

**Reef Fish Amendment 41: Red Snapper Management for Charter Vessels  
Reef Fish Amendment 42: Reef Fish Management for Headboats  
Scoping Workshops were held in the following locations:**

**Mon, October 19, 2015**

Courtyard Marriott Gulfport Beachfront  
1600 East Beach Blvd.  
Gulfport, MS 39501

**Thurs, October 22, 2015**

Hilton Galveston Island  
5400 Seawall Blvd.  
Galveston, TX 77551

**Wed, October 21, 2015**

Adult Activity Center  
26251 Canal Road  
Orange Beach, AL

**Mon, October 26, 2015**

Marriott Clearwater Beach Sand Key  
1201 Gulf Blvd.  
Clearwater Beach, FL 33767

**Thurs, October 22, 2015**

Embassy Suites  
570 Scenic Gulf Drive  
Destin, FL 332550

**Thurs, October 29, 2015**

Webinar

**Tues, November 3, 2015**

Courtyard Marriott  
142 Library Drive  
Houma, LA 70360

**Summaries of Scoping Workshops**

**Gulfport, Mississippi**

**October 19, 2015**

**Council/Staff**

Joe Jewell / Kelly Lucas  
Ed Swindell  
Ava Lasseter  
Bernadine Roy

**22 Members of the public attended**

Chuck Guilford  
Tom Becker  
Diane Castoro  
Mike Foto  
Brandon Morano  
Kenny Barhanovian  
Dick Wilson  
Glenn Bremen Kemp  
Skip Roberts  
Bob Brown  
Tom Steber

Dustin Trochesset  
Pat Grannan  
Frank Becker  
Kenny Bellais  
Bill Des Jardins  
Lauren Nelson  
Doug Nelson  
Clarence Seymour  
Ron Harmon  
Jim Young  
James Brumfield

## **Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

- 1. Should the Council consider traditional management measures (bag limit, size limit, season)?**
  - Yes, traditional management is more in line with the natural order. Allocation-based approaches would not allow the charter operators to stay in business. The season is too short.
  - We've "done done" that. Let's try something new.
  - No, need more flexibility.
  - Would like to fish in the spring or fall.
- 2. Should the Council consider allocation-based measures (group or individual based)?**
  - Allocation-based offers more flexibility as long as you have good accountability measures. Allows one to fish when best for the business and customers.
  - There is no season if harvest tags are used.
  - Yes, if allocation is based on fair and equitable data.
- 3. What is your preferred management approach (traditional methods or allocation-based)?**
  - Tags assigned to a permit.
  - Allocation that best benefits the for-hire industry.
- 4. If the Council allocates red snapper to charter vessels, should the allocation consider the passenger capacity of charter vessels or regional differences between homeports?**
  - Equal allocation per permit holder. All 6-packs would get the same allocation.
  - Totally opposed to allocating among for-hire vessels.
  - Allocation-based approaches will reduce the number of fishing days.
  - Under a tagging program, when out of tags season is over.
  - Allows each individual to fish when they want, because you can use tags when you want.
  - Prefers distribution of shares based on a tiered passenger capacity.
  - Allow vessels to opt in/out of an allocation based program, annually.
- 5. Should the Council consider additional management measures that were not mentioned?**
  - Should eliminate a lot of latent permits. Require proof of charter income.
  - Concern that latent permit holders will receive allocation to sell to active charters resulting in unfair profits.
  - Does not support trading or selling of allocation. If you don't use it, you lose it.
  - Supports VMS as optional and require electronic logbooks. Would prefer an app instead of a satellite tracker.
  - VMS is the gold star for accountability. NMFS knows when you go fishing. VMS will identify latent permits.
  - Don't want to further reduce access by eliminating permits, but want to identify latent permits for program participation.

- Shouldn't negate access due to unforeseen circumstances. Don't define a latent permit as one not used in a single year. Need an appeals process to protect permit holders.
- In a well-designed program there will not be latent permits because they will have value and get used.

### **Amendment 42: Scoping Questions**

#### **1. What species should be included in Amendment 42?**

- All reef fish to avoid discards.
- Just red snapper.

#### **2. Should the Council consider traditional management measures (bag limit, size limit, season)?**

- No.
- Support for split season in the spring and fall.
- When private recreational season is open, close the charter for-hire season, and vice versa. There are limited spots to fish and this would reduce fishing pressure on popular spots.

#### **3. Should the Council consider allocation-based measures (group or individual based)?**

- Yes.
- Fishing cooperatives like the headboat collaborative.
- With catch histories, can use tags that are based on historical landings.
- Allocation should be associated with the permit.

#### **4. Additional management measures that were not mentioned?**

- VMS should be optional on headboats.
- Let headboats opt out of Amendment 42 and join charter vessels in Amendment 41.
- Support for VMS.

**Orange Beach, Alabama  
October 21, 2015**

#### **Council/Staff**

Kevin Anson  
Chris Blankenship  
Ava Lasseter  
Bernadine Roy

#### **24 members of the public attended**

Larry Kelley  
Lane Sarrold  
Gordon Burdette  
Michael Choron  
Mike Rowell

Gary Bryant  
David Adams  
Don McPherson  
Dennis McKay  
Robert Wasilausky

Randy Boggs  
Josh South  
John Hollingshorn  
Blakeley Ellis  
Brian Swindle  
Phillip West  
Troy Frady  
Dale Woodruff

Bill Jeffries  
Robert Stuart  
Steve Johnson  
Joe Nash  
Tom Steber  
Denny Kearley

### **Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

- 1. Charter vessels are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**
  - It doesn't work. The for-hire industry desperately needs flexibility. Need to manage our own business. Want to fish when we want to fish.
  - With the set season and set catch limits, they have no flexibility.
  - Leads to derby fishing.
  - Leads to regional/localized depletion, because all recreational vessels are fishing in a short time period.
  - Creates targeting of red snapper instead of fishing for other fish. Red snapper becomes a bycatch fishery. Meeting the bag limit defines a successful trip.
  - Decreases access for recreational fishermen because they can only fish during a set time.
  - The uncertainty of exceeding the catch limit still exists.
  - Does not provide accurate landings data.
  - Necessitates that charter operators do multiple trips per day during the short season.
- 2. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**
  - Reduce bag limit to one fish.
  - Adopt a split season, such that both May and October are open.
  - Charter for-hire needs a June/July season because of stable weather and reliable tourism numbers at that time.
  - Short continuous seasons do not work because of the possibility of bad weather.
- 3. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder charter operators and their passenger anglers?**
  - Would increase flexibility. Can fish when you want to or need to, and could do other trips. Would stabilize the charter fisherman's business by allowing his customers to choose when to fish.
  - Would reduce discards.
  - Would increase the area for fishing if able to take fewer but longer trips and be able to access waters farther from shore.
  - Distributing allocation would decrease uncertainty by fixing the amount of harvest up front. Could reduce discard mortality with available quota and by modifying fishing practices.

- It further establishes a privileged fishery.
- If harvest tags are used, use for recreational sector as a whole and allocate to the angler who could then fish on charter or private boats. Supports recreational sector management as a whole.
- No, it would not hinder anglers.
- The success of a charter management plan could encourage private anglers to create a management plan, too.

**4. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach which one is most appropriate and why?**

- Allocation-based, but without ownership of shares.
- Does not support IFQs. Wants a voluntary opt-in/out program if going to fish for red snapper. Provide allocation to vessels that are catching red snapper.
- Harvest tags for enforcement and validation.
- Electronic log books for real-time data collection.
- If there are permits that aren't being used and an allocation-based program is adopted, could have an inequitable distribution of allocation. Recommends a use-it or lose-it provision.
- Supports modeling charter management similar to the headboat collaborative program, including VMS, logbooks, and tags.

**5. Other comments:**

- Explore every avenue for allocation approaches to ensure fairness and equity.
- Use tags for the entire recreational sector.

### **Amendment 42: Scoping Questions**

**1. Headboats are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**

- Same list as for Amendment 41.

**2. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**

- Same list as for Amendment 41.

**3. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder headboat operators and their passenger anglers?**

- Same list as for Amendment 41.

**4. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach which one is most appropriate and why?**

- The headboat pilot program was successful. Supports modeling management after that program.
- Use catch histories because you have them.
- Use allocation only, not shares.

- Does not support allocation-based management because a recreational angler is a recreational angler whether on a charter or private vessel.

**5. Which species should be included for Amendment 42? Should all reef fish be included?**

**Red snapper and gag only?**

- Red snapper and gag would keep it simple but if considering reef fish use the six species with sector allocations.
- Include all species with landings histories on the surveys. Would reflect regional differences in species caught.

**6. Other comments on Amendments 41 and 42:**

- They could reduce the likelihood of triggering the 407(d) provision.

**Destin, Florida  
October 22, 2015**

**Council/Staff**

Martha Bademan  
Pam Dana  
Ava Lasseter  
Ryan Rindone  
Karen Hoak  
Bernadine Roy

**23 members of the public attended**

Jeff Shoults  
Dean Cox  
Pam Anderson  
Charlie Saleen  
Kirk Pristas  
Candy Hansard  
Lee Rogers  
Dennis McKay  
Casey Weldon  
Ed Greene  
Aaron Smith  
Jason Mikel  
Sean Kelley

Dennis Reed  
Stan Phillips  
Gary Hickman  
Chris Couvillion  
E.A. Hipsty, Jr.  
Jennifer Bobo  
Eric Thrasher  
Mary Beth Barrows  
Britton Corbin  
Michelle Sempsrott

**Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

**1. Charter vessels are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**

- Want to get away from everyone being lumped together. Likes individual boats being accountable for their individual anglers.

- There are issues with processing the data already collected. Why increase reporting requirements if the data cannot yet be used?
2. **If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**
    - No issue with size limit.
    - Increase in fishing days (as a result of sector separation) was good. Happy with more access.
  3. **In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder charter operators and their passenger anglers?**
    - Accountability could be improved. Not be limited to a set season. Allow more flexibility by not being limited to a timeframe.
    - Derby style fishing is not as safe.
    - Current season is during spawning season. May be good to not have fishing pressure during spawning season.
  4. **If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach which one is most appropriate and why?**
    - Based on vessel permit. Run the system to collect catch data from two years, or base allocation on passenger capacity.
  5. **Other comments on Amendment 41:**
    - If can't accomplish allocation-based management, emphasize accountability of catches.

#### **Amendment 42: Scoping Questions**

1. **Which species should be included for Amendment 42? Should all reef fish be included? Red snapper and gag only?**
  - Red snapper and gag only. Keep it simple. Don't want tags for every species.
2. **Headboats are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**
  - As long as quota continues to increase, we can count on having a longer fishing season. 44 days worked well; 9 days does not work well. Will have a full boat when red snapper is open.
3. **If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**
  - Could lower to a one-fish bag limit and have a longer season.
  - Don't lower bag limit because customers prefer the larger bag limit. They are not going to pay for a longer trip if they can't keep two red snapper.
4. **In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder headboat operators and their passenger anglers?**
  - A consistent season that coincides with the tourist season is important for headboats.

- It would limit us further.
- Consider an allocation-based strategy for all reef fish so as not to have to worry about lowering bag limits for key species.
- An allocation-based strategy won't protect from more restrictions.

**5. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach which one is most appropriate and why?**

- None.

**Galveston, Texas  
October 22, 2015**

**Council/Staff**

Doug Boyd  
Emily Muehlstein  
Charlotte Schiaffo

**11 Members of the public attended**

Serena Etie  
Shane Cantrell  
Mike Jennings  
Darrel Hingle  
Taylor Borel  
Matt Etie

Greg Ball  
Travis Eifert  
Mike Nugent  
Daniel Willard  
Sam Miller

**Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

**1. Charter vessels are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**

- The sudden announcement of season openings or closures does not give businesses enough time to plan trips.
- Traditional management has failed historically to constrain fishing within the quota.
- The one-size-fits-all season does not take into account regional needs of the fishery.
- Traditional management creates effort shifting when seasons close. Additionally, in some seasons, when multiple species are closed, it's difficult to find a fish to target.
- Under traditional management red snapper is still a derby fishery because the season is so short. Fishermen can be put in harm's way by trying to fish in bad weather.
- Rebuilding is working under traditional management. The snapper population is robust and they're hard to avoid.
- Catching fish outside of season promotes dead discards and inside of the season it promotes high grading.
- Limited seasons constrain tourism and economies for destination fishing.
- Current season and bag limits fail the charter industry because it's hard to run a business under traditional management.

**2. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**

- The Council has already tried to change each parameter and nothing has improved.
- The concept of split seasons should be considered if the Council decides to continue with traditional management approaches.
- People should be allowed to choose when to fish. Potentially, consider a days-at-sea type program. If the season can be open for 9 days allow individuals to select the days they want to fish.

**3. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit or hinder charter operators and their passenger anglers?**

- A well thought-out system could do away with buffers that are caused by management uncertainty, and that would increase the amount of fish that can actually be harvested.
- Allocation based management would allow charter boat operators and customers the ability to pick and choose when to fish.
- Under an allocation system some people could be forced out of the sector if everyone is not equal within the program. It will hurt charter boats if smaller operators are pushed out.
- The allocation system can be designed to meet the exact needs of the program.
- Allocation-based management will allow customers to decide what kind of trip they want to take.

**4. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach, which one is most appropriate and why?**

- An allocation-based approach should not include fleet reduction.
- The Council should use a permit-based fishing quota program where quota is distributed evenly across permits. This will add certainty in the fishery and it will level the playing field by making the program equal for everybody.
- If there is even distribution there will be permit holders that aren't interested in the snapper. In that case, you could use unclaimed fish as a buffer or roll them back into next year's distribution. Either way, do not set up a system that cuts people out of the fishery.
- Group allocation instead of individual allocation would require data collection for a number of years.
- If the Council uses group-based allocation there will already be people with multiple permits that automatically become more powerful within a co-op.
- Everyone must be equal in a permit-based system so no one benefits more than anyone else. A permit-based allocation with even distribution across permits would accomplish that.
- At beginning of each year everyone with a permit will need to declare their intent to fish and opt into the program.
- Allocation needs to stay with a single permit and it cannot be sold or traded.
- Use a tiered approach to distribution - equal allocation across permits based on permit capacity groupings where they naturally break.
- Permit and vessel capacity need to be linked.
- In an allocation-based system, a referendum would be required.

- Under an allocation-based system the Council should still set a bag limit to evenly distribute the amount of trips taken and ease the burden on law enforcement.

### **Supplementary Questions:**

#### **1. How has MRIP system helped or hurt traditional management?**

- If you don't have fish to start with, it doesn't matter.
- The data is 6-9 months behind.
- A good system can't be created with outdated information and State systems are in conflict with each other so, they are not significantly different from MRIP.
- A deadline for data should be created so anglers will know when the season will be made.
- Data collection has been flawed, which has artificially shortened seasons. States are overly liberal, federal data is overly restrictive.
- Numbers can be steered in any way state or federal agency wants it to go to.
- The charter industry needs electronic reporting.
- The MRIP system was never supposed to be used for management. The system has been acknowledged to be inaccurate.

#### **2. Should there be restraint on whether snapper could be sold? Should Council regulate whether prices go up or down?**

- Charter boats currently change their pricing structure during red snapper season. Under an allocation-based system the same thing would happen. If a customer wants to take a red snapper trip, or a blue water trip, or an inshore trip, the pricing structure could change accordingly.

### **Amendment 42: Scoping Questions**

#### **1. Which species should be included in a management plan for headboats?**

- All of them because there are management issues with all of them. Effort shifting and other problems could be avoided if all the species were included.
- For species like vermilion, where recreational anglers have never gotten close to the quota, this would provide protection. The Council reduced the recreational bag limit despite the fact that the recreational sector has never harvested their full quota.
- Make a headboat program for all the important reef fish: red snapper, gag, red grouper, vermilion, triggerfish, amberjack, mangrove snapper, and also create a miscellaneous reef fish allocation or aggregate for less popular fish like lane snapper and hogfish.

#### **2. Headboats are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work/not work?**

- Headboats don't have the ability to target as many pelagic fish as charterboats. Headboats spend more time for bottom fishing and cannot vary species being fished as much.
- Headboats are very dependent on the tourism season and those seasons are different in different regions.

3. **If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management what parameters (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**
  - Headboats have a massive amount of discards because passenger capacity is much higher, and discards are harder to monitor. A traditional management approach makes it difficult to manage this problem.
4. **In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder headboat operators and anglers?**
  - An allocation-based approach would benefit them because they have a catch history, so delegating allocation would be easier.
  - Allocation-based management would be the best way to help curtail the bycatch issue. In the headboat collaborative out-of-season discards were reduced and the conservation covenant had each operator keep mortally wounded fish. There is evidence to support that discards were reduced in this program; red snapper discards were down by 43% and gag discards were down 59%.
  - The species that is targeted can be changed for a trip based on the quota. Even within the red snapper season effort can be moved to something different like spadefish or white grunt if red snapper quota is being harvested too quickly.
5. **If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach for headboats which one is most appropriate and why?**
  - Use the pilot program as a template to build new program as per Advisory Panel recommendations.
  - It is more practical to do a co-op for headboats instead of charterboats.
  - It would make it impossible to switch from being a charter to a headboat.
  - This will have to go to referendum.

**Clearwater, Florida  
October 26, 2015**

**Council/Staff**

Roy Williams  
Ava Lasseter  
Assane Diagne

**13 members of the public attended**

R.W. Keys  
Eric Mahoney  
Robert Kirn  
Alexandra White  
Paul Matthews  
Paul R. Matthews  
Heyward Mathews

Jeff Antous  
Richard Nicajevsky  
Chad Haggert  
Brad Gorst  
Helen Nicajevsky  
Mike Colby

## **Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

### **1. Charter vessels are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**

- Derby fishing does not work, particularly for charter fishermen. There is a mismatch between when the season is and when the customers are here. Derby seasons are also hard on all species, particularly red snapper.
- Different areas have different tourist seasons and the traditional approach does not account for regional differences.
- Release mortality is an issue for red snapper during gag season.
- Bag limits and size limits could be used alongside some other management approach.
- Bag and size limits do not lead to a derby fishery. So alongside appropriate management measures, these traditional approaches work. Mix and match approaches may work (permit-based coupled with bag and/or size limits).
- Size limits work. Reducing the minimum size limit from 16" to 15" would ease discard mortality.
- June is not a particularly good month for anglers in Clearwater. They can catch many other species then and don't really need red snapper, even though gag is closed in June. Even if the season began earlier or later, the derby is a hindrance. The best thing for charters is to be able to determine the best time to go catch fish.

### **2. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**

- Keep the first fish to avoid high-grading, but that would be hard to police.
- High-grading is predominant in the fishery. Captains would have to enforce it and they would if it could lead to more fishing opportunities.
- Minimum size limit becomes a moot point when fishers know there are much larger fish out there. Traditional approaches like this don't work, because smaller fish will be thrown back for larger ones. We need to get away from traditional approaches and find new ways of doing things.

### **3. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder charter operators and their passenger anglers?**

- Would give flexibility to fish when they or their customers want to fish.
- If each vessel is given allocation, could potentially adopt the first fish caught rule.
- Can reduce management uncertainty because you have a limited number of charter vessels (permits), so you know the universe. With that limited number of vessels, could move towards a census of landings, versus estimates of landings.
- Allocation-based management must be crafted well and be understandable to operators to be successful. If not, it won't work.
- Under an allocation-based approach that distributes a number of fish rather than pounds, the average weight of the fish could be greater than the number of fish distributed. To avoid exceeding the quota, a set-aside or buffer could be used to account for the difference in estimated weight versus actual weight of fish caught.

**4. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach, which one is most appropriate and why?**

- Support for a permit fishing quota, because that is how you get business value. It would add equity. If the permit becomes valuable, then the vessel and the business become valuable. This makes the business look more viable if the allocation is tied to the permit.
- A cooperative would be too complicated for the number of permits in Pinellas County.
- A yearly opt-in or opt-out provision would be good for latent permits and for people who don't fish red snapper. Those who don't want to go out that distance or don't want to deal with logbooks or VMS can opt out, increasing the allocation to those who opt in.

**5. Are there additional management measures for charter vessels that should be considered?**

- Include transferability provisions for latent permit holders. This would be more effective if the range of species were broadened. For example, if you included gag in the amendment, could transfer gag for red snapper.
- Doesn't want fish to not be used under a latent permit. So, let the fish that would go to those who opt out be distributed to those who opt in. They want the larger quota to go to the active permits.
- Include more species than red snapper; west Florida is a multi-species fishery. A permit is not latent just because the vessel doesn't land red snapper. Charters in this area must travel far offshore to catch them. The two-year electronic logbook program was specifically multi-species for these reasons.
- If allocation was tied to all the permits, then even latent permits would have some value. So if someone buys a permit in the future, it may have some value attached to it.

**Amendment 42: Scoping Questions**

**1. Which species should be included in a management plan for headboats?**

- Red snapper and gag. Would not be opposed to including greater amberjack, red grouper, or any of the six managed species with sector allocations.

**2. Headboats are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work/not work?**

- Flexibility on when they can fish is the primary objective, and avoidance of derby conditions.

**3. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management what parameters (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**

- Being able to fish for red snapper in January is beneficial. There are plenty of other fish available in June, so flexibility in the timing of the fishing season is desirable.

**4. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder headboat operators and anglers?**

- A benefit of the collaborative structure is that managers know what is being caught and overages can be prevented. Accounting would be better through a collaborative manager who converts average weights to their numbers of fish, making it easier to know when they are getting close to the limit.

- The headboats have historical landings data, so determining allocation was easier for the headboat collaborative.

**5. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach for headboats which one is most appropriate and why?**

- Have allocation attached to the permits based on catch history, then form a cooperative to double check what people are doing.
- Regional allocation could be divided up among the permit holders in a region based on catch history, then they could put some percentage of their permits' allocation into a pool, to protect themselves from overages and to maximize the fishing season. A hybrid of an allocation-type permit with a pool-type permit.
- If someone buys a boat and enters the headboat survey, the headboat amendment could include a designated set aside of some quota for when that new entrant builds up a catch history. Then, they would receive quota from that set aside.

**6. Are there additional management measures for headboats that should be considered?**

- A set aside could also be captured from annual quota increases rather than percentages of allocation.
- Economically, it doesn't seem fair that a private vessel owner who spends \$30,000 a year on his boat has 6 months where he can't go grouper or red snapper fishing, but a tourist can come down, spend \$1,000 on a weekend trip, and catch what the private vessel owner can't catch.
- Begin an amendment to address data collection and accountability for private recreational anglers.

**Webinar  
October 29, 2015**

**Council/Staff**

Charlene Ponce

Emily Muehlstein

**6 members of the public attended**

Bruce Buckson

Chad Hanson

TJ Marshall

George McKinney

Michael Miglini

Kellie Ralston

**Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

**1. Charter vessels are currently managed using a traditional approach. In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**

- Traditional management doesn't work because it constrains the fishing season and days for the charter fleet.

- Traditional management does work because it constrains catch.
  - Traditional management limits flexibility in the days charter boats can choose to fish.
  - Traditional management is not working because it doesn't allow a system where boats in different areas can have different seasons and use their fishing mortality when it's best for them.
  - Current management fails because it forces boats to discard dead fish. A system that would allow the retention of dead fish would be good for the charter industry.
- 2. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (size limit, bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**
- The question is hard to answer because we don't know how one option will affect the other. For example, how will changing the size limit impact the fishing season?
  - Allow the charter industry to get together and decide on their own regional seasons and bag limits (regional management).
- 3. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit/hinder charter operators and their passenger anglers?**
- Allocation-based management could benefit charter operators by allowing them and their angler passengers to benefit from a rebuilt fishery and have increased allocations as things get better without being constrained to a one-size-fits all season.
  - Have the opportunity to reduce discard mortality and to be able to take anglers fishing when they want to instead of when the Council says the season is open or closed.
  - Improve safety at sea.
- 4. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach which one is most appropriate and why?**
- A system that allocates according to the permit capacity for charter boats and passenger capacity or landings for the headboats.
  - It would be important for charter and headboat operators to come up with an allocation-based solution for themselves.
  - An allocation-based program would need a data collection element.
  - Distribution of shares and allocation should be even.
  - An electronic tag system should be considered.
  - The Council will need to consider similar management options for the private angling component.

**Houma, Louisiana  
November 3, 2015**

**Council/Staff**

Camp Matens  
Emily Muehlstein  
Karen Hoak

### **17 members of the public attended**

John Dupont  
Gerald Ellewider  
David Cresson  
Rad Trascher  
Joshua Ellender  
Jean Marmande  
Brian Rushing  
Julie Hebert

Ryan Richard  
Jerome Zeringue  
Douglas Waitz  
Chris Lapeyre  
George Huye  
Ed Landgraf  
Ben Weber  
Danny Hebert

### **Amendment 41: Scoping Questions**

**1. Charter vessels are currently managed using a traditional approach (bag limit, size limit, fishing season). In what ways does the current approach work or not work?**

- Traditional management does not work at all because sector separation has privatized about half of the allocation.
- Current management experiences undue pressure by environmental groups which do not have the interests of the recreational fishers in mind.
- Regional management would solve a lot of the problems. Gulf-wide management does not work and gives an unfair advantage to some areas and disadvantages others.
- Some charter operators appreciated the 45-day season under traditional management.
- The current data collection program does not work for traditional management measures.
- Current management does not allow for flexibility in the season.

**2. If the Council selects to continue using a traditional approach to management, what measures (bag limit, fishing season) should be adjusted and how?**

- The Council should get rid of minimum sizes.
- Regional management should be implemented.
- There should be some way to have flexible seasons.

**3. In what ways might an allocation-based management approach benefit or hinder charter operators and their passenger anglers?**

- Allocation-based management puts a value on the catch.
- Allocation-based management will shrink the for-hire fleet.
- It will potentially cause inequity (i.e. newcomers may receive less allocation)
- It may cause an incestuous approach to new entry where the right to charter is handed down from generation to generation.
- Allocation-based management could cause the commercial sector to buy/sell recreational allocation.
- It privatizes a public resource.
- It would force participation or sale of ones permit if a fisherman did not want to participate in the program.

**4. If the Council selects an allocation-based management approach, which one is most appropriate and why?**

- Any allocation-based management approach used should allow freedom to choose when to fish.
- Do not reduce the fleet. Anyone that has a permit should be able to keep it with this program.
- Do not consider allowing non-fishermen to own allocation.
- Make allocation equitable across the board.

**5. Are there additional management measures for charter vessels that should be considered?**

- Regional management.
- 30B should be removed.