



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Division of Marine Fisheries

(617) 626-1520 | www.mass.gov/marinefisheries



MAURA T. HEALEY
Governor

KIMBERLEY DRISCOLL
Lt. Governor

REBECCA L. TEPPER
Secretary

THOMAS O'SHEA
Commissioner

DANIEL J. MCKIERNAN
Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marine Fisheries Advisory Commission (MFAC)

FROM: Daniel J. McKiernan, Director 

DATE: April 18, 2025

SUBJECT: **Emergency Rule Making to Implement Addendum XXXII to the American Lobster Management Plan**

Status of Addendum XXXII to American Lobster Fishery Management Plan

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) Lobster Board (“Board”) initiated draft Addendum XXXII to the American Lobster Fishery Management Plan (FMP) at its February meeting. This addendum seeks to repeal the gauge and escape vent size measures approved in Addendum XXVII to the FMP (Table 1) given concerns raised by industry interests around potential economic impacts. The ASMFC held a virtual public hearing on Addendum XXXII on April 10, 2025 and I anticipate Addendum XXXII will be approved by the Board at their May 5, 2025 meeting.

Prior Regulatory Action and Need for Emergency Rules

In late 2024, Massachusetts adopted a suite of regulations to implement Addendum XXVII¹. This included establishing compliant regulations for the commercial fishery (Table 2) and extending complementary gauge size and escape vent rules to the recreational fishery in the Gulf of Maine and Outer Cape Management Areas (Table 3). Whereas the commercial rules go into effect on July 1², as required by Addendum XXVII, the recreational rule changes were scheduled to go into effect at the start of the season on May 15.

In anticipation of the Board approving Addendum XXXII, DMF has initiated emergency rule making. This should allow DMF to repeal those relevant aspects of our rules by May 15 for recreational fishers and July 1 for commercial fishers and seafood dealers. This is consistent with my long-held position that DMF will work to ensure Massachusetts’ fishers (and by extension seafood dealers and consumers) should not end up subject to stricter standards than fishers who fish the same Lobster Conservation Management Area (LCMA) (Figure 1).

¹ Refer to page 16 of the October 2024 MFAC [meeting materials](#) for more details

² With commercial fishery rules going into on July 1, complementary rules for seafood dealers were scheduled to become effective simultaneously at the point of primary transaction. However, seafood dealers were to be afforded a 90-day window when they could possess non-conforming product lawfully purchased prior to the July 1 implementation date to allow for the sell off of inventory.

Given the tight timeline with the recreational fishing season, DMF has notified recreational permit holders³ that they should expect that last year's rules will remain in place for 2025 (Table 4) and that the gauge and vent size amendments that were announced in December 2024 are no longer expected to go into effect. Formal notice will go out to commercial permit holders and seafood dealers once emergency rules are adopted and well in advance of the pending July 1 implementation date.

Once the emergency regulation is filed, DMF will have 90-days to hold a public comment period, public hearing, obtain MFAC approval, and file final rules with the Secretary of State. To meet these deadlines, I project that we will need to hold a short MFAC meeting in July to review and vote on a final recommendation. I anticipate this will be a short, virtual meeting to accommodate your various summertime schedules.

Background

Development and Implementation of Addendum XXVII

The most recent stock assessment for American lobster dates back to 2020. The assessment concluded that the Gulf of Maine/Georges Bank (GOM/GBK) lobster stock was not overfished and overfishing was not occurring. However, survey and landings trends indicate the GOM/GBK lobster stock population was declining from the preceding period which featured record high abundance and recruitment indices demonstrated the stock was also likely headed towards a period of lower productivity. Declining recruitment is thought to be environmentally driven related to changing seasonal availability of copepods which lobsters feed on during the larval stage.

This raised concerns through northern New England (Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts) about the long-term health of the resource and the fishery, particularly as more than 90% of lobster landings nationally come out of the Gulf of Maine. These concerns were particularly acute in Maine where officials feared the effect of declining landings and revenues across the state's maritime economy given its dependence on this resource. Consequently, there was interest at the ASMFC to get out ahead of expected declines and protect spawning stock biomass to buffer against environmental-driven changes in recruitment and productivity.

This resulted in the development of Addendum XXVII, which addressed management in the three LCMAs that fish on the GOM/GBK lobster stock—LMCA1, LCMA 3 (Offshore), and Outer Cape Cod (OCC) LCMA (Figure 1). This addendum featured two discrete components: (1) an index-based approach to track and respond to declining recruitment and trigger conservation measures designed to further protect spawning stock biomass; and (2) standardization measures to create more consistent rules within LCMA's to be adopted more immediately and irrespective of the trigger index.

To achieve the first feature of the addendum, ASMFC's Technical Committee (TC) for Lobster developed an index by blending data from ventless lobster trap surveys and state bottom trawl surveys as a mechanism to track abundance of recruit-sized (sub-legal) lobsters between stock

³ See DMF's April 11, 2025 [advisory](#).

assessments. This provided the Board with a mechanism to track and react to declining recruitment. This became the so-called “trigger index” whereby certain prescribed gauge size and escape vent mandates would occur gradually over a five-year period should a 35% decline in this index be observed from the 2016 – 2018 baseline.

The addendum also featured three discrete standardization measures. Historically, the management program for the OCCLCMA featured less restrictive maximum size and v-notch rules for state-only permit holders compared to those who also hold a federal permit. Specifically, the state-only permit holders were not subject to a maximum gauge size and had a v-notch standard of a sharp “v” not to exceed ¼” depth and without setal hairs, whereas federal permit holders were subject to a 6 ¾” maximum size and a v-notch standard of any indentation with a depth not to exceed 1/8” with or without setal hairs. Considering the primary focus of the addendum was to take a precautionary management approach to enhance spawning stock biomass, standardization focused on adopting the more restrictive 6 ¾” maximum gauge size and 1/8” v-notch rule across all participants (state-only permit holders and federal permit holders) in the OCCLCMA. The last standardization measure in the addendum prevented states (MA & NH) from automatically issuing additional (10%) trap tags to permit holders in LMCA 1 and LCMA 3 above their trap limit or trap allocation to preemptively account for in-season losses. This was intended to constrain permit holders from unlawfully fishing traps in excess of their trap limit or trap allocation and it would also bring the other states in the range into phase with what was already required in Maine.

The Board approved Addendum XXVII in May 2023⁴ for implementation by May 2024. The expectation was that the standardization measures would be effective for the implementation date and the trigger-based measures would be on the books to go into effect at some future date should the index decline by 35% compared to the baseline. However, within five months, the TC informed the Board that the index declined by 39% compared to the baseline triggering management changes for 2024.

The unexpected and immediate triggering of management caused a wave of concern across industry and government. There was worry that gauge manufacturers would be unable to timely fabricate new gauges for industry, enforcement, and recreational fishers throughout the range. Additionally, there was interest pursuing the Canadian fishery to adopt complementary measures in the Gulf of Maine⁵. Complementary measures would help resolve legal issues regarding the importation of undersized product from Canada to the United States and address anxieties in Downeast Maine about equity as Canadian and US vessels would be fishing side-by-side in the so-called “grey zone” but subject to disparate conservation standards. Accordingly, the Board voted twice to delay implementation. The first vote was in February 2024 and delayed implementation from May 1, 2024 to January 1, 2025. The second vote was in October 2024 and delayed implementation until July 1, 2025.

⁴ Note that Massachusetts delegation voted against Addendum XXVII due to concerns about the standardization measures affecting the state-only permit holders in OCCLCMAA.

⁵ Under Canadian rules, such a management action would have to be brought about by an industry petition because it was not mandatory conservation to respond to a stock assessment finding, which further complicated these negotiations.

In response, I proposed—and the MFAC approved—Massachusetts regulations to implement Addendum XXVII at its October 2024 business meeting. DMF’s regulations were filed on December 20, 2024 and codified on January 3, 2025⁶. Throughout the regulatory development and approval process, MFAC members questioned how DMF would act if other states (namely Maine) failed to implement Addendum XXVII. I responded that I would work through the ASMFC process but intended to avoid any scenario whereby Massachusetts’ fishers (and by extension seafood dealers and consumers) would end up subject to stricter standards than fishers who fish the same Lobster Conservation Management Area (LCMA). Additionally, I explained that should this occur, tight timelines for implementation would be likely and DMF would likely need to rely on emergency regulations to achieve this goal.

Unraveling of Support for Addendum XXVII

The scenario of noncompliance among our partner states came to fruition on January 9, 2025. Then Maine Commissioner Patrick Keliher announced he was “pulling the rule” to implement Addendum XXVII following two highly contentious public hearings where there was vitriolic outrage from some members of his industry towards Commissioner Keliher and his science and management staff regarding the pending minimum size increases and the perceived associated economic impacts. Video footage from a particularly out-of-control public hearing went viral on social media. Once word spread among the industry, newly elected New Hampshire Governor Kelly Ayotte announced on January 21 that New Hampshire would also go out of compliance with the minimum size increases⁷.

The unraveling of Addendum XXVII is a prime example of history repeating itself. Back in the 1980’s, there was a federal fishery management plan for lobster overseen by the New England Fishery Management Council and NOAA Fisheries. The federal plan adopted four 1/32” gauge increases scheduled over a five-year period. In the middle year, 1990, when no gauge increases were scheduled, industry groups (led by Maine industry) were successful in having each state legislature in the region block additional minimum size increases through state legislation. In response, NOAA Fisheries and the New England Fishery Management Council recognized lobster management was predominately a state issue and turned over management authority to the ASMFC⁸. The minimum gauge for LCMA1 has remained at 3 1/4” since.

February 2024 Lobster Board Meeting and Addendum XXXII

Soon after Keliher’s announcement, the Board recognized the challenge it faced as the largest lobster producing state in the country was intent on going out-of-compliance with the FMP. Accordingly, at its February 2025 meeting, the Board voted to initiate draft Addendum XXXII to “repeal all gauge and vent size changes in Addendum XXVII.” Subsequently, the ASMFC held a virtual public hearing on the addendum on April 10, 2025 and the Board is expected to vote on the addendum at the upcoming May 5 Board meeting.

⁶ See DMF’s December 19, 2024 [advisory](#).

⁷ Note that Maine and New Hampshire’s rule-making processes were at different stages when these determinations were made. Maine was in its public hearing process and could simply not move forward final rules. Whereas New Hampshire had already codified rules and would have to initiate a process to amend and rescind them.

⁸ Note that NOAA Fisheries does implement federal regulations for lobster management (often on a delayed schedule). This is done to support the ASMFC’s interstate fishery management plan and not on their own volition through the Council process under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. NOAA Fisheries is also a voting member of the ASMFC’s Lobster Board.

During the February Board meeting, I expressed my strong disappointment about what transpired—the industry’s undermining of most of the conservation benefits developed through a multi-year management plan process at the 11th hour and the chilling effect this would likely have on the ASMFC process. I was especially frustrated because the states of Maine and New Hampshire—whose ASMFC delegations voted for these measures numerous times over the past two years—were the principal parties to this unravelling. While this sentiment was broadly shared among my colleagues at the Board, the draft addendum was supported if only to avoid a non-compliance scenario. For this reason, I fully anticipate the Board will also approve Addendum XXXII in May.

However, the Board also found it necessary and compelling to address the frustrations of its members. Accordingly, a second motion was also approved at the February 2025 meeting. This motion was for the ASMFC leadership to write a strongly worded letter to the states of Maine and New Hampshire, expressing disappointment in the outcome and the harm done to the ASMFC process, and putting those states and their industries on notice that the next round of conservation proposals must emanate from them. I moved this motion forward because, in my view, Maine and New Hampshire “broke it, so they own it”. I very much look forward to hearing from my counterparts on how to proceed, particularly following the release of the 2025 stock assessment later this year.

As a state director and long-time fishery manager, I fully understand the challenges associated with managing by consensus. I also recognize these challenges are particularly acute in Maine where there are four very active fishing associations representing lobster fishing interests and state law carves up the coast into seven zones, each with its own Zone Council that provides management advice to Maine DMR. However, given the size of Maine’s fishery and its obvious influence on region-wide lobster management initiatives, it is critical and sensible for Maine regulators and industry members to develop mutually acceptable conservation proposals before they are pursued at an interstate level. I believe a lesson was learned in Massachusetts (and New Hampshire) that Maine should provide leadership in lobster management and develop management options that the ASMFC can promulgate without being undermined by Maine interests.

Addendum XXXII and the OCCLCMA

While the focus of this memorandum so far has been primarily on the fallout from Maine’s decision to pursue non-compliance, there are also challenges regarding the state-only OCCLCMA fishery that warrant further discussion.

The OCCLMCA is a unique lobster fishery. Permit holders fish on the GOM/GBK stock like neighboring LCMA 1 and LCMA 3. However, unlike LCMA 1, which is principally a recruitment fishery, the size frequency of its lobster catch in the OCCLCMA is large and remarkably similar to LCMA3. This is due to the fact that the area is a migratory corridor for sexually mature lobsters moving seasonally between inshore and offshore grounds, as demonstrated by lobster tagging studies.

It is also a very small fishery in terms of the total number of traps fished and total number of active participants. There are only 67 OCCLCMA lobster trap fishers permitted. Of these, 40 do

not have a federal permit and are “state-only”. These participants fish the narrow three-mile band of waters around the eastern shore of the Cape primarily out of Provincetown Harbor and Nauset Inlet. The remaining 27 permit holders have a federal permit and can fish out into the federal zone and are primarily homeported out of the various harbors around Chatham and Harwich.

Beginning around 2000 with Addendum III, lobster management in the OCCLMCA began diverge from management in LCMA 1. This included going from a 3 ¼” to 3 ⅜” minimum gauge size (consistent with LCMA 3 at the time), very restrictive limited entry and individual (permit-specific) trap allocations based on historical performance, a 10% trap tax when allocations and permits are transferred⁹, and a two-month wintertime trap closure¹⁰. Additionally, unlike LCMA 1, OCCLCMA fishers are also not required to v-notch all egg-bearing female, nor are the OCCLCMA permit holder subject to LCMA 1’s very restrictive v-notch standard of any v-shaped notch (commonly referred to as “zero-tolerance”).

In the past 25 years, ASMFC and NOAA Fisheries have pursued some additional changes to lobster management across the various LCMAs. While much of this effort has focused on the Southern New England stock (affecting LCMA 2 in Massachusetts), there have also been some changes affecting the offshore Gulf of Maine fishery. LCMA 3 permit holders have seen their trap allocations cut by about 25%, their minimum gauge size was increased from 3 ⅜ to 3 17/32, and a maximum gauge size of 6 ¾” and 1/8” v-notch standard were adopted. These last two biological measures (size limit and v-notch possession standard) were also applied by NOAA Fisheries in 2010 to the OCCLCMA federal permit holders. However, those federal rules were not extended to the state-only fishery, resulting in the disparate limits within this LCMA that Addendum XXVII sought to resolve through standardization. As a result, the state-only fishers are the only fishers along the US coast that do not have a maximum gauge size and this fishery also has the least restrictive v-notch standard among all commercial fishers.

These management differences have frequently put the state-only OCCLCMA fishery at odds with interests at the Board and their industry peers along the coast. This tension is particularly acute among the state-waters-only OCCLCMA fleet and LCMA 1 fishers, particularly in Maine. Many LCMA 1 fishers have embraced v-notching as the preeminent conservation strategy, and since the early 2000’s, have opted to mandate the v-notching of all egg-bearing lobsters and adopt the strictest v-notch possession standard (so-called “zero tolerance”). As such, they view the lax v-notching requirements in the state-only OCCLCMA fishery as undermining their conservation efforts (“they take the lobsters we v-notch”). These frustrations are also frequently aired while not fully recognizing the small scale of the OCCLCMA fishery and the strict effort controls it functions under. This dynamic was clearly at play at the recent virtual ASMFC public hearing on Addendum XXXII. In response, I intend to develop a brief report on the status and performance of the OCCLCMA fishery which I will share with the Board and the MFAC later this spring.

⁹ The 10% tax is no longer applied when a permit is transferred, only when trap allocation is transferred independent of a permit transfer.

¹⁰ This effort control closure has now been subsumed by the February 1 – May 15 Massachusetts Restricted Area trap gear closure to protect right whales which affects all of LCMA 1 in Massachusetts.

It is important to put this dynamic into context when dissecting the development of Addendum XXXII. This addendum was drafted to repeal all gauge and vent size changes in Addendum XXVII. This means the other aspects of Addendum XXVII—v-notch standardization in OCCLCMA and trap tag issuance for LCMAs 1 and 3—are maintained and to go into effect as scheduled. Accordingly, while the state-only OCCLCMA fishery will get a reprieve from the maximum gauge size, they will still be subject to the 1/8” v-notch standard beginning on July 1, 2025.

At the February 2025 Board meeting, the Massachusetts delegation made a motion to pursue an option in the draft addendum that would repeal all aspects of Addendum XXVII. Chairman Kane and Representative Armini both argued that excluding the repeal of the v-notch standardization rule inequitably targeted a small number of fishers while giving reprieve to the primary harvest area. This motion was notable because it failed to obtain a second, which in my view, speaks to the above stated tension regarding the v-notch rules for these fishers and the lack of support for maintaining this management approach coastwide. Because the motion did not receive a “second”, the management option was not included in the draft addendum. Accordingly, the repeal of the v-notch standardization requirement cannot be included in the final addendum, which was requested by certain state-only OCCLCMA lobster fishers and their representatives at the ASMFC public hearing. Repealing the v-notch standardization rule would require the initiation of an additional addendum.

Throughout both the development of Addendum XXVII and XXXII, representatives from the state-only OCCLCMA fishery (including the Outer Cape Cod Lobstermen’s Association), have raised objections to both the conservation and standardization measures proposed for the OCCLCMA. The argument is generally that: (1) they are a small fishery and their impact on the overall stock is negligible; (2) their conservation contributions, particularly their effort control plan, is strict and should be honored given a previous agreement between the Outer Cape Lobstermen’s Association, the ASMFC, and DMF; and (3) the economic impact of v-notch standardization (and maximum gauge size standardization) is significant. To this last point, some fishers have argued that the economic impact of v-notch standardization could exceed reach 25% loss in catch. Curiously, we have not heard much comment from the federal permit holders in the OCCLCMA who have been subject to the 1/8” v-notch standard and 6 3/4” maximum gauge size since 2010.

I do not intend to editorialize much on the arguments made by the state-only interests, as the Outer Cape Cod Lobstermen’s Association and their attorney have made it known that they are considering pursuing legal action against DMF and the ASMFC over Addendum XXXII. However, I will reiterate several things that I have previously stated in public forums.

I understand the frustrations expressed by the state-waters only OCCLCMA fleet regarding Addendum XXXII and recognize that they operate at a fraction of the scale of the other LCMAs that fish on the GOM/GBK stock. However, the purpose of the v-notch rule is standardization within the LCMA, and the v-notch standardization measure (as well as the maximum gauge size measure for which they will get reprieved) were scheduled to go into effect for 2025 irrespective of the trigger-index-based conservation measures. As justified in the Statement of the Problem in Addendum XXVII, “increasing consistency across management areas may help to address some

assessment and enforcement challenges, as well as concerns regarding the shipment and sale of lobsters across state lines.” I support the logic set forth in this justification and have long been concerned that disparate rules within the LCMA challenge the enforcement of conservation standards in the federal OCCLCMA fishery, across Massachusetts and elsewhere. For this reason, I have favored the v-notch and gauge size standardization pursued by Addendum XXVII, as I believe it reasonably balances enforcement and compliance issues against the unique nature of the OCCLCMA fishery. This position is also informed by the fact that I think the economic impacts expressed by the state-only OCCLMCA fishery are significantly exaggerated for effect. DMF has sampled this fishery (both state-only and federal permit holders) since 1981, and sampling intensity has been ramped up over the past decade. The data we have collected demonstrate that only 2.2% of the catch by weight includes lobsters that would be otherwise legal (e.g., not egg-bearing) but have a v-notch between the ¼” and the ⅛” standard. This is an order of magnitude lower than estimates provided by industry.

Final Thoughts

I have stated previously that I intend to honor the ASMFC process and ensure Massachusetts fishers are not subject to stricter standards than fishers who fish the same LCMA but under rules enacted by another jurisdiction. I am resolute in the maintenance of this position, and this is evidenced by my intention to pursue emergency action to immediately implement Addendum XXXII. Given my respect for the ASMFC process, I also have no intention to pursue non-compliance (like Maine and New Hampshire threatened) so the state-waters-only OCCLCMA fishers can maintain a ¼” v-notch standard.

Table 1. Commercial Gauge Size and Escape Vent Rules to Be Rescinded by Addendum XXXII by LCMA

| Implementation | LCMA 1 | LCMA 3 | OCCLCMA |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| July 1, 2025 | <p>Minimum gauge size increase from 3 1/4" to 3 5/16"</p> <p>Maintains existing 3 1/4" minimum gauge size.</p> | <p>Maintains existing 6 3/4" maximum gauge size.</p> | <p>Establish 6 3/4" standard maximum gauge size for OCCLCMA.</p> <p>Maintains existing 6 3/4" maximum gauge size for OCCLCMA federal permit holders and no maximum gauge size for state-only OCCLCMA.</p> |
| July 1, 2027 | <p>Minimum gauge size increase from 3 5/16" to 3 3/8"</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| 2028 | <p>Trap escape vent size increase to 2" by 5 3/4" rectangular to 2 5/8" diameter.</p> <p>Maintains escape vent size of 1 15/16" by 5 3/4" rectangular or 2 7/16" diameter</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| 2029 | <p>N/A</p> | <p>Maximum carapace size decrease from 6 3/4" to 6 1/2".</p> <p>Maintains existing 6 3/4" maximum gauge size.</p> | <p>Maximum carapace size decrease from 6 3/4" to 6 1/2".</p> |

Table 2. Implementation Schedule for Commercial Fishing Gauge Size, Escape Vent, and V-Notch Rules Adopted in Addendum XXVII by LCMA

| Implementation | LCMA 1 | LCMA 3 | OCCLCMA |
|---|--|---|---|
| July 1, 2025 (Regardless of trigger index) | Limit trap tag issuance to trap allocation with no extra trap tags awarded. | Limit trap tag issuance to trap allocation with no extra trap tags awarded. | Establish 6 3/4" maximum carapace size for state waters OCCLCMA. V-notch standard changes from 1/4" sharp v-notch without setal hairs to 1/8" v-notch with or without setal hairs for state waters OCCLCMA |
| July 1, 2025 (Year 1 following 35% decline in trigger index) | Minimum carapace size increase from 3 1/4" to 3 5/16" | N/A | N/A |
| July 1, 2026 (Year 2 following 35% decline in trigger index) | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| July 1, 2027 (Year 3 following 35% decline in trigger index) | Minimum carapace size increase from 3 5/16" to 3 3/8" | N/A | N/A |
| July 1, 2028 (Year 4 following 35% decline in trigger index) | Trap escape vent size change from 1 15/16" by 5 3/4" rectangular or 2 7/16" diameter to 2" by 5 3/4" rectangular to 2 5/8" diameter. | N/A | N/A |
| July 1, 2029 (Year 5 following 35% decline in trigger index) | N/A | Maximum carapace size decrease from 6 3/4" to 6 1/2". | Maximum carapace size decrease from 6 3/4" to 6 1/2". |

Table 3. Implementation Schedule for Recreational Fishing Rules by Management Area to Complement Addendum XXVII

| Implementation | Gulf of Maine Management Area | Outer Cape Management Area |
|---|--|---|
| May 15, 2025 | Minimum carapace size increase from 3 1/4" to 3 5/16" | Establish 6 3/4" maximum carapace size* |
| May 15, 2027 | Minimum carapace size increase from 3 5/16" to 3 1/4" | N/A |
| May 1, 2028 | Trap escape vent size change from 1 15/16" by 5 3/4" rectangular or 2 7/16" diameter to 2" by 5 3/4" rectangular to 2 5/8" diameter. | N/A |
| May 1, 2029 | N/A | Maximum carapace size decrease from 6 3/4" to 6 1/2". |
| * Recreational v-notch rule is standardized across state at 1/8" indentation with or without setal hairs. | | |

Table 4. Anticipated 2025 Gauge Size, Escape Vent, and V-Notch Rules for Recreational Lobster Fishery by Management Area

| Management Area | Minimum Gauge | Maximum Gauge | Escape Vent | V-Notch Standard |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| Gulf of Maine | 3 1/4" | 5" | A rectangular vent measuring at least 1 15/16" by 5 3/4" or two circular escape vents that measure at least 2 7/16" diameter. | 1/8" indentation with or without setal hairs. |
| Outer Cape Cod | 3 3/8" | N/A | A rectangular vent measuring at least 2" by 5 3/4" or two circular escape vents that measure at least 2 5/8" diameter. | 1/8" indentation with or without setal hairs. |
| Southern New England | 3 3/8" | 5 1/4" | A rectangular vent measuring at least 2" by 5 3/4" or two circular escape vents that measure at least 2 5/8" diameter. | 1/8" indentation with or without setal hairs. |

Figure 1. Map of Lobster Management Areas Overlaid on Lobster Stock Areas

