

#2

Monkfish Advisory Panel  
Meeting Summary  
March 9, 2011

Advisors Present: Mike Johnson (NJ), Dan Mears (NJ), Rick Mears (NJ), Kevin Wark (NJ), Chris Walker (VA), Chris Hickman (NC), Tim Caldwell (ME), Tim Froelich (NY), Ted Platz (RI), Tom Dempsey (MA), Louis Julliard (MA), Maggie Raymond (ME)

Also present: Terry Stockwell and Howard King, Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, council member Mark Alexander, staff from both NE and Mid Atlantic Councils, staff from NMFS, and approximately 50 interested parties.

**1) Issue of trip limit exemption in research set aside program:**

Advisors reviewed written comments from public regarding the trip limit exemption allowed for vessels involved in compensation fishing, and complaints that this exemption causes concentration of effort in certain areas, as well as gear conflict problems.

NMFS analysis shows that research set aside compensation trips are occurring in 3 statistical areas.

Advisors who participate in the research set aside program explained that the trip limit exemption is critical to the financial feasibility of compensation fishing, and that concentration of effort is the result of limited number of vessels participating in program.

Without objection, the advisory panel recommends that the Council write to the director of the Cooperative Research Program to request an outreach program to increase participation in the research set aside program.

Motion: Dempsey/Platz

Move that the advisory panel recommends the Councils consider converting the DAS research set aside to a quota set aside  
Motion carried 6-5

**2) At the request of the Committee Chair, the Advisory Panel entered into a discussion of "problem areas" within the directed monkfish fishery.**

Without objection, the advisory panel agreed that the following problems exist within the monkfish fishery:

- Latent effort
- Lack of continuous supply to processors
- Wasteful discards
- Inefficient vessel operation
- Lack of flexibility
- Geographic restriction for category H permits

**3) The Advisory Panel entered into a discussion of the differences in the fishery between the two management areas**

Motion: Dempsey/Wark

Move that the advisory panel recommends that the Councils consider developing distinct and separate management systems for the north and southern management areas

Motion carried unanimously

Motion: Platz/ Wark

Move that the advisory panel recommends that the Councils consider separating the FMP into two FMPs one for each of the two management areas.

Motion carried unanimously

Motion: Dempsey/Platz

Move that the advisors recommend that the Councils develop and consider a full range of alternatives for each management area to meet the management objectives as well as to address the problems identified by the advisory panel, including status quo, DAS leasing, extension of running clock, sector management and ITQs

Motion carried 6-5-1, with Chair voting to break a tie

**4) The Advisory Panel discussed a need for information to more fully characterize the problems defined in 2 above**

Without objection, the advisors requested the Committee Chair and Vice Chair task the staff with providing information about the extent of the problems defined by the advisory panel, e.g. how many permits are latent. The advisors request that as much information as possible, given time constraints, be provided to the Committee at the March 29<sup>th</sup> meeting.

More specifically the advisory panel recommends looking at time and geographic trends in latency by permit category and gear type, and the potential impacts to the directed fishery and to the resource should latent permits become active (i.e. what does it look like if 15%, 30% of those permits start fishing). The advisory panel is also interested in landings and pricing trends in this fishery as well as existing information on discards and data gaps re: wasted marketable fish resulting from trip limits.