

**ADDENDUM TO THE  
REGULATORY AMENDMENT  
TO THE  
REEF FISH FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN  
TO SET 1996 RED SNAPPER  
TOTAL ALLOWABLE CATCH**

*(Includes Environmental Assessment,  
and Regulatory Impact Review)*

**MARCH 1996**



Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council  
Lincoln Center, Suite 331  
5401 West Kennedy Boulevard  
Tampa, Florida 33609

813-228-2815

**Table of Contents**

A-1. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

A-2. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION..... 1

A-3. PROPOSED ACTION ..... 2

A-4. MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES AND REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW ..... 2

    Introduction ..... 2

    Proposed Alternatives..... 3

        Rationale ..... 3

        Biological Impacts ..... 4

        Economic Impacts..... 5

    Private and Public Costs ..... 7

    Summary and Net Impact of Proposed Action..... 7

    Determination of a Significant Regulatory Action..... 7

    Determination of a Need for an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis ..... 8

A-5. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ..... 10

    Environmental Consequences ..... 10

    Finding of No Significant Environmental Impact ..... 10

A-6. OTHER APPLICABLE LAW ..... 12

    Habitat Concerns ..... 12

    Vessel Safety Considerations ..... 12

    Coastal Zone Consistency..... 12

    Paperwork Reduction Act ..... 12

    Federalism ..... 13

A-7. PUBLIC REVIEW ..... 13

### Abbreviations Used in This Document

EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
Plan	Reef Fish FMP for the Gulf of Mexico
RFA	Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980
RIR	Regulatory Impact Review
SEFC or SEFSC	Southeast Fisheries Center, Miami, Florida (NMFS Southeast Regional Office)
TAC	Total Allowable Catch

## **A-1. INTRODUCTION**

The Regulatory Amendment to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan to Set 1996 Red Snapper TAC was originally submitted to NMFS in December 1995. The original regulatory amendment proposed to:

- 1) increase the red snapper TAC for 1996 to 9.12 million pounds, with 4.47 million pounds allocated to the recreational sector and 4.65 million pounds allocated to the commercial sector<sup>1</sup>.
- 2) implement the recreational allocation by retaining the current 5 fish daily bag limit and 15 inch minimum size limit, and implement the commercial allocation by a quota.
- 3) extend the recovery target date to the year 2019.
- 4) repeal, for the commercial sector, the automatic increase in red snapper size limit to 15 inches on January 1, 1996 and 16 inches on January 1, 1998 that were implemented through Amendment 5, and restore the 14 inch commercial minimum size limit.

This addendum contains an additional proposed action to create split season for the 1996 red snapper commercial fishery. There are no changes to the original Proposed Actions or supporting documentation for those actions in the original December 1995 regulatory amendment. The original regulatory amendment in combination with this addendum constitutes the complete resubmittal of the 1996 red snapper TAC regulatory amendment.

## **A-2. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION**

The red snapper endorsement system was created by emergency rule in 1993 as an interim measure to reduce the impact of the commercial "derby" fishery while the Council developed a permanent limited access system. After having twice been extended by a plan amendment (Amendments 6 and 9), the endorsement system was to have terminated on December 31, 1995.

A red snapper Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) system was proposed by the Council in Amendment 8., and was approved by NMFS for implementation beginning in 1996. However, because of the time needed to conduct an appeals process and for NMFS to prepare for administration of the ITQ system, implementation could not occur before April 1996.

Rather than keep the commercial fishery closed for nearly a year (the previous season closed on April 15, 1995), the Council requested that NMFS take emergency action to release 1 million pounds of the quota on February 1 through an extension of the red snapper endorsement system and associated trip limits, and the remainder through the individual transferable quota system that was expected to become operational in April 1996. If there

---

<sup>1</sup>This allocation ratio in terms of weight is 51 percent commercial and 49 percent recreational, based on the landings data contained in Amendment 1, Table 8.1.

was a delay in implementation of the ITQ system, the Council requested that the entire quota be released under the February 1 opening.

Implementation of the red snapper ITQ plan was postponed due to delays resulting from the government shutdown earlier this year and uncertainties about Congressional funding. As a result, NMFS is preparing an emergency rule to release the entire commercial quota, currently 3.06 million pounds (pending approval of the proposed increase) under the February 1 opening.

After the 1995 commercial red snapper season closed, NMFS reported that about 220,000 pounds of the quota was not harvested due to a premature closure. The Council considered adding this underharvest on the following year's quota. However, fishermen present at the September 1995 Council meeting stated that there would be a greater benefit to them from having that additional harvest in the fall, in order to have some income from red snapper fishing prior to the holidays. As a result, the Council requested, and NMFS approved, a 36 hour mini-season in November 1995.

If the Council's proposed increase in red snapper TAC is approved by NMFS, an additional 1.59 million pounds will be added to the quota (to 4.65 million pounds). It is likely that the original 3.06 million pound quota will be filled and the commercial season closed before the increased is approved. Delaying the release of the additional harvest until September 15 would provide an economic benefit to fishermen similar to that which fishermen received from the 1995 mini-season, but on a larger scale. In addition, it would delay the additional harvest until after the peak of the spawning season, and would reduce any adverse impacts on the success of the 1996 spawning.

### **A-3. PROPOSED ACTION**

The Council proposes to split the 1996 commercial red snapper quota. The original quota of 3.06 million pounds is to be filled through the February 1 opening. The additional 1.59 million pounds along with any unused quota from the February opening will be filled through a September 15 opening. This split season is also to be implemented in 1997 unless Amendment 8 (red snapper ITQ system) or an alternate plan to limit access to the commercial red snapper fishery is implemented.

### **A-4. MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES AND REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW**

#### **Introduction**

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) requires a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for all regulatory actions that are of public interest. The RIR does three things: 1) it provides a comprehensive review of the level and incidence of impacts associated with a proposed or

final regulatory action, 2) it provides a review of the problems and policy objectives prompting the regulatory proposals and an evaluation of the major alternatives that could be used to solve the problem, and 3) it ensures that the regulatory agency systematically and comprehensively considers all available alternatives so that the public welfare can be enhanced in the most efficient and cost effective way.

The RIR also serves as the basis for determining whether any proposed regulations are a "significant regulatory action" under certain criteria provided in Executive Order 12866 and whether the proposed regulations will have a "significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities" in compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA). The primary purpose of the RFA is to relieve small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions (collectively: "small entities") of burdensome regulatory and recordkeeping requirements. The RFA requires that if regulatory and recordkeeping requirements are not burdensome, then the head of a Federal agency must certify that the requirement, if promulgated, will not have a significant effect on a substantial number of small entities.

The alternatives in this regulatory amendment affect mainly the red snapper commercial sector. For this reason, the succeeding analysis focuses mainly on impacts of the alternatives on participants of the red snapper commercial fishery.

The "Economic Impacts" statements under each of the management options comprise the bulk of the RIR. The problems and objectives are described in previous sections of this regulatory document as a part of the RIR by reference.

### Proposed Alternatives

**Proposed Alternative. Establish a split season for the 1996 commercial red snapper quota. The commercial season will open on February 1 and will close on the date when 3.06 million pounds of red snapper are projected to be harvested. The season will reopen on September 15 for the remainder of the quota above 3.06 million pounds plus any unharvested part of the 3.06 million pounds that resulted from a premature closure. This split season is also to be implemented in 1997 unless Amendment 8 (red snapper ITQ system) or an alternate plan to limit access to the commercial red snapper fishery is implemented.**

**Rejected Alternative. No Action. The entire 1996 quota will be harvested under the February 1 opening. If the provisions to increase 1996 TAC and commercial quota are approved after the original 3.06 million pounds has been harvested, the commercial season will reopen immediately upon implementation of the increased TAC for harvest of the remaining quota.**

**Rationale:** A split season would provide red snapper fishermen with a source of income going into the Fall holiday season. When the Council was deliberating how to handle an underharvest in the 1995 quota, commercial fishermen stated that having some income from red snapper fishing at this time of the year was an important benefit. In public comments for the proposed action in this amendment, fish dealers requested an October 1 opening because of low demand for seafood during September. Fishermen asked for a September 1 opening in order to avoid the deteriorating weather conditions and attendant vessel safety concerns that generally occur after October 1. Both groups agreed that a September 15 opening was a reasonable compromise. In addition, a September 15 opening would delay the additional harvest resulting from an increased quota until after the peak of the spawning season and allow fish a chance to spawn that would, under the derby fishery, be harvested before spawning season. This would provide marginal biological benefits to the red snapper recovery program. Finally, a split season leaves open the option of implementing the red snapper ITQ program in 1996, pending the outcome of federal legislation regarding ITQ's. If an ITQ system is not implemented, the September 15 opening would occur under an extension of the interim red snapper endorsement system (as proposed in Amendment 13). This split season will also occur in 1997 if the endorsement system continues through that year.

**Biological Impacts:** The spawning period for red snapper is in the summer, May to September. In recent years, as a result of the derby fishery, the entire commercial quota has been harvested before spawning season. Many of the fish that are now being caught before spawning season would have been caught later in the year under a year-round fishery, and would have had a chance to spawn in the current fishing year. As a result, under a derby fishery the stock spawning potential for the current year becomes less than would be the case if harvest of some of the fish were deferred until after spawning season. An increase in the commercial quota under the status quo single-season derby fishery will increase the number of fish caught before spawning season. If a split season is adopted with the sub-quota for the February season being no greater than previous quotas, and the remainder of the snapper harvested after spawning season, there will be no change to the impact on current spawning resulting from an increased quota.

In addition, the current stock assessment states that there is a trend in commercial landings over the years toward harvesting smaller (younger) fish. Tables 94-96 of the stock assessment indicate that in 1994, 24 percent of the commercial red snapper harvested (by number) were age-3 or younger. At the 14 inch red snapper size limit, the red snapper are predominately age-3 fish. This is the age at which most snapper first enter the spawning population, but in late winter/early spring they have not yet spawned. At 15 inches red snapper are age-4 fish and may have had one opportunity to spawn, although the average annual egg deposition of both age-3 and age-4 snapper is low relative to older ages. The derby fishery before spawning season allows commercial harvest to occur on newly mature fish that have never spawned, as well as intensifying release mortality on undersized fish, some of which would grow to legal size later in the season if allowed to live. An increase in the quota under the status quo single-season fishery will increase the number of fish that will

be harvested without having spawned. Under a split season, the impact will be no different than in recent years.

Since age-3 fish are still growing fairly rapidly, red snapper in this age group caught early in the year are smaller than the same fish caught later in the year. As a result, under the February 1 single season derby fishery, and under the proposed reduction in commercial size limit, a greater number of red snapper will need to be caught to harvest a given poundage than would be the case if the season were split and some of the snapper were caught later in the year.

The fishing mortality rate (F) is a measure of the number (rather than pounds) of fish that are caught, thus catching a larger number of small fish results in a higher fishing mortality rate than catching a smaller number of large fish even if the total number of pounds caught is the same. For example, during the Council conference call meeting of March 15, 1996, stock assessment biologist Phil Goodyear estimated that if red snapper were caught under a 14 inch size limit vs. a 15 inch limit, fishing mortality would be about 7 percent higher. The recovery model is based on levels of fishing mortality. The NMFS/SEFSC has characterized any long term biological benefits to be gained from spreading out red snapper harvest over the year as marginal. However, higher a fishing mortality rate reduces the potential for future increases in TAC until the recovery is complete.

**Economic Impacts:** The Proposed Alternative would essentially break the 1996 season (and 1997 season if necessary) into two, with starting dates of February 1 and September 15. Preliminary projections indicate the 3.06 MP quota will be filled between March 21 and April 5, 1996 (Eldridge, pers. comm., 1996). If the previously proposed red snapper commercial quota of 4.65 MP is approved, the remaining 1.59 MP will be left for harvest starting September 15, 1996.

The Socioeconomic Panel (SEP) indicated that spreading the red snapper season over a longer period would result in higher economic (and social) benefits (GMFMC, 1992). On the other hand, they cautioned that having many mini-derbies as a way of lengthening the fishing season would also result in less economic benefits. The Proposed Alternative appears to fall in between, for while it lengthens the season, it also promotes two derby seasons. In this regard, the relevant economic issue relates to whether benefits from a longer season outweigh those from having two derby seasons.

In the presence of a fixed quota that has been often met, the price structure plays an important role in determining revenues. For the period 1986-1990 when the red snapper remained open the whole year round, red snapper prices in the Gulf of Mexico were generally higher in January-April period, fell down in May, and remained flat at that low price throughout the rest of the year. For the period 1991-1994, red snapper prices in the January-April period were lower than those in the September-December period. Prices in the May-August period were between those of the earlier and later months. Very likely this change in price structure is largely due to the short red snapper season in the early part of the year.

There is a good possibility that an additional quota of 1.59 MP would be met within a two-month period, even if harvested later in the year. Under the Proposed Alternative, the fishery will open on September 15 and at the most could last through the early part of November. The corresponding two-month period under the No Action Alternative is difficult to determine, since it depends on when a previous regulatory amendment increasing the TAC will be approved and implemented. Considering that submission of this addendum has been interpreted to mean suspension of the approval process for the previous regulatory amendment, the two regulatory amendments will likely be considered for approval at the same time. If the Council decides to go forward with this regulatory amendment, the relevant two months will likely be July and August.

For the period 1992-1994, the red snapper average price for July and August was \$2.58 per pound (Waters, 1995). The corresponding price for September through November was \$2.82 per pound, or a 24-cent differential. If domestic production were the only source of market supply, we may expect that differential to be maintained, regardless of when the additional quota is harvested. Needless to say, the actual price would be lower than \$2.58 or \$2.82 per pound since an increase in quantity sold (due to reopening of the red snapper fishery) would dampen the price as may be expected from an inflexible demand function characterizing the snapper fishery (Keithly and Prochaska, 1985). For example, preliminary data on the November 1995 reopening of the red snapper season registered an average price for red snapper of \$2.35 per pound (Bennett, pers. comm., 1996). This is well below the November average price of \$2.87. At any rate, the scenario described leads to the conclusion that under the Proposed Alternative ex-vessel revenues would tend to be higher than those under the No Action Alternative. Using a 24-cent differential, total revenue would increase by approximately \$380 thousand.

If imports are brought into the picture, the differential may or may not exist depending on when imports tend to be relatively higher. For the period 1991-1994, snapper imports averaged at 4.44 MP for April and May and 5.05 MP for September through November (Waters, 1995). Imports then in later months are higher than those in earlier months by more than half a million pounds. This difference may negate a good part of the above-mentioned price differential for red snapper, although it is deemed that some part of that differential may remain especially in the early part of the second season.

Noting both the trend in red snapper price and imports, we may conclude that revenues would be higher under the Proposed Alternative, but not as high as suggested by the differential in price for the relevant months compared.

Harvesting cost may or not be different between July-August and September-November fishing months, but information in this regard is not available. There is some possibility that weather conditions in the October-November period may not be as favorable as that in the July-August period. While this condition may result in different fishing cost between the two periods, it is more likely to result in different catch distribution. In a relatively unfavorable

weather, larger boats are better able to fish than smaller boats. In this situation the catch distribution would be different, but the total industry cost will not increase by a significant amount. There is then a fairly good chance that the potential increase in revenue may translate to higher industry profits.

Another cost item that may become more important in this case is the cost associated with fishing and non-fishing plans. Fishermen who traditionally fish for other species or who undertake other employment activities later in the year would be adversely impacted by the proposed split-season. To the extent, however, that they have the ability to readily adapt their activities to the proposed-split season, such cost may not be significant. This is likely to happen if they are made aware of the time the red snapper fishery is reopened.

### Private and Public Costs

The preparation, implementation, enforcement and monitoring of this or any federal action involves the expenditure of public and private resources which can be expressed as costs associated with the regulations. Costs associated with this specific action include:

Council costs of document preparation, meetings, public hearings, and information dissemination.....	\$7,000
NMFS administrative costs of document preparation, meetings and review.....	4,000
Law enforcement costs.....	none
Public burden associated with permits.....	none
NMFS costs associated with permits.....	none
TOTAL.....	\$11,000

The Council and Federal costs of document preparation are based on staff time, travel, printing and any other relevant items where funds were expended directly for this specific action. The proposed measures are not expected to incur additional enforcement cost and permit cost to either the public or NMFS.

### **Summary and Net Impact of Proposed Action**

The proposed regulatory action constitutes changes in management for red snapper in the EEZ under the jurisdiction of the Gulf Council. The proposed alternative to split the season for red snapper commercial fishery is expected to generate net economic benefits, but the extent of such benefits cannot be determined.

### **Determination of a Significant Regulatory Action**

Pursuant to E.O. 12866, a regulation is considered a "significant regulatory action" if it is likely to result in: a) an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; b) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or c) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic or export markets.

The entire commercial red snapper fishery had an ex-vessel value of about \$6.2 million in 1994. There is currently no adequate measure of the recreational red snapper fishery impacted by the proposed regulation, but the estimated impacts of the proposed regulation are relatively small relative to the \$100 million a year benchmark. Thus, given the size of the fishery and the segment of the fishery directly affected by the proposed regulation, it is concluded that any revenue or cost impacts on the fishery would be significantly less than \$100 million annually.

The proposed split-season for red snapper is expected to result in an increase in revenues and profits to the commercial sector. While this amount cannot be quantified, it is deemed to be relatively small. Commercial cost of fishing operation remains largely unaffected. Prices to consumers may slightly decrease in the months of October and November as a result of higher supply of snapper. As can be gleaned from the cost estimates, there are no major increases in cost to the Federal, State, or local government agencies. In fact the cost incurred by these agencies are only those that are directly related to the formulation of the proposed regulation. Since the proposed regulation has no adverse effects on the commercial and for-hire sectors, any of the sub-items under item (c) above would not apply.

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that this regulation if enacted would not constitute a "significant regulatory action" under any of the enumerated criteria.

### **Determination of a Need for an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis**

#### Introduction

The purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) is to relieve small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental entities from burdensome regulations and record keeping requirements. The category of small entities likely to be affected by the proposed plan amendment is that of commercial and for-hire businesses currently engaged in the reef fish fishery. The impacts of the proposed action on these entities have been discussed above.

The following discussion of impacts focuses specifically on the consequences of the proposed action on the mentioned business entities. An Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) is conducted to primarily determine whether the proposed action would have a "significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities." In addition to analyses conducted for the Regulatory Impact Review (RIR), the IRFA provides an estimate of the number of small businesses affected, a description of the small businesses affected, and a discussion of the nature and size of the impacts.

#### Description of Economic Impact on Small Entities

In general, a "substantial number" of small entities is more than 20 percent of those small entities engaged in the fishery (NMFS, 1992). In 1992, a total of 2,195 permits were issued to qualifying individuals and attached to vessels, and are deemed to comprise the reef fish fishery in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. There are currently 1,532 active permits. Others are in the process of being renewed. The Small Business Administration (SBA) defines a small business in the commercial fishing activity as a firm with receipts of up to \$2.0 million annually. Practically all current participants of the reef fish fishery readily fall within such definition of small business. Since the proposed action will affect practically all the current participants of the reef fish commercial fishery, the "substantial number" criterion will be met.

Economic impacts on small business entities are considered to be "significant" if the proposed action would result in any of the following: a) reduction in annual gross revenues by more than 5 percent; b) increase in total costs of production by more than 5 percent as a result of an increase in compliance costs; c) compliance costs as a percent of sales for small entities are at least 10 percent higher than compliance costs as a percent of sales for large entities; d) capital costs of compliance represent a significant portion of capital available to small entities, considering internal cash flow and external financing capabilities; or e) as a rule of thumb, 2 percent of small business entities being forced to cease business operations (NMFS, 1992).

While the proposed split-season has been determined to result in an increase in revenues, the magnitude of such effects cannot be ascertained. There is, nonetheless, a good chance that such increase will not exceed 5 percent of gross revenues to red snapper commercial vessels.

Under the proposed regulation, commercial operations are not expected to incur increases in production cost (item b) or increases in cost to comply with the regulation (items c and d). Considering that the impacts of the proposed regulation are determined to be positive, none of the existing businesses may cease operation as a result of the regulation.

In conclusion, the proposed measure in this regulatory amendment may be regarded as not effecting a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Therefore an IRFA is not required.

## **A-5. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

### **Environmental Consequences**

Physical and Human Environment: The action proposed in this amendment addendum will have no impact on the physical environment. A split commercial season will provide income from red snapper fishing to fishermen during the fall which they do not currently have. It also assures fishermen who may have been unable to fish during the February 1 opening of a second opportunity to fish for red snapper in 1996.

Fishery Resource: The action proposed in this amendment will delay harvest of the increased amount of the commercial quota until after the red snapper spawning season. These fish would otherwise be harvested before or at the beginning of spawning season under the February 1 derby season. Although the NMFS/SEFSC has characterized any long term benefits to the resource from spreading out the harvest as marginal, the proposed action avoids introducing any negative impact that might occur from harvesting the additional quota before spawning season, and is consistent with the Council's objective of rebuilding the overfished red snapper stock within one and a half generation times. Detailed analysis on the impacts of the proposed action can be found in the biological impacts discussion under the alternatives and is included herein by reference.

Effect on Endangered Species and Marine Mammals: The NOAA will conduct a consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. A consultation was previously conducted regarding the impact of Amendment 1 which included the framework measures under which this action is being taken. A biological opinion resulting from that consultation found that neither the directed fisheries nor the proposed action jeopardize the recovery of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat.

Effect on Wetlands: The proposed action will have no effect on flood plains, wetlands, or rivers.

Mitigating Measures: No mitigating measures related to the proposed action are necessary because there are no harmful impacts to the environment.

Unavoidable Adverse Affects: The proposed action does not create unavoidable adverse affects.

Irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources: There are no irreversible commitments of resources caused by implementation of this amendment.

### **Finding of No Significant Environmental Impact**

The proposed amendment addendum is not a major action having significant impact on the quality of the marine or human environment of the Gulf of Mexico. The proposed action is an adjustment of the original regulations of the FMP under the framework procedure set forth in Amendment 1 to rebuild overfished reef fish stocks. The proposed action should not result in impacts significantly different in context or intensity from those described in the environmental impact statement and environmental assessment published with the regulations implementing the FMP and Amendment 1.

Having reviewed the environmental assessment and available information relative to the proposed action, I have determined that there will be no significant environmental impact resulting from the proposed actions. Accordingly, the preparation of a formal environmental impact statement on this issue is not required for this amendment addendum by Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act or its implementing regulations.

Approved:

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **A-6. OTHER APPLICABLE LAW**

### **Habitat Concerns**

Reef fish habitats and related concerns were described in the FMP and updated in Amendments 1 and 5. The action in this amendment addendum does not affect the habitat.

### **Vessel Safety Considerations**

A determination of vessel safety with regard to compliance with 50 CFR 605.15(b)(3) has been requested from the U.S. Coast Guard. The proposed action in this amendment addendum is not expected to affect vessel safety.

### **Coastal Zone Consistency**

Section 307(c)(1) of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 requires that all federal activities which directly affect the coastal zone be consistent with approved state coastal zone management programs to the maximum extent practicable. The proposed action in this amendment addendum will make no changes in federal regulations that are inconsistent with either existing or proposed state regulations.

While it is the goal of the Council to have complementary management measures with those of the states, federal and state administrative procedures vary, and regulatory changes are unlikely to be fully instituted at the same time.

This amendment addendum is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management programs of the states of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi to the maximum extent possible; Texas does not have an approved Coastal Zone Management program. This determination has been submitted to the responsible state agencies under Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act administering approved Coastal Zone Management programs in the states of Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

### **Paperwork Reduction Act**

The purpose of the Paperwork Reduction Act is to control paperwork requirements imposed on the public by the Federal Government. The authority to manage information collection and record keeping requirements is vested with the Director of the Office of Management and record keeping requirements is vested with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. This authority encompasses establishment of guidelines and policies, approval of information collection requests, and reduction of paperwork burdens and duplications.

The Council does not propose, through this amendment addendum, to establish any reporting requirements or burdens.

### **Federalism**

No federalism issues have been identified relative to the actions proposed in this amendment addendum. Therefore, preparation of a federalism assessment under Executive Order 12612 is not necessary.

### **A-7. PUBLIC REVIEW**

A public hearing to obtain public comments on this addendum to the regulatory amendment was held during the Gulf Council meeting on March 12, 1996 in Duck Key, Florida. Copies of this document may be obtained from the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council office, 5401 West Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 331, Tampa, Florida 33609, (813)228-2815.

### LIST OF AGENCIES CONSULTED

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's

- Socioeconomic Panel
- Standing and Special Reef Fish Scientific and Statistical Committee
- Red Snapper Advisory Panel

National Marine Fisheries Service

- Southeast Regional Office
- Southeast Fisheries Science Center

### RESPONSIBLE AGENCY:

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council  
Lincoln Center, Suite 331  
5401 West Kennedy Boulevard  
Tampa, Florida 33609  
(813)228-2815

### LIST OF PREPARERS

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council  
- Steven Atran, Population Dynamics Statistician

- Antonio Lamberte, Economist

#### **A-8. REFERENCES**

GMFMC. 1995. Report of the socioeconomic panel meeting on reef fish. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 10 p.

Keithly, W. R. and F.J. Prochaska. 1985. The demand for major reef fish species in the Gulf and South Atlantic regions of the United States. Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Tropical and Subtropical Fisheries Technological Conference of the Americas, Texas A&M Sea Grant TAMU-SG-86-102, pp. 59-72.

Waters, J. R. 1995. Economic assessment of the commercial reef fishery in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. SERO/NMFS, NOAA. 9450 Koger Boulevard, St. Petersburg, Florida 33702.