

**Summary of Public Comment
April 1, 2019**

Generic Amendment: Carryover Provisions and Framework Modifications

**Webinar Public Hearing
March 4, 2019**

Staff

Ryan Rindone
Emily Muehlstein

0 members of the public attended.

Summary of Written Public Comment

9 comments were received.

- Allowing carry over of unused harvest (*Action 1, Preferred Alternative 2*) would increase access to all fisheries and should be a top priority. For red snapper in the for-hire component of the recreational sector, carryover will translate underfished quota into more fishing days.
- A carry over provision is a good idea in limited scenarios such as premature closures. However, you do not want to increase the catch on every species that falls short of its ACL. Many species listed in the document show uncaught quota because there is a problem with the fishery and those stocks don't need higher harvest to be allowed in the following year.
- Support for *Action 2, Preferred Alternative 2c* Adjust the amount of ACL to be carried over by limiting the difference between ABC and OFL by 50%. This will ensure that quota is only carried over due to management action and are not overfished.
- Support for the fixed framework approach (*Action 3, Preferred Alternative 2*) to allow carryover to be executed quickly and easily.
- The Council should follow National Standard 1 Guidelines with respect to carryover, especially regarding the requirements that stocks subject to carryover must be specified in advanced, alongside the circumstances that trigger carryover.

**Summary of Public Comment
April 1 - June 3, 2019**

2 comments were received.

- The Council should exclude stocks under a rebuilding plan from the carryover provision to ensure that rebuilding targets are met.
- Support for carryover because it will give management and operators more flexibility to access the resources.