

**Report of the New England Fishery Management Council's
Multispecies Monitoring Committee**

December 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| | Executive Summary | i |
| 1.0 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2.0 | Landings | 5 |
| 3.0 | Effort | 11 |
| 4.0 | Gulf of Maine cod trip limit analysis | 24 |
| 5.0 | Status and 1998 projections results for 5 main stocks..... | 57 |
| 6.0 | Status of the other large mesh regulated species..... | 79 |
| 7.0 | Fishing Mortality objectives and days at sea DAS) reductions | 95 |
| 8.0 | Area closures | 106 |
| 9.0 | Options for 1999 | 114 |
| | References | 125 |
| | Glossary | 126 |

Appendix I. Statistical Areas Associated with Stock Definitions

Appendix II Preliminary Prorated monthly Landings for January through December 1997

Appendix III Preliminary Prorated monthly Landings for January through August 1998

Appendix IV. Comparison of 1997 MSMC Projection Results to SARC 27 Results

Appendix V. Analysis of Gulf of Maine Alliance Proposals

Appendix VI. The Gulf of Maine Cod Fishery: Numbers of Vessels and Landings by selected Ports, States, Gear Sector, and Vessel Sizes.

Appendix VII. Table of expected DAS usage for various combinations of Fleet and Individual DAS Category Allocations

Fishermen's Report Summary and Background

Preface

This report represents the consensus opinion of the New England Fishery Management Council's Multispecies Monitoring Committee. The Multispecies Monitoring Committee consists of the following people:

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Andy Applegate, | New England Fishery Management Council |
| Steven Correia (Chair), | Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries |
| LCDR Ray Erne, | United States Coast Guard |
| Philip Haring | New England Fishery Management Council |
| Tom Hoff, | Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council |
| Kevin Kelly | Maine Department of Marine Resources |
| Frank Mirarchi, | FV Christopher Andrew |
| Ralph Mayo, | Northeast Fishery Science Center |
| Rick Pearson | National Marine Fisheries Service, (NERO) |

The Multispecies Monitoring Committee would like to express its gratitude to the many staff members of the following organizations for their assistance in producing this report: Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Northeast Regional Office of the National Marine Fisheries Service, Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries' Resource Assessment Project, and New England Fishery Management Council. This Report would not have been possible without their extensive and timely efforts.

The following typographical errors were found in the Draft Multispecies Monitoring Report:

Executive Summary, pg. Iii. Table 2. Current Closures in the Gulf of Maine, Month of June. Change Block “159” to block **152**.

Pg 13, fourth paragraph, Second sentence reads “...and average of 5% of...”. Sentence should read: **For fishing years 1995, 1996, and 1997, Individual DAS vessels have used an average of 75% of the total DAS allocated to this category.**

Pg 56a and 56b. Note that Table 4.4.2 is on page 56A and Table 4.4.1 is on 56B.

Pg 61. 2nd paragraph. First Sentence reads “*the total 1998 Target TAC is ...*”. Sentence should read: **The total 1999 target TAC is estimated to be 9550 metric tons (Table 5.19).**

Pg 67. 2nd paragraph, Second sentence reads “*Spawning stock biomass will increase slightly to...*”. Sentence should read “**Spawning stock biomass will decrease to...**”. The slight increase in SSB occurs when the 1999 SSB projected under $F_{0.1}$ is compared to 1999 SSB projected under F_{max} .

Pg. 111, Table 8.3. Current closures in Gulf of Maine. **Add Block 146 in June.** Analysis includes this block. Correct versions of this Table are Table 2 in the Executive Summary and Table 9.1 in Chapter 9.

Pg 112. Table 8.6. Delete “*and an additional 21.9% reduction in DAS*” from Table 8.6 Title.

The careful reader will notice that some numbers on DAS usage are slightly different between Chapter 3: *Days-at-Sea (DAS) utilized under the Call-in System* and Chapter 7: *Fishing Mortality Objectives and Days-At-Sea (DAS) Reductions*. These differences do not impact the analyses or the conclusions drawn from these analyses. These differences occur because the database was queried on different dates and the database is still being audited. For example, the 52,081 DAS used in 1996 cited in Table 3.4 (pg. 17) differs from the 51,997 cited in Figure 7.1 (pg 99). This is due to querying the databases at different times. In other cases, the analyses were performed on a subset of the data. These instances are footnoted in the text.

The same issue applies with the number of vessels bought out in the Fishing Capacity Reduction Program (Vessel Buy-out). Section 3.3 (pg. 19) lists 79 vessels bought out in the program and represents data after finalization of the Buy-Out. The analysis referenced in Section 7.1 (pg. 95) lists 80 vessels and reflects an analysis on a

dataset queried before Finalization of the Vessel Buy-out on July 15, 1998. Again these small differences do not affect the analyses or conclusion drawn from these analyses.

A comment on the Chapter 9.0 MSMC Options:

As stated in the summary Options 2, 3, 4 and 6 do not achieve the target mortality for Georges Bank cod. Further measures to achieve a 22% reduction in will need to be implemented to achieve the target for Georges Bank cod if these Options are chosen.

Similarly, Options 4 and 5 only achieves the Amendment 7 target of F_{\max} for Gulf of Maine cod. These Options were develop by the MSMC to meet the Amendment 7 objective (F_{\max}) for Gulf of Maine cod. The MSMC **strongly recommends using $F_{0.1}$ as a target fishing mortality for Gulf of Maine cod.** Option 6 is a more restrictive version of Option 4 to achieve $F_{0.1}$ for Gulf of Maine cod. Option 5 can achieve $F_{0.1}$ for both cod stocks by counting DAS in the Gulf of Maine at an increased rate in addition to the overall 22% reduction in DAS.

Executive Summary

The Multispecies Monitoring Committee (MSMC) updated landings for Georges Bank cod, Georges Bank haddock, Georges Bank yellowtail, Southern New England yellowtail and Gulf of Maine cod through December 1998. These landings were used along with January 1, 1998 population numbers from the 27th Stock Assessment Review Committee assessments to project fishing mortality rates and spawning stock biomass estimates through December 1998 for the five stocks.

Stock status has improved for the three Georges Bank stocks and Southern New England yellowtail. Calendar year 1998 fishing mortality rates are below the overfishing definitions for these stocks and below the more restrictive Amendment 7 targets for all but Georges Bank cod. The fishing mortality rate on Georges Bank cod increased slightly to 0.26 in calendar year 1998. Spawning stock biomass has increased for these stocks but, with the exception of Georges Bank yellowtail, remains below the Amendment 7 biomass goals. In general, recruitment (incoming year classes) is below the long-term average with the exception of Georges Bank yellowtail.

The status of Gulf of Maine cod has continued to deteriorate. The fishing mortality rate is projected to increase slightly to 0.82 in 1998, and remains well above both the overfishing definition ($F_{20\%}=0.37$) and the Amendment 7 mortality target ($F_{\text{Max}}=0.29$). Recruitment is at record low levels and spawning stock biomass is projected to decline in 1998 to the lowest level ever observed. Biomass is projected to decline below $\frac{1}{4} B_{\text{MSY}}$ in 1999. The proposed control law recommends zero fishing mortality when biomass is below $\frac{1}{4} B_{\text{MSY}}$. Given the SARC 27 management advice based on the stock condition, continued high fishing mortality rates, poor recent recruitment and decline in the survival ratios (recruit/ spawning stock biomass), the Amendment 7 **objective of F_{max} is no longer appropriate.**

The MSMC also examined the status of the other large mesh regulated species (white hake, pollock, redfish, American plaice, witch flounder, winter flounder, and windowpane flounder) through calendar year 1997 using research trawl survey indices, commercial landings and a relative exploitation index. Survey biomass is low for five stocks (white hake, pollock, American plaice, Southern New England winter flounder, and Southern New England windowpane) and low to medium for three stocks (witch flounder, Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank windowpane and medium for two stocks (Cape Cod yellowtail and redfish). Relative exploitation has declined for all species, except white hake and Southern New England winter flounder. Exploitation has remained remain flat for these species since 1991.

Target total allowable catches (TACs) were calculated for calendar year 1999 (January 1 1999 to December 31, 2000) based on MSMC projected stock sizes for January 1, 1999 and target fishing mortality rates. These target TACs are then assumed to be the target TACs for the fishing year (May 1, 1999 to April 30, 2000). The TACs assume that the 1998 Canadian quota for the three Georges Bank stocks will be carried over in 1999. The assumed Canadian quota was subtracted from the Total TACs for transboundary stocks to obtain the USA target TAC. Target

TACs are found in the Table 1.

Table 1. 1998 projected landings (calendar year) and TACs for 1998 and 1999 (calendar year applied to fishing year) in metric tons for the 5 major groundfish stocks.

| <u>Stock</u> | <u>1998 TAC</u> | <u>1998 landings</u> | <u>Projected 1999 TAC</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Georges Bank cod | 4700 | 6348 | 5354 |
| Georges Bank haddock | 4797 | 3394 | 5600 |
| Georges Bank yellowtail | 2145 | 1110 | 2725 |
| SNE yellowtail | 814 | 223 | 1115 |
| Gulf of Maine cod (F_{MAX}) | 1783 | 4075 | 1340 |
| Gulf of Maine cod ($F_{0.1}$) | 1783 | 4075 | 782 |

The TAC (for F_{MAX}) for Gulf of Maine cod represents a 67% drop from projected 1998 landings.

The MSMC evaluated days-at-sea use in fishing years 1996 and 1997. Days-at-sea allocations greatly exceeded the actual usage in those years. In general, vessels with individual days-at-sea used 82% of their allocation while fleet category vessels used only 43% in fishing year 1997. Based on fishing year 1997 utilization rates, days-at-sea limits in 1997 are more constraining on individual vessels than fleet vessels. Utilization of DAS usage in 1998 is projected to be similar to utilization in 1997. The MSMC expects a 7.4% reduction in effort from fishing year 1998, based on the 1999 fishing year days-at-sea schedule, utilization rates, and the vessel buyout program. This reduction has no probability of achieving F_{max} goal for Gulf of Maine cod or the $F_{0.1}$ goal for Georges Bank cod

After accounting for the expected 7.4% reduction in DAS, fishing mortality needs to be reduced on Georges Bank cod (21.9%) and Gulf of Maine cod (56.2%) from the fishing year 1997/98 fishing mortality rates. The MSMC proposes various options consisting of days-at-sea reductions, Gulf of Maine trip limits, and Gulf of Maine area closures and combinations thereof for achieving Amendment 7 targets. Options 1, 2, 3 and 5 achieve $F_{0.1}$ for Gulf of Maine cod and options 4 and 5 achieve F_{max} for Gulf of Maine cod. Only options 1 and 5 achieve the $F_{0.1}$ for Georges Bank cod. Additional measures for Georges Bank cod will be needed if Options 2, 3, 4 or 6 are selected. The options are summarized below and discussed in more detail with examples as needed in Chapter 9.

Table 2. Current closures in the Gulf of Maine and closure Alternatives 1, 2 and 3. Closures replace current closures in Gulf of Maine.

| Current closures in the Gulf of Maine | |
|--|---------------|
| Blocks | Months |
| 124, 125 | March |
| 131, 132, 133 | April |
| 138, 139, 140 | May |
| 129, 145, 146, 147, 152 | June |
| 156 (Western Gulf of Maine closure) | Year-round |

| Closure Alternative # 1 | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Blocks | Months |
| 124, 125 | October-April |
| 131, 132, 133 | April-June |
| 129, 130 | September-December |
| 138, 139, 140 | June |
| 156 (Western Gulf of Maine closure) | Year-round |

| Closure Alternative # 2 | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Blocks | Months |
| 124, 125 | October-April |
| 128, 129, 130 | September-December |
| 132, 133 | March – June |
| 139, 140 | May – June |
| 156 (Western Gulf of Maine closure) | Year-round |

| Closure Alternative # 3 | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Blocks | Months |
| 125 | April-May |
| 133 | April-June |
| 139, 140 | May-June |
| 124, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132 | Year-round |
| 156 (Western Gulf of Maine closure) | Year-round |

Table 3. Summary of various MSMC options described in Chapter 9.

| OPTION | DAS | AREA CLOSURES | GOM COD TRIP LIMIT (per day) | MSMC COMMENTS |
|---------------|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Reduce 56% to 20,813 total (e.g. fleet: 22 DAS, individual: 77% from baseline) | current | current (400 lbs. on vessels not in GOM Cod Exemption Program.) | Achieves $F_{0.1}$ objective for GOM and GB cod |
| 2 | Count at 3-for-1 rate on vessels not in GOM Cod Exemption Program. | current | current (400 lbs. on vessels not in GOM Cod Ex. Prog.) | Achieves $F_{0.1}$ objective for GOM cod but not for GB cod |
| 3 | Status Quo | current | 100 lbs. on vessels not in GOM Cod Ex. Prog. | Achieves $F_{0.1}$ objective for GOM cod but not for GB cod; this option is not recommended because of concerns about discards |
| 4 | Status Quo | Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 | current (400 lbs. on vessels not in GOM Cod Ex. Prog.) | Achieves F_{MAX} for GOM cod but not the $F_{0.1}$ target for GB cod |
| 5 | reduce 22% to 37,078 total (e.g. fleet: 62 DAS, individual: 67% from baseline) | Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 | 600 lbs. on vessels not in GOM Cod Ex. Prog. | Achieves F_{MAX} for GOM cod and the $F_{0.1}$ target for GB cod |
| 6 | Count at 2-for-1 rate on vessels not in GOM Cod Exemption Program. | Alternatives 1, 2 or 3 | 500 lbs. on vessels not in GOM Cod Ex. Prog. | Achieves $F_{0.1}$ target for GOM cod but not for GB cod |

Summary of pros and cons for MSMC Options 1 through 6.

An overall DAS reduction that applies to all limited access multispecies vessels, whether singly (Option 1) or in combination with other measures (Option 5), achieves the fishing mortality goals for all five stocks of concern, and reduces mortality on other regulated species. An overall DAS reduction affects all multispecies vessels and regions where multispecies fisheries occur. It also results in the lowest rate of discard mortality, and has lower administrative and enforcement costs in comparison to other management alternatives. However, because the level of required DAS reductions is driven by Gulf of Maine cod, DAS allocations could be below break-even levels for much the fleet and, in response, vessels would shift effort to other fisheries or become insolvent. Furthermore, severely reducing DAS may encourage adaptive changes in fishing technology and behavior that would mitigate its conservation impact.

Counting DAS at a higher rate for vessels fishing in the Gulf of Maine (3-for-1, Option 2, or 2-for-1, Option 6) shares many of the pros and cons of a general DAS reduction option stated above, except that the impacts will primarily affect vessels fishing in the Gulf of Maine. Also, in addition to increasing pressure on non-regulated species in the Gulf of Maine, these options would provide an incentive for those vessels capable of shifting to redirect their effort to Georges Bank stocks.

A Gulf of Maine cod trip limit reduction alone (Option 3) is area specific and could achieve the target mortality reductions needed for Gulf of Maine cod, but could cause significant discarding, both regulatory discards and high-grading. For this reason, the MSMC does not recommend adoption of Option 3. A trip limit reduction on cod may also increase pressure on other regulated species and on non-regulated species in the Gulf of Maine, as well as shift effort onto Georges Bank in order to maintain viable trip revenues.

Area closures protect species and habitat within the closure, but may cause increased fishing pressure on areas left open. The net impact of an area closure depends on the relative abundance of species outside the closure area and the amount of effort that is displaced. Combining area closures with trip limits and/or DAS reductions addresses the problems associated with the individual management strategies. For example, when combined with a trip limit, an area closure may forestall increased discards if the closed areas cover the grounds where highest cod catches occur. When combined with DAS reductions, the amount of effort displaced to open areas is reduced, increasing the potential net conservation benefit of the closure.

Options 1, 2 and 3 include current (status quo) area closures in combination with reduced DAS or GOM cod trip limits. Options 4, 5 and 6 include three options for expanding Gulf of Maine area closures in different combinations with trip limits and DAS allocations. The trip limit and DAS allocations remain at the status quo level in Option 4 (GOM cod trip limit of 400 pounds per day). The trip limit increases to 700 lbs in combination with counting DAS at 3-for 1 in the Gulf of

Maine in Option 2, increases to 600 pounds in Option 5 in combination with an overall DAS reduction of 22 percent from current levels, and increases to 500 pounds in Option 6 in combination with counting DAS at a rate of 2-for-1 in the Gulf of Maine. Because the area closures and trip limits are focused on Gulf of Maine cod, Options 4 and 6 which do not include overall DAS reductions, do not achieve the target for Georges Bank cod. Furthermore, Options 4 and 5 achieve the plan objective of F_{MAX} for Gulf of Maine cod, while Option 6 achieves a more conservative $F_{0.1}$ target.

The MSMC has included three area closure options for the Gulf of Maine, to help address the issues associated with the distribution of economic impacts of area closures. Section 8.0 of this report contains a description of the different options and an analysis of their conservation impacts. All options retain the current Western Gulf of Maine Closed Area (year-round). The options differ in the proportion of inshore and offshore areas closed and the duration of the closures. Since Gulf of Maine cod is caught predominantly in inshore grounds, options which include more offshore grounds also include closures of longer duration, including, in Option 6, year-round closure of seven 30-minute-square blocks.

Figure 1. Gulf of Maine divided into thirty minute squares used to described area closures alternatives.

