MID-ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

AGENDA FOR

MONKFISH AMENDMENT 5
COUNCIL ACTIONS

- Review Monkfish Advisory Panel, Oversight Committee, and Scientific and Statistical Committee recommendations

- Identify measures to be developed and considered in Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Amendment 5

New England Fishery Management Council
50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116
John Pappalardo, *Chairman* | Paul J. Howard, *Executive Director*

AGENDA
MONKFISH OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MEETING
Holiday Inn, Mansfield, MA

May 27, 2009

9:00 am	Introductions, review agenda and materials
	Monkfish PDT Report
	Discussion and recommendations on MSY, OFL, OY, ABC and ACL
	Discussion and recommendations on AMs
	Discussion and recommendations on specification and modification of management measures (DAS, incidental and directed trip limits, gear, fish size, VMS, etc.)
	Discussion on issues regarding monkfish catch by vessels in groundfish sectors
	Discussion on ITQs and Sectors
	Other Business
5:00	Adjourn

This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities

Monkfish PDT Report based on agenda items for 4/28/09 & 5/13/09

1) Confirm for SSC the calculations of MSY and OFL using exploitable biomass.

   The PDT updated calculations of OFL and MSY using current exploitable biomass, rather than total biomass, as had been presented at the last SSC meeting. OFL is an annual limit derived as the product of current exploitable biomass and $F_{threshold}$. In this case, the most recent estimate of biomass is the one from the Data Poor Working Group (DPWG) assessment for 2006. MSY is a long-term average value derived as the product of B_{target} and $F_{threshold}$. The DPWG calculated B_{target} the average of *total* biomass 1980-2006, but for the purpose of determining MSY, *exploitable* biomass needs to be used. For the Northern area, the SCALE model input maintained a consistent selectivity pattern throughout the time series, but for the Southern area, three different selectivity patterns were applied to reflect changes in predominant gears during the period. As a result, the PDT recalculated B_{target} as exploitable biomass by applying the selectivity pattern during the most recent period to the entire time series (Table 1 and Figure 1).

   The results of the calculations are shown in Table 2. **MSY values are 17,053 mt and 25,487 mt for Northern and Southern areas, respectively. OFL values are 22,729 mt and 28,263 mt, North and South.**

2) Review and confirm calculations of ABC based on the method recommended by the SSC.

   The SSC recommended that an interim ABC should be derived as the product of the average exploitation rate during the recent period of stable or increasing trend in biomass for each management unit and the most recent estimate of exploitable biomass. The PDT reviewed the SCALE model results from the 2007 assessment and determined that the period 1999-2006 and 2000-2006 be used for northern and southern management areas, respectively. The starting years are those where the first increase was observed (see **Error! Reference source not found.**). The calculations produced values for **ABC of 17,485 mt (North) and 13,326 mt (South).** These resulted in buffers between OFL and ABC of 5,234 mt (North) and 14,930 mt (South), or 23% and 53% of the respective OFL values (Table 4).

3) Discuss the two options for ACT – pros and cons. For the bottom-up method, what is a recommended precautionary increase in TTAC (ACT), and why? For the top-down method, what is a recommended buffer from ACL to account for management uncertainty, and why?

   At the previous meeting, the PDT discussed, but did not develop a final recommendation on one method of calculating the ACT over the other, but rather outlined some of the pros and cons of each. In the end, the PDT concluded that a blended approach might overcome some of the difficulties associated with either method, namely establishing an objective and quantifiable accounting of management uncertainty. On the bottom-up approach, the PDT noted that it provides a greater