section only 3. Options below for gear requirement on MF only or combined DAS
<p>DAS Alternative 1b – Annual declaration for de-coupled DAS, not area based</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Category C & D vessels annual declaration to have option of MF only DAS (not limited by area) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicable measures under MF only, Multispecies only, or combined DAS summarized in Table 1. 2. Requires establishment of trawl exempted fishery in NFMA for MF only DAS – or vessels may shift to SFMA to use MF only DAS 3. Options below for gear requirement on MF only or combined DAS

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

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

Decision 1d	Details	Impacts/Issues
Transferable DAS Option 1 – No action	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
Transferable DAS Option 2 – DAS Leasing	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 4. Social and economic impacts would be short-term compared to Option 3
Transferable DAS Option 3 – Sale of DAS	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. 4. Would result in permanent redistribution of monkfish effort (positive effect for acquiring vessels and communities, negative for selling vessels and their communities).

Decision 2	Details	Impacts/Issues
Incidental Catch Alternative 1 – No action	1. 50 lbs. tails per trip (possession limit) on small mesh trips	1. No new impacts, but may result in increased discards as stocks rebuild and incidental catch rates increase.
<u>Incidental Catch Alternative 2 –</u>	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. Goal II; Goal V, Objective 2
Incidental Catch Alternative 3 –	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
GC Scallop/clam dredge Alternative 1 – No action	1. Prohibited from possessing monkfish	1. No evidence these vessels are discarding monkfish
<u>GC scallop/clam dredge Alternative 2 –</u>	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. Goal II; Goal IV, Objective 2

Decision 4	Details	Impacts/Issues
Incidental catch limit west of 72°30' Alternative 1 – 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
<u>Incidental catch limit west of 72°30' Alternative 2 –</u>	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. Goal II; Goal IV, Objective 2

Decision 5	Details	Impacts/Issues
Minimum mesh size Alternative 1 – No action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rationale for preferred alternative being no action is uncertainty about effectiveness of larger mesh versus efficiency and cost.
Minimum trawl mesh size Alternative 2 –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Minimum trawl mesh size Alternative 3 –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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
Minimum fish size Alternative 1 – No action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11" tail or 17" whole, NFMA 14" tail or 21" whole, SFMA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum size cited as primary reason for MF discards in trawl and scallop fishery
Minimum fish size Alternative 2 –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Uniform size both areas Two options: 11" tail/17" whole, or 10' tail/15" whole 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces discards of small monkfish in the SFMA Does not eliminate regulatory discards due to minimum size Goal II; Goal III; Goal IV, Objective 2; Goal VII
Minimum fish size Alternative 3 –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No minimum size 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates regulatory discards due to minimum size (not market cull) PDT recommendation Improves data on commercial catch-at-age used in assessments
Minimum fish size Alternative 4 –	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Applies only on monkfish-only DAS, if DAS are de-coupled. Councils would select from options above for multispecies/monkfish DAS 14" tail/21" whole in both areas 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Selectivity characteristics of large mesh not quantified; impact on reducing discards uncertain

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

Decision 8	Details	Impacts/Issues
Offshore SFMA Fishery Alternative 1 – No action	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
Offshore SFMA Fishery Alternative 2 –	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. Goal II, Objectives 2 & 3; Goal III

Decision 9	Details	Impacts/Issues
Modification of permit qualification for vessels fishing south of 38°N. Landings criteria are the same in all alternatives as current permit requirements. Four alternatives differ on qualification period, four years prior to date shown below . 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)		
Permit Qualification Alternative 1	1. June 15, 1998, full year landings	1. est. new permits: 7
Permit Qualification Alternative 2	1. June 15, 1997, full year landings	1. est. new permits: 3
Permit Qualification Alternative 3 <i>MAFMC preferred alternative</i>	1. June 15, 1998, landings during March 15 – June 15	1. est. new permits: 5 2. Goal II, Objective 1;
Permit Qualification Alternative 4	1. June 15, 1997, landings during March 15 – June 15	1. est. new permits: 3
Permit Qualification Alternative 5 – no action	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
NAFO Area Exemption Alternative 1	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
NAFO Area Exemption Alternative 2 – no action	1. no exemption, must use DAS and comply with trip limits and other FMP regulations.	1. No negative impacts but would retain inconsistency with Multispecies FMP

Decision 11	Details	Impacts/Issues
Essential Fish Habitat Alternatives. Except for no action, alternatives are not exclusive, that is, Councils may select more than one preferred alternative.		
EFH Alternative 1 - no action	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
EFH Alternative 2	1. No specific action on EFH	1. Other actions in Amendment 2 to be analyzed for EFH benefits
EFH Alternative 3	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
EFH Alternative 5ab – 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
EFH Alternative 5c – 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
Cooperative Research programs funding. 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.		
Research Alternative 1 – DAS set aside	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vessel allocations would be reduced by equal contribution to pool for research/surveys 2. NMFS would award DAS to vessels conducting research/surveys based on proposals' requests. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would streamline research program review and provide cost-reductions through allowing monkfish landings 2. Vessel contributions to be less than 1 DAS for the largest proposed pool of DAS (500) 3. Goal III; Goal V, Objectives 1 & 2; Goal VI
Research Alternative 2 - DAS Exemption	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vessel allocations would not be reduced 2. NMFS would issue exemption upon approval of Experimental Fishery Permit application 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. see item 1 above 2. Committee preferred alternative
Research Alternative 3 – no action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduced incentive for cooperative research

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

Decision 14	Details	Impacts/Issues
NFMA trawl experimental fishery Alternative 1 – no action	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. Vessels with dual baselines may have to forego a limited access permit in order to upgrade or transfer another limited access permit..
<u>NFMA trawl experimental fishery Alternative 2</u>	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. Goal II, Objective 3; Goal III; Goal V, Objectives 1 & 2

Decision 15	Details		Impacts/Issues
Change the fishing year. 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.			
<u>Fishing Year Alternative 1</u> – no action	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.
Fishing Year Alternative 2	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
Fishing Year Alternative 3	1. Oct. – Sept.		1. Fishing year would start at the beginning of the peak monkfish landings and price cycle
Fishing Year Alternative 4	1. July - June		1. Fishing year would start at the low point in monkfish landings and price cycle

Decision 16 – no preferred alternative	Details	Impacts/Issues
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.		
DAS Prorating Alternative 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transition period is from May 1, 2005 to start of new fishing year. 2. Allocations based on # months in transition period divided by 12, times Amendment 2 DAS allocations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shorter transition period
DAS Prorating Alternative 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transition period is from May 1, 2005 through the next full fishing year 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longer transition period, may provide greater flexibility for vessels

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

TABLE 2 - Summary of Monkfish Amendment 2 Advisory Panel and Oversight Committee Recommendations and Comments and Councils' Recommendations for Final Measures

NOTES: Preferred Alternatives in the DSEIS are underlined while Alternatives recommended by the Councils are identified under “Recommendations”.

Decision 1	Recommendations	Comment
<u>DAS Alternative 1</u> – Category C and D vessels may decouple MF DAS from Scallop or Multispecies DAS usage requirements		One advisor supported to restore offshore fishery, to be done incrementally. One OS member supported as a means to measure and control NFMA monkfish effort.
DAS Alternative 2 – Category C and D vessels on a MF DAS must also use a Scallop or Multispecies DAS	AP and OS Councils	Both concerned about effort increases, on monkfish and multispecies, and impact of resulting adjustments to trip limits and DAS on currently active vessels. OS also cited impact on skate rebuilding, and lag time in adjustment to effort increases (NMFS comment).

NOTE: The following decisions 1a-1d pertained only to Alternative 1 above. The AP recommended alternatives in the event the Councils decide to adopt Alternative 1 anyway. The OS only made a recommendation on Decision 1c.

Decision 1a	Recommendations	Comment
DAS Alternative 1a – Area-based de-coupled DAS (SFMA only) by annual declaration		
<u>DAS Alternative 1b</u> – Annual declaration for de-coupled DAS, not area based	AP	If Councils consider de-coupling in the future, they should consider NFMA only.

Decision 1b	Recommendations	Comment
<u>DAS Alternative 1 Option 1a</u> – Fleet MF DAS (MAFMC preferred alternative)	AP	
DAS Alternative 1 Option 1b – Individual MF DAS		

Decision 1c	Recommendations	Comment
DAS Alternative 1 Option 2a – Implement transferable MF only DAS under Amendment 2 rule		
<u>DAS Alternative 1 Option 2b</u> – Include transferable DAS in list of possible actions under framework adjustment process	AP and OS Councils	Whether or not Councils adopt Alternative 1, Decision 1.

Decision 1d	Recommendations	Comment
Transferable DAS Option 1 – No action		
Transferable DAS Option 2 – DAS Leasing	AP	
Transferable DAS Option 3 – Sale of DAS	AP	

Decision 2	Recommendations	Comment
Incidental Catch Alternative 1 – No action – 50 lbs.	AP (majority)	Enforcement concerns with per-day limit not on DAS call-in or VMS.
Incidental Catch Alternative 2 – 50 lbs./day - 150 lbs. max.	OS and one AP member Councils	Reduces regulatory discards in multi-day trips for fluke, whiting and squid. Electronic reporting partially addresses enforcement concerns.
Incidental Catch Alternative 3 – 50 lbs./day - 500 lbs. max.		

Decision 3	Recommendations	Comment
GC Scallop/clam dredge Alternative 1 – No action		
GC scallop/clam dredge Alternative 2 – Include in Decision 2 incidental limit	AP and OS Councils	AP recommends 50 lbs. possession limit, regardless of Decision 2 alternative chosen. Considered and rejected by OS.

Decision 4	Recommendations	Comment
Incidental catch limit west of 72°30' Alternative 1 – No action		
Incidental catch limit west of 72°30' Alternative 2 – Restore incidental limit on Mid-Atlantic large mesh vessels to 5% of total weight of fish on board. <i>See comment on recommended 450 lb. cap.</i>	AP and OS Councils	Both recommend a cap of 450 lbs. (tail wt.) NEMFC adopted 450 lb. cap. Rationale: cap would keep incidental catch below directed fishery trip limit while still minimizing regulatory discards in fluke fishery; fluke vessels now targeting scup have larger total catch than in the past, therefore 5% allowance represents more total monkfish allowance (in excess of the directed fishery)

Decision 5	Recommendations	Comment
Minimum mesh size Alternative 1 – No action	One AP member <u>Councils</u>	NEFMC cited lack of selectivity data for 12-inch trawl gear; minimal bycatch of groundfish and sub-legal sized monkfish with 10" square mesh.
Minimum trawl mesh size Alternative 2 – 12" throughout trawl net	One AP member	
Minimum trawl mesh size Alternative 3 – 12" sq. codend	AP (majority) and OS OS recommends 30 cm. sq. mesh for 20 meshes or 40 bars	Reduces regulatory discards, minimal cost.
Decision 6	Recommendations	Comment
Minimum fish size Alternative 1 – No action	AP divided (Alt. 1 and 2)	AP supporters did not want smaller fish size in SFMA.
Minimum fish size Alternative 2 – Uniform fish size in both areas; Options for 11" and 10" tail.	AP divided (Alt. 1 and 2) with support for 11" tail OS with 11" tail <u>Councils w/ 11" tail</u>	
Minimum fish size Alternative 3 – no min. fish size		
Minimum fish size Alternative 4 – Uniform, 14" tail in both areas on MF only DAS, one of above options for MS/MF DAS. Only applies if DAS are decoupled in Decision 1.		
Decision 7	Recommendations	Comment
Closed Season Alternative 1 – No action (20 days out)		
Closed Season Alternative 2 – Eliminate closed season	AP and OS <u>Councils</u>	Ineffective at protecting spawning fish. Reduces FMP complexity.
Closed Season Alternative 3 – 40 day closed season		
Decision 8	Recommendations	Comment
Offshore SFMA Fishery Alternative 1 – No action		
Offshore SFMA Fishery Alternative 2 – includes two area options and two trip limit/DAS options (Option 1 has variable trip limit/DAS ratios; Option 2 has fixed trip limit of 1,600 lbs./DAS with variable DAS ratio)	AP and OS with Area Option 1 (squid exemption line) and Trip Limit/DAS Option 2. <u>Councils</u>	

Decision 9	Recommendations	Comment
Permit Qualification Alternative 1 – four years prior to 6/15/98		
Permit Qualification Alternative 2 – four years prior to 6/15/97		
Permit Qualification Alternative 3 <i>MAFMC preferred alternative</i> – four years prior to 6/15/98 (3/15 – 6/15 only)	AP and OS Councils	
Permit Qualification Alternative 4 - four years prior to 6/15/97 (3/15 – 6/15 only)		
Permit Qualification Alternative 5 – no action		

Decision 10	Recommendations	Comment
NAFO Area Exemption Alternative 1 – allow exemption	AP and OS Councils	
NAFO Area Exemption Alternative 2 – no action		

Decision 11	Recommendations	Comment
Essential Fish Habitat Alternatives. Except for no action, alternatives are not exclusive, that is, Councils may select more than one preferred alternative.		
EFH Alternative 1 - no action		
EFH Alternative 2 - Consider other Amendment 2 actions	OS, Councils	
EFH Alternative 3 – Consider MS Amendment 13 and Scallop Amendment 10 actions	OS, Councils	
EFH Alternative 4 – Trawl gear modification options. Option 1: no action; Option 2 specified trawl net design; Option 3 max. disc diameter in SFMA, only to be considered if Option 2 not adopted and DAS not decoupled under Decision 1.	AP and OS recommend Option 3. Councils (Option 3)	AP recommends only mesh-size component of Option 2 be adopted until other elements have been tested, and then adopted through a framework adjustment. Enforcement concerns with complex gear regulations.
EFH Alternative 5ab – Oceanographer Canyon and Lydonia Canyon closure	OS with Option 2 (all gears on a monkfish DAS) Councils	AP strongly supports protection of deep-sea corals from all gears having an impact, not just monkfish gear. Should be addressed in the Habitat Omnibus Amendment.
EFH Alternative 5c – Major steep-walled canyons closure		See comment above (5AB).

Decision 12	Recommendations	Comment
Cooperative Research programs funding. Two alternatives, not including no action, could both be adopted. 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.		
Research Alternative 1 – DAS set aside	AP and OS OS recommends up to 500 DAS available to both programs, combined. Councils	
Research Alternative 2 - DAS Exemption	AP and OS OS recommends up to 500 DAS available to both programs, combined. Councils	
Research Alternative 3 – no action		

Decision 13	Recommendations	Comment
Vessel Upgrading Baseline Alternative 1 – no action		
Vessel Upgrading Baseline Alternative 2 – set baseline at first federal permit level	AP and OS, with stipulation that adjustment be a one-time opportunity, and only at vessel owner request Councils	NEFMC also adopted OS and AP stipulation.

Decision 14	Recommendations	Comment
NFMA trawl experimental fishery Alternative 1 – no action		
NFMA trawl experimental fishery Alternative 2 – establish GOM experimental fishery for two years	AP	OS motion failed 3-4. Action viewed as unnecessary since vessel can, and are already doing the same experimental work

Decision 15	Recommendations	Comment
Change the fishing year. 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.		
Fishing Year Alternative 1 – no action	AP and OS, Councils	
Fishing Year Alternative 2 – calendar year		
Fishing Year Alternative 3 – Oct. – Sept.		
Fishing Year Alternative 4 – July - June		

Decision 16 – no preferred alternative	Recommendations	Comment
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.		
DAS Prorating Alternative 1 – partial year		
DAS Prorating Alternative 2 – full year plus partial year		

Decision 17	Recommendations	Comment
Modify Framework Adjustment procedure – Alternative 1 - No action		
Include measures to minimize impact on protected species - Alternative 2	AP and OS Councils	
Include bycatch reduction devices Alternative 2	AP and OS Councils	