

**Framework Adjustment 42
to the
Northeast Multispecies
Fishery Management Plan**

And

**Framework Adjustment 3
to the
Monkfish Fishery Management Plan**

Including an

Environmental Assessment
Regulatory Impact Review
Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

Prepared by the
New England Fishery Management Council
in consultation with the
Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
National Marine Fisheries Service

Initial framework meeting:	June 22, 2005
Final framework meeting:	February 1-2, 2006
Date submitted:	March 29, 2006
Date resubmitted:	April 21, 2006

Intentionally Blank

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In New England, the New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) is charged with developing management plans that meet the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (M-S Act). The Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP) specifies the management measures for twelve groundfish species (cod, haddock, yellowtail flounder, pollock, plaice, witch flounder, white hake, windowpane flounder, Atlantic halibut, winter flounder, redfish, ocean pout) off the New England and Mid-Atlantic coasts. The Monkfish Fishery Management Plan specifies the management measures for monkfish, also known as goosefish or American angler. The FMPs have been updated through a series of amendments and framework adjustments. The most recent multispecies amendment, published as Amendment 13, was approved by the National Marine Fisheries Service in March, 2004 and became effective on May 1, 2004. This amendment adopted a broad suite of management measures in order to achieve fishing mortality targets and meet other requirements of the M-S Act. The current rebuilding plan for monkfish was implemented by Monkfish Framework 2 on May 1, 2003.

For several groundfish stocks, the mortality targets adopted by Amendment 13 represented substantial reductions from existing levels. For other stocks, the mortality targets were at or higher than existing levels and mortality could remain the same or even increase. Because most fishing trips in this fishery catch a wide range of species, it is impossible to design measures that will selectively change mortality for individual species. The management measures adopted by the amendment to reduce mortality where necessary are also expected to reduce fishing mortality unnecessarily on other, healthy stocks. As a result of these lower fishing mortality rates, yield from healthy stocks is sacrificed and the management plan may not provide optimum yield - the amount of fish that will provide the greatest overall benefit to the nation. Amendment 13 created opportunities to target these healthy stocks. The FMP restricts the number of days that vessels can fish by allocating each limited access permit a specific amount of days-at-sea (DAS). Amendment 13 further defined three categories of DAS. The DAS categories are:

- Category A: These DAS can be used to target any regulated groundfish stock, subject to the restrictions on gear, areas, and landing limits that are defined by the FMP.
- Category B: These DAS are used to target healthy groundfish stocks – that is, stocks that are not overfished and that are not subject to overfishing. Programs to use Category B DAS prescribe specific conditions for their use.
- Category C: These DAS cannot be used, but remain associated with a permit. As stocks rebuild, in the future some of these DAS may be re-allocated into other categories and may be used.

Since the adoption of Amendment 13, three framework adjustment actions (Frameworks 40A, 40B, and 41) were adopted. These frameworks created opportunities to use Category B DAS in Special Access Programs or through the Category B (regular) DAS Pilot Project in order to target healthy stocks. Some of the adopted programs were pilot programs that are scheduled to end in fishing year (FY) 2006.

Amendment 13 adopted a schedule for periodic reviews of groundfish stock status to make certain that fishing mortality targets are achieved. The first adjustment was scheduled for May 1, 2006. In order to provide information on stock status for that action, groundfish stock assessments were performed in August 2005. Of nineteen managed groundfish stocks, the assessments found that fishing mortality for seven stocks exceeded Amendment 13 targets. This action is designed to reduce mortality on these stocks

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

so that rebuilding will continue. In addition, it modifies several other programs to meet the objectives of the M-S Act.

Because of delays in developing this framework adjustment, the proposed management measures will not be implemented on May 1, 2006. As a result, the Secretary of Commerce announced plans to implement measures that will take effect on May 1, 2006, and will remain in effect until Framework 42 is implemented. While a proposed rule was published on March 3, 2006, the final rule has not been published and the exact measures have not been announced.

Monkfish Framework 2 amended the monkfish rebuilding plan to include an annual measure of the status of the stocks and adjustment to management measures as needed to maintain a 10-year rebuilding schedule. This action occurred before the Multispecies FMP created multiple DAS categories in Amendment 13. Framework 2 implemented a target total allowable catch (TAC) setting method that is based upon the relationship between the 3-year running average of the National Marine Fisheries Service's (NOAA Fisheries) fall trawl survey biomass index (3-year average biomass index) and established annual biomass index targets (annual index target). The adjustments to measures are done each year following availability of the fall survey indices, and rulemaking to be effective at the start of the fishing year on May 1.

The Council created the tiered multispecies DAS categories in Amendment 13, and created the Category B (regular) DAS pilot program in Framework 40A. The pilot program was designed to test the concept of using Category B (regular) DAS to target healthy groundfish stocks while minimizing the impact on groundfish stocks of concern. Since monkfish Category C and D vessels fishing on a "multispecies" DAS in the NFMA have no monkfish trip limit, those vessels could target monkfish on a Category B (regular) DAS provided they did not exceed the limits on multispecies stocks of concern. The Framework 40A analysis of impacts acknowledged that this provision could result in an increase in monkfish fishing mortality, but at the time the NEFMC was considering Framework 40A the northern monkfish stock was nearly rebuilt and the southern stock was showing significant improvement. The NEFMC, therefore, took no steps to limit the ability of Category C and D vessels to use a Category B (regular) DAS to either target monkfish (in the northern area) or to satisfy the multispecies DAS usage requirement on a monkfish DAS (particularly, in the southern area).

The Monkfish Monitoring Committee, in reviewing data for the FY 2006 annual adjustment, determined that the 3-year average of the trawl survey data for both areas declined in 2005, both stocks have returned to an overfished status and are lagging behind the rebuilding schedule. The TACs for both areas will be reduced substantially in FY 2006, adding to the importance of reducing effort directed on monkfish. As a result of this information, the Council determined that monkfish needs to be removed as a species that can be targeted under the Category B (regular) DAS program established under the Northeast Multispecies FMP. The Council believes it does not make sense to allow vessels to target monkfish under a Category B (regular) DAS when this species is under a rebuilding plan, and is behind in its rebuilding schedule. Since monkfish is not managed by the Northeast Multispecies FMP, this action is also considered Monkfish Framework 3 so that monkfish possession limits can be established for vessels fishing in the Category B (regular) DAS program.

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action includes a broad range of measures designed to achieve mortality targets, provide opportunities to target healthy stocks, mitigate (to the extent possible) the economic impacts of the measures, and improve administration of the fishery. Details of the measures summarized below can be found in section 4.0. The measures include:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **George Bank Yellowtail Flounder Rebuilding Strategy:** This stock was recently determined to be overfished. The Proposed Action adopts an adaptive rebuilding strategy for this stock that will rebuild the stock to SSBMSY by 2014 with approximately a 75 percent probability. Fishing mortality will be controlled to F_{MSY} through 2008, and then will be adjusted to an F rebuild that will achieve the biomass target by the end of the rebuilding period.
- **Commercial Fishery Measures:** The following measures are proposed to control fishing mortality to the Amendment 13 rebuilding targets.
 - A change in the ratio of Category A and B DAS that reduces the number of Category A DAS available to the fishery by 8.3 percent.
 - Establishment of areas in the Gulf of Maine (GOM) and Southern New England (SNE) where DAS are counted at the rate of 2:1. In the GOM, a vessel is charged this rate for the entire trip if it catches fish from this area at any time. In SNE a vessel is charged at the differential rate only for time spent in the area.
 - Adoption of a trip limit for Georges Bank (GB) yellowtail flounder and Georges Bank winter flounder, and changes to the trip limits for Cape Cod/Gulf of Maine (CC/GOM) and Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic (SNE/MA) yellowtail flounder.
 - Provision to allow the Regional Administrator to adjust trip limits, including specific guidance to adjust the GB yellowtail flounder trip limit.
- **Recreational Measures:** In order to reduce fishing mortality of GOM cod, the minimum size for cod is increased to 24 inches and possession of cod from the GOM is prohibited from November 1 through March 31.
- **Special Management Programs:** Several changes are proposed to the Category B (regular) DAS Program and two Special Access Programs.
 - **Category B (regular) DAS Program:** The program is extended, but the total number of DAS that can be used in the program is reduced to 3,500. Trawl vessels are required to use a haddock separator trawl. Incidental catch Total Allowable Catches (TACs) are adopted for GB yellowtail and winter flounder since overfishing is occurring on those stocks. Trip limits are adopted that will prevent targeting GB yellowtail, GB winter flounder, and monkfish.
 - **Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP:** A process is established to automatically adjust the haddock TAC for this SAP based on changes in exploitable biomass of the haddock stock. The TACs proposed for fishing years 2006 through 2009 are calculated based on the proposed formula.
 - **Eastern U.S./Canada Haddock SAP:** This SAP is extended through fishing year 2008. The opening date for the SAP is changed from May 1 to August 1 in order to reduce discards of cod and winter flounder. A process is also defined for the Regional Administrator to approve additional gear that can be used in this SAP.
 - **Standard Requirements for Special Management Programs:** Standard reporting and other requirements are adopted for all SAPs and the Category B (regular) DAS program in order to simplify compliance and the implementation of future programs.
- **GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector:** A second sector is established that will be assigned a hard quota for GB cod. Participants must agree to use sink gillnets, jig, handline, or non-automated demersal longline gear.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **DAS Leasing:** The DAS leasing program is extended with no changes.
- **DAS Transfer Program:** The permanent exchange of DAS through the DAS Transfer Program is made more favorable through modifications to this program. This includes technical changes intended to clarify the transfer of permit and fishing history, elimination of the requirement that the vessel selling DAS exit all fisheries, and a prohibition to prevent hook category vessels from transferring DAS to vessels that are not required to use hook gear.
- **Vessel Monitoring System (VMS):** All limited access DAS groundfish vessels will be required to install a VMS in order to fish for groundfish while on a DAS. A vessel is allowed to renew its groundfish permit without installing a VMS, but will not be allowed to fish for groundfish during the fishing year without a VMS.
- **Haddock Separator Trawl Incentive Standards:** In order to encourage the proper use of the haddock separator trawl, vessels required to use the trawl will be subject to landing no more than 500 pounds of flounders (all species, combined), monkfish (whole live weight), and skates, and will be prohibited from landing lobsters.
- **Haddock Trip Limit:** The haddock trip limit is removed, but the Regional Administrator retains authority to implement a trip limit if necessary to prevent exceeding the haddock TAC.
- **SNE Regulated Mesh Area Trawl Mesh Requirement:** The minimum size for a diamond mesh cod end while fishing on a groundfish DAS in the SNE RMA is reduced from 7 inches to 6.5 inches. Cod ends in this area must be a minimum of 6.5 inch diamond or square mesh.

Summary of Environmental Consequences

The environmental impacts of this action are discussed in detail in section 7.2. Biological impacts are described in section 7.2.1, impacts on essential fish habitat are described in section 7.2.2, impacts on endangered and other protected species are described in section 7.2.3, the economic impacts are described in section 7.2.4, and social impacts are described in section 7.2.5. Cumulative effects are described in section 7.11. Summaries of the impacts are provided in the following paragraphs.

Biological Impacts

The Proposed Action will reduce fishing mortality on most groundfish stocks, and as a result mortality targets will be achieved for all stocks. In some instances fishing mortality that will result from these measures will be below the Amendment 13 targets. The Proposed Action will also reduce fishing mortality on monkfish. The expected reductions in groundfish fishing mortality are shown in the following table.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Species	Stock	Proposed Action Change In Fishing Mortality	Targeted Fishing Mortality Reduction from Effort Controls
Winter Flounder	GB	-41%	-35%
Winter Flounder	GOM	-52%	
Winter Flounder	SNE/MA	-19%	-9%
Cod	GB	-9%	0%
Cod	GOM	-44%	-32%
Haddock	GB	1%	
Haddock	GOM	-22%	
Plaice		-11%	
Pollock		-17%	
Redfish		-5%	
White Hake		-18%	-13%
Windowpane	NORTH	-31%	
Windowpane	SOUTH	-45%	
Witch	ALL	-25%	
Yellowtail	CC/GOM	-49%	-46%
Yellowtail	GB	-40%	-0%
Yellowtail	SNE/MA	-63%	-55%

For some stocks, rebuilding is expected to proceed more rapidly than anticipated by Amendment 13 as a result of this action. These stocks include GB haddock, GB cod, GOM cod.

Because the Proposed Action includes several changes to trip limits, this action may increase discard rates of GB yellowtail and winter flounder, CC/GOM and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, and white hake. It is uncertain whether this will result in increased discards since effort is also being reduced and it is possible that the amount of discards may decrease even as discard rates increase. This may be particularly true for CC/GOM and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, where the proposed differential DAS counting areas may reduce effort on these two stocks.

Essential Fish Habitat Impacts

No adverse impacts on EFH are expected to result from the Proposed Action. Reductions in effort, including differential DAS counting areas and a reduced number of DAS in the Category B (regular) DAS Program, are expected to benefit habitat. Other changes to special management programs are expected to have either neutral or beneficial effects on EFH.

Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species

None of the measures proposed in Framework 42 are likely to produce impacts to protected species beyond those described in Amendment 13. While not quantifiable, the impacts of that action were expected to be beneficial as a result of overall reductions in groundfish fishing effort. In the case of the Framework 42 Proposed Action, particular effort reductions will occur in the GOM and in SNE, relative high use areas for several large whales species, small cetaceans and pinnipeds, resulting in more distinct benefits to protected resources compared to the status quo.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Economic Impacts

The Proposed Action will affect any commercial groundfish vessel with a limited access permit and a DAS baseline greater than zero. Total nominal revenues landed by these vessels on trips where groundfish was landed was \$109 million in FY 2004. The Proposed Action would result in a short-term reduction in total fishing revenues of \$21 million, of which the majority (\$15 million) would be losses in revenue from regulated groundfish. This represents 19 percent of total groundfish revenue. Since many of these vessels participate in other fisheries, it represents an 8 percent decline in total fishing revenue.

Impacts on revenues are not evenly distributed. In general, ports adjacent to differential DAS areas that receive landings from the dayboat fleet are expected to have the largest declines in groundfish revenues. The ports of Portsmouth NH, Gloucester MA, Boston MA, Portland ME, South Shore MA, Chatham MA, and Provincetown MA are expected to see a decline in the value of landed catch (all species) of more than four percent, but the loss in groundfish revenues is higher. The ports expected to have the largest loss in groundfish revenues include Other NH Coast (-43%), New Jersey (-40%), South Shore MA (-32%), and North Shore MA (-31%). When impacts are measured by homeport state of fishing vessel, at the median level of impacts the largest declines in total fishing revenues are expected for vessels with homeports in New Hampshire (-33%) and Massachusetts (-16%). The largest declines in total revenues (again, reported at the median level) are inversely related to vessel size: -16% for vessels less than 50 feet, -12% for vessels 50 to 70 feet, and -5% for vessels greater than 70 feet. Gillnet and trawl vessels are expected to have similar declines at the median (-13%), while total revenues for hook vessels are expected to decline 5%. Vessels that fish more than 75% of their time in the inshore GOM blocks are expected to lose 35% of total revenue at the median, while those that fish less than 75% of their time in the inshore blocks are expected to lose 10% of their total revenue at the median.

The reductions in revenues summarized in the previous paragraph do not take into account revenues from Special Access Programs (SAPs) or the Category B (regular) DAS Program. Estimates suggest that revenues from these programs should exceed \$6 million, providing a measure of mitigation to the economic impacts. Since these programs are primarily used on Georges Bank, they may not benefit all vessels affected by this action.

Regional impacts were estimated using an input/output model of the Northeast Region. The estimated short-term impact on the northeast region gross sales was estimated as harvesters of \$21 million for harvesters, \$5 million for dealers, and \$26 million for processors. Given this decline in gross sales of \$52 million, the overall impact on the region's economy is estimated as \$98 million. The largest impacts would be felt in the sub-regions of New Bedford (\$14.4 million), Gloucester (\$13.5 million), New York coastal (\$12.6 million), and Boston (\$11.1 million). Impacts in Massachusetts account for 43% of total northeast region impacts.

Social Impacts

The increased regulation of the groundfish fishery implemented by this action will likely have negative impacts on several of the key social factors identified in Amendment 13. Reductions in DAS and differential DAS counting areas will cause disruptions in daily living and will reduce occupational opportunities in the groundfish fishery. It is likely that the attitudes of fishermen towards the regulations will also suffer negative impacts, as fishermen resent the imposition of additional regulations so soon after the adoption of Amendment 13. The social impacts will not be evenly distributed. Ports most affected by the differential DAS counting area in the inshore Gulf of Maine will be more heavily impacted than those ports that do not rely on that area for a substantial portion of groundfish revenues. The impacts on vessel safety are uncertain. The Proposed Action was selected in part because it was viewed as having less adverse impact on safety than the other most promising alternative, but that does not mean that there

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

will be no impacts on vessel safety. Some of the measures adopted in this action may help mitigate the adverse social impacts. These measures include the DAS leasing program, the extension of the Eastern U.S./Canada Haddock SAP, the adjustment to the haddock TAC for the CAI Hook Gear Haddock SAP, and the Category B (regular) DAS Program. Some of the smaller inshore vessels that are most affected by the action may be unable to take advantage of these programs, however, and so their communities may not receive much benefit from them.

Cumulative Effects

This action, when considered in light of past, other present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, will not have a significant impact on the human environment as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (“the natural and physical environment and the relationship of the people with that environment”). Since this action continues the rebuilding programs adopted by Amendment 13, the physical and biological impacts fall within the range of the impacts characterized by that action. Analysis shows that there will not be significant impacts on habitat, protected species, groundfish stocks, or other stocks. It is likely, however, that the combination of Amendment 13 and this action will result in significant social and economic impacts.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The Council considered the No Action alternative and six other alternatives, with the major elements of these alternatives described below. For details of these alternatives, see section 5.0. The impacts of the alternatives are summarized in Table 1.

- No Action: Most measures in place in FY 2005 would be continued. Available Category A DAS would be reduced by eight percent, the DAS leasing program would end on April 30, 2006, the Category B (regular) DAS Program would not be renewed, and the Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP would expire in November, 2006. Monkfish would not be targeted on Category B (regular) DAS since that program would not be renewed.
- Alternative 1: Available Category A DAS would be reduced by 22 percent, differential DAS counting areas would be implemented in the GOM and SNE, trip limits would be established for GB winter flounder, GB yellowtail flounder, white hake, and changed for CC/GOM yellowtail flounder and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, additional measures would be adopted for the recreational fishery, the DAS leasing program would be renewed, the Category B (regular) DAS Program would be renewed, the Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP would be extended, and Fixed Gear Sector would be authorized.
- Alternative 2: Available Category A DAS would be reduced by 23 percent, larger differential DAS counting areas would be implemented in the GOM and SNE, trip limits would be established for GB winter flounder, GB yellowtail flounder, white hake, and changed for CC/GOM yellowtail flounder and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, additional measures would be adopted for the recreational fishery, the DAS leasing program would be renewed, the Category B (regular) DAS Program would be renewed, the Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP would be extended, and a Fixed Gear Sector would be authorized.
- Alternative 3: Available Category A DAS would be reduced by 38 percent, DAS would be counted as a minimum of twelve hours in the GOM, a differential DAS counting area would be implemented in SNE, trip limits would be established for GB winter flounder, GB yellowtail flounder, white hake, and changed for CC/GOM yellowtail flounder and SNE/MA yellowtail

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

flounder, additional measures would be adopted for the recreational fishery, the DAS leasing program would be renewed, the Category B (regular) DAS Program would be renewed, the Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP would be extended, and a Fixed Gear Sector would be authorized.

- Alternative 4: Available Category A DAS would be reduced by 25 percent, DAS would be counted as a minimum of twenty-four hours in the GOM, a differential DAS counting area would be implemented in SNE, trip limits would be established for GB winter flounder, GB yellowtail flounder, white hake, and changed for CC/GOM yellowtail flounder and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, additional measures would be adopted for the recreational fishery, the DAS leasing program would be renewed, the Category B (regular) DAS Program would be renewed, the Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP would be extended, and a Fixed Gear Sector would be authorized.
- Alternative 5: Available Category A DAS would be reduced by 40 percent, a differential DAS counting area would be implemented in SNE, trip limits would be established for GB winter flounder, GB yellowtail flounder, white hake, and changed for CC/GOM yellowtail flounder and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, additional measures would be adopted for the recreational fishery, the DAS leasing program would not be renewed, the Category B (regular) DAS Program would be renewed, the Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP would be extended, and a Fixed Gear Sector would be authorized.
- Alternative E(modified): This alternative is not numbered sequential to the other alternatives as it was developed at a later date. It was developed as an option for reducing commercial fishing mortality, but issues such as changes to special management programs, extending the DAS leasing program, and recreational measures were not specified though if this option were selected it is possible those other measures may have been incorporated. This alternative would reduce available Category A DAS by 8 percent, count DAS in all hours in twenty-four hour blocks, adopt a differential DAS counting area in SNE, and trip limits would be established for GB winter flounder, GB yellowtail flounder, white hake, and changed for CC/GOM yellowtail flounder and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Table 1 – Comparison of impacts across alternatives

Type of Impacts	Alternative							
	Proposed Action	No Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	Alternative E(mod)
<p>Biological</p> <p>Groundfish</p> <p>Other species</p> <p>Bycatch</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>Reduces monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>	<p>Does not achieve all mortality targets</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>Reduces monkfish catch</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>May reduce monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>May reduce monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>May reduce monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>May reduce monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>May reduce monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>	<p>Achieves all mortality targets</p> <p>Rebuilds some stocks more rapidly</p> <p>Reduces catches because of effort reductions</p> <p>May reduce monkfish catch</p> <p>May increase groundfish discard rates on Cat A DAS from additional trip limits</p>
Habitat	Beneficial	Neutral	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	Beneficial	
Endangered/ Protected Species	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions	Beneficial effort reductions
<p>Human Communities</p> <p>Economic</p> <p>Social</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$15M</p> <p>Negative impacts, not distributed evenly</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$6M</p> <p>Negative impacts, but relatively minor compared to alternatives</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$19M</p> <p>Negative impacts, somewhat evenly distributed</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$20M</p> <p>Negative impacts, somewhat evenly distributed</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$26M</p> <p>Negative impacts, more severe, somewhat evenly distributed</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$23M</p> <p>Negative impacts, more severe, somewhat evenly distributed</p> <p>Additional safety concerns</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$28M</p> <p>Negative impacts, more severe, somewhat evenly distributed</p>	<p>Reduces groundfish revenues \$15M</p> <p>Negative impacts, not distributed evenly</p> <p>Additional safety concerns</p>

Intentionally Blank

2.0 CONTENTS

2.1 Table of Contents

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2.0 CONTENTS	13
2.1 Table of Contents	13
2.2 List of Tables	23
2.3 List of Figures.....	30
2.4 List of Acronyms	33
3.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	37
3.1 Background	37
3.1.1 Background for Multispecies Framework 42.....	37
3.1.2 Background for Monkfish Framework 3.....	38
3.2 Purpose and Need for the Action.....	41
3.2.1 Purpose and need for Monkfish Framework 3.....	41
3.3 Brief History of the Northeast Multispecies and Monkfish Fishery Management Plans	42
3.3.1 Multispecies FMP	42
3.3.2 Monkfish FMP	42
3.4 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	44
4.0 PROPOSED ACTION	45
4.1 Framework Mortality Objectives	45
4.1.1 GB Yellowtail Flounder Rebuilding Strategy	45
4.1.2 Target TACS	47
4.1.3 Incidental Catch TACs.....	48
4.2 Commercial Fishing Measures	51
4.2.1 Effort Controls	51
4.2.2 Differential DAS Counting	51
4.2.3 Differential DAS Counting Area	52
4.2.4 Trip Limits	54
4.2.5 Trip Limit Adjustments.....	55

4.3	Recreational Fishing Measures	56
4.4	Special Management Programs	57
4.4.1	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	57
4.4.1.1	Effort Controls	57
4.4.1.2	Incidental Catch TACs.....	59
4.4.1.3	Catch limits	61
4.4.1.4	Gear requirements	63
4.4.1.5	Catch Monitoring	63
4.4.1.6	Program Monitoring.....	64
4.4.2	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	64
4.4.3	Eastern US/CA Haddock SAP	65
4.4.3.1	Extension.....	65
4.4.3.2	Season Opening.....	65
4.4.3.3	Approval of additional gear	65
4.4.4	Standard requirements for special management programs (including SAPs, fishing in US/CA area, Category B (regular) DAS program).....	65
4.5	Georges Bank Cod Fixed Gear Sector	67
4.5.1	TAC.....	67
4.5.2	Management Measures	67
4.6	DAS Leasing Program	67
4.7	DAS Transfer Program Modifications	68
4.8	Vessel Monitoring System	69
4.9	Haddock Separator Trawl or Other Authorized Gear Performance Incentives	69
4.10	Changes to the Haddock Trip Limit	69
4.11	US/CA Resource Sharing Understanding	70
4.11.1	Combined Trips to the Eastern US/CA Area	70
4.11.2	Regional Administrator Authority to Adjust Measures in the US/CA Area.....	70
4.11.3	Cod Landing Limit in the Eastern US/CA Area	71
4.12	SNE/MA RMA Trawl Mesh Requirements	71
5.0	ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION	73
5.1	Introduction	73
5.2	Principal Management Measures	76
5.2.1	No Action.....	76
5.2.2	GB Yellowtail Flounder Rebuilding Strategy.....	79
5.2.3	Measures to meet mortality targets	81
5.2.3.1	Differential DAS counting in the Inshore Gulf of Maine	81
5.2.3.2	Revised DAS Counting.....	85
5.2.3.3	Combined Measures.....	86
5.2.3.4	GOM Cod Trip Limit.....	87

CONTENTS
Table of Contents

5.2.3.5	Differential DAS counting to protect SNE/MA Yellowtail Flounder.....	87
5.2.3.6	Trip Limits	89
5.2.3.7	Reduction in Allocated Category A DAS	90
5.2.3.8	Alternative E (modified)	90
5.2.3.9	Recreational Fishing Measures	91
5.2.4	Special Management Programs.....	92
5.2.4.1	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	92
5.3	Independent Measures.....	94
5.3.1	Measures to Reduce Haddock Bycatch.....	94
5.3.2	Changes to Groundfish Permit Eligibility for Scallop Vessels	94
5.4	Measures that may be considered in a future action	94
6.0	AFFECTED HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	97
6.1	Physical Environment.....	97
6.2	Biological Environment	101
6.2.1	Regulated Groundfish Stock Status	101
6.2.1.1	Summary of Groundfish Stock Status in 2004.....	101
6.2.1.2	Estimates of Stock Status in 2005	123
6.2.2	Monkfish Stock Status	125
6.2.2.1	Stock Assessment (SAW 40).....	125
6.2.2.2	2005 Fall Survey Results	125
6.2.3	Skates Stock Status	128
6.2.4	Spiny Dogfish Stock Status.....	130
6.3	Habitat	130
6.3.1	Habitat Associations	131
6.3.1.1	Gulf of Maine.....	131
6.3.1.2	Georges Bank.....	135
6.3.1.3	Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic Bight.....	139
6.3.2	Gear Effects	141
6.4	Endangered and Other Protected Species	144
6.4.1	Protected Species Not Likely to be Affected by the Multispecies FMP.....	145
6.4.2	Protected Species Potentially Affected by the Multispecies FMP.....	146
6.4.3	Actions to Minimize Interactions with Protected Species	167
6.4.3.1	Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan.....	168
6.4.3.2	Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan.....	168
6.4.3.3	NMFS Rule to Conserve Sea Turtles.....	168
6.4.3.4	Atlantic Trawl Take Reduction Team.....	169
6.5	Human Communities and the Fishery	170
6.5.1	Overview.....	170
6.5.2	Commercial Harvesting Sector	173
6.5.2.1	DAS Allocations and Use	174
6.5.2.2	Landings and Revenues	184
6.5.2.3	Days-At-Sea Leasing and Transfer Programs.....	203
6.5.2.4	Closed Area II Yellowtail Flounder Special Access Program	204

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

6.5.2.5	Category B (regular) DAS Pilot Project.....	205
6.5.2.6	Closed Area 1 Hook Gear Haddock SAP	208
6.5.2.7	Eastern U.S./CA Area Haddock SAP	209
6.5.2.8	Haddock Separator Trawl	211
6.5.3	Recreational Harvesting Sector.....	215
6.5.4	Processing and Wholesale Trade Sector	227
6.5.5	Communities	227
6.5.5.1	Background.....	227
6.5.5.2	Expected Impacts of Amendment 13	233
7.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES – ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS	239
7.1	Introduction.....	239
7.2	Proposed Action	242
7.2.1	Biological Impacts	242
7.2.1.1	Impacts on Groundfish.....	242
7.2.1.2	Impacts on Other Species.....	287
7.2.1.3	Impacts on Bycatch.....	289
7.2.2	Impact to EFH of Proposed Action.....	292
7.2.2.1	Framework Mortality Objectives	292
7.2.2.2	Commercial Fishing Measures.....	294
7.2.2.3	Effort Controls	294
7.2.2.4	Differential DAS Counting	295
7.2.2.5	Differential DAS Counting Area	295
7.2.2.6	Trip Limits	297
7.2.2.7	Trip Limit Adjustments.....	298
7.2.2.8	Recreational Fishing Measures	298
7.2.2.9	Special Management Programs.....	299
7.2.2.10	GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector	306
7.2.2.11	DAS Leasing.....	306
7.2.2.12	DAS Transfer Program Modification.....	306
7.2.2.13	Vessel Monitoring System	307
7.2.2.14	Haddock Separator Trawl Performance Standards	307
7.2.2.15	Summary of Impacts to EFH of Proposed Action.....	309
7.2.3	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	314
7.2.3.1	Introduction.....	314
7.2.3.2	Measures not likely to affect protected resources	315
7.2.3.3	Measures that may affect protected resources	316
7.2.3.4	Conclusion	317
7.2.4	Economic Impacts.....	317
7.2.4.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	317
7.2.4.2	Recreational Fishery Measures	330
7.2.4.3	Special Management Programs.....	332
7.2.4.4	GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector	335
7.2.4.5	DAS Leasing.....	335
7.2.4.6	DAS Transfer Program Modifications.....	336
7.2.4.7	Vessel Monitoring System	337
7.2.4.8	Haddock Separator Trawl Performance Incentives.....	338
7.2.4.9	Changes to the Haddock Trip Limit.....	339

CONTENTS
Table of Contents

7.2.4.10	U.S./Canada Resource Sharing Understanding.....	339
7.2.4.11	SNE/MA Trawl Mesh Requirements.....	339
7.2.4.12	Summary of Proposed Action Economic Impacts	339
7.2.5	Social Impacts.....	340
7.2.5.1	Commercial Fishing Measures.....	341
7.2.5.2	Recreational Measures	345
7.2.5.3	Special Management Programs.....	345
7.2.5.4	GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector	349
7.2.5.5	DAS Leasing.....	350
7.2.5.6	DAS Transfer Program Modifications.....	350
7.2.5.7	Vessel Monitoring System.....	351
7.2.5.8	Haddock Separator Trawl Performance Standards	351
7.2.5.9	Changes to the Haddock Trip Limit.....	352
7.2.5.10	U.S./CA Resource Sharing Understanding	352
7.2.5.11	SNE/MA Trawl Mesh Requirements.....	352
7.2.5.12	Summary	352
7.2.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	353
7.2.6.1	Mid-Atlantic Fisheries	353
7.2.6.2	Scallop Fishery.....	354
7.2.6.3	Skate Fishery.....	359
7.2.6.4	Monkfish.....	359
7.3	No Action	360
7.3.1	Biological Impacts	360
7.3.1.1	Impacts on Groundfish.....	360
7.3.1.2	Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch	362
7.3.2	Habitat Impacts	363
7.3.3	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species.....	363
7.3.4	Economic Impacts.....	364
7.3.4.1	Summary	369
7.3.5	Social Impacts	370
7.3.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	370
7.4	Alternative 1	370
7.4.1	Biological Impacts	371
7.4.1.1	Impacts on Groundfish.....	371
7.4.1.2	Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch	379
7.4.2	Habitat Impacts	380
7.4.3	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species.....	381
7.4.4	Economic Impacts.....	382
7.4.4.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	382
7.4.4.2	Recreational Measures	388
7.4.4.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP.....	391
7.4.4.4	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	391
7.4.4.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	391
7.4.4.6	DAS Leasing.....	392
7.4.4.7	Fixed Gear Sector.....	392
7.4.5	Social Impacts.....	393
7.4.5.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	393
7.4.5.2	Recreational Measures	393
7.4.5.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	393

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

7.4.5.4 Category B (regular) DAS Program..... 394

7.4.5.5 Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP 395

7.4.5.6 DAS Leasing 395

7.4.5.7 Fixed Gear Sector..... 395

7.4.5.8 Summary of Alternative 1 Social Impacts 396

7.4.6 Impacts on Other Fisheries 396

7.4.6.1 Mid-Atlantic Fisheries 396

7.4.6.2 Scallop Fishery..... 397

7.4.6.3 Skate Fishery..... 397

7.4.6.4 Monkfish 397

7.5 Alternative 2 398

7.5.1 Biological Impacts 398

7.5.1.1 Impacts on Groundfish..... 399

7.5.1.2 Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch 406

7.5.2 Habitat Impacts 407

7.5.3 Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species 408

7.5.4 Economic Impacts..... 408

7.5.4.1 Commercial Fishery Measures..... 408

7.5.4.2 Recreational Fishing Measures 414

7.5.4.3 Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment..... 416

7.5.4.4 Category B (regular) DAS Program..... 416

7.5.4.5 Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP 417

7.5.4.6 DAS Leasing 417

7.5.4.7 Fixed Gear Sector..... 418

7.5.5 Social Impacts 418

7.5.5.1 Commercial Fishery Measures..... 418

7.5.5.2 Recreational Fishing Measures\ 418

7.5.5.3 Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment..... 418

7.5.5.4 Category B (regular) DAS Program..... 419

7.5.5.5 Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP 420

7.5.5.6 DAS Leasing 420

7.5.5.7 Fixed Gear Sector..... 420

7.5.5.8 Summary of Alternative 2 Social Impacts 421

7.5.6 Impacts on Other Fisheries 421

7.5.6.1 Mid-Atlantic Fisheries 421

7.5.6.2 Scallop Fishery..... 422

7.5.6.3 Skate Fishery..... 422

7.5.6.4 Monkfish 422

7.6 Alternative 3 423

7.6.1 Biological Impacts 423

7.6.1.1 Impacts on Groundfish..... 423

7.6.1.2 Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch 435

7.6.2 Habitat Impacts 436

7.6.3 Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species 437

7.6.4 Economic Impacts..... 437

7.6.4.1 Commercial Fishery Measures..... 437

7.6.4.2 Recreational Fishing Measures 443

7.6.4.3 Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment..... 445

7.6.4.4 Category B (regular) DAS Program..... 445

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

7.6.4.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	446
7.6.4.6	DAS Leasing	446
7.6.4.7	GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector	447
7.6.5	Social Impacts	447
7.6.5.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	447
7.6.5.2	Recreational Fishing Measures\.....	447
7.6.5.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	447
7.6.5.4	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	448
7.6.5.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	449
7.6.5.6	DAS Leasing	449
7.6.5.7	Fixed Gear Sector.....	449
7.6.5.8	Summary of Alternative 3 Social Impacts	450
7.6.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	450
7.6.6.1	Mid-Atlantic Fisheries	450
7.6.6.2	Scallop Fishery.....	451
7.6.6.3	Skate Fishery.....	451
7.6.6.4	Monkfish	451
7.7	Alternative 4	452
7.7.1	Biological Impacts	452
7.7.1.1	Impacts on Groundfish.....	453
7.7.1.2	Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch	460
7.7.2	Habitat Impacts	461
7.7.3	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	462
7.7.4	Economic Impacts.....	462
7.7.4.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	462
7.7.4.2	Recreational Fishing Measures	469
7.7.4.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	471
7.7.4.4	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	472
7.7.4.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	472
7.7.4.6	DAS Leasing	472
7.7.4.7	GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector	473
7.7.5	Social Impacts	473
7.7.5.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	473
7.7.5.2	Recreational Fishing Measures	473
7.7.5.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	474
7.7.5.4	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	474
7.7.5.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	475
7.7.5.6	DAS Leasing	475
7.7.5.7	Fixed Gear Sector.....	476
7.7.5.8	Summary of Alternative 4 Social Impacts	476
7.7.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	476
7.7.6.1	Mid-Atlantic Fisheries	477
7.7.6.2	Scallop Fishery.....	477
7.7.6.3	Skate Fishery.....	477
7.7.6.4	Monkfish	478
7.8	Alternative 5	478
7.8.1	Biological Impacts	479
7.8.1.1	Impacts on Groundfish.....	479
7.8.1.2	Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch	492

CONTENTS

Table of Contents

7.8.2	Habitat Impacts	493
7.8.3	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	494
7.8.4	Economic Impacts	494
7.8.4.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	494
7.8.4.2	Recreational Fishing Measures	500
7.8.4.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	502
7.8.4.4	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	502
7.8.4.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	502
7.8.4.6	GB Cod Fixed Gear Sector	503
7.8.5	Social Impacts	503
7.8.5.1	Commercial Fishery Measures.....	503
7.8.5.2	Recreational Fishing Measures	503
7.8.5.3	Closed Area I Hook Gear Haddock SAP TAC Adjustment.....	503
7.8.5.4	Category B (regular) DAS Program.....	504
7.8.5.5	Eastern U.S./Canada Area Haddock SAP	505
7.8.5.6	Fixed Gear Sector.....	505
7.8.5.7	Summary of Alternative 5 Social Impacts	505
7.8.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	506
7.8.6.1	Mid-Atlantic Fisheries	506
7.8.6.2	Scallop Fishery.....	506
7.8.6.3	Skate Fishery.....	507
7.8.6.4	Monkfish	507
7.9	Alternative E (modified).....	507
7.9.1	Biological Impacts	508
7.9.1.1	Impacts on Groundfish.....	508
7.9.1.2	Impacts on Other Species/Bycatch	509
7.9.2	Habitat Impacts	509
7.9.3	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	509
7.9.4	Economic Impacts.....	510
7.9.5	Social Impacts	515
7.9.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	516
7.9.6.1	Mid-Atlantic Fisheries	516
7.9.6.2	Scallop Fishery.....	516
7.9.6.3	Skate Fishery.....	516
7.9.6.4	Monkfish	517
7.10	Independent Measures.....	517
7.10.1	Biological Impacts	517
7.10.1.1	Measures to Reduce Haddock Bycatch.....	517
7.10.1.2	Changes to Groundfish Permit Eligibility for Scallop Vessels	521
7.10.2	Habitat Impacts	521
7.10.3	Impacts on Endangered/Threatened Species.....	522
7.10.3.1	Measures to Reduce Haddock Bycatch.....	522
7.10.3.2	Changes to Groundfish Permit Eligibility for Scallop Vessels	522
7.10.4	Economic Impacts.....	522
7.10.4.1	Measures to Reduce Haddock Bycatch.....	522
7.10.4.2	Changes to Groundfish Permit Eligibility for Scallop Vessels	523
7.10.5	Social Impacts	523
7.10.5.1	Measures to Reduce Haddock Bycatch.....	523
7.10.5.2	Changes to Groundfish Permit Eligibility for Scallop Vessels	524

CONTENTS
Table of Contents

7.10.6	Impacts on Other Fisheries	526
7.10.6.1	Measures to Reduce Haddock Bycatch.....	526
7.10.6.2	Changes to Groundfish Permit Eligibility for Scallop Vessels	526
7.11	Cumulative Effects Analysis	526
7.11.1	Introduction to Cumulative Impacts	526
7.11.2	Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions	528
7.11.2.1	Target and Non-Target Species.....	528
7.11.2.2	Protected Species	532
7.11.2.3	Habitat.....	533
7.11.2.4	Human Communities and the Fishery.....	537
7.11.3	Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action	538
7.11.3.1	Cumulative Effects on Regulated Groundfish Stocks.....	538
7.11.3.2	Cumulative Effects on Non-groundfish Species	539
7.11.3.3	Cumulative Effects on Endangered and Other Protected Species.....	539
7.11.3.4	Cumulative Effects on Habitat	539
7.11.3.5	Cumulative Effects on Human Communities and the Fishery	540
7.11.4	Summary of Cumulative Impacts	540
7.12	Comparison of Alternatives	544
7.12.1	Comparison of Impacts	544
7.12.2	Biological Impacts	544
7.12.3	Habitat Impacts	547
7.12.4	Endangered and Other Protected Species	549
7.12.5	Human Communities and the Fishery.....	549
7.12.6	Rationale for Selecting the Proposed Action	559
8.0	APPLICABLE LAW	561
8.1	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.....	561
8.1.1	Consistency with National Standards	561
8.1.2	EFH Assessment	569
8.1.2.1	Description of Action.....	569
8.1.2.2	Assessing the Potential Adverse Impacts.....	570
8.1.2.3	Minimizing or Mitigating Adverse Impacts.....	572
8.1.2.4	Conclusions.....	572
8.1.3	Skate Baseline Review	572
8.1.3.1	Updated Stock Status for Thorny and Barndoor Skates.....	573
8.1.3.2	Summary of potential impacts on skate mortality from the measures that consider modifications to the NE Multispecies year-round closed areas	579
8.1.3.3	Summary of potential impacts on skate mortality from the measures that consider modifications to the NE Multispecies DAS restrictions	579
8.1.3.4	Conclusions.....	580
8.2	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	586
8.2.1	Environmental Assessment	586
8.2.2	Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)	586
8.2.3	List of Preparers; Point of Contact.....	593
8.2.4	Agencies Consulted	594
8.2.5	Opportunity for Public Comment	594

CONTENTS
Table of Contents

8.3	Endangered Species Act	595
8.4	Marine Mammal Protection Act.....	595
8.5	Coastal Zone Management Act.....	595
8.6	Administrative Procedure Act	596
8.7	Data Quality Act	596
8.7.1	Utility of Information Product	596
8.7.2	Integrity of Information Product.....	596
8.7.3	Objectivity of Information Product.....	597
8.8	Executive Order 13132 (Federalism).....	598
8.9	Executive Order 13158 (Marine Protected Areas).....	598
8.10	Paperwork Reduction Act.....	598
8.11	Regulatory Impact Review.....	600
8.11.1	Executive Order 12866	600
8.11.1.1	Summary of Impacts on Fishing Revenue	601
8.11.1.2	Summary of Recreational Fishing Impacts	602
8.11.1.3	Summary of Regional Economic Impacts.....	602
8.11.1.4	Mitigating Measures	603
8.11.1.5	Determination of Significance	605
8.11.2	Regulatory Flexibility Act	606
8.11.2.1	Impacts on Small Entities	606
8.11.2.2	Commercial Fishing Vessel Impacts.....	607
8.11.2.3	Mitigating Measures	608
8.11.2.4	Impacts on Party/Charter Vessels	609
8.11.2.5	Impacts on Category C and D Monkfish Vessels	609
8.11.2.6	Alternatives to the Proposed Action	610
9.0	REFERENCES.....	617
9.1	Glossary	617
9.2	Literature Cited	633
9.3	Index.....	646

APPENDICES

- Appendix I – DAS Leasing Report
- Appendix II – Closed Area II Yellowtail Flounder SAP in FY 2004
- Appendix III – Category B (regular) DAS Pilot Project, FY 2004/FY 2005
- Appendix IV – Multispecies Fishery in FY 2004
- Appendix V – Analytic Techniques
- Appendix VI – Regional Impacts Supporting Tables
- Appendix VII - Target TAC Projection Output

2.2 List of Tables

Table 1 – Comparison of impacts across alternatives.....	11
Table 2 – Mortality reduction necessary to achieve FY 2006 Amendment 13 targets	45
Table 3 – GB yellowtail flounder rebuilding strategy mortality rates and estimated catches. US catch based on 70/30 split with Canada.	46
Table 4 – Target TACs for 2006 through 2009 (metric tons, live weight)	48
Table 5 – Proposed incidental catch TACs for major stocks of concern (mt). TACs are for the fishing year. TACs shown are metric tons, live weight. Note: GB cod and GB yellowtail flounder TAC is determined annually and cannot be estimated in advance.	50
Table 6 - Proposed allocation of incidental catch TACs for major stocks of concern to Category B DAS programs (shown as percentage of the incidental catch TAC).....	50
Table 7 – Current estimates of the GB cod incidental catch TACs for FY 2006 through 2009 (mt, live weight)	51
Table 8 – Current estimates of the GB yellowtail flounder incidental catch TACs for FY 2006 through FY 2009 ((mt, live weight)	51
Table 9 – Current estimates of the GB winter flounder incidental catch TACs for FY 2006 through FY 2007 (mt, live weight).....	51
Table 10 – GB yellowtail flounder trip limit adjustment guidance.....	56
Table 11 – Proposed incidental catch TACs for the Category B DAS pilot program (mt, live weight). TACs for GB cod and GB yellowtail flounder depend on annual setting of TACs in the U.S./CA area.	60
Table 12 – Areas that will be closed to the use of Category B DAS when the incidental catch TAC is caught. Areas shown are statistical areas for all stocks except CC/GOM and SNE/MA yellowtail flounder, which are based on thirty-minute squares	60
Table 13 - Monkfish catch limits on Multispecies vessels under Alternative 1 (vessels prohibited from targeting monkfish on a B-regular DAS).....	62
Table 14 – Proposed CAI Haddock SAP TACs, FY 2006-2009	64
Table 15 – Measures analyzed in each alternative group	75
Table 16 – Rebuilding strategy Adaptive 1 mortality rates and estimated catches. US catch based on 70/30 split with Canada.....	80
Table 17 – Rebuilding strategy Phased 2 mortality rates and estimated catches. US catch based on 70/30 split with Canada.....	81
Table 18 Monkfish catch limits on Multispecies vessels under Alternative 2 (B-regular DAS program same as pilot program).....	93
Table 19 - Summary of groundfish stock status in 2004.	102
Table 20 – Derivation of estimated catch for CY 2005. Total catch incorporates Canadian and recreational catch, where appropriate	124
Table 21 2000 – 2005 NMFS autumn bottom trawl survey indices of monkfish abundance and biomass reference points.....	125
Table 22 - Gulf of Maine benthic assemblages as identified by Watling (1998).....	132
Table 23 - Comparison of demersal fish assemblages of Georges Bank and Gulf of Maine identified by Overholtz and Tyler (1985) and Gabriel (1992).	134
Table 24 - Sedimentary provinces of Georges Bank, as defined by Valentine <i>et al.</i> (1993) and Valentine and Lough (1991) with additional comments by Valentine (personal communication) and Benthic Assemblages assigned from Theroux and Grosslein (1987).....	137
Table 25 - Major Recurrent Demersal Finfish Assemblages of the Mid-Atlantic Bight During Spring and Fall as Determined by Colvocoresses and Musik (1983).....	140

CONTENTS
List of Tables

Table 26. Species and life stages determined to be adversely impacted by otter trawls in Amendment 13.	143
Table 27 – FY 2004 estimated catch compared to FY 2004 target TACs for major groundfish species (mt, live weight)	172
Table 28 – Number and Percent of monkfish limited access vessels also issued a limited access permit in other fisheries in 2004, by permit category.....	174
Table 29 – Monkfish open-access (Category E) permits issued each year since implementation of the FMP in 1999.	174
Table 30 – Category A DAS use by month, FY 2001- FY 2004	177
Table 31 – DAS allocated and used by limited access permit category, FY 2001- FY 2004 (Source: NMFS DAS, permit databases).....	178
Table 32 - DAS allocated and used by vessel length group, FY 2001- FY 2004 (Source: NMFS DAS, permit databases)	179
Table 33 – DAS allocations and use by homeport state, FY 2001 –FY 2004 (Source: NMFS DAS, permit databases).....	180
Table 34 – DAS allocations and use by principal gear designation, FY 2001 – FY 2004 (Source: NMFS DAS, permit databases)	181
Table 35 – Category B DAS use, FY 2004 (Source: NMFS DAS, permit databases)	182
Table 36 – Monkfish DAS usage, FY 2004.....	183
Table 37 - Monkfish-only, Monkfish/Multispecies and Monkfish/Scallop DAS Usage by call-in vessels (vessels fishing in the SFMA), FY 2004.....	183
Table 38 – Regulated groundfish landings and revenues, FY 2001 – FY 2004	185
Table 39 – Total landings (lbs., all species) by groundfish permit category (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).....	187
Table 40 – Total revenues (1999 dollars) by permit category (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).....	187
Table 41 – Number of multispecies permits landing regulated groundfish by permit category	188
Table 42 – Regulated groundfish landings (lbs., landed weight), by permit category (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).....	188
Table 43 – Regulated groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) by permit category (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	189
Table 44 – Average regulated groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) by permit category	189
Table 45 – Average groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) per DAS for limited access DAS permit categories	189
Table 46 – Total landings (lbs., all species) by vessel length group (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).....	190
Table 47 – Total revenues (1999 dollars, all species) by vessel length group (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	190
Table 48 – Regulated groundfish landings by vessel length group (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).....	191
Table 49 – Regulated groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) by vessel length group (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	191
Table 50 – Total landings (lbs., landed weight) by gear (Source: NMFS dealer database).....	192
Table 51 – Total revenues (1999 dollars) by gear (Source: NMFS dealer database)	192
Table 52 – Regulated groundfish landings (lbs., landed weight) by gear (Source: NMFS dealer database)	192
Table 53 – Regulated groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) by gear (Source: NMFS dealer database)	193
Table 54 – Total landings (lbs., landed weight) by homeport state (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).....	194
Table 55 – Total revenues (1999 dollars) by homeport state (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases).	194
Table 56 – Regulated groundfish landings (lbs., landed weight) by homeport state (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	195

CONTENTS
List of Tables

Table 57 – Regulated groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) by homeport state (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	195
Table 58 – Total landings (lbs., landed weight) by state and port group of landing (Source: NMFS dealer database)	197
Table 59 – Total revenues (1999 dollars) by state and port group of landing (Source: NMFS Dealer database)	198
Table 60 – Regulated groundfish landings (lbs., landed weight) by state and port group of landing (Source: NMFS dealer database)	199
Table 61 - Regulated groundfish revenues (1999 dollars) by state and port group of landing (Source: NMFS dealer database).....	200
Table 62 – Number of vessels with multispecies permits landing regulated groundfish in principal groundfish ports (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	201
Table 63 – Total landings for principal groundfish ports (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	201
Table 64 – Total revenues (1999 dollars) for principal groundfish ports (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	202
Table 65 – Groundfish landings for principal groundfish ports (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	202
Table 66 – Groundfish revenues for principal groundfish ports (Source: NMFS dealer, permit databases)	202
Table 67 – Comparison of FY 2004 and FY 2005 DAS leasing activity through January, 2006 (Source: NMFS DAS database).....	204
Table 68 - Total number of B (regular) DAS trips by quarter.	207
Table 69 - Distribution of B DAS used in the pilot B (regular) DAS program	207
Table 70 - Estimated catch (live pounds) from B (regular)-DAS pilot program for unflipped trips. Catch includes discards for cod, haddock, yellowtail, American Plaice, winter flounder, witch flounder, and white hake.	208
Table 71 - Contingency Table Analysis of FY 2005 Eastern US/Canada Haddock SAP Trip Flipping Rates.....	210
Table 72 – Species landed on 41 trips in the Eastern U.S./CA Haddock SAP in FY 2005 (Source: NMFS VTR and DAS databases as of December 19, 2005)	211
Table 73 – Observed trips using a separator panel, CY 2005 (OBDBS data available as of December 14, 2005)	214
Table 74 – Catches (pounds, live weight, kept and discarded) by statistical area on observed tows using a haddock separator trawl, CY 2005.....	214
Table 75 – Catch composition (pounds, live weight) for seven trips that made tows with and without the separator panel, CY 2005 (Source: NMFS OBDBS as of December 12, 2005).....	215
Table 76 – Measures analyzed in alternative groups	241
Table 77 – Proposed Action median change in exploitation for regulated groundfish.....	245
Table 78 - Proposed Action median change in fishing mortality or exploitation (Note: GOM haddock, pollock, white hake, windowpane, values shown are changes in exploitation)	246
Table 79 – Cod rank (based on pounds landed weight) on FY 2004 trips in the proposed differential DAS area; compared against all groundfish species and combined other species.....	248
Table 80 – GOM cod rank (based on pounds landed weight) on FY 2004 trips in the proposed differential DAS area (GOM cod stock area only); compared against all groundfish species	248
Table 81 – GOM cod as proportion of total groundfish kept catch on trips in the proposed differential DAS area (FY 2004)	249
Table 82 – Cod/total kept all species, percent of trips in GOM differential DAS area, FY 2004 (sink gillnet).....	250
Table 83 – Cod/total kept all species, percent of trips in GOM differential DAS area, FY 2004 (otter trawl).....	250

CONTENTS
List of Tables

Table 84 – White hake (over 60 cm) and pollock short-term projections (trawl survey index, three year average).....	256
Table 85 – Illustration of GOM cod mortality reduction necessary from the commercial and recreational sectors in order to achieve the targeted mortality reduction	257
Table 86 - Impact of Recreational Harvest of Gulf of Maine Cod by Proposed Measure and Mode.....	258
Table 87 - Proportion of Gulf of Maine Trips that Targeted Haddock that also Caught Cod by Mode (MRFSS 2001-2004).....	259
Table 88 - Total trips by composition of cod and haddock on GOM Party/Charter VTR’s reporting retention of either cod or haddock.	259
Table 89 - Distribution of proportion of haddock to total combined cod and haddock for GOM party/charter trips retaining both cod and haddock.....	260
Table 90 - Estimated bycatch rate for cod on GOM party/charter trips where haddock was at least 75% of combined cod and haddock.....	260
Table 91 – Maximum number of DAS used in the Category B (regular) program assuming daily catch limit is caught on each day.....	262
Table 92 Monkfish landings (live lbs.) in the Category B (regular) DAS program and coastwide by management area.	264
Table 93 Monkfish landings and “savings” (live lbs.) in the Category B (regular) DAS program by monkfish management area and DAS system fishery code.	267
Table 94 Monkfish landings and “savings” (live lbs.) in the Category B (regular) DAS program by monkfish management area and month.	267
Table 95 - Quarterly Landings By Species/Stock of Concern in mt Live Weight For the Regular B DAS Pilot Program	271
Table 96 - Simulation Results of For Estimated Catch of Stocks of Concern (mt Live Weight)	274
Table 97 - Quarterly Landings By Species/Stock in mt live weight for the Category B (regular) DAS Pilot Program	276
Table 98 - Simulation Results of For Estimated Catch of Other Species (mt live weight).....	277
Table 99 – Cod and haddock catches (lbs., including estimated discards) in the Eastern US/CA Area, FY 2005, May/July/August.....	279
Table 100 - Selection curve parameter estimates and model diagnostics for yellowtail flounder selection by various experimental mesh codend configurations.	287
Table 101 – Summary of skate catch on observed Category B (regular) DAS trips (OBDBS December 2004-July 2005) ¹	288
Table 102- Summary of bycatch reduction strategies used in Proposed Action.....	292
Table 103 – Mortality reduction necessary to achieve FY 2006 Amendment 13 targets.	292
Table 104 - Species and life stages with EFH that is moderately or highly vulnerable to mobile, bottom-tending gears. <i>Bold rows indicate species in the Northeast Multispecies FMP management unit.</i> ...	302
Table 105– Expected Habitat Impacts of Proposed Action Relative to No Action Alternative	310
Table 106 - Proposed Action Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups	320
Table 107 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue by Home Port State	321
Table 108 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue by Home Port/Port Group	322
Table 109 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Revenues Vessel Length Class	322
Table 110 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Revenues by Primary Groundfish Gear	323
Table 111 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Revenues by Primary Groundfish Gear and Vessel Length	323
Table 112 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenues by Quartiles of Dependence on Groundfish (FY 2004).....	323
Table 113 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue by Dependence on Inshore Gulf of Maine Blocks	324
Table 114 - Summary of Output, Income, and Employment Impacts of the Proposed Action on the Northeast Region Economy	329

CONTENTS
List of Tables

Table 115 - Estimated Total Revenue from Regular B DAS Trips During FY 2006.....	333
Table 116 - Cost Requirements for Approved VMS Units.....	338
Table 117 - Minimum Power Requirements for VMS Units.....	338
Table 118 - Landings and "savings" of monkfish (live lbs.) in the Category B (regular) days at sea program by permitted principal port. Some ports are combined to protect confidentiality.	347
Table 119 - Landings and "savings" of monkfish (live lbs.) in the Category B (regular) days at sea program by port of landing. Some ports are combined to protect confidentiality.	348
Table 120 – MUL permit categories for vessels with a VMS and General Category scallop permit, as of Feb. 2006.....	355
Table 121 Composition of revenue by species for active General Category vessels homeported in New England: species greater than 5% landed value in 1994-2003 (Active = one recorded landing of scallops)	358
Table 122 Composition of revenue by species for active General Category vessels homeported in the Mid-Atlantic: Species Greater Than 5% Landed Value in 1994-2003 species greater than 5% landed value in 1994-2003 (Active = one recorded landing of scallops)	358
Table 123 Number of General Category vessels by average annual scallop landings per trip and tonnage Categories (2003 Fishing Year)	358
Table 124 – No Action alternative changes in exploitation (median value from CAM)	362
Table 125 - No Action Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups	365
Table 126 - No Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue from all Species by Home Port State	366
Table 127 - No Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue from all Species by Home Port/Port Group	367
Table 128 - No Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue from all Species Vessel Length Class	368
Table 129 - No Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue from all Species by Primary Groundfish Gear	368
Table 130 - No Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue from all Species by Primary Groundfish Gear and Vessel Length.....	369
Table 131 - No Action Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue from all Species by Quartiles of Dependence on Groundfish (FY 2004).....	369
Table 132 – Alternative 1 changes in exploitation (median value from CAM).....	371
Table 133 - Monthly Proportion of GOM Cod Landed Inside the WGOM Closure Area for FY 2004..	373
Table 134 - Alternative 1 Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups	384
Table 135 - Alternative 1 impact on total fishing revenue by home port state	385
Table 136 - Alternative 1 impact on total fishing revenue by home port/port group.....	386
Table 137 - Alternative 1 impact on total revenues vessel length class.....	386
Table 138 - Alternative 1 impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear	387
Table 139 - Alternative 1 Impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear and vessel length.....	387
Table 140 - Alternative 1 impact on total fishing revenues by quartiles of dependence on groundfish (FY 2004)	388
Table 141 - Alternative 1 impact on total fishing revenue by dependence on inshore Gulf of Maine blocks	388
Table 142 – Alternative 2 changes in exploitation (median value from CAM).....	399
Table 143 - Alternative 2 Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups	410
Table 144 - Alternative 2 impact on total fishing revenue by home port state	411
Table 145 - Alternative 2 impact on total fishing revenue by home port/port group.....	412
Table 146 - Alternative 2 impact on total revenues vessel length class.....	412
Table 147 - Alternative 2 impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear	413
Table 148 - Alternative 2 Impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear and vessel length.....	413
Table 149 - Alternative 2 Impacts on Total Fishing Revenues by Quartiles of Dependence on Groundfish (FY 2004).....	413
Table 150 - Alternative 1 Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue by Dependence on Inshore Gulf of Maine Blocks	414

CONTENTS

List of Tables

Table 151 – Alternative 3 changes in exploitation (median value from CAM)..... 424

Table 152 - Alternative 3 Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups 439

Table 153 - Alternative 3 impact on total fishing revenue by home port state 440

Table 154 - Alternative 3 impact on total fishing revenue by home port/port group..... 441

Table 155 - Alternative 3 impact on total revenues vessel length class..... 441

Table 156 - Alternative 3 impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear 442

Table 157 - Alternative 3 Impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear and vessel length..... 442

Table 158 - - Alternative 3 impact on total fishing revenues by quartiles of dependence on groundfish (FY 2004) 443

Table 159 - Alternative 1 Impact on Total Fishing Revenue by Dependence on Inshore Gulf of Maine Blocks 443

Table 160 – Alternative 4 changes in exploitation (median value from CAM)..... 453

Table 161 - Alternative 4 Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups 465

Table 162 – Alternative 4 impact on total fishing revenue by home port state 466

Table 163 - Alternative 4 impact on total fishing revenue by home port/port group..... 467

Table 164 - Alternative 4 impact on total revenues vessel length class..... 467

Table 165 - Alternative 4 impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear 468

Table 166 - Alternative 4 Impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear and vessel length..... 468

Table 167 - - Alternative 4 impact on total fishing revenues by quartiles of dependence on groundfish (FY 2004) 469

Table 168 - Alternative 4 Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue by Dependence on Inshore Gulf of Maine Blocks 469

Table 169 – Alternative 5 changes in exploitation (median value from CAM)..... 485

Table 170 - Alternative 5 Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups 496

Table 171 - Alternative 5 impact on total fishing revenue by home port state 497

Table 172 - Alternative 5 impact on total fishing revenue by home port/port group..... 498

Table 173 - Alternative 5 impact on total revenues vessel length class..... 498

Table 174 - Alternative 5 impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear 499

Table 175 - Alternative 5 Impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear and vessel length..... 499

Table 176 - Alternative 5 impact on total fishing revenues by quartiles of dependence on groundfish (FY 2004) 499

Table 177 - Alternative 5 Impacts on Total Fishing Revenue by Dependence on Inshore Gulf of Maine Blocks 500

Table 178 – Alternative E(modified) changes in exploitation (median value from CAM) 508

Table 179 – Alternative E(modified) Impact on Total Revenues by Port/Port Groups 511

Table 180 - Alternative E(modified) impact on total fishing revenue by home port state..... 512

Table 181 - Alternative E(modified) impact on total fishing revenue by home port/port group 513

Table 182 - Alternative E(modified) impact on total revenues vessel length class 513

Table 183 - Alternative E(modified) impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear 514

Table 184 - Alternative E(modified) impact on total revenues by primary groundfish gear and vessel length 514

Table 185 - -Alternative E(modified) impact on total fishing revenues by quartiles of dependence on groundfish (FY 2004) 515

Table 186 - Alternative E(modified) impact on total fishing revenue by dependence on inshore Gulf of Maine blocks..... 515

Table 187 - Habitat impacts of independent measures under consideration..... 522

Table 188 – Groundfish permits held by limited-access scallop permit holders. 525

Table 189 - Potential non-fishing threats to fish habitat in the New England region prioritized within regions (H = high; M = moderate; L = low)2 536

Table 190 – Summary of cumulative effects 541

Table 191 – Comparison of changes in exploitation for Proposed Action and all alternatives 546

CONTENTS
List of Tables

Table 192 - General relative impacts to essential fish habitat (EFH) of each packaged management alternative as compared to Amendment 13.....	548
Table 193 – Comparison of changes in revenues across alternatives	551
Table 194 – Median alternative percent change in port total revenues, by port group	552
Table 195 – Unweighted ranking of percent change in port total revenues, by port group	553
Table 196 – Median alternative percent change in port groundfish revenues, by port group.....	554
Table 197 – Average unweighted ranking of change in port groundfish revenues, by port group	555
Table 198 - Median alternative impacts on total fishing revenue by home port/port group.....	556
Table 199 – Unweighted ranking of median change in total revenues for alternatives (1=least revenue reduction, 7=largest reduction)	557
Table 200 – Comparison of impacts across alternatives.....	558
Table 201 – Expected Negative Habitat Impacts of Proposed Action Relative to No Action Alternative.....	570
Table 202 – Expected Positive Habitat Impacts of Proposed Action Relative to No Action Alternative.....	571
Table 203 - Summary of NEFSC biomass indices for barndoor and thorny skate from 1992 through 2004, including 3-year moving averages for several time periods, as well as updated stock status according to the most recent Skate Annual Review, February 2005.....	575
Table 204 – Number of barndoor and thorny skates from the NMFS Autumn trawl survey (1963 through 2003).....	576
Table 205 – Number of barndoor and thorny skates from the Autumn Survey caught within the boundaries of the Groundfish closed areas (1963 through 2003).....	576
Table 206 – NEFSC Autumn survey indices and updated status of Barndoor and Thorny skates	582
Table 207 – Number of barndoor and thorny skates from the NMFS Autumn trawl survey (1963 through 2003).....	583
Table 208 – Number of barndoor and thorny skates from the Autumn Survey caught within the boundaries of the Groundfish closed areas (1963 through 2003).....	583
Table 209 - Proposed Action Impacts on Total Gross Sales by Quartiles for FY 2004	607
Table 210 - Comparison of Change in Economic Burden of Small Fishing Businesses Provided by Alternative 1.....	611
Table 211 - Comparison of Change in Economic Burden of Small Fishing Businesses Provided by Alternative 2.....	612
Table 212 - Comparison of Change in Economic Burden of Small Fishing Businesses Provided by Alternative 3.....	612
Table 213 - Comparison of Change in Economic Burden of Small Fishing Businesses Provided by Alternative 4.....	613
Table 214 - Comparison of Change in Economic Burden of Small Fishing Businesses Provided by Alternative 5.....	614
Table 215 - Comparison of Change in Economic Burden of Small Fishing Businesses Provided by Alternative E-Modified.....	615

2.3 List of Figures

Figure 1 – Monkfish management areas and statistical areas	40
Figure 2 - Proposed Action differential DAS counting area (shaded)	54
Figure 3 – Gulf of Maine Regulated Mesh Area (shaded)	57
Figure 4 - Option 1, proposed GOM differential DAS area	83
Figure 5 - Option 2, proposed GOM differential DAS area	84
Figure 6 – Option 1, SNE Differential DAS area	88
Figure 7 – Option 2, SNE Differential DAS area	88
Figure 8 – Option 3, SNE Differential DAS area	88
Figure 9 - Alternative E differential DAS counting area	91
Figure 10 - U.S. Northeast Shelf Ecosystem, showing multispecies year round mortality closed areas and current SAP areas (shaded)	99
Figure 11 - Georges Bank cod spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1978-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	103
Figure 12 - Georges Bank haddock spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	104
Figure 13 - Georges Bank yellowtail flounder Base Case Model spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1973-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	105
Figure 14 - Georges Bank yellowtail flounder Major Change Model spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1973-2004 reported in GARM 2005.	106
Figure 15 - Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic yellowtail flounder spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1973-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	107
Figure 16 - Cape Cod/Gulf of Maine yellowtail flounder spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1985-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	108
Figure 17 - Gulf of Maine cod spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1982-2004 using GARM 2005 data and corrected 2004 bycatch estimate along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	109
Figure 18 - Witch yellowtail flounder spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1982-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	110
Figure 19 - American plaice spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1980-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	111
Figure 20 - Gulf of Maine winter flounder spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1982-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	112
Figure 21 - Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic winter flounder spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1980-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	113
Figure 22 - Georges Bank winter flounder total biomass (B) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates.	114
Figure 23 - Georges Bank/Gulf of Maine white hake biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005.	115
Figure 24 - Georges Bank/Gulf of Maine pollock biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005.	116

CONTENTS
List of Figures

Figure 25 - Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank Acadian redfish spawning stock biomass (SSB) and fishing mortality (F) estimates during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005 along with 80% confidence intervals for 2004 estimates. 117

Figure 26 - Ocean pout biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1968-2005 reported in GARM 2005..... 118

Figure 27 - Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank windowpane flounder biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1975-2004 reported in GARM 2005. 119

Figure 28 - Southern New England/Mid-Atlantic windowpane flounder biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1975-2004 reported in GARM 2005. 120

Figure 29 - Gulf of Maine haddock biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005. 121

Figure 30 - Atlantic halibut biomass (B) and exploitation rate (F) indices during 1963-2004 reported in GARM 2005..... 122

Figure 31 - NFMA biomass index (2005 three-year running average) relative to annual rebuilding targets 127

Figure 32 - SFMA biomass index (2005 three-year running average) relative to annual rebuilding targets. 127

Figure 33 – Status of seven skate species 129

Figure 34 - Distribution of the seven major benthic assemblages in the Gulf of Maine as determined from both soft bottom quantitative sampling and qualitative hard bottom sampling. 133

Figure 35 - Sedimentary provinces of eastern Georges Bank based on criteria of sea floor morphology, texture, sediment movement and bedforms, and mean tidal bottom current speed (cm/sec)..... 138

Figure 36 - DAS used by permit category, FY 2001 – 2004 184

Figure 37 – Calendar year GOM Cod harvest by mode (MRFSS) 218

Figure 38 – FY 2001 – FY 2004 party/charter reported GOM cod kept (VTR)..... 218

Figure 39 – Calendar year angler trips harvesting GOM cod (MRFSS)..... 219

Figure 40 – Party/charter passengers, trips, and GOM cod kept (VTR)..... 219

Figure 41 – Calendar year total GOM cod catch (MRFSS)..... 220

Figure 42 – Party/charter operating units that landed GOM cod (VTR) 221

Figure 43 – Seasonal private boat GOM cod harvest (MRFSS)..... 221

Figure 44 – Seasonal party/charter GOM cod harvest (MRFSS) 222

Figure 45 – Seasonal party/charter GOM cod kept (VTR) 222

Figure 46 – Monthly number of party/charter trips keeping GOM cod (VTR) 223

Figure 47 – CY 2003 and 2004 private boat GOM cod size distribution (MRFSS)..... 223

Figure 48 – CY 2003 and 2004 party/charter GOM cod size distribution (MRFSS) 224

Figure 49 – Private boat catch per angler (MRFSS)..... 225

Figure 50 – Party/charter catch per angler (MRFSS)..... 225

Figure 51 – FY 2004 party/charter GOM cod kept by area (Source: VTRs)..... 226

Figure 52 – FY 2001 to FY 2004 party/charter GOM haddock kept (VTR) 226

Figure 53 - Amendment 13 expected sales impacts, by port group 236

Figure 54 – Amendment 13 expected income impacts, by port group 236

Figure 55 - Amendment 13 expected employment impacts, by port group..... 237

Figure 56 - GB yellowtail flounder rebuilding trajectory based on base case VPA model 244

Figure 57 - GB yellowtail flounder rebuilding trajectory based on major change VPA model..... 244

Figure 58- GB cod short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory..... 252

Figure 59 - GOM cod short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory 252

Figure 60 - GB haddock short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory 253

Figure 61 - CC/GOM yellowtail flounder short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory 253

Figure 62 - SNE/MA yellowtail flounder short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory 254

CONTENTS

List of Figures

Figure 63 - SNE/MA winter flounder short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory 254

Figure 64 - American plaice short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory... 255

Figure 65 - Witch flounder short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory..... 255

Figure 66 - Acadian redfish short-term projection compared to Amendment 13 rebuilding trajectory.... 256

Figure 67 - Annual discard to kept ratio for GB Cod by gillnet gear (Source: NEFSC, unpublished data) 281

Figure 68 - Location of VMS demarcation line in the vicinity of Massachusetts Bay 284

Figure 69 - Proposed Action differential DAS counting area (shaded) 296

Figure 70 - - Sediment composition in the Differential DAS Counting Area (Proposed Action) as derived from the USGS usSEABED database. 297

Figure 71 - - Sediment composition in the George’s Bank Haddock SAP as derived from the USGS usSEABED database. 304

Figure 72 – Projected Category A DAS catch resulting from Proposed Action..... 318

Figure 73 – Proportional change in total revenue by dependence on inshore GOM blocks 326

Figure 74 – Proportional change in total revenue compared to estimated FW 42 revenue impacts for vessels with at least a 75 percent dependence on inshore GOM blocks 326

Figure 75 - Proportional change in total revenue compared to estimated FW 42 revenue impacts for vessels with less than a 75 percent dependence on inshore GOM block 327

Figure 76 – Deviations between estimated proportional reduction and FW 42 reductions in total fishing revenues 327

Figure 77 - Total scallops harvested by General Category vessels in 2000, by Lat./Long. of reported fishing location..... 357

Figure 78 - Total scallops harvested by General Category vessels in 2003, by Lat./Long. of reported fishing location..... 357

Figure 79 – Comparison of 6.5 inch square a diamond mesh cod selectivity (DeAlteris and Grogan 1997) 482

Figure 80 - Comparison of 6.5 inch square a diamond mesh cod selectivity (Halliday et al 1999) 482

Figure 81 – Comparison of 6.5 in. square and diamond mesh selectivity for yellowtail. Flounder (DeAlteris and Grogan 1997)..... 483

Figure 82 – Hangs per ten minute square 484

Figure 83 – Comparison of 6.5 inch diamond and square mesh cod end haddock selectivity from Halliday et al (1999) 520

Figure 84 – Comparison of 6.5 inch diamond and square mesh cod end haddock selectivity from DeAlteris and Grogan (1997)..... 520

Figure 85 - Distribution of Barndoor skate from NMFS Autumn trawl survey data (1963 – 2003) 577

Figure 86 - Distribution of Thorny skate from NMFS Autumn trawl survey data (1963 –2003)..... 578

Figure 87 - Distribution of Barndoor skate (left) and Thorny skate (right) from NMFS Autumn trawl survey data (1963 – 2003)..... 584

2.4 List of Acronyms

ALWTRP	Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan
APA	Administrative Procedures Act
ASMFC	Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
CAI	Closed Area I
CAII	Closed Area II
CC	Cape Cod
CPUE	catch per unit of effort
DAM	Dynamic Area Management
DAS	days-at-sea
DFO	Department of Fisheries and Oceans (Canada)
DMF	Division of Marine Fisheries (Massachusetts)
DMR	Department of Marine Resources (Maine)
DSEIS	Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEZ	exclusive economic zone
EFH	essential fish habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
F	Fishing mortality rate
FAAS	Flexible Area Action System
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FMP	fishery management plan
FSCS	Fisheries Scientific Computer System
FW	framework
FY	fishing year
GAMS	General Algebraic Modeling System
GB	Georges Bank
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOM	Gulf of Maine
GRT	gross registered tons/tonnage
HAPC	habitat area of particular concern
HPTRP	Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan
I/O	input/output
IFQ	individual fishing quota
ITQ	individual transferable quota
IVR	interactive voice response reporting system
IWC	International Whaling Commission
LOA	letter of authorization
LPUE	landings per unit of effort
MA	Mid-Atlantic

CONTENTS
List of Acronyms

MAFAC	Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee
MAFMC	Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
MARFIN	Marine Fisheries Initiative
MEY	maximum economic yield
MMC	Multispecies Monitoring Committee
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MPA	marine protected area
MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey
MSFCMA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MSMC	Multispecies Monitoring Committee
MSY	maximum sustainable yield
NAA	No Action Alternative
NAPA	National Academy of Public Administration
NAS	National Academy of Sciences
NEFMC	New England Fishery Management Council
NEFSC	Northeast Fisheries Science Center
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NERO	Northeast Regional Office
NFMA	Northern Fishery Management Area (monkfish)
NLCA	Nantucket Lightship closed area
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NSTC	Northern Shrimp Technical Committee
NT	net tonnage
NWA	Northwest Atlantic
OBDBS	Observer database system
OLE	Office for Law Enforcement (NMFS)
OY	optimum yield
PBR	Potential Biological Removal
PDT	Plan Development Team
PRA	Paperwork Reduction Act
PREE	Preliminary Regulatory Economic Evaluation
RFA	Regulatory Flexibility Act
RMA	Regulated Mesh Area
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives
SA	Statistical Area
SAFE	Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation
SAP	Special Access Program
SARC	Stock Assessment Review Committee
SAW	Stock Assessment Workshop
SBNMS	Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

CONTENTS
List of Acronyms

SFA	Sustainable Fisheries Act
SFMA	Southern Fishery Management Area (monkfish)
SIA	Social Impact Assessment
SNE	southern New England
SNE/MA	southern New England-Mid-Atlantic
SSB	spawning stock biomass
SSC	Social Science Committee
TAC	total allowable catch
TED	turtle excluder device
TEWG	Turtle Expert Working Group
TMGC	Trans-boundary Management Guidance Committee
TMS	ten minute square
TRAC	Trans-boundary Resources Assessment Committee
TSB	total stock biomass
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VMS	vessel monitoring system
VPA	virtual population analysis
VTR	vessel trip report
WGOM	Western Gulf of Maine
WO	weighout
YPR	yield per recruit

CONTENTS
List of Acronyms

Intentionally blank