

**Monkfish FMP
Framework 7**

Appendix 3

Summary of Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

The actions summarized in the table below are presented in chronological order, and codes indicate whether an action relates to the past (P), present (Pr), or reasonably foreseeable future (RFF). When any of these abbreviations occur together, it indicates that some past actions are still relevant to the present and/or future. A brief explanation of the rationale for concluding what effect each action has (or will have) had on each of the VECs is provided in the table and is not repeated here.

Impacts of Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions on the five VECs. These actions do not include those which were considered to have little impact on the fishery or actions under consideration in this framework.

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MONKFISH FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS						
^P direct or incidental catch of monkfish by foreign fleets in the area that would become the U.S. EEZ (pre-MSA)	Foreign fishing pressure peaked in the 1960s and slowly declined until passage of the MSA in 1974	Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information but foreign fishing may have had a significant impact on monkfish stocks	Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on discarding, but fishing effort was very high and there were no gear requirements to reduce bycatch	Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on protected resources encounters, but fishing effort was very high	Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on habitat, but fishing effort was very high	Potentially Indirect Negative Revenue from fishing was split between foreign and domestic communities, rather than just domestic communities
^P direct or incidental catch of monkfish by domestic vessels (post-MSA, 1976-1999)	Very limited markets resulted in anecdotally high levels of discards and unknown landings early in the period, but rapid growth of the directed fishery in the 1980's	Direct High Negative Rapid growth of the fishery starting in the 1980's reduced stock sizes significantly and likely caused recruitment overfishing	Potentially Direct High Negative Uncontrolled effort and lack of gear restrictions probably caused significant incidental catch of non-target species, especially skates and dogfish	Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on protected resources encounters, but fishing effort was very high especially in the latter half of the period	Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on habitat, but fishing effort was very high especially in the latter half of the period	Mixed Initial growth of markets for monkfish had a positive impact, but unsustainable levels of effort resulted in declining stocks and likely overfishing

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MONKFISH FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
^P Original FMP implemented in 1999	Limited entry, effort controls, gear restrictions and other measures designed to stop overfishing and rebuild stocks including default closure of the directed fishery in year 4	Direct Positive Provided slight effort reductions and regulatory tools available to rebuild and manage stocks	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing and associated impacts on non-target species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability Potential direct negative Default year 4 closure would adversely affect dependent communities
^P Amendment 1 (1999)	Designated EFH for monkfish and required Federal agencies to consult with NMFS on actions that may adversely effect EFH	Indirect Low Positive A consultation with NFMS that leads to the protection of monkfish EFH is beneficial to multispecies stocks	Indirect Low Positive A consultation with NFMS that leads to the protection of monkfish EFH is beneficial to other stocks that share the same EFH	Indirect Low Positive Consultation with NFMS that leads to the protection of monkfish EFH is beneficial to protected resources that share a need for the same habitat	Direct High Positive Consultation with NMFS on activities that may adversely effect habitat provides NMFS the opportunity to mitigate or even prevent EFH impacts	Indirect Low Positive Where NMFS consults on projects impacting monkfish EFH, the overall health of the stocks should improve which would lead to long term sustainability

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MONKFISH FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
^P Framework 1 to the Monkfish FMP (2002)	Specifications for FY2002, 1-year delay in year 4 closure; aligned gillnet and trawl trip limits per court order	Mixed Uncertain scientific information suggested end or reversal of stock declines; impact of closure of directed fishery not clear due to likely increased discards of incidentally caught monkfish	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed One-year delay in closure of directed fishery benefitted dependent communities; changes to trip limits reduced viability of offshore trawl fishery
^P Framework 2 to the Monkfish FMP (2003)	Incorporated updated scientific information; revised reference points, adopted index-based TAC setting method; specifications for FY2003	Direct Positive Established a rebuilding program based on survey index relative to annual growth targets	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability; eliminated year-4 closure of the directed fishery

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MONKFISH FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Amendment 2 to the FMP (2005)	Addressed EFH and bycatch issues: a new limited access permit for NC-VA vessels; SMA offshore monkfish fishery program); SMA trawl roller limit; 2 deep-sea canyon closures; research DAS set-aside program, and other measures;	Neutral Measures did not have a direct impact on fishing effort or stock rebuilding	Neutral Measures did not have a direct impact on fishing effort or incidental catch of non-target species	Neutral or indirect positive Other than protection of deep-sea corals from future effort shifts, measures did not have a direct impact on fishing effort or interaction with protected species	Direct Positive Canyon area closures and gear restrictions reduced impact of fishery on EFH	Direct positive Provided access to NC-VA fishermen with historical participation; cooperative research program to improve science underlying management
P, Framework 3/ Multispecies FMP Framework 42 (joint, 2006)	Prohibited targeting monkfish on a Multispecies B DAS	Direct Positive Prevented expansion of directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Prevented expansion of directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Prevented expansion of directed fishing effort, thus limited interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Prevented expansion of directed fishing effort, thus limited gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but effort limitations result in short term lost revenues for fishermen and communities

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MONKFISH FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, Framework 4 (2007)	Eliminated survey-based TAC setting; set 3-year specifications to achieve rebuilding, including trip limits and DAS for NMA for 2007-2009 with automatic extension;	Direct High Positive Controlled directed fishing effort to achieve rebuilding in 3 years.	Indirect Positive controlled directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Neutral or Indirect Positive controlled fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Neutral or Indirect Positive controlled fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but NMA effort reductions result in short term lost revenues for some fishermen and communities; stability of 3-year specifications benefits fishermen;
P, Pr Framework 5 (2008)	Revised biological reference points based on stock assessment; closed loopholes in DAS program; revised SMA incidental catch limit	Direct Positive Improved effectiveness of DAS program	Neutral No major change to directed effort levels or incidental catch of non-target species	Neutral No major change to directed effort levels or interaction with protected species	Neutral No major change to directed effort levels or interactions with habitat	Direct Positive New reference points result in stock status improvement to rebuilt and no overfishing;

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MONKFISH FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Framework 6 (2008)	Eliminated a backstop provision that would have adjusted and possibly closed the monkfish fishery in FY 2009 if landings exceeded the target total allowable catch by more than 30 percent	Neutral No change to directed fishing effort	Neutral No change to directed fishing effort	Neutral No change to directed fishing effort	Neutral No change to directed fishing effort	Direct Positive Eliminated the non-warranted closure of the directed fishery for TAC overages in excess of 30%, in light of rebuilt stock status
RFF Amendment 4 (in development)	Monkfish component of the Omnibus EFH Amendment; would revise EFH designations for all New England fisheries, possibly establish new HAPCs and consider measures to further protect critical habitat	Unknown or potentially positive Final measures not defined, but protection of monkfish EFH likely positive for monkfish stocks	Unknown or potentially positive Final measures not defined, but protection of monkfish and other species' EFH likely positive for non-target species	Unknown Final measures not defined,	Likely Direct positive Final measures not defined, but purpose of amendment is protection of monkfish and other species' EFH	Unknown Final measures not defined,

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
OTHER FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS						
<p>P, Pr, RFF Atlantic Sea Scallop FMP – a series of amendment and framework actions from the mid-1990s through the present</p>	<p>Implementation of the Atlantic Sea Scallop FMP and continued management of the fishery, primarily through effort controls</p>	<p>Direct Positive Effort reductions taken over time have resulted in a sustainable scallop fishery and reduction in both directed and incidental catch of monkfish</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Effort reductions taken over time also reduced bycatch, including gear modifications that improved bycatch escapement</p>	<p>Mixed Effort reductions taken over time reduced interactions with protected species however, turtle interactions remain problematic</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Effort reductions reduced gear contact with habitat and the current rotational access program focuses fishing effort on sandy substrates which are less susceptible to habitat impacts</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Initial negative impacts due to effort reductions have been supplanted by a sustainable, profitable fishery</p>

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
OTHER FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Groundfish FMP – a series of amendment and framework actions from implementation of the FMP in 1977 through the present	Implementation of the NE Multispecies FMP and continued management of the fishery, primarily through effort controls, and, recently also through sectors	Direct Positive Multispecies FMP effort controls and reductions have resulted in a fishery that is no longer overfished, nor is overfishing occurring	Indirect Positive Effort reductions and gear controls taken over time also reduced bycatch	Indirect Positive Reducing effort and other measures reduced opportunities for interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reducing effort and other measures reduced opportunities for habitat interactions	Indirect Positive Reducing effort has created a sustainable fishery
Pr, RFF Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Amendment (2008)	Removed the DAM program, implemented sinking ground lines for lobster gear, includes more trap/pot and gillnet fisheries under the plan, and requires additional markings on gear to improve information about entanglements ; future actions will seek to minimize impact of vertical lines	Negligible Changes implemented through the amendment are not expected to have substantial changes on groundfish	Negligible Changes implemented through the amendment are not expected to have substantial changes on non-groundfish species	Direct Positive New regulations implemented to protect large whales are expected to have a positive impact on large whales by reducing incidental takes	Negligible Changes implemented through the amendment are not expected to have substantial changes to habitat	Indirect Negative Changes implemented through the amendment require some gear changes for gillnet fisheries which have minor negative economic impacts

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
OTHER FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
Pr. RFF Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan Amendment (2010)	Actions to reduce takes of harbor porpoise toward the long-term zero mortality rate goal.	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact groundfish	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact non-groundfish species	Direct Positive Changes to protect harbor porpoise have a positive impact on protected species	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact habitat	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact human communities
RFF Amendment 3 to the Skate FMP (2010)	This amendment addresses rebuilding of winter and thorny skates and reduce mortality on little and smooth skates; reduces trip limits, adopts ACLs and AMs	Minor Negative Lower skate possession limits and closures may cause vessels to use DAS for monkfish	Mixed Actions taken to reduce skate mortality; they could lead to increased targeting of non-monkfish species	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact protected species	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact habitat	Minor negative Actions taken to reduce skate mortality negatively impact human communities

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
NON FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS						
P, Pr, RFFA Agriculture runoff	Nutrients applied to agriculture land are introduced into aquatic systems	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality negatively affects resource viability and can lead to reduced income from fishery resources
P, Pr, RFFA Port maintenance	Dredging of wetlands, coastal, port and harbor areas for port maintenance	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality negatively affects resource viability in the immediate project area
P, Pr, RFFA Offshore disposal of dredged materials	Disposal of dredged materials	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality negatively affects resource viability in the immediate project area

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
NON FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFFA Beach nourishment	Offshore mining of sand for beaches	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Mixed Positive for mining companies, possibly negative for fisheries
	Placement of sand to nourish beach shorelines	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Positive Improves beaches and can help protect homes along the shore line
P, Pr, RFFA Marine transportation	Expansion of port facilities, vessel operations and recreational marinas	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Mixed Positive for some interests, potential displacement for others
P, Pr, RFFA Installation of pipelines, utility lines and cables	Transportation of oil, gas and energy through pipelines, utility lines and cables	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Initially reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Mixed End users benefit from improved pipelines, cables, etc., but reduced habitat quality may impact fisheries and revenues

Action	Description	Impacts on Monkfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-target species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
NON FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
Pr. RFFA Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) terminals (w/in 5 years)	Transportation of natural gas via tanker to terminals located offshore and onshore (Several LNG terminals are proposed, including ME, MA, NY, NJ and MD)	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality possible in the immediate project area	Mixed End users benefit from a steady supply of natural gas but reduced habitat quality may impact fisheries and revenues
RFFA Offshore Wind Energy Facilities (w/in 5 years)	Construction of wind turbines to harness electrical power (Several facilities proposed from ME through NC, including off the coast of MA)	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality possible in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality possible in the immediate project area	Mixed End users benefit from a clean energy production but reduced habitat quality may impact fisheries and revenues