

FINAL REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32

GAG GROUPER– REBUILDING PLAN, ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS, MANAGEMENT MEASURES


RED GROUPER – ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS, MANAGEMENT MEASURES GROUPER ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES

**(INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, REGULATORY IMPACT
REVIEW, AND REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS, FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENT)**

OCTOBER 2011



Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100
Tampa, Florida 33607
813-348-1630
813-348-1711 (fax)
888-833-1844 Toll Free
gulfcouncil@gulfcouncil.org
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org>



National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Southeast Regional Office
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
727-824-5305
727-824-5308 (fax)
<http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov>

This page left intentionally blank

Table of Contents

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (FEIS) COVER SHEET	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	VII
FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENT.....	XIV
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED	5
1.3 HISTORY OF MANAGEMENT.....	6
1.4 STATEMENT OF ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS AND ANNUAL CATCH TARGETS	17
1.4.1 <i>Specification of Annual Catch Limit and Annual Catch Target</i>	<i>17</i>
1.4.2 <i>Setting of Acceptable Biological Catch</i>	<i>19</i>
1.4.3 <i>Use of moving average annual catch limits for recreational fishery.....</i>	<i>21</i>
2 MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES	22
2.1 ACTION 1. REBUILDING PLAN FOR GAG.....	22
2.2 ACTION 2. RECREATIONAL MANAGEMENT MEASURES.....	25
2.2.1 <i>Action 2.1 Gag Bag Limit, Size Limits, and Closed Season Scenarios.....</i>	<i>25</i>
2.2.2 <i>Action 2.2 Red Grouper Bag Limit</i>	<i>31</i>
2.3 ACTION 3. COMMERCIAL GAG QUOTA ADJUSTMENT TO ACCOUNT FOR DEAD DISCARDS	33
2.4 ACTION 4. ADJUSTMENTS TO MULTI-USE INDIVIDUAL FISHING QUOTA SHARES.....	35
2.5 ACTION 5. COMMERCIAL GAG SIZE LIMIT	38
2.6 ACTION 6. TIME AND AREA CLOSURES.....	43
2.7 ACTION 7. GAG, RED GROUPEr, AND SHALLOW-WATER GROUPEr ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES.....	54
2.7.1 <i>Action 7.1 Gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper commercial accountability measures.....</i>	<i>54</i>
2.7.2 <i>Action 7.2. Gag and red grouper recreational accountability measures</i>	<i>55</i>
3 DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERY AND AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	58
3.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.....	58
3.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT	61
3.2.1 <i>Reef Fish.....</i>	<i>61</i>
3.2.2 <i>Protected Species</i>	<i>68</i>
3.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERY AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT	69
3.3.1 <i>Description of the Economic Environment</i>	<i>69</i>
3.3.2 <i>Description of the Social Environment</i>	<i>70</i>
3.3.3 <i>Environmental Justice Considerations</i>	<i>71</i>
3.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE ENVIRONMENT	72
3.4.1 <i>Federal Fishery Management.....</i>	<i>72</i>
3.4.2 <i>State Fishery Management.....</i>	<i>73</i>
4 BYCATCH PRACTICABILITY ANALYSIS.....	74
5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	88
5.1 ACTION 1. REBUILDING PLAN FOR GAG	88
5.1.1 <i>Direct and Indirect Effects on Physical Environment.....</i>	<i>88</i>
5.1.2 <i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	<i>90</i>

5.1.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	93
5.1.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	97
5.2	ACTION 2. RECREATIONAL BAG LIMITS, SIZE LIMITS, AND CLOSED SEASONS	97
5.2.1	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment</i>	97
5.2.2	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	99
5.2.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	101
5.2.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	127
5.3	ACTION 3. COMMERCIAL GAG QUOTA ADJUSTMENT TO ACCOUNT FOR DEAD DISCARDS	128
5.3.1	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment</i>	128
5.3.2	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	128
5.3.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	129
5.3.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	130
5.4	ACTION 4. ADJUSTMENTS TO MULTI-USE INDIVIDUAL FISHING QUOTA SHARES	131
5.4.1	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment</i>	131
5.4.2	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	131
5.4.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	132
5.4.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	134
5.5	ACTION 5. COMMERCIAL GAG SIZE LIMIT	134
5.5.1	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment</i>	134
5.5.2	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	135
5.5.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	136
5.5.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	137
5.6	ACTION 6. TIME AND AREA CLOSURES	137
5.6.1	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment</i>	138
5.6.2	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	138
5.6.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	140
5.6.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	142
5.7	ACTION 7. GAG, RED GROUPER, AND SHALLOW-WATER GROUPER ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES	142
5.7.1	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment</i>	142
5.7.2	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment</i>	143
5.7.3	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment</i>	144
5.7.4	<i>Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment</i>	147
5.8	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS (CEA)	147
5.9	UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS	162
5.10	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY	163
5.11	MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES	163
5.12	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES	164
5.13	ANY OTHER DISCLOSURES	164
6	REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW	166
6.1	INTRODUCTION	166
6.2	PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES	166
6.3	DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERY	166
6.4	IMPACTS OF MANAGEMENT MEASURES	166
6.4.1	<i>Action 1: Rebuilding Plan for Gag</i>	166
6.4.2	<i>Action 2: Recreational Bag Limits, Size Limits, and Closed Seasons</i>	168
6.4.3	<i>Action 3. Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment to Account for Dead Discards</i>	168
6.4.4	<i>Action 4. Adjustments to Multi-Use Individual Fishing Quota Shares</i>	169

6.4.5 Action 5. Commercial Gag Size Limit	169
6.4.6 Action 6. Time and Area Closures.....	170
6.4.7 Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures	170
6.5 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COSTS OF REGULATIONS	171
6.6 DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANT REGULATORY ACTION	172
7 REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT ANALYSIS	173
7.1 INTRODUCTION	173
7.2 STATEMENT OF THE NEED FOR, OBJECTIVES OF, AND LEGAL BASIS FOR THE RULE	173
7.3 DESCRIPTION AND ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF SMALL ENTITIES TO WHICH THE PROPOSED ACTION WOULD APPLY	173
7.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTED REPORTING, RECORD-KEEPING AND OTHER COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED RULE, INCLUDING AN ESTIMATE OF THE CLASSES OF SMALL ENTITIES WHICH WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENT AND THE TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL SKILLS NECESSARY FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE REPORT OR RECORDS	175
7.5 IDENTIFICATION OF ALL RELEVANT FEDERAL RULES, WHICH MAY DUPLICATE, OVERLAP OR CONFLICT WITH THE PROPOSED RULE	175
7.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF ECONOMIC IMPACTS ON SMALL ENTITIES	175
7.7 DESCRIPTION OF SIGNIFICANT ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED ACTION AND DISCUSSION OF HOW THE ALTERNATIVES ATTEMPT TO MINIMIZE ECONOMIC IMPACTS ON SMALL ENTITIES	179
8 OTHER APPLICABLE LAW	186
9 LIST OF PREPARERS (INTERDISCIPLINARY PLANNING TEAM)	192
10 LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE AMENDMENT / DEIS ARE SENT	192
11 PUBLIC HEARING LOCATIONS AND DATES	194
12 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED	195
12.1 BYCATCH ISSUES	195
12.1.1 Commercial Bycatch	195
12.1.2 Recreational Bycatch	196
12.2 RECREATIONAL DATA COLLECTION AND MONITORING PROGRAMS	196
13 REFERENCES	198
14 INDEX	207
APPENDIX A SCOPING MEETING SUMMARIES AND WRITTEN COMMENTS.....	A-1
APPENDIX B PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARIES AND WRITTEN COMMENT	B-1
APPENDIX C-1 COMMENTS ON THE DEIS FROM EPA.....	C-1
APPENDIX C-2 NMFS RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM THE EPA	C-6
APPENDIX C-3 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE DEIS	C-8
APPENDIX D ADDITIONAL GAG RECREATIONAL MANAGEMENT SCENARIOS.....	D-1

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

ABC	Acceptable biological catch
ACL	Annual catch limit
ACT	Annual catch target
B	Biomass
EA	Environmental assessment
EEZ	Exclusive economic zone (federal waters)
F	Fishing mortality
FEIS	Final environmental impact statement
FIS	Fishery Impact Statement
FWCC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
GMFMC	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
GW	Gutted weight
IFQ	Individual fishing quota
MFMT	Maximum fishing mortality threshold
MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey
MRIP	Marine Recreational Information Program
MSST	Minimum stock size threshold
MSY	Maximum sustainable yield
NMFS	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OFL	Overfishing limit
OY	Optimum yield
RA	Regional administrator of NMFS
RFA	Regulatory flexibility analysis
RIR	Regulatory impact review
SEDAR	Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review
SEFSC	Southeast Fisheries Science Center
SPR	Spawning potential ratio
SSC	Scientific and Statistical Committee
TAC	Total allowable catch
TL	Total length
VMS	Vessel monitoring system

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Cover Sheet

Responsible Agencies and Contact Persons

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2203 N. Lois Avenue, Suite 1100
Tampa, Florida 33607
Steven Atran (steven.atran@gulfcouncil.org)

813-348-1630
888-833-1844 (toll-free)
813-348-1711 (fax)
gulfcouncil@gulfcouncil.org
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org>

NOAA Fisheries Service (Lead Agency)
Southeast Regional Office
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
Peter Hood (peter.hood@noaa.gov)

727-824-5305
727-824-5583 (fax)
<http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov>

Name of Action

Reef Fish Amendment 32: Gag – Rebuilding Plan, Annual Catch Limits, Management Measures; Red Grouper – Annual Catch Limits, Management Measures; Grouper Accountability Measures

Location of Action Gulf of Mexico

Type of Action

(X) Administrative
() Draft

() Legislative
(X) Final

Filing Dates with EPA

Notice of intent (NOI) to prepare EIS published: February 2, 2010 (75 FR 5282).
Draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) filed with EPA: June 3, 2011
DEIS comment period ended: July 25, 2011
EPA comments on DEIS: July 21, 2011

Abstract

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA) requires NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Gulf Council to prevent overfishing, and achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from federally managed fish stocks. Red grouper are not undergoing overfishing and are not considered overfished. Gag is undergoing overfishing and is considered overfished. This action incorporates both red grouper and gag management measures as actions affecting one species invariably affect the other. Amendment 32 would consider: Rebuilding plans for the gag stock; establishing or modifying recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons for gag and red grouper; applying commercial gag quota adjustments to account for dead discards; adjusting multi-use individual fishing quota shares (allocation); changing the commercial gag size limit; establishing time and area closures; and modifying current gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper accountability measures.

Table of Contents for FEIS

Please note this fishery action is presented as an integrated document. It addresses different applicable laws including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Therefore, the document does not follow a standard EIS format, however, elements of the FEIS are present and identified in the following table of contents for the FEIS. Amendment 32 contains a total of seven actions, four subactions, 34 alternatives, and 18 options. The amount of analysis required to evaluate these alternatives is thus very extensive, causing the EIS to exceed 150 pages.

COVER SHEET	V
SUMMARY	VII
PURPOSE AND NEED	5
ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTIONS	22
AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	58
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	88
LIST OF PREPARERS	192
LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE AMENDMENT / DEIS ARE SENT	192
REFERENCES	198
APPENDICES	A-1

Executive Summary

Gag and red grouper are the two most abundant grouper species in the Gulf of Mexico and account for the bulk of the recreational and commercial grouper landings. Gag are primarily caught by the recreational sector and the current allocation ratio defining the annual catch limits of the acceptable biological catch is 61% recreational and 39% commercial. On the other hand, red grouper are primarily harvested by the commercial sector and the allocation ratio is 24% recreational and 76% commercial.

The stocks of both species received update stock assessments in 2009. For gag, the assessment indicated the gag stock size had declined since 2005. A large part of the decline was attributed to an episodic mortality event in 2005 (most likely associated with red tide) that resulted in an additional 18% of the gag stock being killed in addition to the normal natural and fishing mortalities. The update assessment indicated the Gulf gag stock was both overfished and undergoing overfishing, and the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) was informed of this status determination in August 2009. For red grouper, the update assessment indicated that although the stock continues to be neither overfished or undergoing overfishing, the stock has declined since 2005. This decline was attributed to a 2005 episodic mortality event resulting in a little more than 20% of the red grouper stock being killed, in addition to normal natural and fishing mortalities.

In response to these assessments, the Council has requested, and NMFS has implemented, two gag interim rules for 2011 management measures to reduce overfishing. These rules reduced the gag commercial quota, prohibited the use of red grouper multi-use shares in the individual fishing quota program the commercial sector operates in, and established a two month fall recreational fishing season. For red grouper, a 2010 regulatory amendment developed by the Council (GMFMC 2010) reduced the 2011 total allowable catch and commercial quota to allow the stock to recover from the episodic mortality event. It did not implement any new recreational measures because harvests under current management measures were not exceeding catch targets. Both red grouper and gag total allowable catches were projected to increase in 2012 as the stocks recovered, and these increases are included in this amendment. However, the total allowable catch projections for red grouper used in the 2010 regulatory amendment were based on estimated 2010 landings which overestimated the actual 2010 red grouper catch. When the reduced 2010 landings were incorporated into a revised set of projections, the revised projections indicated that the red grouper total allowable catch could be increased in 2011 rather than wait until 2012, although the subsequent increase in 2012 under the regulatory amendment would be lower than what is proposed in this amendment. A 2011 regulatory amendment is currently under development for implementation in the fall of 2011 that would increase the 2011 red grouper total allowable catch as well as increase the red grouper bag limit. A similar increase for gag was not possible because gag is overfished and is under a rebuilding plan.

Given the overfished status of gag, the primary purpose of this amendment is to decrease or end overfishing of gag so that the stock can recover under a set rebuilding plan. This purpose has been temporarily addressed by the interim rules discussed above; however, long-term measures are needed to allow this stock to recover. A secondary purpose of this action is to develop red grouper management measures that will allow the optimum yield of red grouper to continue to be caught as the stock recovers from the 2005 episodic mortality event. Actions addressing these purposes would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Council's plan to manage gag and red grouper to achieve the mandates of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

A total of seven actions, four subactions, 34 alternatives, and 18 options are evaluated in this draft environmental impact statement. A short summary of each action follows.

Action 1. Rebuilding plan for gag

This action evaluates four alternatives ranging from a no action alternative (Alternative 1; no rebuilding plan) to the shortest time period to rebuild the stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield and assumes no harvest of gag (Alternative 4; 5 years). Other alternatives include the longest period allowed under the Magnuson-Stevens Act (Preferred Alternative 2; 10 years) and the time period associated with harvesting the stock at the fishing mortality associated with optimum yield (F_{OY}) (Alternative 3; 7 years). The catch targets explained in the amendment for gag are based on protocols developed in Amendment 30B. These catch targets are based on F_{OY} yield streams and should rebuild the stock in seven years as dictated by Alternative 3. However, given management uncertainties and uncertainties about the stock assessment projections for more than a few years out, the Council selected **Alternative 2** as preferred because it allows a buffer for achieving the management target.

With respect to the physical and biological/ecological environments, Alternatives 2-3 provide benefits over no action, albeit minor, because they limit fishing effort which reduces impacts with the physical environment and benefits to the gag stock. For the social and economic environments, in general, the shorter the rebuilding period, the more stringent the required management measures will be, and thus the greater the indirect economic and social costs on fishing participants in the short-term. On the other hand, the indirect economic benefits resulting from larger yields will also accrue sooner as well. Conversely, longer rebuilding periods will require less stringent management measures in the short-term and thus smaller indirect economic costs on fishing participants in the short-term. The indirect economic benefits from larger yields would accrue farther into the future. This action should have minimal effects on the administrative environment because measures to monitor and enforce landings are already in place.

Action 2. Recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons

Action 2.1. Gag scenarios

Reductions in the total removals (landed fish and dead discards) from recreational harvest need to be between 36 and 61% depending on the baseline years used to estimate the reductions and what F value the fishery is managed at. The baseline years are the last three years of the stock assessment (2005-2008) and 2009, the last year of full landings data available for the assessment rerun. The 2005-2008 average landings are greater than the 2009 landings, so needed reductions are greater when using this time series. Sub-action 2.1 is comprised of five alternatives ranging from no changes to current gag regulations (Alternative 1; no action) to a two month fall fishing season (Alternative 2) that would achieve a 60 percent reduction in harvest. The other alternatives evaluated in this sub-action include a split-season (Alternative 3 – winter and spring season with a 52-56% reduction in removals) and using changes in size limits to achieve the longest season possible of July 1 through October 31 (Preferred Alternative 4, preferred option a – 22-inch minimum size limit and option b – 22-30-inch slot limit). Preferred Alternative 4 meets the Council's objective of maintaining the longest season possible while Alternatives 3 and 4 meet the preferred fishing time periods of anglers from different areas of the Gulf of Mexico. The Council's Reef Fish Advisory Panel did recommend another split season alternative (winter and summer season with a 46-52% reduction in removals) to better meet the needs of the recreational sector; however, this alternative did not quite meet the reduction objectives developed by the Council.

For the physical environment, Alternative 1 and Preferred Alternative 4 would be least beneficial because longer seasons and increased fishing effort can result in increased gear interactions and lost or discarded fishing line, which could foul the hard bottom. For the biological/ecological environment, longer open fishing seasons and shorter closed seasons will reduce the amount of regulatory discards of gag caught by fishermen targeting other species and provide a benefit for gag as long as the measures meet the target removals needed to rebuild the stock. For the economic and social environments, Alternative 2 would have the greatest adverse economic effects over the short term and Alternative 1 the least. Size limits and season closures are standard fisheries management measures and are in effect for many species, therefore, this action should have minimal effects on the administrative environment.

Action 2.2. Red grouper bag limit

Red grouper are not considered overfished and undergoing overfishing. Recent recreational landings have not exceeded current catch targets, therefore Action 2.1 evaluates changes in bag limits to allow the recreational sector to harvest its allocation. This action evaluates three alternatives ranging from not changing the current bag limit of two fish within the four fish grouper aggregate bag limit (Alternative 1; no action) to increasing the bag limit to four red grouper within the four fish grouper aggregate bag limit (Preferred Alternative 3). Alternative 2 would set the red grouper bag limit at three fish within the four fish grouper aggregate bag limit. Both Alternative 2 and Preferred Alternative 3 have an accountability measure in the alternative where if, as a result of increasing the bag limit, the annual catch limit for a year is exceeded, the bag limit will be reduced in the subsequent year. Preferred Alternative 4 is the greatest red grouper bag limit increase that can be achieved within the four fish per person aggregate grouper bag limit.

For the physical and biological/ecological environments, Preferred Alternative 3 would likely have the greatest adverse effects because of potential increased effort. However, this impact to the physical environment should be minimal because of the fishing gear used as well as to the biological/ecological environment because it minimizes discards and has an adaptive management component should the annual catch limit be exceeded. For the economic and social environments, Preferred Alternative 3 had the greatest benefit to the recreational sector because it allows those fishermen catching red grouper to retain more fish. This action should not have any adverse effect effects on the administrative environment because bag limits are standard fishery management measures. In addition, should either Alternative 2 or Preferred Alternative 3 lead to exceeding the recreational annual catch limit, automatic measures would be implemented to reduce future bag limits to control harvest.

Action 3. Commercial gag quota adjustment to account for dead discards

Action 3 specifies gag quotas from 2012 forward. In testimony to the Council, commercial sector representatives have indicated that although they can reduce the number of gag caught by targeting the harvest of other reef fish species, they cannot absolutely avoid gag. Therefore, there will be some incidental gag harvest that will result in dead discards from either the capture of undersized fish or by fishermen without gag individual fishing quota allocation. The alternatives in this action range from specifying no quota reductions to account for these discards (Alternative 1; no action) to reducing the quotas by 47% (Alternative 3; worst case reduction needed). Preferred Alternative 2 is consistent with actions taken by the Council in a gag interim rule and reduces the quota by 14% to account for discards.

The effects of this action on the physical and biological/ecological environments would likely be minimal with the biological effects being similar to those of Action 1. As would be expected, the greater the

reductions in the quota, the greater the adverse economic and social effects of the alternative. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have the greatest adverse effect and Alternative 1 the least. Because this action does not change how the individual fishing quota program is run, regardless of the alternative chosen, this action should have no effect on the administrative environment.

Action 4. Adjustments to multi-use individual fishing quota shares

To allow for flexibility and account for varying gag to red grouper ratios across the Gulf of Mexico, at the beginning of each fishing year a percentage of the gag and red grouper allocation is designated as multi-use allocation, valid for harvesting either red or gag grouper. Amendment 29 established that 4% of red grouper allocation and 8% of gag allocation would be converted to multi-use. However, under the reduced red grouper and gag annual catch limits expected to be implemented in this amendment, the current multi-use allocations could result in commercial harvest of gag exceeding its sector annual catch limit. The alternatives for this action range from not making any changes to how multi-use allocations are awarded (Alternative 1; no action) to setting the percentage of gag multi-use allocation using a formula based on the buffer between the gag quota and the gag annual catch limit to prevent the multi-use shares from exceeded the red grouper annual catch limit (Preferred Alternative 3). In addition, Preferred Alternative 4 sets the percentage of red grouper multi-use allocation to zero while the gag stock is under a rebuilding plan. Then once the stock is rebuilt it allows red grouper multi-use shares based on a formula similar to Preferred Alternative 3 but applied to red grouper multi-use shares. Alternative 2 is similar to Preferred Alternative 4 except it would award red grouper multi-use shares starting in 2011.

This action should not affect the physical environment. Alternative 1 would have the greatest adverse effect on the biological/ecological environment because it could lead to gag overfishing and Preferred Alternative 4 should be most beneficial because it minimizes the risk of gag overfishing. For the social and economic environments, although it restricts the flexibility to the social environment that individual fishing quota program participants would enjoy under the other alternatives, Preferred Alternative 4 is expected to yield positive economic effects due to the anticipated beneficial impacts to the rebuilding of the gag stock which is currently overfished and is undergoing overfishing. Preferred Alternative 4 would be beneficial to the administrative environment relative to the other alternatives because red grouper multi-use allocation, at least for the short term, would not need to be calculated and tracked.

Action 5. Commercial gag size limit

Estimates of average release mortality rates for gag in the commercial fishery are high (~67%). Thus, a major concern for the commercial sector is bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag while fishermen target red grouper. This is likely to occur because of the large differences in the expected red grouper and gag quotas. The alternatives for this action range from maintaining the current 24-inch minimum size limit (Alternative 1; no action) to the elimination of a minimum size limit (Alternative 4). The Council is considering two other minimum size limits of 22 inches (Preferred Alternative 2) and 20 inches (Alternative 3). The effect of Alternatives 2-4 would be to convert some or all the regulatory discards due to size to catch.

This action should have little effect on the physical environment because the alternatives should have no effect on how fishing gear is used; however, if reducing the size limit allows fishermen to be more efficient, there could be some reduction in effort and hence a reduction in impacts. The current minimum size for the commercial sector is 24 inches which is just above the size at 50% maturity, thus any decrease in minimum size is likely to have a negative effect on the spawning potential of gag. The economic and

social environments may receive slight benefits with decreasing minimum size limits, however, these may be offset if there is a differential price between larger (higher price per pound) and smaller (lower price per pound) gag. However, there may be some social benefit to equalizing the minimum size limit for the commercial and recreational sectors (Preferred Alternative 2). Reducing the gag size limit may have a negative effect on the administrative environment because of confusion between black grouper and gag. Both currently have the same size limit so reducing the gag size limit could lead to enforcement and voluntary compliance difficulties.

Action 6. Time and area closures

Given the disproportionate commercial quotas between red grouper and gag (5.49 and 0.659 million pounds gutted weight, respectively), it may be possible through the strategic use of seasonal area closures to direct fishing away from concentrations of gag towards red grouper or other species. The alternatives range from maintaining the existing season area closures (Preferred Alternative 1, no action) to closing the area between the Madison-Swanson marine reserve and The Edges seasonal area closure (Alternative 3; add 244 square nm) and adding to the current Madison-Swanson marine reserve (Alternative 2-extension; add 70 square nm). Other alternative include modify the period and type of closure for The Edges (Alternative 4; seasonally add 390 square nm), and modify the period and type of closure for the current Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps marine reserves. For each of the alternatives with the exception of Preferred Alternative 1, there are four options including prohibiting all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allowing surface trolling from May 1 through October 31 (Option a), prohibiting all fishing from November 1 through April 30 and allowing all fishing from May 1 through October 31 (Option b), prohibiting all fishing from January 1 through April 30 and allowing all fishing from May 1 through December 31 (Option c), and prohibiting fishing year-round (Option d).

Preferred Alternative 1 is not expected to have any effect on the physical or biological environment with the other alternatives having a positive benefit as long as the area and time period of the closure to fishing is greater than the no action alternative. Positive impacts to the biological environment may be expected simply based on size of the closed areas relative to status quo. These benefits would include additional protection to spawning aggregations of gag and potentially reducing bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag while fishermen are targeting red grouper. Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would add an additional time-area closure in a region which is the prime spawning area for gag, shifting fishing effort on red grouper and other species to areas where gag spawning aggregations are less abundant from January through April, the peak gag spawning season. For the economic and social environments, the expansion of these closed areas and modifications to seasonal closure times relative to no action are expected to reduce effort; however, the magnitude of the anticipated effort reductions that could result from Alternatives 2-4 is not known and could simply be shifted if fishers target other areas. Currently, seasonal area closures are used in the management of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery and commercial vessels are required to have functioning vessel monitoring systems. The effects of the other alternatives in this action other than status quo on the administrative environment should be minimal.

Action 7. Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures

Accountability measures are designed to prevent annual catch limits from being exceeded, and if exceeded, correct or mitigate any overages. Annual catch limits are amounts of fish allowed to be caught in a year and can either relate to a stock as a whole or to individual fishing sectors (commercial and recreational). For gag and red grouper, the annual catch limits are sector specific.

Action 7.1 Gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper commercial accountability measures

Current accountability measures are based on quota monitoring for red grouper, gag, or shallow-water grouper quota and were implemented before the current individual fishing quota program was established. This individual fishing quota program is also an accountability measure because it allocates the red grouper, gag, and other shallow-water species quotas to the individual fishermen based on their shares. The program strictly monitors individual catches to ensure participating fishermen do not exceed their individual allocation, thus ensuring the overall quota for a stock is not exceeded. This action has two alternatives. One is to maintain the current quota based accountability measures (Alternative 1, no action) and the other is to have the individual fishing quota program to the accountability measure (**Preferred Alternative 2**). This action should have no effects on the physical, biological/ecological, economic, and social environments because any effects will be administrative. **Preferred Alternative 2** should have provide a benefit to the administrative environment relative to Alternative 1 in that less emphasis on commercial quota tracking would be required for these species. However, NMFS would still manage the individual fishing quota program and monitor commercial harvests, so this benefit would be slight.

Action 7.2 Gag and red grouper recreational accountability measures

The recreational sector currently has accountability measures developed in an earlier amendment. This action considers measures that would enhance the existing accountability measures. The alternatives range from maintaining the current accountability measures (Alternative 1, no action) to adding an overage adjustment if an annual catch limit is exceeded for stocks in a rebuilding plan and providing for in-season measures if landings are projected to exceed the annual catch limit (**Preferred Alternative 4**). Alternative 2 would provide only an overage adjustment for stocks in a rebuilding plan and Alternative 3 would provide only in-season accountability measures. Currently, if recreational landings are determined to exceed the red grouper or gag annual catch limits, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification maintaining the prior year red grouper or gag target catch level. In addition, the notification will reduce the length of the recreational shallow-water grouper fishing season in the following year by the amount necessary to ensure recreational gag and red grouper landings do not exceed the recreational target catch level for that fishing year.

For the physical and biological/ecological environments, added constraints to harvest would limit fishing effort and the chances of overfishing. Therefore, the greater the protection the accountability measures afford, the greater the benefit. For the economic and social environments, establishing accountability measures could lead to closures of the fishery, and thus could have short-term adverse effect. However, establishing accountability measures could have future effects if these measures are triggered. Alternative 3 and **Preferred Alternative 4** would require in-season monitoring which would add to the burden on the administrative environment.

Cumulative effects

The cumulative effects of the rebuilding plan for gag and constraining red grouper harvests from expanding on the biophysical and socioeconomic environments are positive because they will ultimately restore/maintain the stocks at a level that will allow the maximum benefits in yield and recreational fishing opportunities to be achieved. However, short-term negative impacts on the fisheries' socioeconomic environment may occur due to the need to limit directed harvest and reduce bycatch mortality. These negative impacts can be minimized for the recreational sector by using combinations of

bag limits, size limits and closed seasons and for the commercial sector through the individual fishing quota program, size limits, and season-area closures. The effects of the proposed actions are, and will continue to be, monitored through collection of landings data by NMFS, stock assessments and stock assessment updates, life history studies, economic and social analyses, and other scientific observations. A full discussion of the cumulative effects is contained in Section 5.8 of the environmental consequences.

FISHERY IMPACT STATEMENT

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service and the Gulf Council to prevent or end overfishing. The primary purpose of this amendment is to decrease or end overfishing of gag so that the stock can rebuild from the overfished status. One secondary goal of this amendment is to develop management measures for red grouper consistent with achieving optimum yield. To address these goals the following actions are proposed: 1) implementing a rebuilding plan for gag, 2) modifying the recreational management measures for gag and red grouper, 3) reducing the commercial gag quota to account for dead discards, 4) modifying the multi-use provision for IFQ shares, 5) lowering the commercial minimum size limit for gag, 6) exploring new and current time and area closures, and 7) adjusting accountability measures for the commercial and recreational sectors. Physical, biological, social, and economic impacts expected from the proposed actions are summarized below. Detailed analyses and discussion of these impacts are provided in Section 5.0.

The effects of the different reef fish actions on the physical and biological/ecological environments are generally tied to how the action affects fishing effort. For the physical environment, reduced effort generally means less interaction of fishing gear with the bottom and so reduces the effects from fishing. For the biological/ecological environments, less effort generally means fewer removals allowing the stock to reproduce and grow larger. However, reducing effort on one stock can sometimes lead to an effort shift which could result in unintended consequences on other stocks.

Under the gag rebuilding plan, the annual catch limit is set according to the rebuilding schedule and divided proportionally according to the allocation of each sector. The reduction in quota is applied through different management measures that are appropriate to each sector. The proposed actions to shorten the recreational gag season, reduce the commercial quota to account for bycatch, and reduce the commercial minimum size limit for gag are each expected to reduce effort relative to taking no action. Thus, these actions are likely to provide biological benefits to the gag stock. These measures are designed to limit the gag harvest and allow the stock to recover to a healthy level. Decreasing the commercial gag size limit is designed to reduce gag bycatch, thereby reducing total removals.

The selected 10 year rebuilding plan, suspension of IFQ multi-use allocations, and accountability measures are more administrative in nature and do not directly affect the physical and biological/ecological environments. However, these actions do indirectly and positively affect these environments relative to no action by providing a framework to rebuild the stock or to limit the likelihood of a stock to be harvested above the optimum yield.

The secondary goal of this amendment is to develop management measures for red grouper consistent with achieving optimum yield. Recent trends in red grouper catches remain below optimum yield. Harvest levels that remain below optimum yield due to management measures do not incur adverse impacts to the biological environment. Therefore increasing the red grouper bag limit is expected to allow fishermen to approach optimum yield without negatively impacting the biological environment. However, increasing the bag limit for red grouper has the potential for greater gear interactions with the bottom which could result in negative effects to the physical environment.

The Council explored an action to create new or modify existing time area closures to provide greater protection of gag spawning aggregations and reduce gag bycatch. Ultimately, the Council selected the no action alternative. Negative biological and ecological impacts may occur while gag is rebuilding if fishers specifically target spawning aggregations of gag, removing the more aggressive dominant males from the

population. However, the Council has selected several other actions in this amendment to rebuild the gag stock and reduce bycatch of gag while fishers are targeting other reef fish within the 10 year rebuilding period.

Adverse economic effects in the short term are expected to result from the more restrictive fishing regulations under the proposed rebuilding plan for gag. However, economic benefits resulting from larger yields following the rebuilding of the stock are expected in the long run. The proposed reduction of the recreational gag season is anticipated to result in reductions in net economic benefits to the recreational sector ranging from approximately \$16.26 million to \$17.98 million. For red grouper, recreational measures proposed are anticipated to be associated with consumer surplus increases estimated at approximately \$1.07 million. The present value of losses in economic value expected to result from proposed commercial quota reductions are estimated at \$472,167, based on a 3% discount rate. However, economic benefits stemming from the added protection to the gag stock during rebuilding are expected to result from these precautionary reductions in the long run. Similarly, long-term positive economic effects are anticipated to result from the added protection afforded to gag due to the suspension of multi-use red grouper allocations while gag is rebuilding. The preferred commercial gag size limit reduction included in this amendment is expected to result in limited positive economic effects due to fishermen's preference for larger gag. No economic effects are expected to result relative to time and area closures because the Council elected to take no action. Nor are economic effects anticipated to result from commercial accountability measures because accountability measures are already in place; this action removed the redundant quota closure measure, leaving the existing individual fishing quota program to serve as the accountability measure. Proposed accountability measures for the recreational sector would add an overage adjustment when the gag or red grouper stocks are overfished and under a rebuilding plan. Overage adjustments, which would result in the implementation of more restrictive regulations, are thus anticipated to be associated with adverse economic effects.

Given the primary purpose of this amendment to decrease or end overfishing of gag so that the stock can begin to rebuild, the primary mechanism to achieve this purpose is to decrease effort targeting gag. Social impacts are expected to accrue as a result of the proposed actions that decrease effort targeting gag because fishing behavior is targeted directly. The adverse social impacts are expected to be more severe in the short-term while the rebuilding plan is in effect, but mitigated in the long-term as the stock rebuilds and effort restrictions are relaxed. Thus, social benefits are anticipated in the long-term as a result of the rebuilding plan.

Recreational fishermen will be most impacted by the shortened gag fishing season. Although positive effects are expected from increasing the red grouper bag limit, lessening the effort restrictions on red grouper is not expected to offset equivalently the impacts from shortening the gag season. Substantial negative impacts may also accrue to the recreational sector should the proposed accountability measures be applied. These impacts would be indirect as they would occur only if the recreational sector exceeds its quota, thereby triggering the accountability measures.

Commercial fishermen will be most impacted by the decrease in gag quota. It is possible that adverse impacts may occur from the suspension of the multi-use IFQ provision and decrease to the minimum commercial size limit for gag, however these impacts would be minor. Because commercial harvest of gag and red grouper are managed under an IFQ program, accountability measures are already in place for the commercial sector. Thus, the action proposes to remove the redundant quota closure accountability measure that is not considered necessary to prevent the harvest from exceeding the shallow-water grouper annual catch limits.

Comparison of the biological, physical, economic, and social impacts from the selected Preferred Alternatives relative to no action.

Action & Preferred Alternative	Anticipated Impacts/Effects on Environmental Components		
	Biological/Physical	Economic	Social
1: Rebuilding Plan: 10 years	Indirect Positive	Indirect Negative	Indirect Negative
2.1: Gag Recreational Season (July 1 – Oct 31)	Positive	Negative short-term.	Negative short-term.
2.2: Red Grouper Recreational Bag limit (increase to 4 fish/person)	Negative, but negligible	Positive to Negligible short-term	Positive to Negligible short-term
3: Commercial Gag Quota Reduction for Discards	Positive	Negative short-term; Positive long-term.	Negative short-term; Positive long-term.
4: Suspension of IFQ Multi-use provision	Indirect Positive	Negative short-term; Positive long-term.	Negative short-term (Minor to None)
5: Reduction of Commercial gag size limit	Positive	Limited positive	Commercial longliners: None. Limited positive for others.
6: Time & Area Closures: No action	None		
7.1: Commercial Accountability Measures	None (removes redundant accountability measures)		
7.2: Recreational Accountability Measures	Indirect Positive	Negative	Indirect Negative
Combined Impacts	Positive benefits for gag but unintended consequences possible if fishing effort shifts to other stocks.	Negative in the short-term; Positive in the long-term.	Negative in the short-term; Positive in the long-term.

The proposed actions to shorten the recreational season and to decrease the commercial quota are expected to incur the greatest negative impacts to the recreational and commercial sector, respectively. Each action decreases the amount of gag that may be caught through a measure appropriate to each sector. Given the alternatives for each action, the Council selected the alternative that would incur the least social disruption while still meeting the required thresholds of the rebuilding plan. Additionally, no action was selected to modify or create additional time and area closures. Thus the Council elected to avoid the additional impacts that would have been incurred through additional time and area closures.

In summary, the goal of ending overfishing, by nature, aims to provide benefits for the biological and ecological environment by reducing fishing effort. Essentially, this means socio-economic impacts are deemed acceptable or necessary in the short-term so as to provide long-term benefits to all components of the environment: physical, biological/ecological, economic, and social. Although fishing effort is not the only impact on the marine environment, fishing effort is the only factor within the Council's domain to

regulate. As such, the Council considered multiple alternatives for each proposed action to be taken and selected alternatives that negotiate the mandates of National Standard 1 (achieve optimum yield while avoiding overfishing), with National Standard 8 (consider the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities).

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Gag and red grouper are the two most abundant grouper species in the Gulf of Mexico. In 2008, these two species accounted for 93% of the recreational grouper landings reported by Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), and 80% of commercial grouper landings in the Gulf (Personal communication from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Fisheries Statistics Division, Silver Spring, MD). The commercial sector accounts for the majority of red grouper landings, while the recreational sector accounts for the majority of gag landings. Both of these groupers are protogynous hermaphrodites, meaning that they start life as females and change sex to males later in life.

Gag

Management of gag uses a variety of management measures. The recreational and commercial allocation of the stock annual catch limit was set in Amendment 30B where 61% of the gag total allowable catch is allocated to the recreational sector and 39% is allocated to the commercial sector (GMFMC 2008a). The commercial grouper fishing sector is managed under an individual fishing quota program that has been in effect since January 1, 2010. Prior to 2010, the grouper portion of the reef fish fishery was managed with quotas, seasonal and area closures, and minimum size limits. Most gag caught by the commercial sector is with handlines (Table 1.1.1) Management of the recreational sector has used traditional measures such as minimum size limits, aggregate and species-specific bag limits, and a closed season (February 1-March 31). Both sectors are subject to area closures.

Table 1.1.1. Commercial gag landings in pounds gutted weight.

Year	Commercial Longline	Commercial Handline	Other	Total Landings
2000	571,801 (25%)	1,589,245 (71%)	86,429 (4%)	2,247,476
2001	946,629 (31%)	2,052,522 (66%)	99,866 (3%)	3,099,017
2002	1,021,695 (34%)	1,880,834 (63%)	61,702 (2%)	2,964,231
2003	1,094,008 (42%)	1,435,412 (55%)	65,133 (3%)	2,594,553
2004	1,097,933 (38%)	1,726,429 (60%)	72,619 (3%)	2,896,980
2005	871,726 (35%)	1,535,458 (62%)	68,958 (3%)	2,476,141
2006	516,528 (38%)	798,282 (58%)	55,175 (4%)	1,369,985
2007	475,295 (38%)	741,954 (59%)	44,931 (4%)	1,262,181
2008	340,626 (27%)	865,382 (69%)	42,473 (3%)	1,248,481

The "other" category is predominantly trawl in the early years (60-70s), trap in the middle years (80s), and spear in the later years (90s-00s).

(Source: personal communication, Brian Linton, Southeast Fisheries Science Center).

The gag stock has been assessed since 1997 when a stock assessment concluded that gag, although not overfished, may be undergoing overfishing (Schirripa and Legault 1997, GMFMC 1998). In 2006 and 2007, the SEDAR 10 (2006) assessment and a subsequent 2007 reanalysis with corrected dead discard estimates (NMFS 2007) concluded that the gag stock was undergoing overfishing and had been since the 1970s. In response to the SEDAR 10 findings, Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008a) created new 2009 regulations that reduced the gag recreational bag limit. In addition, a commercial gag quota of 1.32 million pounds gutted weight was adopted, representing a 41% decrease from the average landings during 2004-2006.

A 2009 update stock assessment of the Gulf gag stock (SEDAR 2009) indicated the gag stock had diminished. This decline could also be seen in commercial and recreational harvests (Tables 1.1.1 and 1.1.2). A large part of the decline was attributed to an episodic mortality event in 2005 (most likely associated with red tide) that resulted in an additional 18% of the gag stock being killed in addition to the normal natural and fishing mortalities¹. The 2008 spawning stock biomass was estimated to be 47% of its minimum stock size threshold and the mean fishing mortality rate during 2005-2007 was estimated to be nearly 2.5 times higher than the maximum fishing mortality threshold. Based on these results, the NMFS Regional Administrator notified the Council on August 11, 2009 of his determination that the gag stock was both overfished and undergoing overfishing. In response and in line with Magnuson-Stevens Act National Standard Guidelines, the Council initiated Amendment 32 to the subject FMP to address this overfishing and develop a stock rebuilding plan.

Table 1.1.2. Recreational gag landings in pounds gutted weight.

Year	Recreational Gag Landings (pounds)
2000	4,503,759
2001	3,710,284
2002	4,078,416
2003	3,434,862
2004	4,491,715
2005	3,513,119
2006	2,286,345
2007	2,231,784
2008	3,009,777

(Source: personal communication, Brian Linton, SEFSC).

The Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed the update stock assessment (SEDAR 2009) to make an allowable biological catch recommendation to the Council. Based on concerns expressed by the SSC and summarized in NMFS (2010a), the SSC asked for revised stock projections using 2009 landings estimates, which were provided for review in May 2010 (NMFS 2010b). After reviewing these estimates, the SSC recommended the 2011 acceptable biological catch be decreased considerably from 3.62 million pounds (MP) to 1.17 MP. Because of the time needed to revise the assessment update, the Council found it could not complete Amendment 32 in time for subsequent rulemaking to be implemented before December 1, 2010, when the 2011 gag individual fishing quota allocation is announced. Therefore, the Council requested NMFS develop an interim rule to set the gag quota at 390,000 pounds, suspend the red grouper multi-use individual fishing quota shares to preclude their use to harvest gag, and set the recreational harvest to zero until recreational measures could be implemented in Amendment 32. However, in the course of developing management alternatives for gag, potential discrepancies in commercial and recreational estimates of discards were discovered². The

¹ Personal communication, Brian Linton, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, FL 33149

² Similar issues about how dead discards were treated in the red grouper assessment were discussed by the Council at its August 2010 meeting. However, because of differences in how dead discards were estimated, the same concerns were not triggered for red grouper. The Council did request NMFS to examine the effects of using observer- versus logbook-based commercial discards in the assessment, but did not ask the assessment itself be reexamined. A report from NMFS indicated these differences had little effect on the assessment outcome (Walter 2011)

Council discussed these discrepancies at their August 2010 meeting and agreed another review of the gag assessment would be in order and asked it be conducted in the fall or winter of 2010. Given this delay and the uncertainty regarding the status of the gag stock, the Council revised their interim rule request to limit the commercial harvest to 100,000 pounds. The Council felt that some commercial harvest was necessary so gag that would otherwise be regulatory discards under a zero harvest restriction could be retained and counted towards the quota. The other two actions remained unchanged from the original interim rule request. This rule, referenced in this document as the 2010 interim rule, was published on December 1, 2010, with an effective date of January 1, 2011 (75 FR 74650).

In December 2010, the gag update assessment was rerun to address the dead discard issues discussed above. The results of the rerun indicated the spawning stock biomass was only slightly lower than the earlier assessment runs and the fishing mortality estimates were nearly unchanged except for 2008, the last year of the assessment³. However, 2008, the terminal year, was not used to calculate the current fishing mortality rate (F_{current}). Yield streams for the overfishing limit (OFL), rebuilding F (F_{rebuild}), and F associated with the optimum yield (F_{OY}) slightly increased for each year, but the rerun did not change the stock status from overfished and undergoing overfishing (Table 1.4.1.1). Based on this review, the Council subsequently requested a second interim rule to replace the current rule. This rule established a commercial quota of 430,000 pounds gutted weight, continue the suspension of the use of red grouper multi-use allocation to harvest gag, and have a recreational season from September 16 to November 15.

Red grouper

Management of red grouper differs between the commercial and recreational sectors. For the commercial grouper fisheries, an individual fishing quota system has been in effect since January 1, 2010. Under this system, percentages of the commercial grouper quotas are allocated to individual fishing quota participants who can then fish or trade their shares. Additionally, most red grouper are caught with longlines (Table 1.1.3) which are managed with minimum depth restrictions. Management of the recreational sector consists of minimum size limits, aggregate and species-specific bag limits, and a closed season (February 1-March 31). Both sectors are subject to a seasonal area closure of the Edges (i.e., January 1-April 30). In addition, all reef fish fishing is prohibited year round in two restricted fishing areas in the northwestern Gulf (Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps), as well as the Tortugas Ecological Reserves off of the Florida Keys. These area closures are explained in more detail in Section 3.1.

³ Draft Standing, Special Spiny Lobster and Special Reef Fish Scientific and Statistical Committee, January 18-21, 2011, Committee Summary, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida

Table 1.1.3. Commercial red grouper landings in pounds gutted weight.

Year	Commercial Longline	Commercial Handline/Bandit	Fish Trap*, Spear and other	Total
2005	3,324,830 (61%)	1,458,048 (27%)	654,683 (12%)	5,437,561
2006	3,141,704 (61%)	1,393,400 (27%)	627,423 (12%)	5,162,527
2007	2,077,544 (56%)	1,584,746 (43%)	46,572 (1%)	3,708,862
2008	2,850,100 (60%)	1,859,847 (39%)	29,347 (1%)	4,739,294
2009	1,132,994 (31%)	2,467,753 (67%)	56,092 (2%)	3,656,839

* Fish traps were banned in February 2007

(Source: January 2011 re-run of red grouper assessment and projections – Walter 2011).

Red grouper were declared overfished and placed under a rebuilding plan in 2004. The stock had been found to be overfished and undergoing overfishing in both a 1999 stock assessment (Schirripa and Legault 1999) and a subsequent 2002 assessment (NMFS 2002a). However, the 2002 assessment indicated that the stock was recovering faster than previously estimated, most likely due to a strong recruitment year class in 1997. Management measures implemented in 2004 as part of the rebuilding plan included a reduced aggregate commercial shallow-water grouper quota, a red grouper quota within the aggregate quota, and a recreational bag limit of two red grouper within the five fish aggregate grouper bag limit. In 2005, stepped commercial grouper trip limits (10,000, 7,500, and 5,500 pounds) were adopted for the commercial fishery, and the recreational red grouper bag limit was further reduced to 1 fish. For 2006 through 2009, a fixed 6,000-pound commercial grouper trip limit was adopted. In 2007, the SEDAR 12 assessment confirmed that the red grouper stock was overfished in the 1990s, but estimated that the red grouper spawning stock had rebuilt to biomass at maximum sustainable yield (SSB_{MSY}) starting in 1999, and that the 2005 stock status was close to its optimum yield spawning stock biomass level. Consequently, the red grouper rebuilding plan could be replaced with a management policy to maintain the stock at its optimum yield level.

The 2009 update stock assessment of the red grouper stock in the Gulf of Mexico (SEDAR 2009a) indicated the stock continues to be neither overfished or undergoing overfishing. However, the stock has declined since 2005 and is reflected with reduced commercial and recreational landings since that time (Tables 1.1.3 and 1.1.4). A large part of this decline was attributed to an episodic mortality event in 2005 (most likely associated with red tide), that resulted in a approximately 20% of the red grouper stock being killed on top of the normal natural and fishing mortalities (personal communication, Clay Porch, SEFSC⁴). The annual catch target currently in effect was found to exceed the optimum yield level for 2010 from the model runs preferred by the Council's SSC. After reviewing the assessment update, the SSC asked that projections of the status of red grouper and gag be rerun using updated landings estimates for 2009. The SSC was concerned that projected 2009 and 2010 harvest levels based on the current total allowable catches were too high and did not reflect actual landings. The requested scenarios used the 'red tide, constant catchability' model for red grouper, used updated estimates for 2009 landings data, and either set the 2010 harvest level equal to the current TAC or equal to 2009 estimated landings (NMFS 2010). The resulting analysis reported the present annual catch target (i.e., 7.57 MP GW) exceeded the 2011 acceptable biological catch level set by the SSC (6.31 MP GW) and 2011 optimum yield level (i.e., 5.68 MP GW) selected by the Council as the level to set the annual catch target.

⁴ Dr. Clay Porch, NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, Florida

Table 1.1.4. Recreational red grouper landings in pounds gutted weight. (Source: Walter 2011)

Year	Recreational Red Grouper Landings (pounds)
2000	2,171,627
2001	1,380,664
2002	1,687,802
2003	1,335,259
2004	3,152,707
2005	1,440,810
2006	960,889
2007	1,016,655
2008	892,925
2009	978,325

As a consequence of this work, the Council developed a framework action that adjusted the total allowable catch from the existing 7.57 million pounds to 5.68 million pounds gutted weight. This total allowable catch was in accordance with the Council's SSC determination of an acceptable biological catch recommendation, which was 85 percent of the overfishing limit defined in the 2009 red grouper stock assessment update. Based on the 76:24 ratio for the commercial and recreational allocation of red grouper, subsequent rule making adjusted the commercial quota to 4.32 million pounds gutted weight.

1.2 Purpose and Need

The actions in this amendment meet several purposes and needs necessary to manage shallow-water grouper stocks. The primary purpose of this amendment is to decrease or end overfishing of gag so that the stock can begin to rebuild. This purpose has been temporarily addressed in an interim rule, however, long-term measures are needed to allow this stock to recover. One secondary purpose of this action is to develop red grouper management measures that will allow the optimum yield of red grouper to continue to be caught as the stock recovers from a 2005 episodic mortality event. These actions would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the Council's plan to manage gag and red grouper to achieve the mandates of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Another secondary purpose of this amendment is to minimize gag bycatch such that landings for the shallow-water grouper harvest are consistent to the extent practicable with both National Standard 1 (prevent overfishing and achieve optimum yield) and National Standard 9 (minimize bycatch and bycatch mortality). The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires NMFS and regional fishery management councils to prevent overfishing, and achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from federally managed fish stocks. These mandates are intended to ensure fishery resources are managed for the greatest overall benefit to the nation, particularly with respect to providing food production and recreational opportunities, and protecting marine ecosystems. To further this goal, the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires fishery managers to specify through rebuilding plans their strategy for rebuilding overfished stocks to a sustainable level within a certain time frame, provide accountability measures to minimize the risk of overharvest, to minimize bycatch and bycatch mortality to the extent practicable, and to ensure that management decision are based on the best available scientific information. The recreational and commercial allocation of the stock annual catch limit will remain consistent with Amendment 30B.

1.3 History of Management

The following summary describes management actions that affect the reef fish fishery in the Gulf. The summary focuses on management of grouper species and on data collection provisions in the fishery management plan.

The Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan and environmental impact statement (EIS) were implemented in November 1984. The regulations, designed to rebuild declining reef fish stocks, included prohibitions on the use of fish traps, roller trawls, and powerhead-equipped spear guns within an inshore stressed area and directed NMFS to develop data reporting requirements in the reef fish fishery.

In July 1985, the Florida Marine Fisheries Commission (now FWCC) established a Florida state regulation to set a minimum size limit of 18 inches total length for red grouper, gag, yellowfin grouper, Nassau grouper, and jewfish (goliath grouper). In December 1986, the FWCC set a state recreational bag limit of five grouper per person per day, with an off-the-water possession limit of 10 per person, for any combination of groupers excluding rock hind and red hind.

Amendments

Amendment 1 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in 1990, set objectives to stabilize long-term population levels of all reef fish species by establishing a survival rate of biomass into the stock of spawning age fish to achieve at least 20% spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSBR) by January 1, 2000. Among the grouper management measures implemented were:

- Set a 20-inch total length minimum size limit on red grouper, Nassau grouper, yellowfin grouper, black grouper, and gag;
- Set a 50-inch TL minimum size limit on goliath grouper (jewfish);
- Set a five-grouper recreational daily bag limit;
- Set an 11.0 MP commercial quota for grouper, with the commercial quota divided into a 9.2 MP shallow-water grouper quota and a 1.8 MP deep-water grouper quota. Shallow-water grouper were defined as black grouper, gag, red grouper, Nassau grouper, yellowfin grouper, yellowmouth grouper, rock hind, red hind, speckled hind, and scamp. Scamp would be applied to the deepwater grouper quota once the shallow-water grouper quota was filled. Deep-water grouper were defined as misty grouper, snowy grouper, yellowedge grouper, warsaw grouper, and scamp once the shallow-water grouper quota was filled. Goliath grouper were not included in the quotas;
- Allowed a two-day possession limit for charter vessels and headboats on trips that extend beyond 24 hours, provided the vessel has two licensed operators aboard as required by the U.S. Coast Guard, and each passenger can provide a receipt to verify the length of the trip. All other fishermen fishing under a bag limit were limited to a single day possession limit;
- Established a framework procedure for specification of total allowable catch (TAC) to allow for annual management changes;
- Established a longline and buoy gear boundary at approximately the 50-fathom depth contour west of Cape San Blas, Florida, and the 20-fathom depth contour east of Cape San Blas, inshore of which the directed harvest of reef fish with longlines and buoy gear was prohibited, and the retention of reef fish captured incidentally in other longline operations (e.g., sharks) was limited to the recreational daily bag limit. Subsequent changes to the longline/buoy boundary could be made through the framework procedure for specification of TAC;

- Limited trawl vessels (other than vessels operating in the unsorted groundfish fishery) to the recreational size and daily bag limits of reef fish;
- Established fish trap permits, allowing up to a maximum of 100 fish traps per permit holder;
- Prohibited the use of entangling nets for directed harvest of reef fish. Retention of reef fish caught in entangling nets for other fisheries was limited to the recreational daily bag limit;
- Established the fishing year to be January 1 through December 31;
- Extended the stressed area to the entire Gulf coast; and
- Established a commercial reef fish vessel permit.

Amendment 2 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in 1990, prohibited the harvest of goliath grouper to provide complete protection for this species in federal waters in response to indications that the population abundance throughout its range was greatly depressed. The harvest prohibition was initially implemented by emergency rule.

Amendment 3 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in July 1991, provided additional flexibility in the annual framework procedure for specifying TAC by allowing the target date for rebuilding an overfished stock to be changed. It revised the FMP's primary objective from a 20% SSBR target to a 20% spawning potential ratio (SPR). The amendment also transferred speckled hind from the shallow-water grouper quota category to the deepwater grouper quota category.

Amendment 4 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in May 1992, established a moratorium on the issuance of new commercial reef fish permits for a maximum period of three years. Amendment 4 also changed the time of year TAC is specified from April to August and included additional species in the reef fish management unit.

Amendment 5 (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented in February 1994, established a fish trap endorsement for vessel permits of permittees who had logbook landings of reef fish from fish traps in 1991 or 1992 through November 19, 1992, and established a three-year moratorium during which those endorsements would be non-transferable. The amendment also required that traps must be returned to shore at the end of each fishing trip; that each trap must be individually buoyed, or if fished in a trawl (several traps connected by a submerged line) a floating buoy is required at each end of the trawl; and prohibited the possession of magnesium pop-up devices. The amendment also created a special management zone with gear restrictions off the Alabama coast, created a framework procedure for establishing future special management zones, required that all finfish except for oceanic migratory species be landed with head and fins attached, and closed the region of Riley's Hump (near Dry Tortugas, Florida) to all fishing during May and June to protect mutton snapper spawning aggregations.

Amendment 6 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in June 1993, extended the provisions of an emergency rule for red snapper endorsements for the remainder of 1993 and 1994, and allowed the red snapper trip limits for qualifying and non-qualifying permitted vessels to be changed under the framework procedure for specification of TAC.

Amendment 7 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in February 1994, established reef fish dealer permitting and record keeping requirements, allowed transfer of fish trap permits and endorsements between immediate family members during the fish trap permit moratorium, and allowed transfer of other reef fish permits or endorsements in the event of the death or disability of the person who was the qualifier for the permit or endorsement. A proposed provision of this amendment that would have required permitted

vessels to sell harvested reef fish only to permitted dealers was disapproved by the Secretary of Commerce and was not implemented.

Amendment 8 (EA/RIR/IRFA), proposed to be implemented in 1996, would have established an individual transferable quota system in the commercial red snapper fishery. A final rule was published in November 1995 to implement the system effective April 1, 1996, but the individual transferable quota system was not implemented. The Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 repealed the system and placed a moratorium on any new individual fishing quota program until after October 1, 2000.

Amendment 9 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in July 1994, provided for collection of red snapper landings and eligibility data from commercial fishermen for the years 1990 through 1992 to qualify for shares under the individual transferable quota system in **Amendment 8**. This amendment also extended the reef fish permit moratorium and red snapper endorsement system through December 31, 1995, in order to continue the existing interim management regime until longer term measures could be implemented.

Rejected Amendment 10 was developed in 1994 but was not submitted to NMFS. **Amendment 5** had established a deadline to qualify for fish trap endorsements of November 19, 1992, but the final rule implementing the endorsements and three-year moratorium did not take effect until February 7, 1994. In the interim, NMFS continued to process applications for fish trap permits, and neither NMFS nor the Council provided public notification of the impending moratorium. On February 7, 1994, 421 vessels that had been issued fish trap tags on or before February 7 became ineligible to continue in the fish trap fishery, of which 54 of those vessels had fish trap landings between November 19, 1992 and February 7, 1994. Amendment 10 was drafted to consider changing the endorsement eligibility requirement to allow those vessels with trap landings through February 7, 1994 to qualify. However, in July 1994 the Council voted to reject the amendment.

Amendment 11 (EA/RIR/IRFA) was partially approved by NMFS and implemented in January 1996. The six approved provisions were: (1) limit sale of Gulf reef fish by permitted vessels to permitted reef fish dealers; (2) require that permitted reef fish dealers purchase reef fish caught in Gulf federal waters only from permitted vessels; (3) allow transfer of reef fish permits and fish trap endorsements in the event of death or disability; (4) implement a new reef fish permit moratorium for no more than five years or until December 31, 2000, while the Council considers limited access for the reef fish fishery; (5) allow permit transfers to other persons with vessels by vessel owners (not operators) who qualified for their reef fish permit; and, (6) allow a one-time transfer of existing fish trap endorsements to permitted reef fish vessels whose owners have landed reef fish from fish traps in federal waters, as reported on logbooks received by the Science and Research Director of NMFS from November 20, 1992 through February 6, 1994. NMFS disapproved a proposal to redefine optimum yield from 20% SPR (the same level as overfishing) to an SPR corresponding to a fishing mortality rate of F0.1 until an alternative operational definition that optimizes ecological, economic, and social benefits to the Nation could be developed. In April 1997, the Council resubmitted the optimum yield definition with a new proposal to redefine optimum yield as 30% SPR. The resubmission document was disapproved by NMFS.

Amendment 12 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in January 1997, reduced the bag limit for greater amberjack to 1 fish and established a 20-fish aggregate bag limit for reef fish species for which there is no other bag limit.

Amendment 13 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in September 1996, further extended the red snapper endorsement system through the remainder of 1996 and, if necessary, through 1997, in order to give the Council time to develop a permanent limited access system that was in compliance with the new provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Amendment 14 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in March and April 1997, provided for a ten-year phase-out for the fish trap fishery; allowed transfer of fish trap endorsements for the first two years and thereafter only upon death or disability of the endorsement holder, to another vessel owned by the same entity, or to any of the 56 individuals who were fishing traps after November 19, 1992 and were excluded by the moratorium; and prohibited the use of fish traps west of Cape San Blas, Florida. The amendment also provided the Regional Administrator (RA) of NMFS with authority to reopen a fishery prematurely closed before the allocation was reached, and modified the provisions for transfer of commercial reef fish vessel permits. In addition, the amendment prohibited the harvest or possession of Nassau grouper in the Gulf Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), consistent with similar prohibitions in Florida state waters, the south Atlantic EEZ, and the Caribbean EEZ.

Amendment 15 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in January 1998, prohibited harvest of reef fish from traps other than permitted reef fish traps, stone crab traps, or spiny lobster traps, and closed the commercial greater amberjack fishery Gulf-wide during the months of March, April, and May.

Amendment 16A (EA/RIR/IRFA), submitted to NMFS in June 1998, was partially approved and implemented on January 10, 2000. The approved measures provided: (1) the possession of reef fish exhibiting the condition of trap rash on board any vessel with a reef fish permit that is fishing spiny lobster or stone crab traps is prima facie evidence of illegal trap use and is prohibited except for vessels possessing a valid fish trap endorsement; (2) NMFS establish a system design, implementation schedule, and protocol to require implementation of a vessel monitoring system (VMS) for vessels engaged in the fish trap fishery, with the cost of the vessel equipment, installation, and maintenance to be paid or arranged by the owners as appropriate; and, (3) fish trap vessels submit trip initiation and trip termination reports. Prior to implementing this additional reporting requirement, there will be a one-month fish trap inspection/compliance/education period, at a time determined by the RA and published in the *Federal Register*. During this window of opportunity, fish trap fishermen will be required to have an appointment with NMFS law enforcement for the purpose of having their trap gear, permits, and vessels available for inspection. The disapproved measure was a proposal to prohibit fish traps south of 25.05 degrees north latitude beginning February 7, 2001. The status quo 10-year phase-out of fish traps in areas in the Gulf EEZ was therefore maintained.

Amendment 16B (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in November 1999 set a recreational daily bag limit of one speckled hind and one warsaw grouper per vessel, with the prohibition on the sale of these species when caught under the bag limit.

Generic Sustainable Fisheries Act Amendment (EA/RIR/IRFA), partially approved and implemented in November 1999, set the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT) for most reef fish stocks at $F_{30\% SPR}$. Estimates of maximum sustainable yield, Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST), and optimum yield were disapproved because they were based on SPR proxies rather than biomass based estimates.

Amendment 17 (EA/RIR/IRFA), was submitted to NMFS in September 1999, and was implemented on August 10, 2000. This amendment extended the commercial reef fish permit moratorium for another five years, from its previous expiration date of December 31, 2000 to December 31, 2005, unless replaced

sooner by a comprehensive controlled access system. The purpose of the moratorium is to provide a stable environment in the fishery necessary for evaluation and development of a more comprehensive controlled access system for the entire commercial reef fish fishery.

Amendment 18A (EA/RIR/IRFA) was implemented on September 8, 2006, except for VMS requirements which were implemented May 6, 2007. Amendment 18A addresses the following: (1) prohibits vessels from retaining reef fish caught under recreational bag/possession limits when commercial quantities of Gulf reef fish are aboard, (2) adjusts the maximum crew size on charter vessels that also have a commercial reef fish permit and a United States Coast Guard certificate of inspection (COI) to allow the minimum crew size specified by the COI when the vessel is fishing commercially for more than 12 hours, (3) prohibits the use of reef fish for bait except for sand perch or dwarf sand perch, (4) requires devices and protocols for the safe release in incidentally caught endangered sea turtle species and smalltooth sawfish, (5) updates the TAC procedure to incorporate the Southeast Data Assessment and Review (SEDAR) assessment methodology, (6) changes the permit application process to an annual procedure and simplifies income qualification documentation requirements, and (7) requires electronic VMS aboard vessels with federal reef fish permits, including vessels with both commercial and charter vessel permits.

Amendment 19 (FSEIS/RIR/IRFA), also known as the Generic Amendment Addressing the Establishment of the Tortugas Marine Reserves, or Generic Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Amendment 2, was implemented on August 19, 2002. This amendment establishes two marine reserves off the Dry Tortugas where fishing for any species and anchoring by fishing vessels is prohibited.

Amendment 20 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented July 2003, established a three-year moratorium on the issuance of charter and headboat vessel permits in the recreational for-hire reef fish and coastal migratory pelagic fisheries in the Gulf EEZ.

Amendment 21 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented in July 2003, continued the Steamboat Lumps and Madison-Swanson reserves for an additional six years, until June 2010. In combination with the initial four-year period (June 2000-June 2004), this allowed a total of ten years in which to evaluate the effects of these reserves and to provide protection to a portion of the gag spawning aggregations.

Amendment 22 (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented July 5, 2005, specified bycatch reporting methodologies for the reef fish fishery.

Amendment 23 (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented July 8, 2005, established a rebuilding plan for vermilion snapper, including an 11 inch total length minimum size limit, a 10-fish vermilion snapper bag limit within the 20-reef fish aggregate bag limit, and an April 22 through May 31 closed season for the commercial fishery.

Amendment 24 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented on August 17, 2005, replaced the commercial reef fish permit moratorium that was set to expire on December 31, 2005 with a permanent limited access system.

Amendment 25 (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented on June 15, 2006, replaced the reef fish for-hire permit moratorium that expired in June 2006 with a permanent limited access system.

Amendment 26 (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented on January 1, 2007, established an individual fishing quota system for the commercial red snapper fishery.

Amendment 27 (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented February 28, 2008, except for reef fish bycatch reduction measures that became effective on June 1, 2008. This amendment addressed overfishing and stock rebuilding for red snapper. It also required the use of non-stainless steel circle hooks when using natural baits to fish for Gulf reef fish effective June 1, 2008, and required the use of venting tools and dehooking devices when participating in the commercial or recreational reef fish fisheries effective June 1, 2008.

Amendment 28 is currently under development. It is intended to address grouper allocation issues.

Amendment 29 (EA/RIR/IRFA), implemented January 1, 2010, established an individual fishing quota system for the commercial grouper and tilefish fisheries.

Amendment 30A (SEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented August 2008, was developed to stop overfishing of gray triggerfish and greater amberjack. The amendment established ACLs and accountability measures (AMs) for greater amberjack and gray triggerfish. For greater amberjack, it modified the rebuilding plan, increased the recreational minimum size limit, set a zero bag limit for captain and crew of for-hire vessels, and set commercial and recreational quotas. For gray triggerfish, it increased the commercial and recreational minimum size limit and set a commercial quota.

Amendment 30B (FEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented May 2009, proposes to end overfishing of gag, revise red grouper management measures as a result of changes in the stock condition, establish ACLs and AMs for gag and red grouper, manage shallow-water grouper to achieve optimum yield, and improve the effectiveness of federal management measures. The amendment (1) defines the gag minimum stock size threshold and optimum yield; (2) set interim allocations of gag and red grouper between recreational and commercial fisheries; (3) makes adjustments to the gag and red grouper TACs to reflect the current status of these stocks; (4) establishes ACLs and AMs for the commercial and recreational red grouper fisheries, commercial and recreational gag fisheries, and commercial aggregate shallow-water grouper fishery; (5) adjusts recreational grouper bag limits and seasons; (6) adjusts commercial grouper quotas; (7) reduces the red grouper commercial minimum size limit; (8) replaces the one month commercial grouper closed season with a four month seasonal area closure at the Edges, a 390 square nautical mile area in the dominant gag spawning grounds; (9) eliminates the end date for the Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps marine reserves; and (10) requires that vessels with federal commercial or charter reef fish permits comply with the more restrictive of state or federal reef fish regulations when fishing in state waters.

Amendment 31 (FEIS/RIR/IRFA), implemented May 26, 2010, establishes additional restrictions on the use of bottom longline gear in the eastern Gulf of Mexico in order to reduce bycatch of endangered sea turtles, particularly loggerhead sea turtles. The amendment (1) prohibits the use of bottom longline gear shoreward of a line approximating the 35-fathom contour from June through August; (2) reduces the number of longline vessels operating in the fishery through an endorsement provided only to vessel permits with a demonstrated history of landings, on average, of at least 40,000 pounds of reef fish annually with fish traps or longline gear during 1999-2007; and (3) restricts the total number of hooks that may be possessed onboard each reef fish bottom longline vessel to 1,000, only 750 of which may be rigged for fishing. The boundary line was initially moved from 20 to 50 fathoms by emergency rule effective May 18, 2009. That rule was replaced on October 16, 2009 by a rule under the Endangered Species Act moving the boundary to 35 fathoms and implementing the maximum hook provisions.

Regulatory Amendments, Emergency and Interim Rules

A July 1991 regulatory amendment, implemented November 12, 1991, provided a one-time increase in the 1991 quota for shallow-water grouper from 9.2 MP to 9.9 MP to provide the commercial fishery an opportunity to harvest 0.7 MP that was not harvested in 1990 [56 FR 58188].

A November 1991 regulatory amendment, implemented June 22, 1992, raised the 1992 commercial quota for shallow-water grouper to 9.8 MP after a red grouper stock assessment indicated that the red grouper SPR was substantially above the Council's minimum target of 20% [57 FR 21751].

An August 1999 regulatory amendment, implemented June 19, 2000, increased the commercial size limit for gag and black grouper from 20 to 24 inches TL, increased the recreational size limit for gag from 20 to 22 inches TL, prohibited commercial sale of gag, black, and red grouper each year from February 15 to March 15 (during the peak of gag spawning season), and established two marine reserves (Steamboat Lumps and Madison-Swanson) that are closed year-round to fishing for all species under the Council's jurisdiction [65 FR 31827].

An emergency rule, published February 15, 2005, established a series of trip limits for the commercial grouper fishery in order to extend the commercial fishing season. The trip limit was initially set at 10,000 pounds gutted-weight (GW). If on or before August 1 the fishery is estimated to have landed more than 50% of either the shallow-water grouper or the red grouper quota, then a 7,500 pound GW trip limit takes effect; and if on or before October 1 the fishery is estimated to have landed more than 75% of either the shallow-water grouper or the red grouper quota, then a 5,500 pound GW trip limit takes effect [70 FR 8037].

An interim rule, published July 25, 2005, proposed for the period August 9, 2005 through January 23, 2006, a temporary reduction in the recreational red grouper bag limit from two to one fish per person per day, in the aggregate grouper bag limit from five to three grouper per day, and a closure of the recreational fishery, from November - December 2005, for all grouper species [70 FR 42510]. These measures were proposed in response to an overharvest of the recreational allocation of red grouper under the Secretarial Amendment 1 red grouper rebuilding plan. The closed season was applied to all grouper in order to prevent effort shifting from red grouper to other grouper species and an increased bycatch mortality of incidentally caught red grouper. However, the rule was challenged by organizations representing recreational fishing interests. On October 31, 2005, a U.S. District Court judge ruled that an interim rule to end overfishing can only be applied to the species that is undergoing overfishing. Consequently, the reduction in the aggregate grouper bag limit and the application of the closed season to all grouper were overturned. The reduction in the red grouper bag limit to one per person and the November-December 2005 recreational closed season on red grouper only were allowed to proceed. The approved measures were subsequently extended through July 22, 2006 by a temporary rule extension published January 19, 2006 [71 FR 3018].

An October 2005 regulatory amendment, implemented January 1, 2006, established a 6,000 pound GW aggregate deepwater grouper and shallow-water grouper trip limit for the commercial grouper fishery, replacing the 10,000/7,500/5,500 step-down trip limit that had been implemented by emergency rule for 2005 [70 FR 77057].

A March 2006 regulatory amendment (GMFMC 2005a), implemented July 15, 2006, established a recreational red grouper bag limit of one fish per person per day as part of the five grouper per person

aggregate bag limit, and prohibited for-hire vessel captains and crews from retaining bag limits of any grouper while under charter [71 FR 34534]. An additional provision established a recreational closed season for red grouper, gag and black grouper from February 15 to March 15 each year (matching a previously established commercial closed season) beginning with the 2007 season.

An interim rule was implemented on January 1, 2009, at the request of the Council to reduce overfishing of gag pending implementation of permanent rules under Amendment 30B. Measures in the temporary rule: (1) established a two-fish gag recreational bag limit (recreational grouper aggregate bag limit remained at five fish); (2) adjusted the recreational closed season for gag to February 1 through March 31 (the recreational closed season for red and black groupers remained February 15 to March 15); (3) established a 1.32 MP commercial quota for gag; and (4) required operators of federally permitted Gulf commercial and for-hire reef fish vessels to comply with the more restrictive of federal or state reef fish regulations when fishing in state waters for red snapper, greater amberjack, gray triggerfish, and gag [71 FR 66878].

An emergency rule was implemented May 18, 2009 through October 28, 2009 prohibiting the use of bottom longline gear to harvest reef fish east of 85°30' W longitude in the portion of the EEZ shoreward of the coordinates established to approximate a line following the 50-fathom (91.4-m) contour as long as the 2009 deepwater grouper and tilefish quotas are unfilled. After the quotas have been filled, the use of bottom longline gear to harvest reef fish in water of all depths east of 85°30' W longitude are prohibited [74 FR 20229].

A rule under the Endangered Species Act was implemented October 16, 2009 that prohibits bottom longlining for Gulf reef fish east of 85°30' W longitude (near Cape San Blas, Florida) shoreward of the 35-fathom depth contour, and it restricts the number of hooks on board to 1,000 hooks per vessel with no more than 750 hooks being fished or rigged for fishing at any given time. The rule replaced the 50 fathom boundary emergency rule in order to relieve social and economic hardship on longline fishermen who were prevented from fishing for shallow-water grouper by the emergency rule, and to keep fishing restrictions consistent with the Amendment 31 actions in place while proposed Amendment 31 is reviewed. The rule was implemented after a Biological Opinion was completed by NMFS on the continued authorization of the Gulf reef fish fishery, as managed under the Reef Fish FMP. That opinion, which considered the proposed actions in Amendment 31, concluded that the continued authorization of the Gulf reef fish fishery was likely to adversely affect sea turtles and sawfish, but was not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species. An Incidental Take Statement was issued specifying the amount and extent of anticipated take on a three-year basis, along with reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions deemed necessary and appropriate to minimize the impact of these takes [74 FR 53889].

In response to an uncontrolled oil spill resulting from the explosion on April 20, 2010 and subsequent sinking of the Deepwater Horizon oil rig approximately 36 nautical miles (41 statute miles) off the Louisiana coast, NMFS issued an emergency rule to temporarily close a portion of the Gulf of Mexico EEZ to all fishing [75 FR 24822]. The initial closed area extended from approximately the mouth of the Mississippi River to south of Pensacola, Florida and covered an area of 6,817 square statute miles. The coordinates of the closed area were subsequently modified periodically in response to changes in the size and location of the area affected by the spill. At its largest size on June 1, 2010, the closed area covered 88,522 square statute miles, or approximately 37 percent of the Gulf of Mexico EEZ. This closure was implemented for public safety.

An August 2010 regulatory amendment, implemented January 1, 2011, reduced the total allowable catch for red grouper from 7.57 million pounds gutted weight to 5.68 million pounds gutted weight, based on the optimum yield projection from a March 2010 re-run of the projections from the 2009 red grouper update assessment. Although the stock was found to be neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, the update assessment found that spawning stock biomass levels had decreased since 2005, apparently due to an episodic mortality even in 2005 which appeared to be related to an extensive red tide that year. Based on the 76%:34% commercial and recreational allocation of red grouper, the commercial quota was reduced from 5.75 to 4.32 million pounds gutted weight, and the recreational allocation was reduced from 1.82 to 1.36 million pounds gutted weight. No changes were made to the recreational fishing regulations as the recreational landings were already below the adjusted allocation in recent years.

On August 11, 2009, the Council was notified by NMFS that the Gulf of Mexico gag stock was both overfished and undergoing overfishing based on the results of the 2009 update stock assessment. Because management measures from Amendment 32 which address these issues could not be completed in time, an interim rule was published on December 1, 2010 [75 FR 74654], to reduce gag landings consistent with ending overfishing. This interim rule implemented conservative management measures while a rerun of the update stock assessment was being completed. At issue was the treatment of dead discarded fish in the assessment. The rule reduced the commercial quota to 100,000 pounds gutted weight, suspended the use of red grouper multi-use individual fishing quota allocation so it would not be used to harvest gag, and to temporarily halted the recreational harvest of gag until recreational fishing management measures being developed in Amendment 32 could be implemented to allow harvest at the appropriate levels.

The gag 2009 update stock assessment was rerun in December 2010 addressing the problems with discards identified earlier in 2010. This assessment was reviewed in January 2011 by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee and presented to the Council at their February 2011 meeting. The assessment indicated that the gag commercial quota implemented in the December 1, 2010, interim rule could be increased and that a longer recreational season could be implemented. In response, the Council requested an interim rule while they continued to work on long-term measures including a gag rebuilding plan in Amendment 32. The interim rule set the commercial gag quota at 430,000 pounds gutted weight (including the 100,000 pounds previously allowed) for the 2011 fishing year, and temporarily suspended the use of red grouper multi-use IFQ allocation so it cannot be used to harvest gag. It also set a two-month recreational gag fishing season from September 16 through November 15. This temporary rule is effective from June 1, 2011 through November 27, 2011, and can be extended for another 186 days [76 FR 31874].

Secretarial Amendments

Secretarial Amendment 1 established a rebuilding plan, a 5.31 MP GW commercial quota, and a 1.25 MP GW recreational target catch level for red grouper. The amendment also reduced the commercial quota for shallow-water grouper from 9.35 to 8.8 MP GW and reduced the commercial quota for deepwater grouper from 1.35 to 1.02 MP GW. The recreational bag limit for red grouper was reduced to two fish per person per day. Rulemaking from this amendment was effective July 15, 2004 [69 FR 33315]. In this amendment bottom longlines were considered for movement out to 50 fathoms which had also been considered under Reef Fish Amendment 18.

Secretarial Amendment 2 was approved on July 3, 2003 [68 FR 39900] and specified a greater amberjack maximum sustainable yield as the yield associated with $F_{30\% SPR}$ (proxy for F_{MSY}) when the

stock is at equilibrium, optimum yield as the yield associated with an $F_{40\% SPR}$ when the stock is at equilibrium, maximum fishing mortality threshold equal to $F_{30\% SPR}$, and minimum stock size threshold equal to $(1-M) \cdot B_{MSY}$ or 75% of B_{MSY} . It also set a rebuilding plan limiting the greater amberjack harvest to 2.9 MP for 2003-2005, 5.2 MP for 2006-2008, 7.0 MP for 2009-2011, and 7.9 MP for 2012. This was expected to rebuild the stock in seven years. Regulations implemented in 1997 and 1998 (Amendments 12 and 15) were deemed sufficient to comply with the rebuilding plan so no new regulations were implemented. No rulemaking was developed from this amendment

Control Date Notices

Control date notices are used to inform fishermen that a license limitation system or other method of limiting access to a particular fishery or fishing method is under consideration. If a program to limit access is established, anyone not participating in the fishery or using the fishing method by the published control date may be ineligible for initial access to participate in the fishery or to use that fishing method. However, a person who does not receive an initial eligibility may be able to enter the fishery or fishing method after the limited access system is established by transfer of the eligibility from a current participant, provided the limited access system allows such transfer. Publication of a control date does not obligate the Council to use that date as an initial eligibility criteria. A different date could be used, and additional qualification criteria could be established. The announcement of a control date is primarily intended to discourage entry into the fishery or use of a particular gear based on economic speculation during the Council's deliberation on the issues. The following summarizes control dates that have been established for the Reef Fish FMP. A reference to the full *Federal Register* notice is included with each summary.

November 1, 1989 - Anyone entering the commercial reef fish fishery in the Gulf and South Atlantic after November 1, 1989, may not be assured of future access to the reef fish resource if a management regime is developed and implemented that limits the number of participants in the fishery [54 FR 46755].

November 18, 1998 - The Council is considering whether there is a need to impose additional management measures limiting entry into the recreational-for-hire (i.e., charter vessel and headboat) fisheries for reef fish and coastal migratory pelagic fish in the EEZ of the Gulf and, if there is a need, what management measures should be imposed. Possible measures include the establishment of a limited entry program to control participation or effort in the recreational-for-hire fisheries for reef fish and coastal migratory pelagic [63 FR 64031] (In Amendment 20 to the Reef Fish FMP, a qualifying date of March 29, 2001, was adopted).

July 12, 2000 - The Council is considering whether there is a need to limit participation by gear type in the commercial reef fish fisheries in the exclusive economic zone of the Gulf and, if there is a need, what management measures should be imposed to accomplish this. Possible measures include modifications to the existing limited entry program to control fishery participation, or effort, based on gear type, such as a requirement for a gear endorsement on the commercial reef fish vessel permit for the appropriate gear. Gear types which may be included are longlines, buoy gear, handlines, rod-and-reel, bandit gear, spear fishing gear, and powerheads used with spears [65 FR 42978].

October 15, 2004 – the Council is considering the establishment of an individual fishing quota program to control participation or effort in the commercial grouper fisheries of the Gulf. If an individual fishing quota program is established, the Council is considering October 15, 2004, as a possible control date regarding the eligibility of catch histories in the commercial grouper fishery [69 FR 67106].

December 31, 2008 – the Council voted to establish a control date for all Gulf commercial reef fish vessel permits. The control date will allow the Council to evaluate fishery participation and address any level of overcapacity. The establishment of this control date does not commit the Council or NOAA Fisheries Service to any particular management regime or criteria for entry into this fishery. Fishermen would not be guaranteed future participation in the fishery regardless of their entry date or intensity of participation in the fishery before or after the control date under consideration. Comments were requested by close of business April 17, 2009 [74 FR 11517].

1.4 Statement of Annual Catch Limits and Annual Catch Targets

1.4.1 Specification of Annual Catch Limit and Annual Catch Target

The protocol for setting the red grouper and gag annual catch limits and annual catch targets was established in Amendment 30B. Given 2009 update assessments of gag and red grouper, annual catch limits and annual catch targets needed to be reset for these species which is described here.

The overfishing thresholds for these species are based on the equilibrium fishing mortality rate that yields the maximum sustainable yield (GMFMC 2004a, 2008b). Thus, the overfishing limit (OFL) would be the yield associated with this fishing mortality rate. For gag, the SSC recommended an acceptable biological catch level, which the Council uses to set the sector specific annual catch limits, as the yield associated with the fishing mortality rate needed to rebuild the stock within 10 years. This is the maximum harvest rate allowed by the SSC under Section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and cannot be exceeded. This yield is greater than the yield associated with the fishing mortality rate needed to harvest the optimum yield which is the value selected in Amendment 30B as the basis for setting the sector specific annual catch targets (Table 1.4.1.1).

As with gag, the Council indicated in Amendment 30B that the red grouper annual catch limits would be based on the maximum fishing levels set by the SSC, which is the acceptable biological catch recommendation. Sector specific annual catch limits are the fraction of the acceptable biological catch recommendation allocated to each sector (Table 1.4.1.2). The Council also indicated in Amendment 30B that the annual catch target should be set at the yield based on the fishing mortality associated with optimum yield.

In January 2011, the Standing and Special Reef Fish SSC reviewed re-runs of the 2009 gag and red grouper update assessments. For gag, the SSC made acceptable biological catch recommendations for yields through 2015, corresponding to the first five years of a ten-year rebuilding plan. For red grouper, which is not overfished or considered undergoing overfishing, the Committee provided acceptable biological catch recommendations only through 2012, with the intent that the catch levels remain at the 2012 levels until a new assessment is conducted (except for adjustments that may be needed due to accountability measures).

Table 1.4.1.1 shows the gag annual overfishing limit, acceptable biological catch, and optimum yield yields for 2011-2015+ years, plus the unadjusted sector allocations for the annual catch target. The 2011 catch limits were adopted through a 2011 interim rule and are not part of this amendment. They are included in this amendment for information only. This amendment specifies the 2012-2015+ annual catch limits and annual catch targets along with the unadjusted sector allocations of the annual catch targets are adopted in this amendment following the Amendment 30B protocol.

Table 1.4.1.1. Gag overfishing limits, acceptable biological catch (which is also the annual catch limit), optimum yield (which is also the annual catch target), and unadjusted sector allocations of annual catch limit and annual catch target for 2012-2015. See text for discussion of “unadjusted” allocations. The 2011 catch levels were previously set through an interim rule, and are included in the table for information only. All values are in million pounds gutted weight, and are based on the January 2011 SSC re-evaluation of gag acceptable biological catch.

	OFL	ABC (= ACL)	OY (= ACT)	Unadjusted Sector ACL		Unadjusted Sector ACT	
				Commercial (39%)	Recreational (61%)	Commercial (39%)	Recreational (61%)
2011	1.67	1.58	1.28	0.616	0.964	0.499	0.781
2012	2.11	2.02	1.69	0.788	1.232	0.659	1.031
2013	2.54	2.45	2.11	0.956	1.495	0.823	1.287
2014	2.91	2.82	2.49	1.100	1.720	0.971	1.519
2015+	3.19	3.12	2.80	1.217	1.903	1.092	1.708

Note that the gag sector annual catch targets are referred to as unadjusted. There are two types of adjustments that can affect the final annual catch target levels.

1. Adjustment for dead discards. The stock assessment analyses on which Table 1.4.1.1 is based assumes that reductions in landed catch from baseline levels will be accompanied by reductions in dead discards in the same proportion. This “linked” scenario is unlikely. In the commercial sector, the limited availability of gag individual fishing quota allocation may result in higher regulatory discards. In the recreational sector, changes to bag limits or size limits, or bycatch of gag during closed seasons may also affect regulatory discards. The commercial quota adopted in Action 3 adjusts the commercial sector annual catch target to explicitly account for non-proportional dead discards. Recreational regulatory measures in Action 2 are based on analysis of total removals (landed catch plus dead discards) that achieve desired reduction levels, thus, the recreational landed catch target may be reduced from the above values to account for dead discards. The exact level of the adjustment depends upon the combination of management measures used.
2. Accountability measures. Action 7 contains accountability measures that may temporarily adjust the sector catch targets in a subsequent year if there is an overage in the prior year.

The red grouper stock biomass is currently above its B_{MSY} level, so the annual yield at F_{MSY} in 2012 is higher than the equilibrium maximum sustainable yield. Consequently, in Table 1.4.1.2, for 2012 the overfishing limit was set at equilibrium maximum sustainable yield and the acceptable biological catch (annual catch limit) at equilibrium optimum yield. Because annual optimum yield for 2012 is less than equilibrium, the annual catch target is set equal to the annual optimum yield.

Table 1.4.1.2 shows the red grouper annual overfishing limit, acceptable biological catch, and optimum yield yields for 2011-2012+ , plus the sector allocations for the annual catch target. The 2011 catch limits were adopted through a 2010 regulatory amendment and are not part of this amendment. They are included in this amendment for information only. This amendment specifies the 2012+ annual catch limit and annual catch target along with the sector allocations of the annual catch target are adopted in this amendment following the Amendment 30B protocol.

Table 1.4.1.2. Red Grouper overfishing limits, acceptable biological catch (which is also the annual catch limit), optimum yield (which is also the annual catch target), and sector allocations of annual catch limit and annual catch target for 2012+. The 2011 catch levels were previously set through an interim rule, and are included in the table for information only. All values are in million pounds gutted weight, and are based on the March 2011 re-evaluation of red grouper ABC.

	OFL	ABC (= ACL)	OY (= ACT)	Sector ACL		Sector ACT	
				Commercial (76%)	Recreational (24%)	Commercial (76%)	Recreational (24%)
2011	7.42	6.31	5.68	4.80	1.51	4.32	1.36
2012+	8.10	7.93	7.22	6.03	1.90	5.49	1.73

Red grouper catch levels are being increased relative to 2011. Because the landed catch level is being increased, there will be no increase in regulatory discards. Therefore, adjustments to account for dead discards are not needed. However, the annual catch limit will still be subject to accountability measures.

Note: At the time that this amendment was being prepared, a red grouper regulatory amendment was also being prepared that would increase the red grouper allowable catch for 2011, and for 2012 – 2015 under a revised yield stream. The yield streams in that regulatory amendment, if implemented, will supersede the yield streams in Table 1.4.1.2.

SEDAR assessments for both gag and red grouper are scheduled for 2013, which may result in further revisions to the subsequent yield streams.

1.4.2 Setting of Acceptable Biological Catch

Section 302 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act states that “each scientific and statistical committee shall provide its Council ongoing scientific advice for fishery management decisions, including recommendations for acceptable biological catch (ABC)”. The Magnuson-Stevens Act further states that the Council shall “develop annual catch limits for each of its managed fisheries that may not exceed the fishing level recommendations of its scientific and statistical committee”.

Update assessments of gag (SEDAR 2009a) and red grouper (SEDAR 2009b) were prepared by the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center and a SEDAR Update Assessment Workgroup during the spring of 2009.

The 2009 red grouper update assessment was conducted using an age-structured assessment model called ASAP (Legault and Restrepo 1998), and projections were estimated using PRO-2BOX (Porch 2002). After reviewing several model runs with varied parameter inputs, the SSC accepted the model run titled “Red Tide Model with Constant Catchability”. This model run allowed the natural mortality rate for 2005, a year when there was an extensive red tide event along the West Florida Shelf, to adjust above the base natural mortality rate. The best-fit result indicated that an additional mortality for red grouper corresponding to a little over 20% of the stock occurred in 2005.⁵

⁵ E-mail from Clay Porch (NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center) to Steven Atran (Gulf Council staff) dated June 24, 2009. There is confusion among some members of the public that the assessment claimed that 30% of the grouper were killed due to red tide. Dr. Porch’s e-mail states, “the estimate of the instantaneous episodic natural mortality rate was 0.3, and that this translates roughly to something like 30% of the stock being killed (I emphasized at the time that it wasn’t exactly 30%).”

As with red grouper, the SSC reviewed several model runs from the 2009 gag update assessment and accepted the model run titled, “Red Tide with Increasing Catchability”. The SSC chose a model with increasing catchability for gag because they felt that the tendency of gag to form aggregations made them more susceptible to improvements in gear technology over time. As with red grouper, this model run allowed the natural mortality rate for 2005, a year when there was an extensive red tide event along the West Florida Shelf, to adjust above the base natural mortality rate. The best-fit result indicated that an additional mortality for gag corresponding to 18% of the stock occurred in 2005.⁶

These assessments were reviewed by the Standing and Special Reef Fish SSC in June 2009. Although the SSC made preliminary recommendations of acceptable biological catch, they asked that the projections be re-run after the 2009 landings data were available.

On March 23, 2010, the Council received revised red grouper and gag projections from NMFS using preliminary 2009 landings data. The new projections also provided an estimate of what the catches will be in 2010, and changed the starting date of the gag rebuilding plan from 2010 to 2011.

Based on the revised projections, the SSC recommended a red grouper overfishing limit of 7.42 in 2011 and 7.43 for 2012. The SSC set the red grouper acceptable biological catch at 85% of the overfishing limit to account for scientific uncertainty, resulting in an acceptable biological catch of 6.31 MP in 2011 and 6.32 MP in 2012. The corresponding optimum yield levels were 5.68 MP in 2011 and 5.90 MP in 2012. Based on these recommendations, the Council set the 2011 red grouper total allowable catch (also the annual catch limit) at 5.68 MP through an August 2010 regulatory amendment (GMFMC 2010).

In August 2010, a discrepancy was found in the estimated size distribution of undersized released fish from the recreational gag sector. The model had incorrectly set the size of released gag at just less than the 22 inch minimum size limit rather than estimate a more realistic size distribution based on tagging data. In addition, newly available data from observers aboard commercial fishing vessels showed that the dead discards of both gag and red grouper from the commercial sector were much larger than the estimates used in the assessment model, which were based on logbook data plus data on size distribution and mortality rate by depth. In addition, the red grouper projections had not taken into account the reduction in the commercial red grouper minimum size limit from 20 inches to 18 inches that took effect in 2009. As a result, the Council asked the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to re-run the gag assessment with corrected recreational release data and with the observer based commercial discard estimates, and to also evaluate the effect of using the observer based discard estimates on the red grouper assessment.

The re-runs of the gag and red grouper update assessments were conducted in the fall of 2010, and the results presented to the SSC in January 2011. As a result, the overfishing limit, acceptable biological catch and optimum yield for red grouper and gag increased slightly from the March 2010 results. The SSC revised its overfishing limit and acceptable biological catch recommendations for gag in January 2011 and for red grouper in March 2011, as shown in Tables 1.4.1 and 1.4.2.

Later during the meeting John (Walter) calculated the actual percentage for red grouper and it was a little over 20% (which I relayed to the AP, and I think the SSC, later on Tuesday)”.

⁶ E-mail from Brian Linton (NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center) to Steven Atran (Gulf Council staff) dated July 7, 2009.

1.4.3 Use of moving average annual catch limits for recreational fishery

Under Amendment 30B a three-year moving average of actual recreational landings is compared to a 3-year moving average of the annual catch limits to determine if the annual catch limit has been exceeded, triggering accountability measures. When first initiated, the moving average is gradually implemented as follows:

Year 1 – catches for year 1 are compared to the annual catch limit for year 1.

Year 2 – the average catches for years 1 and 2 and compared to the average annual catch limit for years 1 and 2.

Year 3 – the average catches for years 1, 2 and 3 and compared to the average annual catch limit for years 1, 2 and 3.

In subsequent years the most recent three years average catches are compared to the most recent three years average annual catch limits. This applies any time the annual catch limit is steady. If the annual catch limit is reduced or increased, the implementation sequence shown above is reinitiated. The purpose of this is to smooth out occasional spikes in recreational landings and reduce the frequency at which accountability measures are implemented. The moving average method is not used with the commercial sector because that sector is under an individual fishing quota system and has a much smaller likelihood of landings spiking above the annual catch limit. The moving average method will also not be used with gag while it is under a rebuilding plan because the rebuilding plan increases the annual catch limit every year.

Table 1.4.3.1. Moving average test statistic for 2011 and subsequent years to be compared to the annual catch limit. If the test statistic exceeds the annual catch limit, accountability measures will be triggered. Values are in million pounds gutted weight.

Year	Gag		Red Grouper	
	Test criteria – Recreational Sector	ACL	Test criteria – Recreational Sector	ACL
2011	2011 Landings	0.964 MP	2011 Landings	1.51 MP
2012	2012 Landings	1.232 MP	Ave. of 2011+2012 landings	1.92 MP
2013	2013 Landings	1.495 MP	Ave. of 2011+2012+2013 landings	1.92 MP
2014	2014 Landings	1.720 MP	Ave. of 2012+2013+2014 landings	1.92 MP
2015	2015 Landings	1.903 MP	Ave. of 2013+2014+2015 landings	1.92 MP

The annual catch limits for red grouper are based on equilibrium optimum yield. The annual catch limits for gag are based on the yield corresponding to F_{rebuild} .

2 MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Action 1. Rebuilding Plan for Gag

On August 11, 2009, the NMFS Regional Administrator notified the Council of his determination that the gag stock was both overfished and undergoing overfishing, based on the results of the 2009 update stock assessment of the Gulf of Mexico gag stock (SEDAR 2009a). The stock has shown declines in indices of abundance since 2005. A large part of the decline was attributed to an episodic mortality event in 2005 (most likely associated with red tide) that resulted in an additional 18% of the gag stock being killed on top of the normal natural and fishing mortalities (personal communication, Brian Linton, SEFSC). The 2008 spawning stock biomass was estimated to be at 47% of its minimum stock size threshold and the mean fishing mortality rate during 2005-2007 was estimated to be nearly 2.5 times higher than the maximum fishing mortality threshold. Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act National Standard Guidelines, once a Council is notified of the stock's condition, a rebuilding plan needs to be developed and implemented within two years of notification to end overfishing and rebuild the gag stock.

Alternative 1. No action. Do not specify a rebuilding plan for gag.

Preferred Alternative 2. Establish a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less.

Alternative 3. Establish a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 7 years or less.

Alternative 4. Establish a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 5 years (T_{\min}).

Discussion:

Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act states that for a fishery that is overfished, the rebuilding plan shall—

- (A) specify a time period for rebuilding the fishery that shall—
 - (i) be as short as possible, taking into account the status and biology of any overfished stocks of fish, the needs of fishing communities, recommendations by international organizations in which the United States participates, and the interaction of the overfished stock of fish within the marine ecosystem; and
 - (ii) not exceed 10 years, except in cases where the biology of the stock of fish, other environmental conditions, or management measures under an international agreement in which the United States participates dictate otherwise;
- (B) allocate both overfishing restrictions and recovery benefits fairly and equitably among sectors of the fishery; and
- (C) for fisheries managed under an international agreement, reflect traditional participation in the fishery, relative to other nations, by fishermen of the United States.

The shortest possible time in which the gag stock can rebuild (T_{\min}) is 5 years in the absence of all fishing mortality including bycatch mortality, whereas the maximum time (T_{\max}) allowed under the National Standard 1 guidelines is 10 years. The proposed annual catch limits are based on yields that will rebuild

the stock in 10 years. The proposed annual catch targets are yields under the Council’s current definition of optimum yield (i.e., yield at 75% of F_{MSY}), which are projected to produce a faster rebuilding, 7 years⁷.

Amendment 30B established an interim allocation of the gag stock, based on commercial and recreational landings during the years 1986 through 2005, of 39% commercial, 61% recreational. This allocation was selected by the Council in Amendment 30B and is based on the longest and most robust time series for landings. A long-term time series reduces the influence of short-term shifts in landings resulting from changes in recruitment or regulations. This also is consistent with the intent of Amendment 1 for setting allocations. This allocation complies with above specification (B) with respect to the commercial and recreational allocations, and nothing in this amendment changes the allocation of harvest, including recovery benefits, among these sectors.

Alternative 1, no action, does not specify a rebuilding plan for gag. This is not allowed under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and is included only for purposes of including a baseline for analysis. As shown in Figure 2.1.1, model trends produced by the “red tide” assessment model suggest that gag were overfished in the 1980’s and at that time were at only half the biomass capable of supporting maximum sustainable yield. In the 1990s, gag began a slow recovery, possibly due to the regulations implemented beginning in 1990. By 2000, the stock was fully recovered, and it remained recovered until 2005, when it once again declined into an overfished state. Assessment scientists have suggested that an episodic mortality event such as the massive 2005 red tide contributed to the decline. However, the fishing mortality rate has been consistently above the rate associated with maximum yield per recruit (used as a proxy for maximum sustainable yield). The fishing mortality rate estimated in the most recent year, 2008, should be viewed with caution, because it is considered less reliable until 2009 estimates are incorporated. Yet even without the 2008 estimate, the fishing mortality rate shows an increasing trend over time. This rate of fishing mortality is not consistent with rebuilding or maintaining the stock at its maximum sustainable yield level.




Figure 2.1.1. (Figure 9.2 from 2009 gag update assessment). Red tide model trends in F and SSB relative to corresponding benchmarks.

⁷ Personal communication from Brian Linton, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami.

Preferred Alternative 2 establishes a rebuilding plan in 10 years or less in accordance with the maximum time frame allowed under the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The assessment estimated that the gag stock would rebuild to its maximum sustainable yield level in 5 years if all sources of fishing mortality (including discard mortality) could be eliminated. Because the stock can recover in less than 10 years, the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires that the rebuilding plan be for no more than 10 years. The Council intends to manage the stock with a target yield at the optimum yield level corresponding to F_{OY} (where F_{OY} is defined as a fishing mortality that is 75 percent of the fishing mortality rate at maximum sustainable yield). At this level, the stock is projected to rebuild in seven years, corresponding to **Alternative 3**. However, given management uncertainties and uncertainties about the stock assessment projections for more than a few years out, **Preferred Alternative 2** allows additional time if needed for achieving the management target. Specifying the rebuilding time to be 10 years or less also allows for fluctuations in catches and leeway to take the needs of fishing communities into account when setting catch levels and management measures.

Alternative 3 establishes a target of 7 years or less to rebuild the gag stock. This is the estimated time to rebuild if the stock is managed at a fishing rate corresponding to optimum yield (F_{OY}) rather than the rate corresponding to a 10-year rebuilding plan ($F_{rebuilding}$). Although the yields under a 7-year rebuilding plan would eventually catch up to those for a 10-year plan, the initial catch targets in the early years would be smaller. However, faster rebuilding could make this a less economically disruptive approach by allowing the yields associated with a fully rebuilt stock to be resumed more quickly. Although, the Council intends to manage the stock at the optimum yield level corresponding to **Alternative 3**, adopting **Alternative 3** for the rebuilding target would only result in a 50% probability of meeting the target date. This is because the yields used under this time period have a 50% chance of success to rebuild the stock in 7 years. Adopting **Preferred Alternative 2** for the target date but managing at the optimum yield level allows greater than 50% probability of success by providing 10 years under the same yield stream as **Alternative 3** to rebuild the stock.

Alternative 4 establishes a target of 5 years to rebuild the gag stock. This is the minimum time in which the stock can be rebuilt (T_{min}) if all sources of fishing mortality (including discard mortality) could be eliminated. It would require a complete closure of the gag fishery for at least 5 years. If this alternative is adopted, strong measures to reduce bycatch of gag in other fisheries should be considered. Because a total elimination of discard mortality is unlikely to be achieved, this alternative would likely result in the stock being slightly under the rebuilding target at the end of five years.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires that the Council establish a plan to rebuild the stock is as short a time as possible. In this instance, “as short as possible” means five years, which would require eliminating all fishing associated mortality including bycatch (**Alternative 4**). Eliminating all such mortality would be very difficult to achieve, and would require prohibiting virtually all fishing activities where gag are present, including most inshore waters in the state of Florida. The social and economic impacts of such restrictions would be tremendous and are believed to outweigh the benefits associated with a faster rebuilding. **Alternative 3** has similar short comings in that it would require extremely draconian measures at the start of the plan. **Preferred Alternative 2**, which is the longest time allowed under the statute, still only accommodates a four month recreational fishing season. This alternative is believed by the Council to best balance the needs of fishing communities dependent on the harvest of gag with the need to rebuild the stock in a short a time as possible.

2.2 Action 2. Recreational Management Measures

2.2.1 Action 2.1 Gag Bag Limit, Size Limits, and Closed Season Scenarios

The reduced gag catch limits under the initial years of the rebuilding plan will require substantial reductions in both commercial and recreational harvest. The commercial harvest can be reduced through an adjustment to the commercial quota, but the recreational sector has no quota. Recreational catch levels are managed primarily through a combination of bag limits, minimum size limits and closed seasons. A combination of management measures needs to be adopted that will achieve the needed reductions in recreational fishery with the least disruption to the fishery. Consideration also needs to be given to the impact of regulatory changes on discards and discard mortality.

Reductions needed from baseline to achieve the rebuilding plan based on the different baseline years are:

	2006-08 baseline	2009 baseline
2012 $F_{REBUILD}$ (ACL)	53%	36%
2012 F_{OY} (ACT)	61%	47%

Alternative 1. No action. Do not modify the bag limits, size limits or closed seasons for the recreational harvest of gag.

Alternative 2. Set the 2012 gag open season to be the same as in 2011, i.e., September 16 through November 15, 22 inch minimum size limit, 2 fish gag bag limit, 4 fish aggregate bag limit (61 days) (60% reduction from both baselines)

Alternative 3. Split the gag open season to provide two fishing seasons: January 1-31 and April 1-30, 22 inch minimum size limit, 2 fish gag bag limit, 4 fish aggregate bag limit (61 days) (52% reduction from 2009 baseline; 56% reduction from 2006-08 baseline)

Preferred Alternative 4. Set the longest gag season possible: July 1 through October 31, 2 fish gag bag limit, 4 fish aggregate bag limit (123 days)

Preferred Option a. 22 inch minimum size limit (50% reduction from 2009 baseline; 53% reduction from 2006-08 baseline)

Option b. 22-30 inch slot size limit (54% reduction from 2009 baseline; 56% reduction from 2006-08 baseline)

The **Reef Fish Advisory Panel** developed an additional recreational scenario. This was:

Split the gag open season to provide two fishing seasons: a winter season January 1-31 and December 24-31, and a summer season June 1 – July 7, 22 inch minimum size limit, 1 fish gag bag limit, 4 fish aggregate bag limit (76 days, 46% reduction from 2009 baseline, 52% reduction from 2006-08 baseline).

This alternative was presented for discussion purposes during public hearings for Amendment 32. However, because this alternative did not quite meet the removal reduction criteria used by the Council in selecting the **Alternatives 2-4** and has not yet been reviewed by the Council, the alternative has not undergone further analyses. The Advisory Panel's rationale for this recommendation is included in the discussion below.

Additional scenarios are shown in Table 2.2.1.1. Please note that the table contains projected reduction under three effort shifting scenarios; that effort during the open season is the same as it would have been in a year-round fishery (1.0), that effort is 1.5 times what it would have been in a year-round fishery (1.5), and that effort is double what it would have been in a year-round fishery (2.0). At their February 2011 meeting, the Council discussed that it is likely that effort would likely increase during the open season, but a doubling of effort seemed to be too high of an assumption. Therefore, the Council restricted the analyses of projected reductions to an effort shifting of 1.5 for evaluating the alternatives, but recognizes the full range of projected effort shifting should be taken into consideration because an exact number cannot be predicted.

In all Scenarios, recreational closed seasons are closed only to gag, except for the existing February-March closed season, which applies to all shallow-water grouper.

Because part of the total removals consists of dead discards, the landed catch for each scenario is less than the unadjusted annual catch target. Appendix D contains two tables similar to Table 2.2.1.1 below, but expanded to show what the estimated landed catch would be. Appendix D, Table 1 contains several scenarios that are variations on the Reef Fish Advisory Panels split season recommendations, while Appendix D, Table 2 contains the scenarios in Alternatives 1 through 4a and b, along with the adjusted landed catch estimates.

Table 2.2.1.1. Gag Recreational Management Scenarios. Reductions in total removals are calculated for scenarios where effort shifting during the open season is 1.0, 1.5, or 2.0 times historical levels. Reductions stated in alternatives are based on 1.5 effort shifting.

Closed Season	Open Season	Days Open	Min Size Limit	Max Size Limit	Bag Limit		State Consistency	Percent Change in Removals for Gag Targ/Dir Trip Elimination Scenario					
								2006-08 base				2009 base	
					Effort Shifting			Effort Shifting					
					2.0	1.5		1.0	2.0	1.5		1.0	
Alt 1- Feb-March	Jan, April-Dec	306	22	---	2	4	Yes	40% inc	13% incr	14%	60% inc	30% incr	1% inc
Jan-Dec	---	0	---	---	---	---	Yes	73%	73%	73%	68%	68%	68%
Jan-Dec	---	0	---	---	---	---	No	55%	55%	55%	32%	32%	32%
Alt 2- Nov 16-Sep 15	Sep 16-Nov 15	61	22	---	2	4	Yes	56%	60%	64%	58%	60%	62%
Nov 16-Sep 15	Sep 16-Nov 15	61	22	30	2	4	Yes	62%	64%	67%	59%	61%	63%
Alt 3- Feb-Mar, May-Dec	Jan & Apr	61	22	---	2	4	Yes	50%	56%	61%	47%	52%	57%
Feb-Mar, May-Dec	Jan & Apr	61	22	30	2	4	Yes	53%	58%	63%	50%	55%	59%
Oct-Jun 15	Jun 16-Sep	107	22	---	2	4	Yes	45%	51%	58%	42%	48%	54%
Oct-Jun 15	Jun 16-Sep	107	22	30	2	4	Yes	52%	57%	62%	46%	51%	57%
Oct-Jul	Aug-Sep	61	22	---	2	4	Yes	60%	63%	66%	56%	59%	62%
Oct-Jul	Aug-Sep	61	22	30	2	4	Yes	62%	65%	67%	59%	61%	63%
Alt 4a- Nov-Jun	Jul-Oct	123	22	---	2	4	Yes	46%	53%	59%	45%	50%	56%
Alt 4b- Nov-Jun	Jul-Oct	123	22	30	2	4	Yes	51%	56%	62%	49%	54%	58%
Nov 16-Jul	Aug-Nov 15	107	22	---	2	4	Yes	46%	52%	59%	47%	52%	57%
Nov 16-Jul	Aug-Nov 15	107	22	30	2	4	Yes	52%	57%	62%	51%	55%	59%
Nov-Jul	Aug-Oct	92	22	---	2	4	Yes	54%	58%	63%	54%	57%	60%
Nov-Jul	Aug-Oct	92	22	30	2	4	Yes	57%	61%	65%	56%	59%	62%
Dec-Aug	Sep-Nov	91	22	---	2	4	Yes	45%	52%	58%	41%	47%	54%
Dec-Aug	Sep-Nov	91	22	30	2	4	Yes	49%	54%	60%	45%	50%	55%
Nov-Aug	Sep-Oct	61	22	---	2	4	Yes	61%	64%	67%	62%	64%	65%
Nov-Aug	Sep-Oct	61	22	30	2	4	Yes	63%	65%	68%	63%	64%	65%
Reef fish Advisory Panel Feb-May Jul 8 –Dec 23	Jan 1-31 Jun 1-Jul 7 Dec 24-31	76	22	---	1	4	Yes	45%	52%	59%	40%	46%	53%

Color codes: Green – meets both ACL (minimum to rebuild) and ACT (target reductions)
Yellow - meets ACL (minimum to rebuild) but not ACT (target reductions)
Red - fails both ACL (minimum to rebuild) and ACT (target reductions) – rebuilding will not occur in 10 years.

Based on an effort shifting assumption of 1.5, the scenarios presented all meet the annual catch target reduction of 47% based on the 2009 baseline. They are less than the 61% target reduction under the 2006-2008 baseline, but meet the 53% rebuilding annual catch limit.


These management scenarios are for 2012 only. The analyses spreadsheets used for this section were designed to analyze reductions in 2011 and 2012. Beyond those years changes in the size distribution of the stock and uncertainties about the stock projections and management success make the use of the spreadsheets invalid. It is the intent that, as the stock recovers and annual catch limits and targets are increased, recreational management actions be re-evaluated on a year-by-year basis and modified when

appropriate under the Generic Framework Procedure being developed in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment.

2006-2008 vs. 2009 Baseline

The gag recreational sector annual catch target in 2012 is 1.03 million pounds (Table 1.4.1). To determine appropriate management actions, the impact of proposed actions is measured against recent harvest levels to determine the percent reduction needed, and achieved. Usually at least three years are averaged together to smooth out any unusual single year spikes or dips in landings, and 2006-2008 was initially selected as a typical baseline. However, catches in 2009 were clearly lower than in the previous years (Figure 2.2.1.1). The 2010 catches appear to be comparable to 2009, although the final numbers are not yet available (Figure 2.2.1).

Figure 2.2.1.1. Landings and dead discards by year, 2006-2010 and projected landings and dead discards for 2011-2012.



*Recreational landings for 2010 are estimated by the SEFSC. Commercial landings for 2010 are from the Gulf of Mexico individual fishing quota program. Dead discard estimates for 2010 are currently not available. Source: An Overview of the Gulf of Mexico Gag Grouper Recreational Decision Model, NMFS Southeast Regional Office.

These reductions in catches have been attributed to be primarily due to a reduction in effort as a result of the declining economic conditions rather than a decline in the gag population. An examination of effort changes reported by MRFSS supports this conclusion. The total average recreational gag catch (landings plus dead discards) were 30% less than the 2006-2008 period to 2009, while the fishing effort in the exclusive economic zone off Florida, where most of the gag fishing occurs, dropped by 29% (Table 2.2.1.2). Although this is just an approximate comparison because the effort attributed to gag fishing has not been partitioned out, it does suggest that effort and catches in 2009 have declined by a similar proportion.

Normally, a single year would not be used to represent a baseline because it might not be a typical year. However, the Florida exclusive economic zone effort in 2010 continued to be reduced according to

MRFSS estimates at 0.75 million angler trips (Recreational Fisheries Statistics Queries website), and 2010 gag catches appear comparable to 2009 (Figure 2.2.1.2). Thus, the 2009 baseline may represent a more typical catch and effort level from which to calculate percent reductions in the near future.

Table 2.2.1.2. Change in gag catch and in total Florida exclusive economic zone effort between the two baselines. Removals include both landed catch and dead discards. Effort is total estimated number of angler trips in the exclusive economic zone off of Florida. Source: NMFS Southeast Regional Office for removals, Recreational Fisheries Statistics Queries website for effort.

Baseline years	Total recreational removals	Florida EEZ effort
2006-2008 average	3.76 MP	1.24 mil. trips
2009	2.62 MP	0.88 mil. trips
Percent change	-30%	-29%

Gag Management Scenarios Discussion

The reductions needed in total removals (landed fish plus dead discards) needs to be between 36 and 61% depending on the baseline used to estimate the reductions and what fishing mortality rate value the sector is managed at. One of the challenges in selecting management alternatives is that actions to achieve reductions in the landed catch of gag often increase the number of discards and dead discards. This has been taken into account in calculating the expected reductions from various management scenarios. Changes in fishing effort due to possible changes in the status of the stock due to effects of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, are unknown at this time and have not been taken into account.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, would revert the management measures to the 2010 measures which keeps the recreational gag season open year-round except for the current February 1 – March 31 closed season on shallow-water grouper, and maintains the 22-inch TL minimum size limit for gag, 2-gag bag limit, and 4-grouper aggregate bag limit. Unlike the other alternatives which assume effort shifting of 1.5, under no action it's more reasonable to assume no effort shifting. Without effort shifting there is an expected 14% reduction in removals from the 2006-2008 baseline period (due to the 2009 reduction in the aggregate bag limit to 4 grouper, and establishment a 2-gag bag limit). Relative to the 2009 baseline there is an expected 1% increase in removals. This alternative would be insufficient to achieve a rebuilding of the gag stock.

Alternative 2 maintains the Fall recreational season established in 2011 by an interim rule: September 16 through November 15. All other bag and size limits remain unchanged. Relative to the 2009 baseline, this reduces removals by 60%, which exceeds the annual catch target reduction target of 47%. Relative to the 2006-08 baseline, this also reduces removals by 60%. This does not fully meet the annual catch target of 61% relative to the 2006-08 baseline, but it does exceed the annual catch limit and rebuilding yield reduction level of 53%. This alternative maintains the adopted regulations until changed by the Council in a plan amendment or framework action. It is therefore more conservative than **Alternative 4**, which allows less restrictive management measures in 2012.

Alternative 3 adopts a split season to allow fishermen an opportunity to fish for gag at different times of the year. The only combination that will allow at least two of months of fishing is to open the gag season for the months of January (winter season) and April (spring season). These months also coincide approximately with the beginning and ending of the gag spawning season. At an effort shifting of 1.5, relative to the 2009 baseline, this reduces removals by 52%, which exceeds the annual catch target

reduction target of 47%. Relative to the 2006-08 baseline, this reduces removals by 56%. This does not fully meet the annual catch target of 61% relative to the 2006-08 baseline, but it does exceed the annual catch limit and rebuilding yield reduction level of 53%. At a higher effort shifting of 2.0, this alternative does not meet either the annual catch limit or annual catch target reductions relative to the 2006-2008 baseline. This can be corrected by adopting a 22" to 30" slot limit, which would add an additional 2% to 3% reduction and meet the minimum 53% reduction needed to achieve annual catch limit and rebuilding. This alternative is similar to **Alternative 2** in that it allows 61 days of fishing, but it splits the season into two segments to provide more fishing opportunities. Its impact on the stock should be comparable to **Alternative 2**, but with greater uncertainty due to the insufficient levels of reduction relative to the 2006-2008 baseline at 2.0 effort shifting.

Preferred Alternative 4 sets the longest fishing season that is consistent with the reductions needed to adhere to the rebuilding plan. The season would be open from July 1 through October 31 (123 days). Bag limits would remain the same. There are two options for size limit.

Preferred Option a maintains the current 22" minimum size limit. This reduces removals by 50% from the 2009 baseline, which exceeds the annual catch target reduction target of 47%. Relative to the 2006-08 baseline, this reduces removals by 53%. This does not fully meet the annual catch target of 61% relative to the 2006-08 baseline, but it does equal the annual catch limit and rebuilding yield reduction level of 53% assuming that the 1.5 effort shifting is accurate.

Option b establishes a slot limit of 22" to 30". This reduces removals by 54% from the 2009 baseline, which exceeds the annual catch target reduction target of 47%. Relative to the 2006-08 baseline, this reduces removals by 56%. This also does not fully meet the annual catch target of 61% relative to the 2006-08 baseline, but it does exceed the annual catch limit and rebuilding yield reduction level of 53% assuming that the 1.5 effort shifting is accurate. This was initially a preferred option because it produced greater reduction in removals than Option a. However, due to concerns from the public that this would lead to increased release mortality of the larger spawning size fish, and a strong recommendation from the Reef Fish Advisory Panel that slot limits not be used, the Council switched its preferred option to Option a.

This alternative allows a fairly long season relative to the other alternatives by setting the season during months when gag fishing is at historically low levels. If effort during this period intensifies by more than the 1.5 assumed in the calculations, the catch levels may fail to achieve the reduction needed to rebuild the stock relative to the 2006-08 baseline, however, the annual catch limit reductions needed relative to the 2009 baseline will be met even at higher effort shifting. Given the longer length of the season and less emphasis on squeezing fishing trips into a limited period of time, effort shifting is likely to be less than for other alternatives. Because of the increased uncertainty as to whether the needed reductions relative to the 2006-2008 baseline can be achieved at higher effort shifting levels, **Alternative 4** is less conservative than **Alternative 2** and about equal to **Alternative 3**. **Option b** provides an additional 3% to 4% reduction than **Preferred Option a**, mitigating that uncertainty somewhat, but at the expense of increasing release mortality on spawning size fish..

In evaluating the alternatives developed by the Council, the Reef Fish Advisory Panel suggested another split season alternative consisting of a winter season from the last week of December through January, and a summer season from June through the first week of July. In order to allow this number of days, the bag limit is reduced to 1 gag per person. This satisfies regional needs for a gag fishing season. In southwest Florida the peak demand is for a winter season, particularly during the Christmas break, In the

northern Gulf of Mexico a summer season is preferred, particularly including the fourth of July weekend. Also, the summer season coincides with red snapper season. The AP preferred this arrangement because they felt it would reduce regulatory discards of red snapper while fishing for gag, and would give fishermen another target species besides the 1 gag under the reduced bag limit. Although the alternative contains fewer fishing days than **Alternative 4** (76 days vs. 123 days) the open days occur when there is increased demand for fishing. However, based on an effort shifting of 1.5, the advisory panel's recommendation falls slightly short of the 2009 annual catch target (47% reduction) by 1%, and falls slightly short of the 2006-08 annual catch limit rebuilding plan reduction (53%) by 1%. However, the advisory panel reasoned that there will be little fishing effort on Christmas day, and that throughout the open season there will be less than the 150% effort shifting assumed in the analyses. Under these assumptions the alternative could meet the 2009 target reduction and the 2006-2008 rebuilding reduction. The Council has yet to evaluate this recommendation as a viable alternative.

2.2.2 Action 2.2 Red Grouper Bag Limit

Note: At the time that this amendment was being prepared, a red grouper regulatory amendment was also being prepared that would increase the red grouper bag limit to either 3 or 4 fish beginning in 2011. However, the provision that the bag limit will revert to a lower bag limit if the sector annual catch limit is exceeded is not included in the regulatory amendment. This is a form of accountability measure, and accountability measures cannot currently be modified in a regulatory amendment (this will change when the new generic framework procedure is implemented from the Generic Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures Amendment). Consequently, if a bag limit increase is implemented through the regulatory amendment, this action will be used to consider adding the accountability measures to the increased bag limits. If the regulatory amendment is not implanted, then this action will be used to consider both the bag limit increase and its associated accountability measure.

The recreational red grouper allocation has not been met in recent years. With the proposed increase in red grouper total allowable catch, the recreational allocation will be increased, creating a larger difference between the allocation and the actual catch. An increase in the bag limit will allow the recreational sector to more fully harvest its allocation and achieve optimum yield.

Alternative 1. No action. The red grouper bag limit remains at 2 fish per person.

Alternative 2. Increase the red grouper bag limit to 3 fish per person. If at the end of any season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper annual catch limit, the red grouper bag limit will revert back to 2 fish.

Preferred Alternative 3. Increase the red grouper bag limit to 4 fish per person. If, at the end of any season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper annual catch limit, the bag limit will be reduced to 3 fish. If, at the end of any subsequent season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper annual catch limit again, the red grouper bag limit will revert back to 2 fish.

Red Grouper Bag Limit Discussion

The current (2011) recreational sector annual catch target for red grouper is 1.36 million pounds, and under the specification of annual catch limits and annual catch targets in this amendment (Section 1.4), the annual catch target will increase to 1.73 million pounds (Table 1.4.2). Recreational landings of red

grouper have been well below these targets, 0.82 million pounds in 2008 and 0.98 million pounds on 2009 (Table 1.1.4). Since 2000, recreational red grouper landings have been above the 1.73 million pound target only twice, in 2000 and 2004 (Table 1.1.4).

Red grouper is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing. The recreational sector has not caught its allocation of red grouper in recent years, and with an increase in catch limits in 2012 it is unlikely to catch its limits. Therefore, a relaxation of the recreational red grouper regulations is warranted to allow the sector to catch more of its allocation. However, because of a lack of recent catch data at increased bag limits, an accurate estimate of catch levels at increased bag limits cannot be made. The alternatives in this section propose increases in the bag limit be combined with an adaptive management approach that includes a feedback mechanism as a precautionary way to raise the bag limit.

Alternative 1 would leave the recreational red grouper bag limit at 2 fish. Given that the recreational sector is landing less than its allocation, this would likely to result in continued landings below the recreational allocation.

Alternative 2 increases the bag limit to 3-fish per person. However, it includes an adaptive management feedback mechanism that will reduce the bag limit back to 2 fish if, at the end of a subsequent season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its annual catch limit. Because the stock is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, the possibility of a onetime overage is unlikely to harm the stock, but this alternative would allow data collection on the impact of a 3-fish bag limit.

Preferred Alternative 3 increases the bag limit to 4 fish per person. This is the maximum possible under a 4 fish aggregate grouper bag limit. As with **Alternative 2**, this alternative includes an adaptive management feedback mechanism, but this one is operated in two stages. It will initially reduce the bag limit to 3 fish if, at the end of a subsequent season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its annual catch limit. If, even at 3 fish, the recreational sector exceeds its annual catch limit in a subsequent season, the bag limit will be further reduced back to the original 2 fish bag limit. The bag limit will not be reduced beyond 2 fish in this action. Because the stock is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, the possibility of overages in one or two years is unlikely to harm the stock, but this alternative would allow data collection on the impact of a 4 fish or 3 fish bag limit.

For purposes of accountability measures, the adaptive management provisions in **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3** will serve as a recreational red grouper accountability measures for the years in which they are implemented. This avoids having double accountability measures imposed on the recreational sector during the adaptive management phase of the regulation. However, this does not preclude the use of other accountability measures if deemed necessary.

2.3 Action 3. Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment to Account for Dead Discards

Reductions in the gag quota under the rebuilding plan assume a proportional reduction in dead discards of gag. However, due to the limited amount of gag individual fishing quota allocation available in the initial years of the gag rebuilding plan, gag bycatch and discards from fishermen targeting red grouper or other fish may be higher than assumed in the assessment projections. Dead discards are accounted for in the analyses of recreational management measures to achieve the recreational annual catch target, but not in the commercial allocation. This section is needed to explicitly account for dead discards in the commercial sector that are not accounted for in the assessment analyses.

Alternative 1. No action. The commercial gag quota will not contain any adjustment for dead discards of gag. Commercial quotas in million pounds gutted weight will be as follows (subject to accountability measure adjustments):

Year	Gag
2012	0.659 MP
2013	0.823 MP
2014	0.971 MP
2015+	1.092 MP

Preferred Alternative 2. Reduce the gag commercial quota to 86% of the annual catch target to compensate for dead discards not being reduced to projected levels needed to achieve 100% of the annual catch target. Commercial quotas in million pounds gutted weight will be as follows (subject to accountability measure adjustments):

Year	Gag
2012	0.567 MP
2013	0.708 MP
2014	0.835 MP
2015+	0.939 MP

Alternative 3. Reduce the gag commercial quota to 47% of the annual catch target to compensate for dead discards not being reduced to projected levels needed to achieve 100% of the annual catch target. Commercial quotas in million pounds gutted weight will be as follows (subject to accountability measure adjustments):

Year	Gag
2012	0.310 MP
2013	0.387 MP
2014	0.456 MP
2015+	0.513 MP

Discussion:

This section specifies gag quotas from 2012 forward. The shallow-water grouper quota will also be adjusted as the sum of the gag and red grouper quotas, plus an allowance of 0.41 million pounds gutted weight for other shallow-water grouper species (this allowance may change under the Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment). Unaccounted for dead discards from red grouper is not an issue because the catch limit for red grouper is being increased from historical levels. The gag annual catch limit and annual catch target are also being increased relative to the 2011 catch levels, but remain well below the 2006-2008 and 2009 baselines from which catch reductions are measured. Due to the limited amount of gag individual fishing quota shares available, fishermen targeting red grouper or other species and who catch gag as a bycatch may be forced to discard gag that they could have kept in the past. Although there may be a reduction in gag bycatch due to fewer fishermen targeting gag, observer data on the level of discards due to limited individual fishing quota allocation does not yet exist. The grouper individual fishing quota system is only one year old and has not yet operated under the reduced rebuilding gag quota. However, as a precautionary measure, in the 2011 interim rule the Council set the commercial gag quota at 86 percent of the annual catch target.

Longline vessels have historically landed about 34 percent of the commercial gag harvest (Table 1.1.1). As a result of the longline endorsement requirements implemented in 2010 under Amendment 31, the number of reef fish longline vessels is expected to have dropped substantially. In 2010, 62 vessels qualified for longline endorsements in communities associated with gag fishing (Table 3.3.3.6). In the past, longline vessels accounted for just 1 percent of the commercial gag discards primarily because of minimum size limit regulations (Table 2.5.1). Additional discards may occur in the future due to limited availability of gag individual fishing quota allocation. Because they are required by regulation to operate in deeper waters (beyond 20 fathoms, 35 fathoms, or 50 fathoms depending upon time and area), the release mortality rate from longline vessels is considered greater than for vertical line vessels.

Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. It leaves the gag quota at the full annual catch target level. This level of harvest assumes that dead discards in the commercial fishery will be reduced by the same proportion as the landed catch. If this assumption is not valid, then total removals of gag (landed plus dead discards) will exceed the levels projected in the assessment. The annual catch target provides a buffer from the annual catch level (for example, the 2012 commercial sector-annual catch limit is 0.788 MP vs. an annual catch target of 0.659 MP, a buffer of 0.129 MP or 16% of annual catch limit), but this may not be enough to offset increased removals from unaccounted for dead discards.

Preferred Alternative 2 follows the precedent of the 2011 gag interim rule and reduces the commercial quota to 86 percent of the annual catch target. At the February 2011 Council meeting, NMFS presented an analysis of best case and worst case scenarios regarding reduction of gag bycatch in proportion to the reduction in gag commercial quota under the temporary rule to set 2011 quota⁸. A new unknown factor was how fishermen would behave under the newly implemented grouper IFQ system. If fishermen with little or no gag allocation actively sought to avoid gag while fishing for red grouper and other shallow-water grouper, then dead discards of gag would be reduced approximately in proportion to the reduction in quota. However, if fishermen maintained their pre-IFQ fishing patterns, then dead discards of gag would not be reduced and could increase. Under the best case scenario, no adjustment for dead discards would be necessary, and the quota could remain at 100% of the commercial allocation. Under the worst

⁸ Amendment 32 management measure analyses. PowerPoint presentation by Andy Strelcheck at the February 2011 Council meeting in Gulfport, Mississippi.

case scenario, the quota would need to be reduced to 47% of the unadjusted allocation in order to achieve the necessary reduction in total removals after accounting for dead discards to stay in line with the rebuilding plan. The Council felt that the true scenario would be in between the best and worst case scenarios, but probably closer to the best case. After discussion, the Council decided to place the adjustment at the 75th percentile between worst and best case. This was calculated to be 86% of the unadjusted allocation, or a 14% reduction. This adjustment was applied in the 2011 temporary rule, and has been carried over in **Preferred Alternative 2** of Action as the best available information. In future years, observer data may provide better estimates of the gag discard levels occurring in the commercial grouper fishery during the rebuilding plan, and the quota adjustment can be modified through a framework procedure.

Alternative 3 represents the worst case scenario, which is that dead discards remain at the 2006-2008 level. Analyses presented to the Council by NMFS analysts in February 2011 in conjunction with the 2011 gag interim rule indicated that, if dead discards remain at the 2006-2008 level, the directed quota would need to be reduced to 47 percent of the annual catch target to compensate. If this alternative is adopted, it will result in a reduction rather than an increase in the commercial gag quota from 2011 to 2012.

2.4 Action 4. Adjustments to Multi-use Individual Fishing Quota Shares

Alternative 1. No Action. Do not modify percentages of red grouper and gag individual fishing quota allocation converted into multi-use allocation. At the beginning of each fishing year, 4% of red grouper allocation would be converted into multi-use allocation and 8% of gag allocation would be converted into multi-use allocation.

Alternative 2. Based on the commercial gag annual catch limit, gag allocation, and red grouper allocation, set the percentage of red grouper individual fishing quota allocation converted into multi-use allocation as follows:

$$\text{Red Grouper Multi-use (in percent)} = 100 * [\text{Gag annual catch limit} - \text{Gag Allocation}] / \text{Red Grouper Allocation}$$

The red grouper multi-use percentage will be recalculated following adjustments in commercial gag annual catch limit, gag allocation, or red grouper allocation.

Preferred Alternative 3. If a the rebuilding plan for red grouper is in effect, set the percentage of gag individual fishing quota allocation converted into multi-use allocation equal to zero. After NOAA Fisheries declares red grouper rebuilt, set the percentage of gag individual fishing quota allocation converted into multi-use allocation as follows

$$\text{Gag Multi-use (in percent)} = 100 * [\text{Red Grouper annual catch limit} - \text{Red Grouper Allocation}] / \text{Gag Allocation}$$

The gag multi-use percentage will be recalculated following adjustments in red grouper annual catch limit, red grouper allocation, or gag allocation.

Preferred Alternative 4. If a the rebuilding plan for gag is in effect, set the percentage of red grouper individual fishing quota allocation converted into multi-use allocation equal to zero. After NOAA

Fisheries declares gag rebuilt, set the percentage of red grouper individual fishing quota allocation converted into multi-use allocation as follows:

$$\text{Red Grouper Multi-use (in percent)} = 100 * [\text{Gag annual catch limit} - \text{Gag Allocation}] / \text{Red Grouper Allocation}$$

The red grouper multi-use percentage will be recalculated following adjustments in commercial gag annual catch limit, gag allocation, or red grouper allocation.

Discussion:

In 2010 a multi-species individual fishing quota (IFQ) system was implemented for the commercial grouper and tilefish fisheries (Reef Fish Amendment 29, GMFMC. 2008a). Multi-species IFQ program participants benefit from the creation of catch quota balancing measures such as multi-use shares which help participants respond to temporal fluctuations (e.g., recruitment pulses) and geographical variations (e.g., different areas of the Gulf) in gag and red grouper abundance. To account for varying gag to red grouper ratios, at the beginning of each fishing year a percentage of the gag and red grouper allocations are designated as multi-use allocation, valid for harvesting either red or gag grouper. Amendment 29 established that 4 percent of red grouper allocation and 8 percent of gag allocation be converted to multi-use. However, under the reduced red grouper and gag annual catch limits expected to be implemented in this amendment, it is possible that the use of multi-use allocation could result in commercial harvest of red grouper or gag exceeding its sector allocation. To prevent this from happening, adjustments need to be made to the provision for multi-use allocation in the grouper individual fishing quota system.

Alternative 1 would maintain the multi-use allocation percentages originally set in Reef Fish Amendment 29, i.e., 8% of the gag allocation and 4% of red grouper allocation converted into multi-use allocation valid for the harvest of gag or red grouper. **Alternative 1** (No Action) is expected to result in red grouper or gag harvests that would exceed specified catch limits.

Alternative 2 would set red grouper multi-use allocation based on the difference between the gag annual catch limit and individual fishing quota allocation. The existence of a gap between the annual catch limit and the individual fishing quota allocation implies that the individual fishing quota allocation is set equal to the annual catch target. In the absence of a gap, the commercial gag allocation is equal to the annual catch limit. In setting the percentage of red grouper allocation that could be converted into multi-use allocation, **Alternative 2** accounts for changes in the relative magnitude of the gag and red grouper annual catch limits and allocations considered in this amendment. In addition, under **Alternative 2**, future changes in annual catch limits and/or allocations would result in a recalculation of the percentage of red grouper allocation that can be converted into multi-use allocation while preventing the commercial gag harvest from exceeding the commercial gag annual catch limit.

If red grouper is not under a rebuilding plan, **Preferred Alternative 3** would set gag multi-use allocation based on the difference between the commercial red grouper annual catch limit and allocation. It follows that if the red grouper annual catch limit and allocation are equal, the issuance of gag multi use allocation would result in harvesting red grouper above its specified catch limit. Given the relative magnitude of the red grouper and gag annual catch limits and allocation, it is conceivable that the totality of the gag allocation could be converted to multi-use allocation and used to harvest red grouper without running the risk of exceeding the red grouper catch limit. The percentage of gag allocation converted into multi-use

allocation valid to harvest gag or red grouper is set to zero if red grouper is under a rebuilding plan, affording additional protection to the red grouper stock while it rebuilds.

Preferred Alternative 3 would also result in a recalculation of the allowable amount of multi use allocation whenever commercial red grouper and/or gag annual catch limits or allocations are adjusted. Under **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3**, the level of flexibility afforded to individual fishing quota participants, as measured by the amount of multi use allocation issued is proportional to the difference between the commercial red grouper annual catch limit and allocation and between the commercial gag annual catch limit and allocation.

Preferred Alternative 4 would set the percentage of red grouper multi-use allocation equal to zero if a rebuilding plan for gag grouper is in effect. After the gag stock is fully rebuilt, the percentage of red grouper allocation converted into red grouper multi-use allocation valid to harvest red or gag grouper would be determined based on the difference between the gag annual catch limit and individual fishing quota allocation and on the magnitude of the red grouper annual catch limit. In effect, after the gag stock is fully rebuilt, the percentage of red grouper multi-use allocation under **Preferred Alternative 4** is equivalent to the one considered under **Alternative 2**. **Preferred Alternative 4** is expected to provide additional protection to gag while its stock is rebuilding.

Adjustments to multi-use allocations considered under this action are well within the provisions of the grouper and tilefish individual fishing quota program included in Reef Fish Amendment 29. These provisions stipulate that the Council could create new share types and adjust existing share types to further its conservation mission or to improve the management of the individual fishing quota program.

2.5 Action 5. Commercial Gag Size Limit

In 2011, there will be a large difference between the red grouper and gag commercial quotas. The gag bycatch must either be taken into account in managing the gag and red grouper quotas, or gag bycatch needs to be reduced. The commercial sector fishes in deeper waters on average than the recreational sector, and has a higher discard mortality rate. One possible way to reduce gag regulatory dead discards may be to reduce the commercial minimum size limit.

Alternative 1. No action. The commercial gag minimum size limit remains at 24 inches total length.

Preferred Alternative 2. Reduce the commercial gag minimum size limit to 22 inches total length.

Alternative 3. Reduce the commercial gag minimum size limit to 20 inches total length.

Alternative 4. Eliminate the commercial gag minimum size limit.

Discussion:

The SEDAR 10 assessment estimated that the average release mortality rate for gag in the commercial sector was 67% (Ortiz 2006). A major concern is bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag while fishermen target red grouper, due to the disproportionate amount of red grouper harvested versus gag harvested.

A 20 inch minimum size limit for gag was implemented in 1990 under Amendment 1, and remained in place from 1990-1999. During this period, handline discards (in numbers of fish) ranged from approximately 18,000 to 24,000 gag per year, and longline discards ranged from 119 to 229 gag per year. In 2000, the commercial minimum size limit for gag was increased from 20 inches total length to 24 inches total length. As a result, there was an increase in discards in both the handline and longline sectors. From 2000 to 2004, handline annual discards ranged from approximately 85,000 to 97,000 gag, while longline annual discards ranged from 688 to 785. Trip limits for commercial grouper began in 2005, and from 2005 to 2008, the number of gag discards in the handline fishery increased again, ranging from 105,000 to 121,000 fish. The longline fishery did not see any increase in discards due to the trip limit, possibly due to that sector targeting red grouper more than gag. Longline discards during 2005-2008 ranged from 550 to 657 gag (Table 2.5.1).

An issue that arose during Council discussion of reducing the size limit is a greater desirability by restaurants for larger sized grouper. A reduction in the minimum size limit could result in a price differential by size and encourage high grading by fishermen. High grading is when fishermen selectively keep larger fish and discard smaller, but legally harvestable fish.

Table 2.5.1. Estimated commercial handline and longline discards in numbers for Gulf of Mexico gag. Source: January 2011 rerun of 2009 gag update assessment using commercial observer data.

Year	January 2011 Rerun	
	Handline	Longline
1990	18,022	126
1991	28,872	229
1992	22,747	141
1993	20,959	119
1994	26,747	148
1995	24,701	126
1996	24,247	135
1997	22,857	157
1998	21,981	146
1999	23,895	171
2000	97,613	778
2001	84,731	785
2002	93,866	688
2003	96,811	748
2004	91,052	726
2005	105,446	550
2006	111,450	657
2007	120,881	595
2008	110,168	618

Beginning in 2011, there will be a large difference between the red grouper and gag commercial quotas, 4.32 million pounds (red grouper) vs. 0.43 million pounds (gag) in 2011. This will result in a red grouper to gag ratio of 10:1. In 2009, the commercial ratio of red grouper to gag landings was 4:1. If commercial fishermen continue to catch gag in 2011 at the same ratio as in 2009, then 6 out of every 10 pounds of gag caught will have to be discarded due to insufficient individual fishing quota allocation. This could potentially amount as much as 1.08 million pounds of gag, of which 60%, or 648,000 pounds, could be discarded dead.

The primary focus of any additional commercial management measures will need to be on decreasing gag bycatch mortality by reducing the number of gag caught. Time and area closures that direct fishing away from areas of high gag concentrations are a possible approach and are discussed in Action 6. Reducing the minimum size limit may reduce some regulatory discards to the extent that a fisherman has individual fishing quota allocation to retain legal sized catch, but catching smaller fish will increase the number of fish needed to fill the individual fishing quota allocation, which could increase the fishing mortality rate (Table 2.5.2). Furthermore, while the percent reductions in discards may seem large, the absolute number of fish discarded is relatively small, particularly for the longline fishery (Table 2.5.1). A reduction in the size limit to 18 inches would reduce the number of discards in the handline fishery by up to 86 thousand fish, but would reduce the number of discards in the longline fishery by only 420 fish (Table 2.5.2). A reduction to 20 inches would have even less impact, reducing discards in the handline and longline fishery by about 67 thousand fish and 297 fish respectively (Table 2.5.2).

Table 2.5.2. Estimated percent increases in number of gag landed within a given IFQ share and percent and number reductions in total gag discards at minimum size limits of 18" to 24", by gear type. Source: Andy Strelcheck presentation to Council February 2011.


Vertical Line – Numbers of Fish				Longline – Numbers of Fish			
Size Limit	Landings increase %	Discard reduction %	Discard reduction Numbers of fish	Size Limit	Landings increase %	Discard reduction %	Discard reduction Numbers of fish
18"	38.2%	-79.9%	86,132	18"	1.3%	-66.7%	420
19"	35.1%	-73.3%	79,017	19"	1.1%	-58.3%	367
20"	29.7%	-62.0%	66,836	20"	0.9%	-47.2%	297
21"	23.2%	-48.4%	52,175	21"	0.8%	-38.9%	245
22"	14.9%	-31.0%	33,418	22"	0.5%	-27.8%	175
23"	7.5%	-15.7%	16,925	23"	0.4%	-19.4%	122
24"	0.0%	0.0%	0	24"	0.0%	0.0	0

Note: Estimated discard reductions in numbers of fish are based on the average number of discards during 2004-2008 as shown in Table 2.5.1

Due to the small quotas relative to historical catch levels, the primary factor affecting gag discards is expected to be availability of gag individual fishing quota allocation, at least for the first few years of the rebuilding program.

Female gag reach 50% maturity at about 23 inches (Figure 2.5.1). At smaller size limits, the majority of the fish will not yet have spawned. Reducing the size limit will reduce spawning potential and could negatively impact the rebuilding plan.

Figure 2.5.1. Gag percent maturity by size. Source: SEDAR Gag Update Assessment (SEDAR 2009a) and Andy Strelcheck presentation to Council February 2011.



Alternative 1, no action, would leave the commercial gag minimum size limit at 24 inches total length. This is approximately the size at 50% female maturity. Regulatory discards due to the minimum size limit would continue at the current rate. However, in the commercial sector, the average size of a gag caught is already near this size limit, so discards due to the size limit are relatively low.

Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternatives 3 and 4 would reduce gag bycatch by reducing the size limit and converting bycatch that is currently due to regulatory discards into retained catch. Because the 50% female maturity level is at 24", the likelihood of harvested gag being juveniles would increase. However, for commercial longline component, the average size of a gag caught is already near the size limit; thus there will be less effect on the longline component than on the vertical line component from size limit reductions (Table 2.5.2).

Preferred Alternative 2 reduces the commercial minimum size limit from 24 inches to 22 inches, matching the current recreational minimum size limit. It takes approximately six months for a gag to grow from 22 to 24 inches (3 years old to 3.5 years old). Until a fisherman's individual fishing quota allocation is reached, this alternative is expected to reduce total gag discards (live plus dead) by 31% for the vertical line component and by 27.8% for the longline component. At the same time, the number of gag needed to fill an individual fishing quota share is expected to increase by 14.9% for the vertical line component, and by 0.5% for the longline component. This would have the advantage of simplifying enforcement by having a single size limit for both sectors (assuming that the recreational size limit is not changed.) As discussed earlier, there is a potential for a price differential by size to develop due to the greater desirability of larger grouper by restaurants, but this alternative creates a minimal change.

Alternative 3 reduces the commercial minimum size limit from 24 to 20 inches. Until a fisherman's individual fishing quota allocation is reached, this alternative is expected to reduce total gag discards (live plus dead) by 62% for the vertical line component of the fishery and by 47.2% for the longline component. At the same time, the number of gag needed to fill an individual fishing quota allocation is expected to increase by 29.7% for the vertical line component, and by 0.9% for the longline component. It takes approximately one year for a gag to grow from 20 to 24 inches (from 2.5 years old to 3.6 years old). This size limit has a greater likelihood of creating a price differential by size and resulting in high grading.

Alternative 4 eliminates the minimum size limit and requires that all commercially caught gag be retained regardless of size. It also requires that a fisherman control enough allocation of gag shares to cover any gag caught. Grouper sizes in the commercial sector have been recorded as small as 11 inches prior to the implementation of size limits, but the numbers landed are few below 18 inches. At the smallest size limit analyzed, 18 inches, the expected reduction in total gag discards (live plus dead) is 79.9% for the vertical line component and 66.7% for the longline component. At the same time, the increase in number of gag needed to fill an individual fishing quota allocation is expected to be 38.2% for the vertical line component, and by 1.3% for the longline component. At size limits less than 18 inches, these values will only change to a small extent because both gears become less selective for gag at the smaller sizes. The requirement to have enough allocation effectively requires that a vessel stop fishing if it has no additional gag allocation and is in an area where gag may be caught, because it will be illegal both to discard or retain the fish. However, in the absence of on-board observers, some vessels may

continue to discard their gag bycatch, reducing the effectiveness of this requirement. To the extent that there is a market demand for larger fish, this alternative is likely to create a price differential for larger size fish. Given the limited amount of gag individual fishing quota shares being distributed, this could encourage high grading by fishermen in order to maximize the economic return of individual fishing quota shares.

2.6 Action 6. Time and Area Closures

*Note: more than one alternative and option can be selected as preferred

Preferred Alternative 1. No Action, Do not create additional time and area closures that prohibit fishing for gag and other reef fishes.

Alternative 2. Close an area that would expand the Madison-Swanson Restricted Fishing Area to the north and west (approximately 70 square nm additional), making one continuous area.

Boundaries for additional area:

- 1) 29° 20' N, 85° 55' W (new NW corner)
- 2) 29° 20' N, 85° 38' W (new NE corner)
- 3) 29° 17' N, 85° 38' W (current NE corner)
- 4) 29° 17' N, 85° 50' W (current NE corner)
- 5) 29° 14' N, 85° 50' W (current NW corner)
- 6) 29° 14' N, 85° 55' W (SW corner of extension)

Period and type of fishing closure that can be selected:

Option a: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, surface trolling allowed May 1 through October 31 (Identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps regulations).

Option b: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through October 31 (Time of year identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, but different regulations).

Option c: all fishing prohibited January 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through December 31 (Identical to current Edges regulations).

Option d: all fishing prohibited year-round.

Alternative 3. Close an area bracketing the 40 fathom contour between the current closed areas of Madison-Swanson and the Edges (approximately 244 square nm), making it one continuous area.

Boundaries for additional area:

- 1) 29° 6' N, 85° 38' W (Existing SE boundary of Madison-Swanson)
- 2) 29° 17' N, 85° 38' W (Existing NE boundary of Madison-Swanson)
- 3) 28° 51' N, 85° 16' W (Existing NW boundary of the Edges)
- 4) 28° 51' N, 85° 4' W (Existing NE boundary of the Edges)

Period and type of fishing closure that can be selected:

Option a: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, surface trolling allowed May 1 through October 31 (Identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps regulations).

Option b: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through October 31 (Time of year identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, but different regulations).

Option c: all fishing prohibited January 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through December 31 (Identical to current Edges regulations).

Option d: all fishing prohibited year-round.

Alternative 4. Modify the seasonal closure dates of The Edges 40 fathom contour area (approximately 390 square nm). Currently, all fishing is prohibited January 1 through April 30, all fishing is allowed May 1 through December 31.

Period and type of fishing closure that can be selected:

Option a: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, surface trolling allowed May 1 through October 31 (Identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps regulations).

Option b: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through October 31 (Time of year identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, but different regulations).

Option c: all fishing prohibited January 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through December 31 (Identical to current Edges regulations).

Option d: all fishing prohibited year-round.

Alternative 5. Modify the seasonal closure dates of Madison-Swanson (approximately 115 square nm) and Steamboat Lumps (approximately 104 square nm) areas. Currently, all fishing is prohibited November 1 through April 30 and surface trolling for species other than reef fish is allowed May 1 through October 31.

Period and type of fishing closure that can be selected:

Option a: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, surface trolling allowed May 1 through October 31 (Identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps regulations).

Option b: all fishing prohibited November 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through October 31 (Time of year identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, but different regulations).

Option c: all fishing prohibited January 1 through April 30, all fishing allowed May 1 through December 31 (Identical to current Edges regulations).

Option d: all fishing prohibited year-round.

Note: *In the alternatives, the phrase “all fishing prohibited” means the same fishing restrictions that apply during November through April for the Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps restricted fishing areas as described in 50 CFR 622.34(k)(3), i.e., “all fishing is prohibited, and possession of any fish species is prohibited, except for such possession aboard a vessel in transit with fishing gear stowed as specified in paragraph (k)(4) of this section. The provisions of this paragraph, (k)(3), do not apply to highly migratory species”.

Discussion:

The main objective of time and area closures in Amendment 30B was to protect spawning aggregations of gag and to protect a portion of the male gag population particularly vulnerable to fishing during spawning (Gilmore and Jones 1992; Coleman et al. 1996; Koenig et al. 1996; GMFMC 2008a). Gag spawning occurs on offshore reefs from southeast of Apalachicola to west of Tampa, and possibly further to the south (Koenig et al. 1996). Gag spawn from mid-January until mid-April, but peak spawning occurs in March (SEDAR 10 2006). Red grouper spawn from February until mid-July, with peak spawning occurring in March-May (Fitzhugh et al. 2006). Currently there are three marine protected areas in the Gulf of Mexico (Figure 2.6.1). Two areas, Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps are closed to all fishing November 1 through April 30, with surface trolling allowed May 1 through October 31. These closed areas were established in 1999 through a regulatory amendment (GMFMC 1999) and implemented in 2000. There have been some poaching issues reported within the marine protected areas since their closure in 1999 (discussed later), but a draft report suggests the importance of these marine protected areas may go beyond providing protection for spawning aggregations. For example, the number of male gag (including transitional males) were found to be greater inside the Madison-Swanson protected area compared to outside the reserve not only during the time spawning aggregations were formed (December-March), but also post-spawning (April-July). This information suggests that Madison-Swanson not only provides protection while gag are forming spawning aggregations, but at other times of the year (Draft Final MARFIN Report NA07NMF4330120, FSU Grant No. 022106; C. Koenig and F. Coleman 2011).

The Council added a third marine protected area, the Edges, which is closed to all fishing January 1 through April 30, but open to all fishing May 1 through December 31. This seasonal-area closure was established through Amendment 30B and implemented in 2009 (GMFMC 2008). All of the above alternatives, including the existing Madison-Swanson, Steamboat Lumps, and Edges restricted fishing areas, are located within the dominant spawning areas and seasons for gag.

In addition to protecting spawning aggregations, closed areas where gag and red grouper are abundant could reduce bycatch and therefore bycatch mortality of gag while fishers are targeting red grouper. Strelcheck et al. (2010) used observer data from 2006-2010 and reported gag and red grouper were only caught on the same set 12 to 38% of all the sets fished in statistical zones 4 through 8⁹. Only sets landing at least one gag or one red grouper were included in the analysis of statistical zones 4 through 8 (Figure 2.6.2). This analysis found gag and red grouper were caught together in the current closed areas (Madison-Swanson, Steamboat Lumps, and the Edges) and the two additional alternatives for area closures (**Alternatives 2** and **Alternative 3**). The proposed and current closed areas are within statistical zones 6 and 8 where 18% and 20% of the gag and red grouper were caught on a set together respectively (Figures 2.6.2 and 2.6.3). Due to the release of a limited commercial gag quota and the ratio of gag to red grouper quota being reduced, gag bycatch may increase.

⁹ The Gulf of Mexico is divided into 21 statistical zones (fishing areas) developed by NMFS to simplify reporting of fisheries landings and effort data.




Figure 2.6.1. Current west Florida Marine Protected Areas (Madison-Swanson, the Edges, and Steamboat Lumps) and proposed Alternative 2 and 3 area closures.




Figure 2.6.2. Percent of observed sets (all gears) from the commercial Reef Fish Observer Program (2006-2010) landing gag and red grouper, gag only, and red grouper only by statistical zone; only sets landing at least one gag or one red grouper were included. Source: A. Strelcheck and N. Farmer, PowerPoint Presentation February 2011.




Figure 2.6.3. Statistical zones 4-8 with current and proposed area closures.




Figure 2.6.4. Estimated discard mortality of gag by depth (m) from the northern Gulf of Mexico.
Source: Burns et al. (2002).

Studies conducted on gag and red grouper discards determined that discard mortality increases with increasing depths (Burns et al. 2002; McGovern et al. 2005). Therefore, it may be beneficial to close areas where red grouper and gag are abundant, particularly at greater depths due to increasing mortality as documented by Burns et al. (2002) study of depth-of-capture estimated discard mortality (Figure 2.6.4). This study focused on the commercial component of the reef fish fishery in the northern Gulf, capturing gag and other reef fish species with electric reels and circle hooks. When undersized gag and other reef fish were caught, they were tagged and then returned to capture depth in cages to document depth-of-capture related mortality. Burns et al. (2002) estimated released fish captured from 50 m had a 50% mortality rate and by 100 m a 100% estimated mortality rate (Figure 2.6.4). Using the estimated discard mortality of gag data and applying it to the current and proposed area closures resulted in high estimated discard mortality ranging from 84 to 95% (Figure 2.6.5). In addition to mortality estimates, depth-related trauma was documented to intensify with increasing depths, such as everted (turned outwards or inside out) stomach, intestines, and eyes. A similar study was conducted in the South Atlantic on depth-related mortality of gag from tagging studies utilizing the commercial fleet, but included greater depths than the Gulf study (McGovern et al. 2005). Their study showed similar depth related mortality estimates ranging from 14% at 15 m to 95% at 95 m (McGovern et al. 2005).




Figure 2.6.5. Estimated discard mortality of gag in current and proposed area closures from the northeastern Gulf of Mexico based on tag returns and the logistic model fit in Figure 2.6.4. Source: Burns et al. (2002).

All current and proposed additional area closures are in deep water (75-150 m), and if fishers were targeting other reef species in those areas, bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag may increase with decreased quota. Adult gag can typically be found over a broad range of depths compared to other shallow-water groupers the Council manages. For example, adult gag typically range from shore to 120 m; whereas, adult red grouper typically range from 40 to 150 m (Parker and Mays 1998; C. Koenig personal communication 2011). Farmer et al. (2010) found red grouper, black grouper, gag, and scamp were caught together most often in the commercial sector. Other reef fish that were caught with gag by the commercial longline component of the reef fish fishery included: red grouper, yellowedge grouper, tilefish (golden), and snowy grouper whereas the commercial vertical line component of the reef fishery caught gag with the following species: red snapper, vermilion snapper, and red grouper.

Reductions in gag fishing effort are expected from closing documented areas where high densities of gag and gag spawning aggregations are known to occur. However, it is difficult to quantify the magnitude of these reductions as well as any reductions in bycatch or bycatch mortality due to effort shifting outside these closed areas. The estimated percent landings within the closed area by period could provide guidance, but are not recommended for use as an equivalent percent reduction in gag landings and bycatch that would be achieved if the areas were closed (Table 2.6.1). This is primarily due to the limited data time series and effort shifting outside the closed areas. **Option a** allows surface trolling May 1 through October 31 with the assumption that surface trolling does not catch reef fish due to the closures being located in deep water, therefore it was excluded from this analysis as it is similar to **Option d**.

Table 2.6.1. Current and proposed seasonal area closures, size of the area in square nautical miles (nm), period of closure, percentage of the west Florida shelf that would be closed (% of shelf closed), and percentage of gag and red grouper landings in the closed area.

Closure	Area (nm ²)	Period	% of shelf closed	% landings in area	
				Gag	Red grouper
Pref. Alt 1-None	0	No Closure	0	0	0
Alt 2-Extension of Madison-Swanson	70	b. (Nov 1-Apr 30)	0.2	0.63	0.08
Alt 2-Extension of Madison-Swanson		c. (Jan 1-Apr 30)		0.55	0.06
Alt 2-Extension of Madison-Swanson		d. Year round		1.25	0.39
Alt 3-Extension of the Edges	244	b. (Nov 1-Apr 30)	0.7	3.98	0.43
Alt 3-Extension of the Edges		c. (Jan 1-Apr 30)		3.23	0.26
Alt 3-Extension of the Edges		d. Year round		5.92	0.93
The Edges	390	b. (Nov 1-Apr 30)	1.1	5.00	1.08
The Edges		c. (Jan 1-Apr 30)		4.13	0.57
The Edges		d. Year round		8.92	2.41

Source: A. Strelcheck and N. Farmer, Southeast Regional Office, July 2011. Notes: Analysis was derived from vessel monitoring systems linked with logbook landings from January 2008-August 2009.

Preferred Alternative 1 is the no action alternative and would not create time and area closures prohibiting fishing for gag or other reef fishes. The Council selected the no action alternative as preferred primarily because of the negative social and economic impacts compared to the measurable biological benefits. These effects are discussed briefly in this section and in greater detail in Section 5. For

example, by closing a particular area numerous biological and ecological benefits were expected; however, these were not quantifiable due to effort shifting outside the closed areas. As previously discussed, only the percent landings by the commercial sector of gag and red grouper could be obtained by area and season (Table 2.6.1). In general closing fishing areas remains a controversial issue and requires well defined rationale and trade-offs for closing a fishing area, particularly large fishing area(s). The Council had previously selected Alternative 3 option c at the April 2011 meeting as the preferred alternative, but this did not pass during the full Council meeting in August 2011 when the Council took final action on this amendment. Other Councils, such as the South Atlantic Council have used area closures when a species has been declared overfished as an additional effort to rebuild the stock.

Alternative 2 would expand the Madison-Swanson Restricted Fishing Area to the north and west, named the Extended Madison-Swanson area in Amendment 30B (Figure 2.7.1). This area is smaller (approximately 70 square nautical miles) than the other area closures, but has gag densities equal to or higher than the Edges (Harter and David 2009). **Alternative 2** would close waters that range in depth from 25-83 fathoms. Increasing the area of a current closure could also improve the effectiveness of the existing Madison-Swanson reserve by increasing the probability of protecting the home range of adult gag. There is some evidence that upon reaching older ages and moving to outer shelf depths associated with spawning habitats, gag have higher site fidelity (Coleman et al. 1996). Ongoing work suggests large male “copperbelly” gag tagged in spawning areas show relatively high site fidelity suggesting that time and area closures aid in protection of spawning aggregations (C. Koenig, personal communication; SEDAR 10 2006).

Another assumption about effective marine protected areas requires that closed areas are of sufficient size to protect enough individuals to maintain genetic diversity and maintain the species population throughout the stock’s range. During an Ecosystem Modeling workshop on red snapper in 2008, the workgroup made preliminary recommendations, but stated they were limited by a lack of information on the spatial distribution of hard bottom habitat. Their preliminary evaluation of marine reserves and ecosystem models based on simulation trials was that the offshore marine protected areas are likely to have almost no impact on fish abundance or fishing rates, because effort would be displaced from the protected offshore areas to potentially target inshore areas where younger fish occur. Only the very large cross-shelf onshore-offshore areas that protect a range of species from fishing throughout their life-cycle had impacts on fishing rates comparable to those achievable through extensive seasonal closures (Ecosystem Modeling Workshop Report 2008). However, increasing the size of a closed area may reduce “edge effects”. Edge effects have been documented in areas where multiple closed marine protected areas exist. Fishers “fish the line” or as close to the edge of the reserve as possible hoping to catch species that spill over from the reserve into legally fishable waters (Kellner et al. 2007). Based on analysis of commercial landings in **Alternative 2, Option d** the percent landings attributed to that area for gag and red grouper are 1.3 to 0.4%, respectively (Table 2.6.1). This information suggests that commercial fishers may not be actively targeting red grouper in this area and closing this area may not reduce bycatch mortality of gag.

Alternative 3 would close the area bracketing the 40 fathom contour between the current closed areas of Madison-Swanson and the Edges, an area approximately 244 square nautical miles for a period of four months during peak spawning (**Option c**). Waters in this area range in depth from 22-68 fathoms. The Edges, currently closed January 1 through April 30 to protect spawning aggregations, is 62% larger than **Alternative 3**. The percent landings attributed to the current Edges closure from January 1 through April 30 is 4.1% for gag and 0.6% for red grouper (Table 2.6.1). If the current Edges closure is combined with **Option c** the total percent landings attributed to that area for gag is 7.4% and red grouper is 0.8% (Table 2.6.1). This area was anecdotally documented by fishers as an area with gag spawning aggregations with

a subsequent study by Koenig et al. (1996) providing evidence for the fishers' observations. Spawning depths range from 27 to 66 fathoms, but are concentrated around 44 fathoms (Koenig et al. 1996). Based on commercial landings data from January 2008-August 2009 the percentage of gag and red grouper landings from this area if closed year round are greater than those in **Alternative 2**.

There are four proposed options for modifying the period and type of fishing closure that can be applied to any of the four alternatives. There are numerous benefits to having consistent regulations for all of the areas, such as simplifying the regulations, reducing public confusion, aiding enforcement, and voluntary compliance. **Option a** would prohibit all fishing November 1 through April 30, but surface trolling would be allowed May 1 through October 31. These regulations are identical to the current Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps regulations. The reductions expected from **Option a** are similar to **Option d**. **Option b** would prohibit all fishing November 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing May 1 through October 31. The time period the fishing season is closed is identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, but the fishing regulations are different. **Option c** would prohibit all fishing January 1 through April 30, and allow all fishing May 1 through December 31. The Council selected these alternatives as preferred to maintain consistency with the adjacent closed area, the Edges. The period this area would be closed is expected to protect gag spawning aggregations and reduce bycatch of gag while fishers are targeting other reef fish species. These regulations are identical to current Edges marine protected area regulations. **Option d** would prohibit all fishing year-round. See Table 2.6.1 for the percentage of gag and red grouper landings attributed to each area by period.

Alternative 4 would modify the seasonal closure dates of the Edges, a marine protected area implemented in 2009 along the 40 fathom contour. Modifying the closed season from the current closure prohibiting all fishing January 1 through April 30 (**Option c**), to any of the other options would provide an increase in the number of months the marine protected area is currently closed, thereby providing additional protection to gag and other reef fish species from fishing and bycatch mortality (**Option a, b, and d**). However, **Option b** would allow all fishing May 1 through October 31, whereas **Option a** would only allow surface trolling during the same time period providing additional protection to reef fishes. **Option d** would provide year-round protection to all reef fish species. A year-round fishing closure could be more beneficial for rebuilding the gag stock if large resident males are protected from fishing mortality both during and post-spawning. The bycatch mortality of gag could also be reduced based on commercial landings data from January 2008-August 2009. The percentage of gag and red grouper landings attributed to the Edges if closed year round are 8.9% and 2.4%, respectively (**Alternative 4, Option d**).

Alternative 5 would modify the seasonal closure dates of the two current marine protected areas implemented in 1999, Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps. Modifying the closed season from the current closure prohibiting all fishing November 1 through April 30, but allowing surface trolling May 1 through October 31 (**Option a**) would decrease the number of months the marine protected area is currently closed, thereby providing less protection to gag and other reef fish species if **Option c** was selected. **Option b** would provide less protection to reef fish during the open season because all fishing is allowed. **Option d** would close all fishing year-round providing the most protection to gag and other reef fish species. Because these two marine areas have been closed since 1999, the percentage of red grouper and gag landings from these areas was not included.

It is possible that the proposed additional closed areas, **Alternatives 2 and Alternative 3**, and the current three marine protected areas could be closed during the same period of time. If all areas were selected to be closed at one time, the total area closed would be 923 square nautical miles off the west coast of Florida. This would be a substantial area and could have positive impacts to the physical and biological

environments. The approximate distance from shore to the center of the proposed or current marine protected areas are estimated as follows: **Alternative 2** is 38 miles, **Alternative 3** is 46 miles, Madison-Swanson is 43 miles, the Edges is 85 miles, and Steamboat Lumps is 111 miles. The actual distances from port of origin to the center of the closed marine protected areas are likely greater.

Given the distance from shore for both the current and proposed marine protected areas, it is probable that fewer recreational than commercial fishers would be impacted by these proposed closures. The Council was given two presentations, one in August 2010 and one in February 2011, with additional alternatives for time and area closures closer to shore that are more likely to impact the recreational sector. However, the percent reduction that would be achieved by closing such areas was difficult to quantify and with the available information to date, the Council has not added additional time and area closures that are closer to shore for analysis in this amendment (A. Strelcheck and N. Farmer, NOAA Fisheries Service, Presentations in October 2010 and February 2011 to the Gulf Council).

2.7 Action 7. Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures

2.7.1 Action 7.1 Gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper commercial accountability measures

The accountability measures implemented in Amendment 30B for red grouper and gag were established under the single quota system and do not fully reflect changes that occurred in the commercial fishery when the individual fishing quota system was implemented in 2010. Individual fishing quota programs are considered accountability measures in and of themselves. Therefore, the accountability measures put in place through Amendment 30B are no longer needed.

Alternative 1. No action. Retain the existing accountability measures for gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper where if commercial landings, reach or are projected to reach the red grouper, gag, or shallow-water grouper quota, then the commercial shallow-water grouper fishery will be closed.

Preferred Alternative 2. The accountability measures for the gag, red grouper and shallow-water grouper commercial sector will be the current individual fishing quota program.

Discussion:

Alternative 1, no action, would leave the current accountability measures for the commercial sector in place. The measures, as written now, state that if commercial landings, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, reach or are projected to reach the red grouper, gag, or shallow-water grouper quota, then the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification closing the commercial shallow-water grouper fishery. In addition, if despite such a closure, commercial red grouper, gag, or shallow-water grouper landings exceed the respective annual catch limits, then the Assistant Administrator would file a notification maintaining the prior year's red grouper, gag, or shallow-water grouper commercial quota in the following fishing year. The problem with these measures is they are inconsistent with the individual fishing quota program put in place through Amendment 29 (GMFMC 2008a). This program allocates pounds to individual fishermen based on the number of shares they have. The fishermen can then use this allocation to land fish throughout the year. They are held to their allocation through a strict reporting system. After an allocation is used up, fishermen can no longer fish for the particular species or species group unless they purchase shares or allocation from another fisherman. They are allowed an overage, but this overage can only occur on their last trip and cannot exceed 10% of the allocation they have left. This overage is deducted from their allocation for the next year.

Preferred Alternative 2 would replace the current accountability measures with the individual fishing quota program already in existence, but has not been declared the accountability measure for shallow-water grouper. Individual fishing programs are considered proactive accountability measures because they put measures in place ahead of time to decrease the likelihood that annual catch limits are exceeded. Individual fishing quota programs are consistent with National Standard 1 guidance in that they provide a mechanism to monitor and prevent catches from exceeding annual catch limits. The current management program to set the quotas used for allocating harvest uses a more conservative catch target based on the fishing mortality rate associated with optimum yield to further minimize the risk of exceeding the annual catch limit.

Some concern has been expressed from the public that species managed under individual fishing quota programs may need additional accountability measures. It is possible some fish (illegally landed fish) may not be counted against the fishery's overall annual catch limit and are vulnerable to overharvest. However, buffers exist in the current individual fishing quota programs that reduce the risk that an annual catch limit will be exceeded. Currently, the annual catch limits are greater than the target catches upon which the species quotas are based. In fact, using annual catch targets can be considered a proactive accountability measure. For red grouper and gag, the respective quotas on which the individual fishing quota allocations are based is the yield associated optimum yield (annual catch target level) and are not based on higher fishing mortality (F) yield streams used for determining the respective annual catch limits and overfishing limits (e.g., F_{MSY}). The quotas the tilefish and deepwater grouper individual fishing quota programs are based on are pro-active quotas and put in place through Secretarial Amendment 1 (GMFMC 2004a) and Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b), respectively, to protect the stocks from effort shifting as a result of shallow-water grouper quota closures that were occurring because of reduced red grouper abundances. For shallow-water grouper, the current 0.41 million pound quota for species (GMFMC 2008b) other than gag and red grouper is based on 2001-04 average landings and put in place through Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b). This quota is lower than the previous shallow-water grouper allowance (after subtracting out gag) put in place through Secretarial Amendment 1 (GMFMC 2004a). One final note with regard to buffers between the harvest and the annual catch limit is the harvest of fish through all the programs has been less than the quota for the individual species and species complexes. Therefore, the targeted harvests, and consequently the annual catch limits, have not been exceeded.

2.7.2 Action 7.2. Gag and red grouper recreational accountability measures

Current recreational accountability measures for gag and red grouper have no provisions for handling overages or in-season measures as allowed for under National Standard 1 guidelines. Overage adjustments are needed particularly for gag to follow guidance that states stocks and stock complexes in rebuilding plans, the accountability measures should include overage adjustments that reduce the annual catch limits in the next fishing year by the full amount of the overages, unless the best scientific information available shows that a reduced overage adjustment, or no adjustment, is needed to mitigate the effects of the overages.

Alternative 1. No action. Retain the existing accountability measures for gag and red grouper. These measures are if recreational landings, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center following the conclusion of the fishing year, exceed the red grouper or gag annual catch limits, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification maintaining the prior year's red grouper or gag target catch level. In addition, the notification would reduce the length of the recreational shallow-water grouper fishing season in the following year by the amount necessary to ensure recreational gag and red grouper landings do not exceed the recreational target catch level for that fishing year.

Alternative 2. Add an overage adjustment to the existing accountability measures should gag or red grouper be overfished.

- If the annual catch limit is exceeded and a stock is under a rebuilding plan, the overage adjustment will be equal to the full amount of the overage, unless the best scientific information available shows that a greater, lesser, or no overage adjustment is needed to mitigate the effects of the overage.

Alternative 3. Add in-season accountability measures to close a season early if needed to the existing accountability measures.

- If gag or red grouper landings are projected to exceed the annual catch limit, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification closing the recreational harvest for the species projected to reach its annual catch limit for the rest of the fishing year on the date the annual catch limit is projected to be harvested. If the harvest, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, has been found to exceed the annual catch limit, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification closing the recreational harvest for the species whose annual catch limit was projected to be exceeded immediately for the rest of the fishing year.

Preferred Alternative 4. Add an overage adjustment to be applied when gag or red grouper are considered overfished and in-season accountability measures to close a season early if needed to the existing gag and red grouper accountability measures.

- If the annual catch limit is exceeded and a stock is under a rebuilding plan, the overage adjustment will be equal to the full amount of the overage, unless the best scientific information available shows that a greater, lesser, or no overage adjustment is needed to mitigate the effects of the overage.
- If gag or red grouper landings are projected to exceed the annual catch limit, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification closing the recreational harvest for the species projected to reach its annual catch limit for the rest of the fishing year on the date the annual catch limit is projected to be harvested. If the harvest, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, has been found to exceed the annual catch limit, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification closing the recreational harvest for the species whose annual catch limit was projected to be exceeded immediately for the rest of the fishing year.

Discussion:

The purpose of this section is to consider alternatives to enhance the current recreational red grouper and gag accountability measures. Accountability measures are designed to prevent annual catch limits from being exceeded, and if exceeded, correct or mitigate any overages (50 CFR 600.310(g)). The National Standard 1 guidelines for accountability measures identify two types. These are in-season accountability measures and accountability measures for when the annual catch limit is exceeded (post-season). These accountability measures are not mutually exclusive and should be used together where appropriate.

Alternative 1, no action, leaves the current accountability measures for the recreational sector in place. Currently, if recreational landings, as estimated by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center following the conclusion of the fishing year, exceed the red grouper or gag annual catch limits, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification maintaining the prior year red grouper or gag target catch level. In addition, the notification will reduce the length of the recreational shallow-water grouper fishing season in the following year by the amount necessary to ensure recreational gag and red grouper landings do not exceed the recreational target catch level for that fishing year. To compare gag and red grouper recreational landings to the annual catch limits, the recreational landings are averaged over a three-year period and compared to the annual catch limit. If the annual catch limit is exceeded, then an overage adjustment is invoked where target catches, quotas, and annual catch limits will remain at the 2011 levels until a subsequent amendment is implemented. The current accountability measures do not

include in-season management measures or an overage adjustment should either the gag or red grouper stocks be determined as overfished (gag are currently in an overfished condition). These are recommended by the National Standard 1 guidance as components of accountability measures and are currently being considered by the Council for the management of other reef fish species in the generic annual catch limit amendment.

Alternative 2 would add an overage adjustment to the current accountability measures when stocks are undergoing a rebuilding plan. National Standard 1 Guidance (50 CFR 600.310(g)(3)) suggests the overage adjustments reduce the annual catch limit by the overage amount “unless the best scientific information available shows that a reduced overage adjustment, or no adjustment, is needed to mitigate the effects of the overages.” This overage adjustment is in addition to the current overage adjustment that would not allow annual catch limits to increase if exceeded in the previous year. **Alternative 2** also follows the National Standard 1 guidance and would simply require any overage to be subtracted from the annual catch limit in the subsequent year if the annual catch limit were exceeded with the caveat that the annual catch limit reduction could be more or less if scientific information indicated otherwise. If this alternative were selected as the preferred alternative, it would apply immediately to gag because it would be subject to the rebuilding plan proposed in this amendment (**Action 1**).

The current gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper recreational sector accountability measures do not include any in-season accountability measures. National Standard 1 guidelines indicate in-season monitoring and management measures should be included in fishery management plans whenever possible to reduce the likelihood annual catch limits will be exceeded within a fishing year. Guidance (§ 600.310(g)(2)) also indicates that if the Council were not to select in-season accountability measures for a stock, “For fisheries without in-season management control to prevent the annual catch limit from being exceeded, accountability measures should utilize annual catch targets that are set below annual catch limits so that catches do not exceed the annual catch limit.” **Alternative 3** would provide the Council with an in-season accountability measure that would end the fishing season at a time that minimizes the risk the annual catch limit will be exceeded or close the fishery if the annual catch limit has been projected to have been exceeded. It should be noted that the Council does use annual catch targets in its management of both red grouper and gag.

Preferred Alternative 4 would add both the overage adjustment of **Alternative 2** and the in-season accountability measures of **Alternative 3** to the current gag and red grouper accountability measures. Combining these measures would provide a more complete set of accountability measures for gag and red grouper. Rationale for these measures is provided above.

3 Description of the Fishery and Affected Environment

3.1 Description of the Affected Physical Environment

The physical environment for reef fish, including gag and red grouper, has been described in detail in the EIS for the Generic Essential Fish Habitat Amendment and is incorporated here by reference (GMFMC 2004b). The Gulf has a total area of approximately 600,000 square miles (1.5 million kilometers²), including state waters (Gore 1992). It is a semi-enclosed, oceanic basin connected to the Atlantic Ocean by the Straits of Florida and to the Caribbean Sea by the Yucatan Channel. Oceanic conditions are primarily affected by the Loop Current, the discharge of freshwater into the northern Gulf, and a semi-permanent, anticyclonic gyre in the western Gulf. Gulf surface water temperatures normally range from 12° C to 29° C (54° F to 84° F) depending on time of year. In the Gulf, adult red grouper are found on coral reefs, flat rock perforated with solution holes, caverns and crevices of limestone reef, and hard bottom habitats as well as artificial reefs (Moe 1969; Bullock and Smith 1991). The vast majority of gag are caught on the west coast of Florida from northern Pinellas County to the northern extent of the state (Schirripa and Goodyear 1994). Adult gag are associated with bottom topographies on the continental shelf which have high relief, i.e., coral reefs, artificial reefs, rocky hard-bottom substrates, ledges and caves, sloping soft-bottom areas, and limestone outcroppings (GMFMC, 2004). Eggs and larvae are pelagic with juveniles settling out to coastal seagrass beds.

The Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill has affected at least one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. The impacts of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill on the physical environment are expected to be significant and may be long-term. However, the oil remained outside most of the west Florida Shelf where red grouper and gag are particularly abundant (GMFMC 2004b). Oil was dispersed on the surface, and because of the heavy use of dispersants (both at the surface and at the wellhead), oil was also documented as being suspended within the water column, some even deeper than the location of the broken well head. Floating and suspended oil washed onto shore in several areas of the Gulf as were non-floating tar balls. Whereas suspended and floating oil degrades over time, tar balls are persistent in the environment and can be transported hundreds of miles.

Oil could exacerbate development of this year's hypoxic "dead" zone in the Gulf of Mexico as could higher than normal input of water from the Mississippi River drainage. For example, oil on the surface of the water could restrict the normal process of atmospheric oxygen mixing into and replenishing oxygen concentrations in the water column. In addition, microbes in the water that break down oil and dispersant also consume oxygen; this could lead to further oxygen depletion. However, the hypoxic "dead" zone occurs in the northern Gulf of Mexico, not on the west Florida shelf.

Environmental Sites of Special Interest Relevant to Red Grouper (Figure 3.1.1)

Longline/Buoy Gear Area Closure - Permanent closure to use of these gears for reef fish harvest. The closure applies to inshore of 20 fathoms off the Florida shelf from September through May, inshore of 35 fathoms off the Florida shelf from June through August, and inshore of 50 fathoms year round for the remainder of the Gulf (72,300 square nautical miles).

Madison/Swanson and Steamboat Lumps Marine Reserves - No-take marine reserves sited on gag spawning aggregation areas where all fishing except for surface trolling during May through October is prohibited (219 square nautical miles).

The Edges – No-take area closure from January 1 to April 30. All commercial and recreational fishing or possession of fish managed by the Council is prohibited. The intent of the closure is to protect gag and other groupers during their respective spawning seasons. Possession is allowed when transiting the area if gear is stowed in accordance with federal regulations. The boundaries of the closed area are: Northwest corner = 28° 51'N, 85° 16'W; Northeast corner = 28° 51'N, 85° 04'W; Southwest corner = 28° 14'N, 84° 54'W; Southeast corner = 28° 14'N, 84° 42'W.

Tortugas North and South Marine Reserves - No-take marine reserves cooperatively implemented by the state of Florida, National Ocean Service (NOS), the Council, and the National Park Service (see jurisdiction on chart) (185 square nautical miles). In addition, Generic Amendment 3 for addressing Essential Fish Habitat requirements, Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC), and adverse effects of fishing prohibited the use of anchors in these HAPCs in the following Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) of the Gulf: Shrimp, Red Drum, Reef Fish, Stone Crab, Coral and Coral Reefs in the Gulf; and Spiny Lobster and the Coastal Migratory Pelagic resources of the Gulf and South Atlantic.

Additionally, Generic Amendment 3 for addressing Essential Fish Habitat requirements establishes an education program on the protection of coral reefs when using various fishing gears in coral reef areas for recreational and commercial fishermen.

Individual reef areas and bank HAPCs of the northwestern Gulf including: East and West Flower Garden Banks, Stetson Bank, Sonnier Bank, MacNeil Bank, 29 Fathom, Rankin Bright Bank, Geyer Bank, McGrail Bank, Bouma Bank, Rezak Sidner Bank, Alderice Bank, and Jakkula Bank - Pristine coral areas protected by preventing use of some fishing gear that interacts with the bottom (263.2 square nautical miles). Subsequently, some of these areas were made a marine sanctuary by NOS and this marine sanctuary is currently being revised. Bottom anchoring and the use of trawling gear, bottom longlines, buoy gear, and all traps/pots on coral reefs are prohibited in the East and West Flower Garden Banks, McGrail Bank, and on the significant coral resources on Stetson Bank.

Florida Middle Grounds HAPC - Pristine soft coral area protected from use of any fishing gear interfacing with bottom (348 square nautical miles).

Pulley Ridge HAPC - A portion of the HAPC where deep-water hermatypic coral reefs are found is closed to anchoring and the use of trawling gear, bottom longlines, buoy gear, and all traps/pots (2,300 square nautical miles).

Stressed Areas for Reef Fish - Permanent closure Gulf-wide of the near shore waters to use of fish traps, power heads, and roller trawls (i.e., “rock hopper trawls”) (48,400 square nautical miles).

Alabama Special Management Zone - In the Alabama special management zone, fishing by a vessel operating as a charter vessel or head boat, a vessel that does not have a commercial permit for Gulf reef fish, or a vessel with such a permit fishing for Gulf reef fish, is limited to hook-and-line gear with no more than three hooks. Nonconforming gear is restricted to bag limits, or for reef fish without a bag limit, to 5% by weight of all fish aboard.




Figure 3.1.1 Map of fishery management closed or gear restricted areas in the Gulf of Mexico

3.2 Description of the Biological Environment

The biological environment of the Gulf of Mexico, including the species addressed in this amendment, is described in detail in the final EIS for the Generic Essential Fish Habitat amendment and is incorporated here by reference (GMFMC 2004b).

3.2.1 Reef Fish

Red Grouper Life History and Biology

In the Gulf, red grouper are commonly caught from Panama City, Florida, to the Florida Keys along the inner to mid-continental shelf in depths ranging from 2 to over 120 m (Moe 1969). Based on reported commercial landings, the Southeast Fishery Science Center's (SEFSC) Headboat Survey, and the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), red grouper are infrequently caught in the western Gulf. The species inhabits flat rock perforated with solution holes, caverns and crevices of limestone reef, and hard bottom areas (Moe 1969; Bullock and Smith 1991). Juveniles live in shallow-water nearshore reefs until reaching approximately 16 inches (40 cm), when they become sexually mature and move offshore (Moe 1969). Red grouper reach a maximum length and weight of 43 inches (110 cm total length) and 50.7 pounds. (23 kg) (Robins et al. 1986). Maximum age of red grouper in the Gulf of Mexico has been estimated at 25 years (SEDAR 12 2007). Clear determinations of size and age of maturity have been difficult for red grouper (Fitzhugh et al. 2006 and references cited therein). Fitzhugh et al. (2006) determined the size and age at 50% maturity was approximately 11 inches (28 cm total length) at age 2. Although previous estimates indicated that red grouper were 50% mature by 5 years of age and 15-20 inches total length (40-50 cm total length) (Moe 1969; Collins et al. 2002). Red grouper are protogynous hermaphrodites, transitioning from females to males at older ages, and form harems for spawning (Dormeier and Colin 1997). Age and size at sexual transition is approximately 10.5 years and 30 inches total length (76.5 cm total length) (Fitzhugh et al. 2006). Red grouper spawn from February until mid-July with peak spawning occurring in the eastern Gulf of Mexico during March through May (Fitzhugh et al. 2006). Over the last 25-30 years, there has been little change in the sex ratio of red grouper, likely because they do not aggregate (Coleman et al. 1996).

The Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill has affected at least one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. However, the affected areas are outside west Florida Shelf where red grouper are primarily found. Therefore the effects of the oil spill on red grouper populations and red grouper essential fish habitat will likely be minimal.

Status of the Red Grouper Stock and the Science and Statistical Committee (SSC) Recommendations

The most recent benchmark stock assessment for red grouper (SEDAR 12 2007) was completed in early February 2007. The assessment used an age-structured assessment model called ASAP (Legault and Restrepo 1999) that was the basis for the 2002 assessment and included data from 1986 through 2005. Approximately 99% of the landings were from the west coast of Florida and the rest were from Alabama. The minimum stock size threshold and maximum fishing mortality threshold were defined for red grouper in Secretarial Amendment 1 as $(1-M)*SS_{MSY}$ and F_{MSY} , respectively. The red grouper stock assessment concluded that spawning stock size exceeded SS_{MSY} starting in 1999. This compares reasonably well with the results of the 2002 assessment which estimated the stock would be rebuilt by 2003 using a stock-recruit steepness relationship of 0.8, which is similar to the 0.84 estimated by the 2007 assessment.

Recovery of the red grouper stock accelerated between 2001 and 2005 as a result of another very strong recruitment year class that occurred in 2000. Additionally, changes in the treatment of natural mortality during the SEDAR 12 assessment resulted in slightly more optimistic results when compared to the 2002 stock assessment. Fishing mortality on red grouper declined below maximum fishing mortality threshold starting in 1995 and has fluctuated but remained below maximum fishing mortality threshold with little trend through 2005. In 2005, fishing mortality was just below the target fishing mortality level of F_{OY} .

The 2009 update stock assessment of the red grouper stock in the Gulf of Mexico (SEDAR 2009a) was conducted using the same model as the 2007 assessment, but with catch data and indices of abundance updated through 2008. After reviewing several model runs with varied parameter inputs, the SSC accepted the model run titled “Red Tide Model with Constant Catchability”. This model run allowed the natural mortality rate for 2005, a year when there was an extensive red tide event along the West Florida Shelf, to adjust above the base natural mortality rate. The best-fit result indicated that an additional mortality for red grouper corresponding to a little over 20% of the stock occurred in 2005.¹⁰ The stock was found to be neither overfished or undergoing overfishing. However, the stock has declined since 2005, much of which was attributed to an episodic mortality event in 2005 (most likely associated with red tide). The 2010 overfishing limit (OFL) or the yield associated with F_{MSY} for this model was estimated at 6.43 million pounds and the optimum yield (OY), calculated from the Council’s default definition as the yield at 75% of F_{MSY} , was estimated at 4.913 for 2010.

The SSC reviewed the 2009 assessment update in June 2009. The model projection used actual catches through 2008, and assumed that the entire TAC would be filled in 2009. However, given that the total allowable catch had not been filled for the past couple of years, and that a longline emergency rule that restricted bottom longlines in order to protect sea turtles was in effect in 2009, the SSC felt that it was unlikely that the TAC would be filled in 2009. As a result, the SSC asked that projections of the red grouper and gag yield streams be rerun using updated landings estimates for 2009. These reruns were presented to the SSC in March 2010. The requested red grouper scenarios used the “Red Tide Model with Constant Catchability”, used updated landings estimates for 2009 data, and either set the 2010 harvest level equal to the current TAC or equal to 2009 estimated landings (NMFS 2010). For red grouper, projections were provided for fishing at F_{MSY} and F_{OY} . Given that the 2010 landings, to date, appeared to better match 2009 harvest levels than in previous years, the SSC selected the model runs where the 2010 projected harvest was equal to the estimated 2009 harvest. Thus, the SSC recommended the 2011 overfishing level be set consistent with the Councils current definition of the yield associated with fishing at F_{MSY} , or 7.42 MP GW. Because the revised projections (NMFS 2010) did not provide probabilities of overfishing based on the different landing projection scenarios, the SSC selected a 2011 acceptable biological catch of 6.31 MP GW. This level is equal to 85% of the yield at F_{MSY} and was felt by the SSC to reduce the probability that overfishing might occur in 2011.

The yield projections were again rerun in late 2010 to incorporate new information on red grouper harvest, with the results presented to the SSC in January 2011 and again in March 2011. This new rerun

¹⁰ E-mail from Clay Porch (NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center) to Steven Atran (Gulf Council staff) dated June 24, 2009. There is confusion among some members of the public that the assessment claimed that 30% of the grouper were killed due to red tide. Dr. Porch’s e-mail states that “the estimate of the instantaneous episodic natural mortality rate was 0.3, and that this translates roughly to something like 30% of the stock being killed (I emphasized at the time that it wasn’t exactly 30%). Later during the meeting John (Walter) calculated the actual percentage for red grouper and it was a little over 20% (which I relayed to the AP, and I think the SSC, later on Tuesday)”.

used revised estimates of historical discards in the commercial sector that were based on newly available observer estimates from the years 2006-2008. Previous discard estimates were based on logbook records of bycatch, area fished, and fishery independent catch-at-depth mortality analyses. The new rerun also took into account a reduction in the commercial minimum size limit from 20 inches to 18 inches that was implemented in 2009 (Walter 2011). Given these changes, the January 2011 projection rerun indicated that the total allowable catch in the near term could be substantially increased. Based on the January rerun, the SSC recommended that the overfishing limit for red grouper be set at 7.93 million pounds gutted weight (the equilibrium yield at the fishing mortality rate associated with harvesting at the equilibrium maximum sustainable yield, and the acceptable biological catch be set at 7.93 million pounds gutted weight (the equilibrium yield at the fishing mortality rate associated with harvesting at the equilibrium optimum sustainable yield). Since the red grouper stock is not overfished, these equilibrium harvest levels are in effect for all years, until a new stock assessment is conducted.

Gag Life History and Biology

Gag is primarily caught on the west coast of Florida from Tampa Bay to the northern extent of the state (Schirripa and Goodyear 1994). Newly settled juveniles are estuarine-dependent, occurring in shallow seagrass beds during late spring and summer (Koenig and Coleman 1998; Strelcheck et al. 2003). At the onset of the first winter, juvenile gag migrate offshore, although some juvenile gag may remain in inshore waters during winter (Heinisch and Fable 1999). As gag mature, they move to deeper, offshore waters to spawn. Gag is a protogynous hermaphrodite, transitioning from females to males at older ages. Age and size at 50% sexual transition is approximately 11 years and 42-43 inches (108.5 - 110 cm) total length (SEDAR 10 2006). Maximum age is 31 years (Lombardi-Carlson et al 2006) and females are mature by 3.7 years of age and 23 inches (58.5 cm) total length (Fitzhugh et al 2006b). They form spawning aggregations at depths ranging from 160-400 feet (Coleman et al. 1996). In the eastern Gulf the spawning season is estimated to extend from late January to mid-April (with a peak in March) (Fitzhugh et al 2006b). Often immature female gag are found with spawning aggregations (Coleman et al. 1996). Gag can reach a maximum length of 54 inches (138 cm) total length and weight of 68 pounds (31 kg) (Lombardi et al 2006).

Oil from the Deepwater Horizon MC252 incident has affected at least one-third of the Gulf area at its maximum extent from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. However, at this point the affected areas are outside west Florida Shelf where gag are primarily found. Some surface oil may have occurred over the west Florida shelf in offshore waters, however, juvenile and adults are demersal and so likely were not affected. In addition, the oil would not have been present during the January to April spawning period when pelagic eggs and larvae could be susceptible to oil at the surface. Therefore, the effects of the oil on gag populations and gag essential fish habitat would likely be minimal.

Status of the Gag Stock and Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Recommendations

The Gulf gag stock was assessed in both SEDAR 10 and the 2009 Stock Assessment Update using a statistical forward projection catch-at-age model called CASAL (SEDAR 2009). The Council's SSC reviewed several model runs and accepted the model run titled, "Red Tide with Increasing Catchability." The SSC chose a model with increasing catchability for gag because they felt that the tendency of gag to form aggregations made them more susceptible to improvements in gear technology over time. In addition, the model run allowed the natural mortality rate for 2005, a year when there was an extensive red tide event along the West Florida Shelf, to adjust above the base natural mortality rate. The best-fit

result indicated that an additional mortality for gag corresponding to 18% of the stock occurred in 2005.¹¹ The SSC asked that the projections of the status of red grouper and gag be reanalyzed using updated landings estimates for 2009 and that the 2010 harvest level be set equal to the current TAC or equal to 2009 estimated landings (NMFS 2010a). Projections were provided for fishing mortality rates associated with rebuilding the stock within 10 years (F_{rebuild}) and with optimum yield (F_{OY}). Based on the resultant projections, the SSC recommended that the acceptable biological catch be set at the F_{rebuild} level of 1.17 million pounds (MP) gutted weight (GW) and 1.64 MP GW for the 2011 and 2012 fishing years, respectively (Table 2.2.1). This level would be less than the Council's current annual catch limit definition which is the yield associated with F_{MSY} .¹²

In the course of developing management alternatives for gag, potential inconsistencies in estimates of commercial and recreational discards were discovered. One difference was preliminary estimates of commercial gag discards were two orders of magnitude greater when estimated using reef fish observer data¹³ rather than from Trip Interview Program (TIP) information. Also, the size and age distributions computed for recreational discards in the 2009 stock assessment indicated most discards were close to the minimum size limit in more recent years, but tagging and observer data indicated a broader size range for discarded fish⁴. The Council discussed these discrepancies at their August 2010 meeting and it was agreed that another review of the gag assessment was needed.

The SEDAR update assessment review panel met in December 2010 and recommended two changes be made to the original assessment reanalyzed⁴. The first was the size distribution of released fish in the charter and private recreational fisheries was revised to provide a better estimate of the size distribution. In the original reanalysis, the size distributions were truncated at just below the minimum size limit (i.e. just sublegal sized fish). The revisions were made by updating Mote Marine Laboratory data already used in the analysis with 2006-2007 data, and by applying the headboat observer data from 2000-2008 to the charterboat sector. In addition, landed undersized gag were excluded from the analyses to avoid biasing the size distribution. These changes resulted in a broader size distribution of discarded fish. The other change was that observer-based commercial discard estimates were used in place of previous estimates based on TIP data. The terminal year of the assessment model remained at 2008 and the F_{current} was estimated as the average F_s of 2005-2007.

The results of the reanalysis produced higher estimates of the number of discards in the commercial handline fishery, but lower estimates of discards in the commercial reef fish longline sector. The spawning stock biomass was lower in the rerun but only slightly (Table 3.2.1.1, Fig. 3.2.1.1). The fishing mortality estimates were nearly unchanged except for the terminal year of 2008, but this year was not used in the calculation of F_{current} (Fig. 3.2.1.2). The end result was that the yield streams for OFL, F_{rebuild} , and optimum yield increased slightly for each year, but the stock remained overfished and undergoing overfishing (Table 3.2.1.1, Fig. 3.2.1.1). Based on these results, the SSC recommended an acceptable biological catch for gag for 2011 to be 1.58 MP GW (based on F_{rebuild} to SSB_{MAX}). The SSC also recommended the 2011 OFL for gag to be 1.67 MP GW (based on yield at F_{MAX}).

¹¹ E-mail from Brian Linton (NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center) to Steven Atran (Gulf Council staff) dated July 7, 2009.

¹² Note: F_{MAX} is used as a proxy for F_{MSY} and is the rate of fishing mortality for a given exploitation pattern rate of growth and natural mortality, that results in the maximum level of yield per recruit.

¹³ SEFSC presentation at the August 2010 Council meeting titled "2009 Gulf of Mexico Gag Update Assessment – Commercial Dead Discards"

Table 3.2.1.1. Required SFA and MSRA evaluations for the December 2010 rerun of the Gulf of Mexico gag update assessment. 2009 assessment update values come from the Gulf of Mexico gag 2009 update assessment report, except where otherwise noted. Assessment rerun values come from the December 2010 rerun of the Gulf of Mexico gag update assessment.

Criteria	Definition	2009 Assessment Update Value Table 9.3 except as noted	Assessment rerun revisions
Mortality Rate Criteria			
F_{MSY} or proxy	F _{MAX}	0.22	0.22
MFMT	F _{MAX}	0.22	0.22
F_{OY}	75% of F _{MAX}	0.16	0.17
F_{CURRENT}	Geometric mean 2005-2007	0.53	0.55
F_{CURRENT}/MFMT	Geometric mean 2005-2007	2.47	2.50
Base M		0.15	0.15
Biomass Criteria			
SSB_{MAX}	Equilibrium SSB @ F _{MAX}	24.02 MP GW	22.51 MP GW
MSST	(1-M)*SSB _{MAX} M=0.15	20.41 MP GW	19.14 MP GW
SSB_{CURRENT}	current = 2008	9.58 MP GW	9.30 MP GW
SSB_{CURRENT}/MSST	current = 2008	0.47	0.49
Equilibrium MSY	Equilibrium Yield @ F _{MSY}	4.28 MP GW	4.19 MP GW
Equilibrium OY	Equilibrium Yield @ F _{OY}	4.17 MP GW	4.08 MP GW
OFL	Annual Yield @ F _{MAX}		
(June 10, 2010 e-mail From Clay Porch & Brian Linton)	2011	1.32 MP GW	1.67 MP GW
	2012	1.81 MP GW	2.11 MP GW
	2013	2.30 MP GW	2.54 MP GW
	2014	2.74 MP GW	2.91 MP GW
	2015	3.08 MP GW	3.19 MP GW
	2016	3.34 MP GW	3.40 MP GW
10-yr rebuild yield (ABC)	Annual Yield @ F _{Rebuild}		
(March 22, 2010 revised assessment with 2009 landings)	2011	1.17 MP GW	1.58 MP GW
	2012	1.64 MP GW	2.02 MP GW
	2013	2.12 MP GW	2.45 MP GW
	2014	2.57 MP GW	2.82 MP GW
	2015	2.93 MP GW	3.12 MP GW
	2016	3.20 MP GW	3.34 MP GW
Annual OY (ACT)	Annual Yield @ F _{OY}		
(March 22, 2010 revised assessment with 2009 landings)	2011	1.01 MP GW	1.28 MP GW
	2012	1.44 MP GW	1.69 MP GW
	2013	1.90 MP GW	2.11 MP GW
	2014	2.34 MP GW	2.49 MP GW




Figure 3.2.1.1. Estimated spawning stock biomass for gag by year from NMFS (2010)




Figure 3.2.1.2. Estimated fishing mortality rate for gag by year from NMFS (2010)




Figure 3.2.1.3. Estimated gag spawning stock biomass relative to the overfishing threshold by year from NMFS (2010)

General Information on Reef Fish Species

The National Ocean Service (NOS) of NOAA collaborated with National Marine Fisheries Service and the Council to develop distributions of reef fish (and other species) in the Gulf (SEA 1998). NOS obtained fishery-independent data sets for the Gulf, including SEAMAP, and state trawl surveys. Data from the Estuarine Living Marine Resources (ELMR) Program contain information on the relative abundance of specific species (highly abundant, abundant, common, rare, not found, and no data) for a series of estuaries, by five life stages (adult, spawning, egg, larvae, and juvenile) and month for five seasonal salinity zones (0-0.5, 0.5-5, 5-15, 15-25, and >25). NOS staff analyzed the data to determine relative abundance of the mapped species by estuary, salinity zone, and month. For some species not in the ELMR database, distribution was classified as only observed or not observed for adult, juvenile, and spawning stages.

Habitat types and life history stages can be found in more detail in GMFMC (2004b). In general, reef fish are widely distributed in the Gulf, occupying both pelagic and benthic habitats during their life cycle. In general, both eggs and larval stages are planktonic. Larvae feed on zooplankton and phytoplankton. Exceptions to these generalizations include the gray triggerfish that lay their eggs in depressions in the sandy bottom, and gray snapper whose larvae are found around submerged aquatic vegetation. Juvenile and adult reef fish are typically demersal, and are usually associated with bottom topographies on the continental shelf (<100 m) which have high relief, i.e., coral reefs, artificial reefs, rocky hard-bottom substrates, ledges and caves, sloping soft-bottom areas, and limestone outcroppings. However, several species are found over sand and soft-bottom substrates. Juvenile red snapper are common on mud bottoms in the northern Gulf, particularly off Texas through Alabama. Also, some juvenile snappers (e.g. mutton, gray, red, dog, lane, and yellowtail snappers) and groupers (e.g. goliath grouper, red, gag, and yellowfin groupers) have been documented in inshore seagrass beds, mangrove estuaries, lagoons, and larger bay systems (GMFMC 1981). More detail on hard bottom substrate and coral can be found in the FMP for Corals and Coral Reefs (GMFMC and SAFMC 1982).

At this time, it is unknown what the effects of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill will be on reef fish species. The oil has affected at least one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. For species that are distributed within the area impacted by the spill, the populations are likely to be affected. However, because reef fish species are demersal as juveniles and adults, the impacts are likely to be minimal. Eggs and larvae are found in surface waters, so species that spawn during the time period oil affected surface waters may suffer from increased egg and larval mortality rates.

Status of Reef Fish Stocks

The Reef Fish FMP currently encompasses 42 species. Stock assessments have been conducted on 11 species: red snapper (SEDAR 7 2005; SEDAR 7 Update 2009), vermilion snapper (Porch and Cass-Calay, 2001; SEDAR 9 2006a), yellowtail snapper (Muller et al. 2003; SEDAR 3 2003), gray triggerfish (Valle et al. 2001; SEDAR 9 2006b), greater amberjack (Turner et al. 2000; SEDAR 9 2006c), hogfish (Ault et al. 2003; SEDAR 6 2004a), red grouper (Schirripa and Legault 1999; NMFS 2002; SEDAR 12 2007, SEDAR 2009a), gag (Turner et al. 2001; SEDAR 10 2006, SEDAR 2009b), yellowedge grouper (Cass-Calay and Bahnick 2002), and goliath grouper (Porch et al. 2003; SEDAR 6 2004b). A review of the Nassau grouper's stock status was conducted by Eklund (1994), and updated estimates of generation times were developed by Legault and Eklund (1998).

Of the 11 species for which stock assessments have been conducted, the first quarter report of the 2010 Status of U.S. Fisheries (<http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/statusoffisheries/SOSmain.htm>) classifies four as overfished (greater amberjack, grey triggerfish, gag, and red snapper), and the same four as undergoing overfishing. Although it should be noted that greater amberjack, grey triggerfish, and red snapper are under rebuilding plans, and a rebuilding plan for gag is presently being developed in Amendment 32. In the most recent red snapper stock assessment update, red snapper overfishing was projected to have ended in 2009. Many of the stock assessments and stock assessment reviews can be found on the Council (www.gulfcouncil.org) and SEDAR (www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar) Websites.

3.2.2 Protected Species

There are 28 different species of marine mammals that may occur in the Gulf. All 28 species are protected under the Marine Mammals Protection Act and six are also listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (i.e., sperm, sei, fin, blue, humpback and North Atlantic right whales). Other species protected under the ESA occurring in the Gulf include five sea turtle species (Kemp's Ridley, loggerhead, green, leatherback, and hawksbill); two fish species (Gulf sturgeon and smalltooth sawfish), and two *Acropora* coral species (elkhorn [*Acropora palmata*] and staghorn [*A. cervicornis*]). Information on the distribution, biology, and abundance of these protected species in the Gulf is included in final EIS to the Council's Generic Essential Fish Habitat amendment (GMFMC 2004b) and the October 2009 ESA biological opinion on the reef fish fishery (NMFS 2009). Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports and additional information are also available on the National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Species website: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/>.

The Gulf reef fish fishery is classified in the 2011 Marine Mammal Protection Act List of Fisheries as Category III fishery (November 8, 2010; 75 FR 68468). This classification indicates the annual mortality and serious injury of a marine mammal stock resulting from the fishery is less than or equal to 1% of the potential biological removal¹⁴. Dolphins are the only species documented as interacting with this fishery. Bottlenose dolphins may predate and depredate on the bait, catch, and/or released discards of the reef fish fishery.

All five species of sea turtles may be adversely affected by the Gulf reef fish fishery via incidental capture in hook-and-line gear (NMFS 2009). Incidental captures of sea turtle species occur in all commercial and recreational hook-and-line components of the reef fishery, but recent observer data indicate they are most frequent in the bottom longline component of the reef fish fishery. On an individual set basis, incidental captures may be relatively infrequent, but collectively, these captures sum to a high level of bycatch. Observer data indicate loggerhead sea turtles are the species most affected by the bottom longline component of the reef fish fishery and that is why a more detailed description of this species is included below. Mortality of sea turtles caught is particularly problematic in this fishery component, because many are dead or in poor condition upon retrieval of the gear as a result of forced submergence (i.e., drowning). Rulemaking from Amendment 31 constrains the bottom longline component of the fishery to limit sea turtle take. All sea turtles caught on hook-and-line and released alive may later succumb to injuries sustained at the time of capture or from exacerbated trauma from fishing hooks or lines that were ingested, entangling, or otherwise still attached when they were released. Sea turtle release gear and

¹⁴The potential biological removal is the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortalities, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock while allowing that stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population

handling protocols are required to reduce the amount of gear on released animals and minimize post-release mortality.

Smalltooth sawfish are also affected by the Gulf reef fish fishery, but to a much lesser extent than hardshell sea turtles. Smalltooth sawfish primarily occur in the Gulf off peninsular Florida. Although the long, toothed rostrum of the smalltooth sawfish causes this species to be particularly vulnerable to entanglement in fishing gear, incidental captures in the commercial and recreational hook-and-line components of the reef fish fishery are rare events. Only eight smalltooth sawfish are estimated to be incidentally caught annually, and none are expected to result in mortality (NMFS 2009). Fishermen in this fishery are required to follow smalltooth sawfish safe handling guidelines.

The Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill may have adverse effects on protected species populations. Cetaceans, manatees, and sea turtles may be exposed to oil or dispersants. These toxic chemicals can affect them externally by swimming in oil or dispersants or internally from eating or swallowing oil, consuming prey that has also come in to contact with oil, or breathing volatile compounds that the oil gives off. Sea turtles could be at additional risk from oil washing ashore on nesting beaches where nesting females and/or their nests may be exposed to chemicals, which may result in decreased survival of eggs and/or developmental defects in hatchlings.

The most recent biological opinion for the reef fish fishery, dated September 29, 2011, concluded this fishery in the Gulf of Mexico is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles, smalltooth sawfish, other listed species, or their designated critical habitat. This opinion incorporated findings on the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill and updated the findings of an earlier opinion (NMFS 2009).

3.3 Description of the Fishery and Economic Environment

3.3.1 Description of the Economic Environment

The economic environment of the Gulf grouper sector of the reef fish fishery was described in the 2010 Red Grouper Regulatory Amendment (GMFMC 2010) and the EA for the 2011 Gag interim rule (NMFS 2010a). Information on the performance of the Gulf commercial grouper sector of the reef fish fishery prior to the implementation of the current individual fishing quota program is provided in NMFS (2010b). Discussion of the expected effects of the individual fishing quota program is provided in GMFMC (2008a) and is incorporated herein by reference. The individual fishing quota program became effective January 1, 2010, though the determination of shares and allocations was made based on information available as of October 1, 2009. Further, restrictions on the use of bottom longline to particular vessels operating in particular areas at certain times of the year were implemented under GMFMC (2009) in order to reduce sea turtle interactions, and discussion of the expected effects of such are incorporated herein by reference. GMFMC (2010) and NMFS (2010a) provide a description of the individual fishing quota program in terms of eligible participants, the distribution of shares and allocations among initial shareholders, as well as vessels qualifying for bottom longline endorsements. Emphasis is placed on entities with initial shares and allocations of red grouper and gag, though individual fishing quota dealers are also described. GMFMC (2010) and NMFS (2010a) also provide a description of the Gulf recreational red grouper and gag sectors of the reef fish fishery. The description provides information regarding target effort, catch effort, and total recreational trips from 2005-2009 by State and mode. In addition, information regarding the economic value of the recreational sector and permits held by for-hire operations in that sector are provided. GMFMC (2010) and NMFS (2010a) also indicate the economic impacts of the commercial and recreational sectors of the Gulf reef fish fishery.

A revision to the description of the economic environment of Gulf grouper sector of the reef fish fishery is not needed in order to properly analyze the actions and alternatives being considered in Amendment 32. Therefore, the information from GMFMC (2010) and NMFS (2010a) is incorporated herein by reference. The Red Grouper Regulatory Amendment and the EA for the 2011 Gag interim rule can be found at: http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/pdfs/2010_Red_Grouper_Regulatory_Amendment_91710_final.pdf and http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/pdfs/draft_EA_2011_gag_interim_rule.pdf respectively.

3.3.2 Description of the Social Environment

This amendment addresses two species: gag and red grouper. Recently passed regulatory actions include a description of the social environment that identifies communities with a strong relationship with these species and are included by reference here.

Gag: Temporary Rule, November 2010. Section 2.4 can be found at: http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/pdfs/Gag_EA_111510.pdf

Red grouper: Regulatory Amendment to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan, September 2010. Section 2.4 can be found at: http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/pdfs/2010_Red_Grouper_Regulatory_Amendment_91710_final.pdf

The referenced descriptions focus on available geographic and demographic data to identify communities with a strong relationship to the grouper fishery. A strong relationship is defined by having significant landings and revenue for gag and red grouper. Thus, positive or negative impacts from regulatory change are expected to occur in places with greater grouper landings. These communities are located primarily in the state of Florida.

To summarize the referenced documents, communities were examined according to available landings and permit data for gag and red grouper, across the commercial and recreational sectors. For both species, Pinellas County clearly has the strongest relationship to the fishery of any county in the Gulf of Mexico region. For red grouper, the individual communities of Panama City, Madeira Beach, and Apalachicola have the strongest relationship with the fishery, though St. Petersburg, Clearwater, Tarpon Springs, and Redington Shores also have relatively strong ties to the fishery. Steinhatchee, Crystal River, Tampa, and Panacea also have somewhat strong relationships with the red grouper fishery. For the gag fishery, Apalachicola has the strongest relationship of all communities in the Gulf. Steinhatchee, Panacea, Panama City, Clearwater, and St. Petersburg also have relatively strong relationships with the gag fishery. Destin, Ft. Myers Beach, Tarpon Springs, and Madeira Beach have somewhat strong relationships with the fishery.

It is highly likely that, other factors being equal, these communities would be the most affected, in absolute terms, by management actions expected to reduce commercial and recreational landings or effort. The magnitude of these effects will vary according to the exact nature of those actions, particularly with respect to their relative effects on the recreational and commercial sectors.

In addition to the importance of gag and red grouper to communities in terms of landings, there is an inverse relationship in allocation of gag and red grouper for the commercial and recreational sectors, as shown in Table 3.3.2.1. The variation in allocation for the two species reflects a difference among

fishermen in effort and, for recreational fishermen, preference (see summary minutes from Scoping Meetings, section 12). In addition to geographical considerations, then, this difference in effort for gag and red grouper is likely to translate into differentiated impacts for each sector. Actions that implement change to red grouper regulations will likely impact commercial fishermen more than recreational fishermen, and vice versa for the gag fishery. It is important to note that the allocation of grouper quota is a highly contentious issue among fishermen and a significant feature of the social environment deserving further analysis.

Table 3.3.2.1. Breakdown of the sector allocation for gag and red grouper.

	Red Grouper	Gag
Commercial	76%	39%
Recreational	24%	61%

3.3.3 Environmental Justice Considerations

Executive Order 12898 requires federal agencies conduct their programs, policies, and activities in a manner to ensure individuals or populations are not excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin. In addition, and specifically with respect to subsistence consumption of fish and wildlife, federal agencies are required to collect, maintain, and analyze information on the consumption patterns of populations who principally rely on fish and/or wildlife for subsistence. The main focus of Executive Order 12898 is to consider “the disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories...” This executive order is generally referred to as environmental justice (EJ).

Persons employed in the gag fishery and associated businesses and communities along the Gulf coast of Florida would be expected to be affected by this proposed action. However, information on the race and income status for groups at the different participation levels (vessel owners, crew, dealers, processors, employees, employees of associated support industries, etc.) is not available. Because this proposed action could be expected to affect fishermen and associated industries in numerous communities along the west Florida coast, census data (available at the county level, only) have been assessed to examine whether any counties have poverty or minority rates that exceed the EJ thresholds.

The threshold for comparison that was used was 1.2 times the Florida state average such that, if the value for the county was greater than or equal to 1.2 times the state average, then the county was considered an area of potential EJ concern. Census data for the year 2007 was used and the estimate of the minority (interpreted as non-white, including Hispanic) population was 38.7%, while 12.6% of the total population was estimated to be below the poverty line. These values translate in EJ thresholds of approximately 46.4% and 15.1%, respectively. Based on the demographic information provided, for the counties of the west coast of Florida, no potential EJ concern is evident with regard to the percent of minorities. Levy County exceeds the threshold with regard to poverty (18.2%); Escambia just barely exceeds the threshold (15.2%) by .08%. No potential EJ concern is evident for the remaining counties which fall below the thresholds with regard to poverty and percent of minorities.

Section 3.3.2 provided a summary of communities considered substantially dependent on gag and red grouper. Pinellas was identified as the county with the strongest relationship to the gag and red grouper fishery of any Gulf county; Pinellas also falls below the EJ thresholds with regard to poverty and percent

of minorities. The individual communities determined to have a strong relationship to the gag and red grouper fishery are located within Pinellas, Bay, Franklin, Taylor, Okaloosa, Lee, Citrus, Hillsborough, and Wakulla counties. None of these counties exceed the EJ thresholds for poverty or percent of minorities.

There are no individual communities within Levy and Escambia counties determined to have a strong relationship to the gag and red grouper fishery. A strong relationship is defined by having significant landings and revenue for gag or red grouper and is calculated by examining the proportion of gag or red grouper landings for a given community out of the total landings for that community. There are communities within these counties that are involved in the gag and red grouper fishery (Yankeetown in Levy County and Pensacola in Escambia County); however no data are available on the race and income status for those involved in the grouper fishery in these communities. Although no EJ issues have been identified or are expected to arise, the absence of potential EJ concerns cannot be assumed. Nevertheless, because the gag and red grouper fishery does not represent a substantial proportion of landings in the respective communities, no EJ concerns are expected to arise in these communities as a result of the actions in this amendment. Additionally, no negative environmental consequences are expected to accrue to this proposed rule.

Although adverse social and economic consequences are expected to accrue to fishermen in the gag fleet and associated industries and communities due to the reduction of expenditures and revenues associated with an expected change in fishing behavior and harvest levels, the environmental consequences of this proposed rule are expected to be positive. This proposed rule is expected to result in a net short-term reduction in the mortality of gag by the commercial and recreational sectors of the fishery. Reduced mortality would be expected to increase the environmental benefits this species contributes to the marine environment and the general health and condition of this environment.

3.4 Description of the Administrative Environment

3.4.1 Federal Fishery Management

Federal fishery management is conducted under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), originally enacted in 1976 as the Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The Magnuson-Stevens Act claims sovereign rights and exclusive fishery management authority over most fishery resources within the Exclusive Economic Zone, an area extending 200 nautical miles from the seaward boundary of each of the coastal states, and authority over U.S. anadromous species and continental shelf resources that occur beyond the Exclusive Economic Zone.

Responsibility for federal fishery management decision-making is divided between the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) and eight regional fishery management councils that represent the expertise and interests of constituent states. Regional councils are responsible for preparing, monitoring, and revising management plans for fisheries needing management within their jurisdiction. The Secretary is responsible for promulgating regulations to implement proposed plans and amendments after ensuring management measures are consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and with other applicable laws summarized in Section 10. In most cases, the Secretary has delegated this authority to NMFS.

The Council is responsible for fishery resources in federal waters of the Gulf. These waters extend to 200

nautical miles offshore from the nine-mile seaward boundary of the states of Florida and Texas, and the three-mile seaward boundary of the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The length of the Gulf coastline is approximately 1,631 miles. Florida has the longest coastline of 770 miles along its Gulf coast, followed by Louisiana (397 miles), Texas (361 miles), Alabama (53 miles), and Mississippi (44 miles).

The Council consists of seventeen voting members: 11 public members appointed by the Secretary; one each from the fishery agencies of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida; and one from National Marine Fisheries Service. The public is also involved in the fishery management process through participation on advisory panels and through council meetings that, with few exceptions for discussing personnel matters, are open to the public. The regulatory process is also in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act, in the form of “notice and comment” rulemaking, which provides extensive opportunity for public scrutiny and comment, and requires consideration of and response to those comments.

Regulations contained within fishery management plans are enforced through actions of the NOAA’s Office for Law Enforcement, the United States Coast Guard, and various state authorities. To better coordinate enforcement activities, federal and state enforcement agencies have developed cooperative agreements to enforce the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Council’s Law Enforcement Advisory Panel and the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission’s Law Enforcement Committee have developed a five-year “GOM Cooperative Law Enforcement Strategic Plan - 2006-2011.”

3.4.2 State Fishery Management

The purpose of state representation at the council level is to ensure state participation in federal fishery management decision-making and to promote the development of compatible regulations in state and federal waters. The state governments of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida have the authority to manage their respective state fisheries. Each of the five Gulf States exercises legislative and regulatory authority over their states’ natural resources through discrete administrative units. Although each agency is the primary administrative body with respect to the states natural resources, all states cooperate with numerous state and federal regulatory agencies when managing marine resources. A more detailed description of each state’s primary regulatory agency for marine resources is provided in Amendment 22 (GMFMC 2004c).

4 Bycatch Practicability Analysis

Background/Overview

Bycatch is defined as fish harvested in a fishery, but not sold or retained for personal use. This definition includes both economic and regulatory discards, but excludes fish released alive. Economic discards are generally undesirable from a market perspective because of their species, size, sex, and/or other characteristics. Regulatory discards are fish required by regulation to be discarded, but also include fish that may be retained but not sold.

Guidance provided at 50 CFR 600.350(d)(3) identifies ten factors to consider in determining whether a management measure minimizes bycatch or bycatch mortality to the extent practicable. These are:

1. Population effects for the bycatch species.
2. Ecological effects due to changes in the bycatch of that species (effects on other species in the ecosystem).
3. Changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and the resulting population and ecosystem effects.
4. Effects on marine mammals and birds.
5. Changes in fishing, processing, disposal, and marketing costs.
6. Changes in fishing practices and behavior of fishermen.
7. Changes in research, administration, and enforcement costs and management effectiveness.
8. Changes in the economic, social, or cultural value of fishing activities and non-consumptive uses of fishery resources.
9. Changes in the distribution of benefits and costs.
10. Social effects.

The Councils are encouraged to adhere to the precautionary approach outlined in Article 6.5 of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries when uncertain about these factors.

As described in Amendment 30B and incorporated by reference here, the harvest of shallow-water grouper and other reef fish species are currently regulated through measures such as quotas, size limits, bag limits, and seasonal closures. These measures are intended to protect these species during spawning and limit fishing mortality, the size of fish targeted, the number of targeted fishing trips, and the time fishermen spend pursuing a species. However, these management tools have the unavoidable adverse effect of creating regulatory discards, which reduces yield from the directed fishery. In addition, there is bycatch of other reef fish species caught when shallow-water grouper are targeted (see “other bycatch” and Criterion 3 below). Consequently, the Council is considering in this amendment the practicability of taking additional action to further minimize directed fishery reef fish bycatch.

Gag Release Mortality Rates and Bycatch

As described in the bycatch practicability analysis in Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b), the 2001 Gulf of Mexico gag assessment used discard mortality rates of 20 percent for the recreational sector and 30 percent for the commercial sector based on different depths fished. However, these rates were revised based on subsequent work that were incorporated into SEDAR 10 (SEDAR 10 2006) that showed a positive relationship between release mortality and depth. SEDAR 10 estimated the average release mortality rate for commercially caught gag was 67 percent and 20 percent for recreationally caught gag. Although the release mortality rate was estimated higher in the commercial sector than in the recreational sector, the number of discards is significantly lower in the commercial sector because of lower encounter rates of undersized fish.

As determined by SEDAR 10, commercial gag discards are primarily due to minimum size regulations, which began in federal waters in 1990. However, as described in Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b), the magnitude of commercial discards was estimated to be a small fraction of total removals. In the course of developing management alternatives in this amendment for gag, potential inconsistencies in estimates of commercial discards were discovered. Preliminary estimates of commercial gag discards provided by the NMFS (2010d) indicated commercial discards were two orders of magnitude greater when estimated using reef fish observer data. Based on SEDAR 10, under a 20 inch minimum size limit (1990-1999), commercial dead discards were estimated to account for about 0.03 percent of the total commercial removals by weight, and under a 24-inch TL minimum size limit (since 2000), dead discards have accounted for about 1.3 percent of the of the total commercial removals by weight. Under the revised values as estimated from 2006-2009 in NMFS (2011), the estimated weight of dead discards averaged 26% of the removals by weight (Table 4.1.1).

Like the commercial sector, recreational discards were also attributed primarily to the minimum size limit. During 1990-1999 (20-inch TL minimum size limit), the recreational dead discards were 16 percent of total recreational removals (GMFMC 2008b). After the increase to a 22-inch TL minimum size limit in 2000, recreational dead discards were estimated at 23 percent of the total recreational removals by weight. This estimate has been revised to an average of 35% of the total recreational removals by weight for the time period between 2006-2009 (Figure 4.1.1). A small number of recreational discards were estimated to occur prior to implementation of federal size limits (1986-1989), accounting for about 3 percent of total recreational removals (note: an 18-inch TL gag minimum size limit was implemented in Florida state waters beginning in 1985).

Table 4.1.1. Gag recreational, commercial, and total landings and dead discards by weight, and as a percentage of the total fish killed for discards, in the Gulf of Mexico from 2006-2009 (From NMFS 2011).

Removal type	Year	Recreational	Commercial	Total
Landings	2006	2,286,440	1,369,985	3,656,425
	2007	2,231,762	1,262,181	3,493,943
	2008	2,958,027	1,248,481	4,206,509
	2009	1,613,316	733,292	2,346,608
	Average	2,272,386	1,153,485	3,425,871
Dead discards	2006	904,294	357,397	1,261,691
	2007	1,218,783	371,134	1,589,917
	2008	1,694,804	301,260	1,996,064
	2009	1,003,761	596,291	1,600,052
	Average	1,205,411	406,520	1,611,931
Percent dead discards of total fish killed	2006	28%	21%	26%
	2007	35%	23%	31%
	2008	36%	19%	32%
	2009	38%	45%	41%
	Average	35%	26%	32%

Red Grouper Release Mortality Rates and Bycatch

Red grouper release mortality rates and bycatch are discussed in detail in the bycatch practicability analysis for Amendment 30B and are incorporated by reference here. The estimation of red grouper release mortality rates are described in detail in SEDAR 12 (2007) and the 2009 red grouper assessment update (SEDAR 2009b). In SEDAR 12 (2007), a 10 percent release mortality rate was estimated for the recreational, handline, and trap sectors and a 45 percent release mortality rate was estimated for the longline sector.

As described in Sections 1.1 and 3.2, commercial discards in the red grouper update assessment based on logbook information was lower than observer-based estimates resulting in a rerun of the assessment. For the handline sector, observer-based estimates were approximately double the previous logbook based estimates used in the 2009 update (Walter 2011). For the longline sector, logbook and observer estimates were generally similar to each other. Because commercial handline landings are relatively low compared to longline landings (Table 1.1.3) and the estimated discard mortality rate is higher for longline gear (45% compared to 10%), these changes to the discard numbers had a relatively minor impact on the historical assessment. Discards from the longline sector generally account for approximately 80% of the total discards by weight (unpublished data supporting Walter 2011).

Total estimated commercial dead discards by weight for 2006-2008 (the last three years of the assessment update) are shown Table 4.1.2 and ranged from 17% to 26% of the total commercial removals (dead discards and landed catch). This removal amount may have declined as a result of the commercial minimum size being reduced from 20 to 18 inches in 2009 through Amendment 30B. Walter (2011)

reported there was an approximately 12% higher probability of a red grouper being retained for age 4 and 9% higher probability for age 5. These higher probabilities result in reducing discards and higher numbers of retained fish in ages 4 and 5. This effectively reduces the harvest of older fish and would lead to a different long-term pattern of fishing mortality and different benchmark values.

For the recreational sector, observer-based discard information from the headboat sector was applied to both private and charter-vessel landings in the assessment. To estimate the magnitude of discards in the recreational sector, a 10% discard mortality rate was applied to number of red grouper released alive (B2 catch type in the Marine Recreational Information Program) and multiplied by an average weight for released fish¹⁵. Total estimated recreational dead discards by weight for 2006-2008 (the last three years of the assessment update) are shown Table 4.1.2. The total estimated weight of discards ranged from 22 to 49% of removals for this sector between 2006 and 2008 and average 35%. However, as illustrated in Table 4.1.2, the weight of removals (both as landings and through dead discards) is much higher for the commercial than the recreational sector.

Table 4.1.1. Red grouper recreational, commercial, and total landings and dead discards by weight, and as a percentage of the total fish killed for discards, in the Gulf of Mexico from 2006-2008.

Removal type	Year	Recreational	Commercial	Total
Landings	2006	960,890	5,162,527	6,123,417
	2007	1,016,807	3,708,863	4,725,670
	2008	892,998	4,739,295	5,632,293
	Average	956,898	4,536,895	5,493,793
Dead discards	2006	272,627	1,428,385	1,701,012
	2007	385,147	1,293,782	1,678,929
	2008	875,121	963,679	1,838,800
	Average	510,965	1,228,615	1,739,580
Percent dead discards of total fish killed	2006	22%	22%	22%
	2007	27%	26%	26%
	2008	49%	17%	25%
	Average	35%	21%	24%

Other Bycatch

Species incidentally encountered by the directed gag and red grouper fisheries include sea turtles, sea birds, and other reef fishes, such as snappers and groupers. The Gulf commercial reef fish fishery is listed as a Category III fishery under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (November 8, 2010; 75 FR 68468)). This classification indicates the annual mortality and serious injury of a marine mammal stock resulting from any fishery is very low (see Section 3.2.2 for further information). The risk of serious injury or mortality to marine mammals resulting from the recreational sector of the reef fish fishery, which uses similar gear (i.e., handlines, rod and reel, spears, etc.), is also expected to be low, although interactions with dolphins and sea turtles are known to occur.

¹⁵Personal communication, John Walter, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL

The most recent biological opinion for the reef fish fishery completed on September 29, 2011, concluded this fishery in the Gulf of Mexico is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles, smalltooth sawfish, other listed species, or their designated critical habitat. The 2011 biological opinion supported the determinations of an earlier 2009 biological opinion (NMFS 2009). Specific actions taken by the Council to reduce the impact of the fishery on listed species include actions taken in Amendment 18A to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan (GMFMC 2005b) that established regulations to minimize stress to endangered species incidentally caught in the reef fish fishery, and actions taken in Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009) to reduce interactions between sea turtles and the longline sector of the fishery.

Three primary orders of seabirds represented in the Gulf are Procellariiformes (petrels, albatrosses, and shearwaters), Pelecaniformes (pelicans, gannets and boobies, cormorants, tropic birds, and frigate birds), and Charadriiformes (phalaropes, gulls, terns, noddies, and skimmers) (Clapp et al., 1982; Harrison, 1983). Several other species of seabirds also occur in the Gulf, and are listed as threatened or endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, including: piping plover, least tern, roseate tern, bald eagle, and brown pelican (the brown pelican is endangered in Mississippi and Louisiana and delisted in Florida and Alabama). Human disturbance of nesting colonies and mortalities from birds being caught on fishhooks and subsequently entangled in monofilament line are primary factors affecting sea birds. Oil or chemical spills, erosion, plant succession, hurricanes, storms, heavy tick infestations, and unpredictable food availability are other threats. There is no evidence that the directed grouper fisheries adversely affect seabirds.

Other species of reef fish are also incidentally caught when targeting red and gag grouper. In the eastern Gulf, scamp, black grouper, other shallow-water grouper, red snapper, greater amberjack, and vermilion snapper are caught as bycatch when targeting grouper. Vermilion snapper are not overfished or undergoing overfishing (SEDAR 9 2006a) and bycatch is not expected to jeopardize the status of this stock. Greater amberjack (SEDAR 9 2006c, SEDAR 2010) and red snapper (SEDAR 7 2005, SEDAR 2009) are overfished and undergoing overfishing. Greater amberjack release mortality is estimated to be fairly low, ranging from 10 to 20 percent. Discards are higher for commercially caught greater amberjack than they are for recreationally caught greater amberjack because of differences in minimum size limits (36 inches FL commercial vs. 30 inches FL recreational). Because greater amberjack are pelagic and grouper are bottom fish, bycatch of greater amberjack is relatively low in the shallow-water grouper fishery and likely not greatly affected by changes in grouper management measures. In contrast, red snapper have been increasing in abundance in the eastern Gulf over the past two decades and fishermen have indicated they are discarding more red snapper. Most commercial grouper fishermen in the eastern Gulf were allocated few red snapper individual fishing quota shares and therefore are unable to retain large quantities of red snapper when fishing for grouper. Bycatch is a significant source of mortality in the red snapper fishery, resulting in the Council approving actions in Amendment 27/14 to reduce directed fishery bycatch. The statuses of other shallow-water grouper species, such as scamp are unknown. Most trips target red, gag, and black grouper, and capture other shallow-water groupers incidentally. Bycatch is not known to be significant for these species, because many (e.g., yellowmouth grouper, rock hind, and red hind) have no or small minimum size limits (e.g., scamp – 16 inches TL).

Practicability of current management measures in the directed shallow-water grouper fishery relative to their impact on bycatch and bycatch mortality.

Bycatch and bycatch mortality can negatively affect a stock by reducing the number of fish that survive and become susceptible to harvest. Fishery management regulations are intended to constrain effort and control fishing mortality, but in some cases increase bycatch or bycatch mortality. When proposing fishing regulations, managers must balance the competing objectives of maximizing yield, ending overfishing, and reducing bycatch to the extent practicable.

Currently, dead discards in weight account for 24%, on average for the last three years of the assessment update, of the total biomass removed from the red grouper stock each year (Table 4.1.2). In the gag stock, dead discards account for an even greater percentage of the total biomass removed (32% for 2006-2009) and the proportion of dead discards to landings has increased greatly in recent years.

The following describes current management measures and their relative impact on bycatch and bycatch mortality for shallow-water grouper. The commercial harvest of shallow-water grouper has been managed with trip limits, quotas, gear restrictions, minimum size limits, and a one-month closed season (applies to gag, red grouper, and black grouper only), while the recreational harvest of shallow-water grouper has been managed with size limits, bag limits, and a one-month closed season (applies to gag, red grouper, and black grouper only). There are also several restricted fishing areas intended to protect reef fish, and in particular gag spawning aggregations.

Size limits

As described in Amendment 30B bycatch practicability analysis GMFMC (2008b), grouper minimum size limits is the greatest factor contributing to bycatch of shallow-water grouper. Size limits are intended to protect immature fish and reduce fishing mortality. For red grouper, the minimum size limit is above the size at 50 percent maturity (Moe 1969; Collins et al. 2002), while the gag minimum size limits are at or slightly above the size at 50 percent maturity (SEDAR 10 2006). For other grouper species, the minimum size limit is above the sizes at maturity for most species, however for some like black grouper, the size limit is below the size at 50 percent maturity.

As described in Amendment 30B (2008b), several yield-per-recruit analyses were conducted for gag and red grouper (Ortiz 2007; Walter 2007) to identify the sizes that best balance the benefits of harvesting fish at larger sizes against losses due to natural mortality. For both species, the size where the yield per recruit was maximized was less than the current minimum size limits. However, although decreasing the minimum size limit for either of these species positively benefits yield per recruit and reduces bycatch as described in Section 5.5.2, it also negatively affects spawning potential. For both species, the spawning potential ratio is below the spawning potential ratio at maximum sustainable yield if the minimum size limit is reduced to too much.

Closed Seasons and Quota Closures

The recreational shallow-water grouper sector is closed in the exclusive economic zone from February 1 through March 31. The impact of the two-month recreational closed season on recreational grouper discards is unknown and because it crosses waves, is hard to evaluate. In addition, this closure was only recently implemented. MRFSS data for March-April in general indicates the number of discards in waves 1-2 (January –April) for gag and red grouper are less than other waves. Although this may be a result of the closed season and reduced effort, the reduction is confounded by reductions in gag availability. More years of data will be needed to determine the actual impact of the recreational closed season on bycatch.

The commercial sector was subject to a one-month closure (February 15-March 15) implemented in 2000, and quota closures. The closure prohibited the harvest of gag, black, and red grouper and was designed to protect spawning. However, with the implementation of the shallow-water grouper individual fishing quota program, this closure has been rescinded and replaced by “The Edges” seasonal area closure (see below under “time/area closures”).

Bag and Trip Limits

The recreational sector of the shallow-water grouper fishery is regulated by a 2-red grouper and 2-gag daily bag limit per person and a 4-grouper aggregate bag limit per person. Grouper discards while harvesting the daily bag limit are primarily the result of incidental capture of undersized fish prior to reaching the bag limit and targeting of other reef fish residing in similar habitat as grouper once the grouper bag limits have been reached. SERO (2007) reported 90 percent or more of MRFSS trips catching gag landed 2 gag or less per angler. Based on these catch rates, the current grouper bag limit is not limiting and proposed bag limits of 2 or more gag would not limit the catch on most trips. With regard to red grouper, the proposed increase in the 2-fish bag limit would likely reduce the number of red grouper discards as discussed in Section 2.2.2.

Trip limits have been used in the past to limit commercial harvests of shallow-water grouper. However, the need for trip limits was superseded by the shallow-water grouper individual fishing quota program.

Allowable Gear

Vertical hook-and-line gear (bandit rigs, manual handlines) and longlines are the primary gears used to commercially harvest grouper. During 2001-2005, fish traps accounted for 14 percent of the total commercial red grouper landings. However, as of February 7, 2007, fish traps are prohibited in federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico. In 2008, new regulations were implemented requiring commercial and recreational fishermen to use circle hooks, venting tools, and dehooking devices when harvesting reef fish in the Gulf of Mexico. Circle hooks were commonly used in the commercial grouper industry prior to implementation of this new regulation. It is unknown how extensively venting tools and dehooking devices were used prior to these new gear requirements.

Longlines account for a majority of the red grouper commercial discards, although estimates of dead discards are not well estimated. Discards of gag by all commercial sectors are relatively low, primarily because gag caught in deeper water are larger and more likely to be legal-size. The use of longlines had been prohibited from waters less than 20 fathoms, however, due higher estimates of sea turtles caught in longline gear, measures were put in place through Amendment 31 to reduce this bycatch. These included the prohibition of the use of bottom longline gear in the Gulf reef fish fishery, shoreward of a line approximating the 35-fathom contour east of Cape San Blas, Florida from June through August; reducing the number of bottom longline vessels operating in the Gulf reef fish fishery through an endorsement based on catch history; and restricting the total number of hooks that may be possessed onboard each Gulf reef fish bottom longline vessel to 1,000, only 750 of which may be rigged for fishing at any given time.

Recreational discards are primarily due to the recreational size limit; however, allowable gears can affect release mortality rates. Rod-and-reel is the primary gear used by the recreational sector. Circle hooks are required by recreational anglers to harvest grouper and other reef fishes to reduce the incidence of gut hooking which is often fatal to the fish. Recreational anglers also use spears to capture grouper.

Spearfishing does not affect release mortality because all fish caught are killed. Only undersized grouper mistakenly killed while spearfishing would contribute to dead discards.

No gear restrictions are proposed in this amendment to further limit bycatch or bycatch mortality of reef fishes, including grouper.

Time/Area Closures

The Council created two restricted fishing areas to specifically protect spawning aggregations of gag in 2000. The Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps marine restricted fishing areas are located in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico at a depth of 40 to 60 fathoms. Both areas prohibit bottom fishing. In addition, the Council created the “The Edges” seasonal-area closure. This no-take area is between the Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps marine restricted fishing areas and is closed from January 1 to April 30. Bottom fishing is also prohibited in the Tortugas North and South marine reserves in the southern Gulf of Mexico near the Dry Tortugas. In addition, actions from Amendment 31 prohibit the use of bottom longline gear in the Gulf reef fish fishery, shoreward of a line approximating the 35-fathom contour east of Cape San Blas, Florida from June through August.

Marine reserves and time/area closures benefit fish residing within reserve boundaries by prohibiting their capture during part or all of the year. Within marine reserves, fish that are undersized potentially have an opportunity to grow to legal size and are no longer caught as bycatch. If these fish emigrate from the marine reserve (i.e., spillover effect), then they may be caught as legal fish outside the reserve, thereby reducing bycatch. However, anglers and commercial fishermen may redistribute their effort to areas surrounding the marine reserve. If fishing pressure in these areas is increased, then any benefits of reduced bycatch of fish in the marine reserve will likely be offset by increases in bycatch of fish residing outside the marine reserve. Within restricted fishing areas or time/area closures, fishing is allowed under restrictions that are intended to protect certain components of the populations within the area (e.g., prohibitions on bottom fishing gear), or to protect populations during a critical phase of their life history, such as during spawning. The time/area closures evaluated in this amendment are primarily in deeper water, where larger, legal-size gag occur. Establishing time/area closures in deeper water is unlikely to reduce bycatch by any significant amount. If such areas are sited in shallow-water, where juvenile and sub-adult grouper are more prevalent, then reductions in bycatch may be more likely to occur in the area where the time/area closure is sited.

Alternatives being considered to minimize bycatch

Reductions in dead discards can be accomplished either by reducing the number of red grouper and gag discarded or reducing the release mortality rate of discards. To reduce the number of grouper discards, management measures must limit fishing effort or change the selectivity of fishing gears in such a way that reduces the harvest of sublegal fish. To reduce the discard mortality rate of red grouper, gag, and other shallow-water grouper, sources of release mortality must first be identified (i.e., depth, hooking, surface interval) and management measures must be imposed to reduce discard mortality rates.

This amendment considers several management measures to reduce shallow-water grouper discards and discard mortality. Alternatives that either directly or indirectly could reduce shallow-water grouper bycatch, include higher red grouper bag limits (Action 2.2), an adjustment for discarded fish in setting the gag quota (Action 3), gag minimum size limits (Action 5), time and area closures (Action 6). Other alternatives considered in this amendment that may increase grouper bycatch include a gag grouper slot limit (Action 2.1) and longer recreational closed seasons (Action 2.1 and 7.2).

Practicability Analysis

Criterion 1: Population effects for the bycatch species

As described in Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b), for both the red and gag grouper stocks, total dead discards have increased significantly because the implementation of minimum size limits. For red grouper, commercial dead discards on average have been greater than recreational discards, and for gag, recreational dead discards on average have been greater than the commercial discards. Therefore, management measures to reduce bycatch will have the greatest effect on commercially caught red grouper and recreationally caught gag.

Measures being considered to end overfishing of gag including the rebuilding plan, setting the commercial quota, restricting the allocation of red grouper multi-use shares, and restricting the recreational harvest are likely to increase gag bycatch when compared to 2010 levels. However, if management measures are less restrictive than the more austere measures put in place through temporary regulations in 2011 to reduce overfishing, the amount of bycatch would be reduced because more fish will be kept rather than be discarded. If the management measures proposed in this amendment are not taken, stock rebuilding could be delayed, further jeopardizing the stock's condition. Therefore, the overall benefits to the stock resulting from these management measures are expected to exceed the losses associated with increasing bycatch.

For other reef fish species including red grouper, management measures to end gag overfishing and rebuild the stock could lead to increased discards for these species. The more restrictive the gag management measures, the more likely fishermen will target other species. This could increase discards in two ways. One would be in targeting these other species, the fishermen would be more likely to have regulatory discards, either by catching undersized fish or maximizing bag or trip limits, fishing during closed seasons, or individual fishing quota allocations. The other source of discards could result from annual catch limits (assuming these measures are implemented through the Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment) being exceeded through the redirected effort, thus causing season closures and regulatory discards resulting from those closures.

The bycatch minimization methods being considered for this amendment are expected to benefit the stocks. These include reducing the minimum size limit for commercially caught gag, season and area closures, and increasing the bag limit for red grouper.

Reducing the size limit of gag for the commercial sector is estimated to reduce bycatch. The extent and magnitude of bycatch reduction depends on the minimum size limit chosen, the gear used for harvest, and the overall release mortality for each gear. Lowering the commercial gag minimum size limit is expected to provide little benefit to the population because most fish harvested are legal size and not discarded. This amendment does not consider lowering the recreational gag minimum size limit. Although this might reduce dead discards and provide net benefits to the population, the decrease in the size limit, would increase angler catch rates and result in a longer recreational closed season. This action should have no effect on bycatch of other species.

Season and area closures considered in the amendment could decrease gag bycatch if the areas closed are areas where gag are more prevalent and shift effort to areas where gag are less prevalent. As discussed above, this shift in effort could result in increased discards for other reef fish species, particularly if these species are subject to minimum sizes, closed seasons, bag or trip limits, or closures due to meeting or

exceeding annual catch limits. Ultimately, the Council elected to go with the no action alternative and not set any season area closures. With the exception on non-governmental organizations, most comments were against additional closures because of concerns including concentrating effort and possible inter-sector conflict within the areas left open to fishing. Therefore, lack of quantifiable biological benefits from a new closure did not seem to balance out the opposition by fishermen to additional restrictions, especially given the other new restrictions under the gag rebuilding plan.

Increasing the red grouper bag limit would reduce the number of red grouper discards because more fish may be kept. However, fish would still be discarded if they were below the minimum size limit. This management measure could reduce discards for other reef fish species if the bag limit increase causes fishermen to target red grouper over other species. This benefit would be seen most for species that do not inhabit the same areas as red grouper.

Amendments 27/14 to the Reef Fish and Shrimp FMPs (GMFMC 2007) and Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009) recently required fishermen to change their fishing practices. This includes using specific gear like circle hooks, dehooking devices, and venting tools, to fishing in deeper waters where fewer undersized fish and sea turtles are found. These are all intended to reduce bycatch and release mortality. The benefits of such actions are discussed in detail in these amendments.

Criterion 2: Ecological effects due to changes in the bycatch of gag and red grouper (effects on other species in the ecosystem)

The relationships among species in marine ecosystems are complex and poorly understood, making the nature and magnitude of ecological effects difficult to predict with any accuracy. The most recent gag and red grouper stock assessment updates (SEDAR 2009a, 2009b) indicated an episodic mortality event in 2005 (possibly due to red tide) reduced both the red grouper and gag stocks. Although the red grouper stock was not reduced sufficiently to be considered overfished, the gag stock was. The red grouper stock has been recovering and allows the Council to increase TAC and the red grouper bag limit (Action 2.2 and a proposed 2011 red grouper regulatory amendment) which should reduce discards. Management measures in this amendment also propose to decrease fishing mortality for the gag stock and allow the stock to rebuild until it is capable of supporting fishing at the optimum yield level. Stock biomass for red grouper is estimated to recover even if red grouper management measures remain unchanged. Reductions in bycatch and fishing mortality will allow the gag stock to increase in abundance, resulting in increased competition for prey with other predators. Consequently, it is possible that forage species and competitor species could decrease in abundance in response to an increase in grouper abundance. Changes in the bycatch of gag, red grouper, and other shallow-water grouper are not expected to directly affect other species in the ecosystem. Although birds, dolphins, and other predators may feed on grouper discards, there is no evidence that any of these species rely on grouper discards for food.

Criterion 3: Changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and invertebrates and the resulting population and ecosystem effects

Population and ecosystem effects resulting from changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and invertebrates are difficult to predict. As discussed in Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b), snappers, greater amberjack, gray triggerfish and other reef fishes are commonly caught in association with shallow-water grouper. Many of these species are in rebuilding plans (red snapper, gray triggerfish, and greater amberjack) with the stocks improving. Regulatory discards significantly contribute to fishing mortality in all of these reef fish fisheries, except gray triggerfish and vermilion snapper.

No measures are proposed in this amendment to directly reduce the bycatch of other reef fish species. Bycatch minimization measures implemented through Amendment 27/14 and Amendment 31 are expected to benefit reef fish stocks. Lowering the commercial gag minimum size limit is estimated to reduce commercial discards, however, these reductions are somewhat tempered by the gag quota reductions. Decreasing the size limit will increase catch rates and allow the individual fishing quota shareholders to potentially catch their allocation faster. The individual fishing quota program eliminates the need for mid-season quota closures of shallow- and deepwater grouper, tilefish, and red snapper, which have the unintended consequences of shifting fishing effort to other species. For species with quotas (greater amberjack, gray triggerfish, and recreational red snapper), this could lead to a shift in fishing effort during quota closures and negatively impact reef fish stocks not currently constrained by annual quotas or individual fishing quota programs. The magnitude of this impact would depend on the size of the quota, the length of the closure, and the amount of effort shifting that occurs. Proposed annual catch limits and accountability measures are now being developed for species not considered undergoing overfishing or overfished, thus potential for effort shifting and changes in bycatch may be lessened for these species.

Criterion 4: Effects on marine mammals and birds

The effects of current management measures on marine mammals and birds are described above. Bycatch minimization measures evaluated in this amendment are not expected to significantly affect marine mammals and birds. There is no information to indicate marine mammals and birds rely on grouper for food, and measures in this amendment are not anticipated to alter the existing prosecution of the fishery, and thus interactions with marine mammals or birds.

Criterion 5: Changes in fishing, processing, disposal, and marketing costs

Lower commercial gag size limits will reduce costs associated with fishing operations. Decreasing the gag minimum size limit will increase efficiency and will reduce the number of fish released, especially in the longline sector. Expanding the recreational seasonal gag closure will likely have direct impacts to the recreational sector. Anglers and for-hire fishermen would incur losses in consumer surplus resulting from a seasonal closure or a lower bag limit. Increases in consumer surplus would be expected from a higher red grouper bag limit. For a more complete discussion of the changes in fishing costs associated with the various management actions see Sections 2 and 5.

Criterion 6: Changes in fishing practices and behavior of fishermen

All bycatch minimization measures proposed are expected to change fishing behavior and fishing practices in a manner that reduces bycatch for species targeted by the regulations. Individual fishing quota shareholders will need to determine if their gag allocation is sufficient to target gag, or to use the allocation to keep incidentally caught gag while targeting other species. Decreases to minimum size limits (commercial gag) will increase catch rates, reduce bycatch, and affect decisions about where to fish. Seasonal closures and higher bag limits will alter angler effort and may affect decisions about when and where to fish. A higher red grouper bag limit may encourage anglers to shift their effort and take more fishing trips targeting red grouper. This would potentially result in less discards for species found in other habitats than where red grouper are found, but could result in higher discards for species sharing the same habitat as red grouper. Anglers may also choose to fish closer to shore because of higher fuel prices and a longer gag closed season.

Criterion 7: Changes in research, administration, and enforcement costs and management effectiveness

Proposed management measures are not expected to significantly impact administrative costs. Size limits, bag limits, quotas, and closed seasons are currently used to regulate the commercial and recreational sectors harvesting shallow-water grouper. None of the commercial actions are expected to diminish regulatory effectiveness. All of these measures will require additional research to determine the magnitude and extent of impacts to bycatch and bycatch mortality.

Criterion 8: Changes in the economic, social, or cultural value of fishing activities and non-consumptive uses of fishery resources

Reducing the commercial gag minimum size limits may positively impact these stocks by reducing regulatory discards and increasing efficiency, however, with the reduced quota, the positive impacts may be minimized. This would result in lower harvest costs for commercial fishermen (i.e., less time to cull undersized fish, less bait, potentially greater catches per trip). However, these benefits would only accrue until commercial fishermen run out of their gag allocation. At this point, the minimum size limit would not be effective because all incidentally caught gag would have to be discarded. For anglers, increasing the red grouper bag limit would result in increases in consumer surplus for recreational anglers.

Imposing recreational closed seasons will positively benefit the gag stock by reducing fishing mortality assuming the times of the closures occur during times of high directed gag effort and that fishermen can avoid gag when targeting other species. These closures, however, have different effects relative to economic losses as to how they would influence angler behavior. This is in part related to the extent anglers are likely to alter their behavior to fish for gag during time periods when the availability of gag is either high or low (see Section 5.2.3). If effort shifting towards gag would occur during the open period, then this could reduce discards of other targeted reef fish species.

Recovery of the gag stock and maintenance of a healthy red grouper stock will positively affect the social and economic value of fishing activities. For a more complete discussion of the changes in fishing costs associated with the various management actions see Sections 2 and 5.

Criterion 9: Changes in the distribution of benefits and costs

Currently, the commercial and recreational red grouper minimum size limits are different and there is a two-inch difference between the recreational and commercial gag minimum size limit. This amendment proposes reducing size limits for the gag commercial sector. Reductions to commercial minimum size limits may be perceived by the recreational sector as inequitable, especially if equivalent reductions are not considered for the other sector. No or minimal changes in gag allocation are expected, resulting in little change to the distribution of benefits and costs associated with bycatch.

Criterion 10: Social effects

Bycatch is considered wasteful because it reduces overall yield obtained from the fishery. Measures that reduce bycatch to the extent practicable will increase efficiency, reduce waste, and benefit stock recovery, thereby resulting in net social benefits. Lower minimum size limits and higher recreational bag limits should all have positive social benefits because these actions would reduce bycatch or bycatch mortality.

Shorter seasons and reduced quotas/allocations should have short-term negative effects on the different sectors and could increase bycatch. However, the long-term benefits of stock rebuilding and accounting for discards in setting these restrictions should outweigh the short-term costs.

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the ten bycatch practicability factors indicates there would be positive biological impacts associated with further reducing bycatch and bycatch mortality in the reef fish fishery. The main benefits of reducing grouper bycatch are: 1) less waste and 2) increased yield in the directed fishery. Reducing discards and discard mortality rates would result in less forgone yield.

When determining reductions associated with various management measures, release mortality was factored into the analyses, in order to adjust the estimated reductions for losses due to dead discards. The increases in discards associated with each of these management measures varies and is contingent on assumptions about how fisherman's behavior and fishing practices will change. In this action, reducing the commercial gag minimum size limit appears to be a practical option for reducing discards as long as landings are constrained to the quota under the individual fishing quota program. Lowering the gag minimum size limit for the recreational sector will reduce bycatch, but this decrease would increase angler catch rates and require a longer closed season. The longer closed season will partially offset benefits resulting from the lower minimum size limit. Therefore, the Council had to weigh the benefits of reducing bycatch with the negative social effects of longer seasonal closures. Increased minimum size limits are expected to have the greatest effect on increasing bycatch, followed by seasonal closures, and lower bag/trip limits. In some instances, the benefits of reducing harvest and ending overfishing may outweigh the benefits of further reducing discard mortality.

The Council needed to consider the practicability of implementing the bycatch minimization measures discussed above with respect to the overall objectives of the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan and Magnuson-Stevens Act. Therefore, given actions in this amendment combined with previous actions, management measures, to the extent practicable, minimize bycatch and to the extent bycatch cannot be avoided, minimize the mortality of that bycatch.

5 Environmental Consequences

5.1 Action 1. Rebuilding Plan for Gag

5.1.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on Physical Environment

Sections 3.1, 3.2, and GMFMC (2004b) describe the physical environment and habitat use by groupers, particularly for red grouper and gag. In general, eggs and larvae are pelagic. Depending on the species, juveniles either share the same habitat as adults, or are found in different habitats and undergo an ontogenetic shift as they mature. For red grouper, juveniles are found in nearshore waters until they reach approximately 16 inches and move offshore (GMFMC 2004b). Adults are associated with rocky outcrops, wrecks, reefs, ledges, crevices, caverns, as well as “live bottom” areas, in depths of 3 to 190 m. Juvenile gag are estuarine dependent and are found in seagrass beds (GMFMC 2004b). Adult gag are associated with hard bottom substrates, including offshore reefs and wrecks, coral and live bottom, and depressions and ledges. Spawning adults form aggregations in depths of 50 to 120 m, with the densest aggregations occurring around the Big Bend area of Florida. Females undergo a migration from shallower waters to the deeper waters where spawning occurs, while males generally stay at the same depths where spawning occurs (Koenig 1999).

In the commercial sector, most red grouper are caught with longlines and most gag are caught with vertical lines (mostly bandit rigs and electric reels) (SEDAR 10 2006). Vertical-line gear is used to harvest most (>60%) commercial and nearly all recreational gag. Prior to 2007, longline gear accounted for 36% of the commercial gag landings and 59% of the commercial red grouper landings. Vertical line gear accounted for 27% of the commercial red grouper landings and nearly all of the recreational red grouper landings. Traps (14% of red grouper commercial landings), spears (2.2% of gag commercial landings), and other gears (< 1%) accounted for the remainder of landings. Traps became illegal for harvest of reef fish after February 7, 2007.

Longlines

Longline gear is deployed over hard bottom habitats using weights to keep the gear in direct contact with the bottom. Its potential for adverse impact is dependent on the type of habitat it is set on, the presence or absence of currents and the behavior of fish after being hooked. In addition, this gear upon retrieval can abrade, snag, and dislodge smaller rocks, corals, and sessile invertebrates (Bohnsack in Hamilton, 2000; Barnette 2001). Direct underwater observations of longline gear in the Pacific halibut fishery by High 1998 noted that the gear could sweep across the bottom. Some halibut were observed pulling portions of longlines 15 to 20 feet over the bottom. Although the gear was observed in contact with or snagged on a variety of objects including coral, sturdy flexible corals usually appeared unharmed while hard corals often had portions broken off. However, in another study that directly observed deployed longline gear (Atlantic tilefish fishery) found no evidence that the gear shifted significantly, even when set in currents. This was attributed to anchors set at either end of the longline as well as sash weights along the line to prevent movement (Grimes et al. 1982). Based on the direct observations, it is logical to assume that bottom longline gear would have a minor impact on sandy or muddy habitat areas. However, due to the vertical relief that hardbottom and coral reef habitats provide, it would be expected that bottom longline gear may become entangled, resulting in potential negative impacts to habitat (Barnette 2001).

Vertical lines

Concentrations of many managed reef fish species are higher on hard bottom areas than on sand or mud bottoms, thus vertical line gear fishing generally occurs over hard bottom areas (GMFMC 2004b). Vertical lines include multi-hook lines known as bandit gear, handlines, and rod-and-reels. Vertical-line gear is less likely to contact the bottom than longlines, but still has the potential to snag and entangle bottom structures and cause tear-offs or abrasions (Barnette 2001).

In using bandit gear, a weighted line is lowered to the bottom, and then the lead is raised slightly off the bottom (Siebenaler and Brady 1952). The gear is in direct contact with the bottom for only a short period of time. Barnette (2001) suggests that physical impacts may include entanglement and minor degradation of benthic species from line abrasion and the use of weights (sinkers).

Commercial or recreational fishing with rod-and-reel and handlines also puts gear on the bottom. The terminal part of the gear is either lifted off the bottom like fishing with bandit gear, or left contacting the bottom. Sometimes the fishing line can become entangled on coral and hard bottom outcroppings. The subsequent algal growth can foul and eventually kill the underlying coral (Barnette 2001). Researchers conducting studies in the restricted fishing area at Madison-Swanson reported seeing lost fishing line on the bottom, much of which appeared to be fairly old and covered with growth (personal communication, Andrew David), a clear indication that bottom fishing has had an impact on the physical environment prior to fishing being prohibited in the area (GMFMC 2003). The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, in issuing grants to remove marine debris, established monofilament fishing line is a priority marine debris issue¹⁶.

Anchor damage is also associated with vertical-line fishing vessels, particularly by the recreational sector where fishermen may repeatedly visit well marked fishing locations. Bohnsack (in Hamilton 2000) points out that “favorite” fishing areas such as reefs are targeted and revisited multiple times, particularly with the advent of global positioning technology. The cumulative effects of repeated anchoring could damage the hard bottom areas where fishing for grouper occurs.

Fish traps

Fish traps were an important part of commercial reef fish sector landings and previously accounted for as much as 14% of the annual red grouper landings. Traps are often set on live substrate and can cause damage to corals, gorgonians, sponges, and submerged aquatic vegetation. In addition, lost traps can continue to move on the bottom with currents continuing to damage adjacent bottom habitat. However, the Council phased out this gear in February 2007 so it is no longer allowed to be used. Thus, this gear no longer impacts habitat in the Gulf of Mexico.

Spear and Powerhead

Spearguns and slings are used in both commercial and recreational grouper fishing but are a relatively minor component of both. Barnette (2001) cited a study by Gomez (1987) that concluded that spearfishing on reef habitat may result in some coral breakage, but damage is probably negligible. In

¹⁶ National Fish and Wildlife Foundation 2006 Marine Debris Grants Program Recipients web page, <http://www.nfwf.org/Content/ContentFolders/NationalFishandWildlifeFoundation/Programs/MarineDebrisPreventionandRemovalProgram/2006MarineDebrisProjectBriefs.pdf>

addition, there could be some impacts from divers touching coral with hands or from resuspension of sediment by fins (Barnette 2001). Such impacts should be negligible to non-existent for well-trained and experienced spearfishermen who stay in the water column and avoid contact with the bottom.

This action simply establishes a target biomass level and a target date to achieve stock rebuilding. As such, it has no direct effects on the physical environment as described above. Indirectly, the targets set in this action will determine the management measures needed, including closed seasons and seasonally closed areas. These actions affect the time amount and time that fishing gear can interact with the physical environment. Fishing line can get entangled on bottom structures and lead to local fouling of areas in some situations. In this respect, **Alternative 1**, the no action alternative, will have the least indirect impact on the physical environment. **Alternative 2**, which established a 10-year rebuilding plan will have some indirect positive impact by the resulting closed seasons and areas that reduce the amount of time that gear can impact the bottom. **Alternative 3**, a 7-year rebuilding plan, will require more restrictive measures and longer closed seasons. The longer closed seasons under **Alternative 3** will provide greater positive impacts on the physical environment than **Alternative 1 or 2** while the rebuilding plan is in effect, while **Alternative 4**, a 5-year rebuilding plan, will require a complete shut-down of the fishery for the duration of the rebuilding period, and will therefore provide the greatest positive impact on the physical environment while the rebuilding plan is in effect. These indirect impacts are expected to be very minor.

5.1.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Gag and red grouper management actions that affect the biological/ecological environment mostly relate to the impacts of fishing on a species' population size, life history, and the role of the species within its habitat. Removal of fish from the population through fishing reduces the overall population size. Fishing gears have different selectivity patterns which refer to a fishing method's ability to target and capture organisms by size and species. For gag and red grouper fishing, this would include the number of discards, mostly sublegal fish or fish caught during seasonal closures, and the mortality associated with releasing these fish. Another factor would be the timing of fishing and if fishing coincides with important seasonal components of a species' life history such as spawning.

Maximum sustainable yield is the largest average catch that can be taken at a sustained level of harvest from a stock under average environmental conditions, and for gag and red grouper is also considered the overfishing limit. Associated with maximum sustainable yield is a fishing mortality and stock biomass that would sustain this harvest (F_{MSY} and B_{MSY} , respectively) from which the acceptable biological catch, annual catch limits, optimum yield, minimum stock size threshold, and maximum fishing mortality rate are generally derived. If fishing is allowed to exceed F_{MSY} (overfishing) for several years, then the stock size will decline to a level where the harvest can no longer be maximized. This overfishing can manifest itself in two ways. The first is growth overfishing where the fishing pressure on smaller fish is too high to allow the fishery to produce MSY. The second is recruitment overfishing where the fishing pressure is so high that the population is no longer able to replace itself. Recruitment overfishing for an extended period of time could lead to the collapse of the stock, or a condition where all fishing effort including bycatch from non-directed fisheries, would need to be severely curtailed or ended for the stock to rebuild. Taken to its extreme, recruitment overfishing could result in the economic and biological extinction of a stock.

Fishing can affect life history characteristics of reef fish. Lombardi-Carlson et al. (2006) found that the mean size of gag at age was larger pre-1990 than in post-1990 years and suggests this decrease may be

due to fishing. Although this trend has not been observed for Gulf red grouper, it has been noted in other reef fish species such as vermilion snapper (Zhao et al. 1997, Hood and Johnson 1999) and red snapper (Cowan et al. 2010). Fishing can also affect a gag and red grouper reproduction. Fitzhugh et al. (2006) reported the size at 50% maturity and 50% transition from females to males was smaller in their studies compared to earlier year. This has also been noted for other reef fish species (Cowan et al. 2010). In addition, for hermaphroditic species, fishing pressure has been suggested for changes in sex ratios. The proportion of male gag in the population has decreased from historical levels of 17% (Hood and Schlieder 1992) to 2-10% in the 1990s (Coleman et al. 1996, June 8, 1998 memo from Fitzhugh, Collins and White), leading to concerns by the Council's Reef Fish Stock Assessment Panel that the reduction in proportion of males may have a potentially negative consequence on population reproductive potential (GMFMC 1998). It has been suggested the resulting reduction in the number of males is a consequence of males being more aggressive feeders than females. Thus, hook-and-line fishing on gag spawning aggregations tends to selectively remove males before females (Gilmore and Jones 1992, Koenig et al. 1996). A decline in the ratio of male to female gag in the Gulf of Mexico has been an ongoing source of concern. Furthermore, for species that aggregate such as gag, the species is particularly vulnerable to fishing because they are concentrated at specific locations. This problem is confounded because of the depth gag spawn (from 27-66 fathoms, but concentrated around 44 fathoms; Koenig et al. 1996). At these depths, gag are vulnerable to mortality from barotrauma through the capture process.

Discard mortality from fishing is a problem for gag and red grouper populations, particularly at deeper depths. Fish with swim bladders can experience air expansion problems when brought to the surface, particularly when raised quickly from deep water. As air expands in the swim bladder, internal organs are pushed out of place and compressed, potentially causing injury and death (Rummer and Bennett 2005). If the bladder bursts, the gas can be retained in the body cavity and continue to cause damage. Management measures have been put in place to reduce this mortality through requiring venting tools (GMFMC 2007). For red grouper, even in shallow water (< 38m) 75% of red grouper had distended stomachs from swim bladder expansion, and in deeper water (> 41m) 95 percent had distended stomachs (Bacheler and Buckel 2004). For gag, no fish had distended stomachs in shallow water (< 24m), but over 60 percent had distended stomachs in deeper water (> 36m). Bacheler and Buckel (2004) indicated that if fish are released while still inflated, they may not be able to return to depth or even move off the surface. The resulting increased exposure to air and predators could increase mortality of discarded fish. The use of venting tools allowed fish to swim normally and return to depth; however, this does not mean the fish survive because mortality may be delayed (Rummer and Bennett 2005).

Discard mortality from fishing may also come from excessive handling of fish in the release process. Dehooking devices can decrease the time and amount of handling needed to remove a hook from a fish. Hook removal time contributes significantly to release mortality (Cooke and Suski 2004). Long-handled dehookers can be used without removing the animal from the water, which can decrease stress and injury from handling and exposure. Even when a fish is removed from the water, exposure and handling time may be reduced by using a dehooker. Management measures have been put in place to reduce this mortality through requiring venting tools through Amendment 27 and contains further discussion of the impacts of venting tools and dehooking devices on survival of fish (GMFMC 2007).

Changes in the abundance from fishing (e.g., changing fishing selectivities) are likely to have ecological effects. However, the relationships among species in marine ecosystems are complex and poorly understood. As a result, the nature and magnitude of ecological effects are difficult to predict with any accuracy. Recent advances in ecosystem modeling may provide some insight into the cascading effects of gag and red grouper management measures. Currently, the only model for the Gulf that could address

these issues is an Ecopath model being developed by the Florida Marine Research Institute and NOAA Fisheries (Behzad Mahmoudi, personal communication). The development of this model is ongoing and it would be impractical to apply at this time. Without knowing how an increase or decrease in the abundance of red grouper or gag would affect other populations or that it would even be detectable, the ecological effects of the various alternatives cannot be distinguished at this time.

Even though current models that can examine the linkages between species are not yet adequate to look at the effects of management measures, it is important to note that some species such as red snapper, greater amberjack, and gray triggerfish are being managed to improve their stock condition. Other species (e.g., vermilion snapper and deepwater grouper) are being managed to maintain a certain stock condition. Therefore, the effects of improving the gag stock and maintaining the red grouper stock to avoid overfishing could have an adverse effect on these stocks. These effects could come about through competition for food or space. For example, adult gag feed primarily on fish (>95%) (Naughton and Saloman, 1985; Nelson 1988; Bullock and Smith, 1991) and red grouper feed on a variety of shrimp, crabs, and lobsters (Bullock and Smith 1991). Less of these prey items may be available to other reef fish species if red grouper and gag stocks are allowed to increase.

Red grouper have a role in shaping the offshore environment. Direct underwater observations of red grouper have shown this species utilizes flat areas with veneer of sand over solution holes, which they excavate to form depressions exposing the underlying carbonate rock¹⁷. Their excavations harbor suites of fish and invertebrate species whose abundances increase as a result, including vermilion snapper, black grouper, and spiny lobster (Coleman and Williams 2002). In this way, red grouper act as ecosystem engineers that alter the habitat and create interdependencies with other important species.

The reef fish fishery can affect species outside the reef fish complex. Specifically, sea turtles have been observed to be directly affected by the longline sector of the Gulf reef fish fishery. These effects occur when sea turtles interact with fishing gear and result in an incidental capture injury or mortality and are summarized in GMFMC (2009). A variety of factors may affect the likelihood and frequency of sea turtles being caught in reef fish bottom longline gear. The spatial overlap between fishing effort and sea turtles is one such factor. The more abundant sea turtles are in a given area where the fishing gear is set, the greater probability a sea turtle would be incidentally caught on the gear. However, for sea turtles and other listed species, the most recent biological opinion for the Reef Fish fishery management plan concluded authorization of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery managed under the reef fish plan is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles, smalltooth sawfish, or *Acropora* species (NMFS 2009). For marine mammal species, the reef fish fishery was classified in the 2011 List of Fisheries (75 FR 69468) as a Category III fishery because it is prosecuted primarily with longline and hook-and-line gear. This classification indicates the annual mortality and serious injury of a marine mammal stock resulting from any fishery is less than or equal to one percent of the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortalities, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock, while allowing that stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population.

As discussed in Section 5.1.3, the setting of a biomass target and date has no direct impact on the biological/ecological environment. However, establishing a target biomass level will result in management actions that will rebuild the gag stock from its present level. This will benefit the gag stock

¹⁷ PowerPoint presentation titled, "Red Grouper on the West Florida Shelf", given by Felicia Coleman at the October 29 – November 1, 2007 Gulf Council meeting in Biloxi, Mississippi.

by rebuilding it to a level where it can support higher catch levels without becoming overfished. In addition, it can better resist periodic environmental impacts. An example is the 2005 episodic mortality event described in the 2009 gag update assessment, which has been attributed to a massive red tide that year. At the start of the event, the gag stock was at or slightly below its B_{MSY} biomass level, and the additional mortality from the event, combined with the normal level of natural mortality and fishing mortality, is believed to have driven the stock below its minimum stock size threshold and into an overfished state. Red grouper, in contrast, was estimated in the 2006 SEDAR benchmark assessment to be at its B_{OY} biomass level, well above the B_{MSY} level. Although red grouper also experienced a severe decline in 2005, it remained above its minimum stock size threshold and avoided becoming overfished. Thus, rebuilding stocks to B_{MSY} and above produces long-term benefits for the health of the stock.

Given that a rapid rebuilding will, for the reasons discussed above, provide the greatest biological benefits to the gag resource, **Alternative 4**, which will rebuild the stock in 5 years, will provide the greatest benefits to the biological/ecological environment, followed by **Alternative 3**, which will rebuild the stock in 7 years, and then **Alternative 2**, which will rebuild the stock in 10 years. **Alternative 1**, the no-action alternative, will not rebuild the stock. It is possible that some rebound of the stock will occur naturally, but is it unlikely to fully rebuild to the MSY target levels in 10 years or less without additional actions, and therefore **Alternative 1** provides the least benefits to the biological/ecological environment.

5.1.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Action 1 considers alternatives with respect to establishing a rebuilding plan for gag. A rebuilding plan would instruct the implementation of future management measures intended to achieve the rebuilding objectives. As discussed above, the setting of a rebuilding plan is an administrative action, and thus has no direct effects on the economic environment. However, establishing a target biomass level and rebuilding plan will result in management actions that will rebuild the gag stock from its present level, which will allow the stock to support higher catch levels without being overfished. As such, establishing a rebuilding plan for gag would only potentially result in indirect economic effects on fishing participants. The actual management measures implemented during the rebuilding period would have direct economic effects on fishing participants.

Alternative 1 (No Action), which does not provide a rebuilding plan, would potentially imply the least restrictive regulations and thus generate the least adverse indirect economic effects on fishing participants in the short-term. Specifically, if a rebuilding plan is not implemented, the total allowable catch (TAC), commercial annual catch limit, annual catch target, and quota, and the recreational annual catch limit and annual catch target for gag would revert back to what was established in Amendment 30B. The Council set the 2009-2011 TAC based on constant F_{OY} projections. For 2011 and subsequent years, this yield was 3.82 MP GW, of which 1.49 MP GW is the commercial allocation (39% of TAC) and 2.33 MP GW is the recreational allocation (61% of TAC). The Council selected this approach to setting TAC and the resultant quota because the harvest can increase or decrease based on the condition of the stock.

However, the fishing mortality rate for gag has shown an increasing trend over time and fishing mortality rates in recent years are not consistent with rebuilding or maintaining the gag stock at its maximum sustainable yield level. Moreover, because the gag stock has been determined to be overfished and undergoing overfishing, **Alternative 1 (No Action)** does not comply with Magnuson-Stevens Act requirements regarding rebuilding plans.

In the absence of all fishing mortality, including bycatch mortality, the shortest possible time in which the gag stock can rebuild is 5 years. Under the National Standard 1 guidelines, the maximum time allowed for rebuilding the gag stock is 10 years. In the Generic annual catch limit/AM Amendment, the proposed annual catch limits are based on yields that are projected to rebuild the stock in 10 years, while the proposed annual catch targets are based on yields that are projected to rebuild the stock in 7 years.

Preferred Alternative 2 establishes a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less. Specifying the rebuilding time to be 10 years or less allows a buffer to account for fluctuations in abundance due to unforeseen events (e.g., red tide) and leeway to take the needs of fishing participants into account when setting catch levels and management measures. **Preferred Alternative 2** would potentially imply the less restrictive regulations and thus generate less adverse indirect economic effects on fishing participants in the short-term relative to **Alternative 3** and **Alternative 4**, but potentially more restrictive regulations and thus more adverse indirect economic effects in the short-term relative to **Alternative 1 (No Action)**.

Alternative 3 establishes a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 7 years or less. Seven years is the estimated time to rebuild if the stock is managed at a fishing rate corresponding to optimum yield (F_{OY}) rather than the rate corresponding to a 10-year rebuilding plan ($F_{rebuilding}$). Although the yields under a 7-year rebuilding plan would eventually catch up to those for a 10-year plan, the initial catch targets in the early years would be smaller under a 7-year rebuilding plan relative to a 10-year rebuilding plan. Thus, **Alternative 3** would potentially imply more restrictive regulations and thus more adverse indirect economic effects in the short-term relative to **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 1 (No Action)**, but less restrictive regulations and thus less adverse indirect economic effects on fishing participants in the short-term relative to **Alternative 4**.

Alternative 4 establishes a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 5 years. If **Alternative 4** is adopted, strong measures to reduce bycatch of gag in other fisheries also need to be considered. Because a total elimination of discard mortality is unlikely to be achieved, this alternative would likely result in the stock being slightly under the rebuilding target at the end of five years. Most importantly, this alternative would require a complete closure of the gag component of the reef fish fishery for at least 5 years. **Alternative 4** would therefore eliminate all net revenue from the commercial sector and all consumer and producer surplus from the recreational sector for at least 5 years. As such, **Alternative 4** would lead to the most restrictive regulations and thus more adverse indirect economic effects in the short-term relative to **Alternative 1 (No Action)**, **Preferred Alternative 2**, and **Alternative 3**.

The choice of a rebuilding plan under each of the various alternatives will lead to different economic costs and benefits. The actual costs and benefits associated with each alternative depend on the difference between current and target biomass level for gag and the length of the rebuilding period. In terms of productive capacity, a wide gap exists between current and potential production of the gag stock, and this gap necessitates the introduction of more stringent measures in order to reach full productive capacity. The length of the rebuilding plan will determine how stringent the management measures will be. In general, the shorter the rebuilding period, the more stringent the required management measures will be, and thus the greater the indirect economic costs on fishing participants in the short-term. On the other hand, the indirect economic benefits resulting from larger yields will also accrue sooner as well. Conversely, longer rebuilding periods will require less stringent management measures in the short-term

and thus smaller indirect economic costs on fishing participants in the short-term. The indirect economic benefits from larger yields would accrue farther into the future.

Regardless of the length of the rebuilding period chosen, the long-term benefits from the fishery would depend on, among others, the regulatory regime adopted over time. Regulatory regimes that promote economic efficiency generally have a higher likelihood of generating higher economic values while preserving the sustainability of the fish stock. Other regulatory regimes could very well erode the economic benefits over time, even at higher stock levels. For example, if regulations proposed in this amendment were successful in rebuilding the gag stock, higher levels of harvest approaching the chosen optimum yield (OY) would be allowed. However, if overcapacity and other open-access issues in the recreational sector are not addressed, the economic status of the gag component of the reef fish fishery could fall back to its current, or possibly worse, condition. Regardless, without knowledge of the actual management measures that would be implemented under the rebuilding plans associated with each alternative, and the associated estimates of costs and benefits over time, it cannot be determined whether a shorter rebuilding period would provide larger net economic benefits than a longer rebuilding period, or vice-versa.

The issue of rebuilding periods in fisheries management was explored by Larkin et al. (2006). They constructed a dynamic programming bioeconomic model and applied it to two hypothesized fisheries, one involving moderate-live stock and the other, a long-lived stock. They noted the possibility of generating a higher net present value (NPV) when moving from a 10-year rebuilding timeframe to 20-year and 30-year timeframes, with a higher discount rate resulting in larger increases than a lower one. One of the additional regulations they simulated was a 10-year fishery closure within a 40-year rebuilding period. Their results showed minimal changes in the NPV and total allowable catch (TAC) under a low discount rate, but an increase in TAC with a slight reduction NPV under a higher discount rate.

Some additional statements on relative costs and benefits can be made based on the respective characteristics of the various rebuilding plans and the current management of fishing for gag. Specifically, as discussed in section 3.3.1, the commercial sector is currently managed under the grouper/tilefish individual fishing quota program. It is assumed the commercial sector for gag will continue to be managed under individual fishing quota program during the course of any rebuilding plan chosen by the Council. Further, the individual fishing quota program is assumed to keep the commercial sector operating within its quota. Economic theory suggests the average allocation price per pound approximates the average net revenue per pound harvested in the commercial sector. In 2010, the first year of the individual fishing quota program, the average price per pound of gag allocation was \$1.00. In each year, the expected total net revenue in the commercial sector would be estimated by multiplying its quota by \$1.00, assuming a constant average price per pound of gag allocation. The net present value (NPV) of the commercial sector's expected total net revenue would be estimated by discounting it by the appropriate rate, which is currently 3%.

Conversely, the recreational sector is currently managed through the use of a bag limit, size limit, and seasonal closures, which are intended to keep it from harvesting more than its allocation. Because the private and for-hire subsectors are not managed separately (e.g. via allocations to each subsector), the allocation of landings between the two subsectors cannot be determined. Further, the management measures used to restrain the recreational sector's harvest and landings are subject to change, as evidenced by measures in the two recent interim rules and Action 2 in this Amendment. As such, net operating revenue (NOR) for the for-hire sector cannot be estimated. However, Carter and Liese (2010) estimated the average consumer surplus (CS) per fish is \$85 (2008 dollars). The average weight per fish

from 2006-2008 was 7.23 pounds GW. Thus, the average CS per pound of fish landed by the recreational sector is estimated to be \$11.76 (2008 dollars). Expected total consumer surplus in the recreational sector can be estimated by multiplying its landings in each year by \$11.76. As in the commercial sector, the net present value (NPV) of the recreational sector's expected total consumer surplus would be estimated by discounting it by the appropriate rate, which is currently 3%.

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Effects from fishing regulations on the social environment are difficult to analyze due to complex human-environment interactions and a lack of quantitative data about that interaction. Generally, social impacts can be categorized according to changes in: human behavior (what people do), social relationships (how people interact with one another), and human-environment interactions (how people interact with other components of their environment, including enforcement agents and fishery managers). It is generally accepted that a positive correlation exists between economic impacts and social impacts. Thus, in the preceding section, Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment, alternatives predicting positive or negative economic impacts are expected to have correlating positive or negative social impacts. At this time, however, social impacts may only be described qualitatively.

National Standard 8 (NS8) specifies that consideration be given to the impacts of regulatory action on fishing communities. However, the specific wording of the Magnuson Stevens Act (MSA) and the National Standards mandates priority to end overfishing within a limited time frame, relegating potential impacts on human communities as secondary. Amendment 32 is driven by the mandates of National Standard 1 and MSA to rebuild the gag stock within a limited time frame. Although each of the actions has a status quo alternative, the selection of the status quo alternative conflicts with the mandates of MSA and is not allowable. Additional alternatives are proposed that vary by severity of change to current regulations regarding gag and red grouper. To the extent practicable, the Council selected as preferred the alternative in each action that provides the most fishing while still fulfilling the required rebuilding plan. It is the Council's intention that the Preferred Alternative incurs the least negative social impacts. In this way, the Council is negotiating its requirement to fulfill the restrictive mandates of NS1 and MSA, with balancing consideration for the impacts on fishing communities thereby satisfying NS8.

Thus, although **Alternative 1**, no action, would result in the least negative social impacts by not implementing a rebuilding plan for gag, meaning no further restrictions on the harvest of gag would be implemented, this alternative is not allowable under MSA. With the rebuilding plan outlined in this action, and detailed in subsequent actions of this amendment, negative impacts are expected to occur in the short-term as the stock rebuilds. It is anticipated that these immediate impacts will be met with improved benefits in the long-term as the stock rebuilds.

Of the remaining alternatives, **Preferred Alternative 2** will entail the least negative impacts in the short term, by providing the longest time frame for rebuilding the gag stock. Under any rebuilding plan, harvest yields will be decreased, affecting fishermen by restricting the quantity of fish that may be caught. A longer time frame for rebuilding allows for larger harvest yields during the rebuilding process than does a shorter rebuilding time frame. This corresponds with lesser social impacts, given the requirement to rebuild, than may be expected under a shorter rebuilding time frame. For example, the 10 years or less rebuilding plan under **Preferred Alternative 2** will allow more fish to be harvested each year than the 7 years or less (**Alternative 3**) or 5 years or less (**Alternative 4**). Each year's total allowable catch will be greater under a 10 year rebuilding plan, than a 5 year rebuilding plan. A greater total allowable catch will allow more fishermen to harvest more fish in the early years of the rebuilding plan. Under **Alternative 3**,

the initial catch targets would be smaller than under **Preferred Alternative 2**, resulting in greater short-term social impacts as fishermen's harvests are more restricted in the early years of the rebuilding plan. On the other hand, more restrictive catch levels in the early years of the rebuilding plan may allow for yields associated with a fully rebuilt stock to be resumed more quickly. This would mean that the greater short-term impacts under **Alternative 3** may be short and be followed by larger catch levels for the duration of the rebuilding plan.

The complete closure of the harvest of gag for at least five years, required in order to rebuild the gag stock within that time frame (**Alternative 4**), would incur the greatest negative social impacts. Although these impacts may be ameliorated in the long-term as the stock rebuilds faster, it is possible that such a closure could lead to non-compliant fishermen behavior, including practices that may be difficult to change at a later date.

5.1.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

The setting of a target for biomass and a target date is an administrative action and it will have administrative effects. The act of setting a target, whether it be 5, 7 or 10 years, is a one-time event, and thus **Alternatives 2, 3 and 4** have equivalent though minor direct administrative impacts. **Alternative 1**, the no-action alternative, is not compliant with the Magnuson-Stevens Act requirement to end overfishing immediately and rebuild the stock in 10 years or less. Therefore, it will trigger additional administrative actions by the Council and NMFS to bring gag management into compliance. Thus, **Alternative 1** has a greater negative effect on the administrative environment than **Alternatives 2, 3 and 4**.

Indirect effects include more restrictive management measures, which may require increased enforcement. From this aspect, **Alternative 4** is the most restrictive rebuilding time period and will require the most active enforcement. **Alternative 3** requires restrictive rebuilding actions and enforcement, while **Alternative 2** even fewer restrictions. **Alternative 1** makes no changes and thus requires no additional enforcement. Therefore, indirect effects on the administrative environment, from greatest to least, result progressively from **Alternative 4, Alternative 3 Alternative 2, and Alternative 1**.

5.2 Action 2. Recreational Bag Limits, Size Limits, and Closed Seasons

5.2.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

With respect to **Action 2.1**, fishery management actions that affect the physical environment mostly relate to the interactions of fishing with bottom habitat, either through gear impacts to bottom habitat or through the incidental harvest of bottom habitat as described in Section 5.1.1. The degree a habitat is affected by fishing gear depends largely on the vulnerability of the affected habitat to disturbance, and on the rate that the habitat can recover from disturbance (Barnette 2001). For example, the complex structure and vertical growth pattern of coral reef species makes reef habitat more vulnerable to adverse impacts from fishing gear and slower to recover from such impacts than is sand and mud bottom habitat (Barnette 2001). Juvenile gag are found in seagrass beds and oyster shell reefs while adult gag primarily occur over mid-to-high relief natural reef habitat. Red grouper are also associated with hard bottom habitat, but tend to prefer lower relief habitat than gag.

The primary effects of recreational grouper fishing on the physical environment generally result from

fishing gear interactions with the sea floor. Most grouper are caught with hook-and-line fishing gear, although some spearfishing does occur. Fishing gear can damage or disturb bottom structures and occasionally incidentally harvest such habitat.

The primary difference between the alternatives in this action are in the length of the fishing season. Longer seasons and increased fishing effort can result in increased gear interactions and lost or discarded fishing line, which could foul the hard bottom. Such fouling could cause marine life to become entangled or overgrown with algae (Hamilton 2000; Barnette 2001).

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, is likely to have the greatest potential impact on the physical environment due to the length of the open season and amount of fishing effort. If no action is taken to modify the recreational fishing regulations, then once the interim gag rule expires, the recreational gag fishery will be open year round, except for February-March, a total of 306 days.

Alternative 2 has 61 days, which along with Alternative 3, is the shortest season length of the alternatives. This also occurs at a time of the year when gag effort is historically low. This alternative exceeds the reductions needed for gag rebuilding, and is likely to have the greatest positive impact on reducing effect on the physical environment.

Alternative 3 also has 61 open days. However, the length of the season is not necessarily an indicator of the amount of fishing effort and gear interaction. Relative to **Alternative 2**, the open days for Alternative 3 have historically had higher fishing effort. As a result, there will be more effort and greater impacts to the physical environment than **Alternative 2**, although less than **Alternative 1**.

Preferred Alternative 4 has 123 fishing days, the next longest season after **Alternative 1**. However, this open season occurs during a period of relatively low gag fishing effort. Therefore the overall effort and impacts to the physical environment are likely to be similar to **Alternative 3**. **Option a** maintains the current 22 inch minimum size limit, while **Option b** implements a 22" to 30" slot limit. The slot limit will slow down the rate of retained catch, and could result in slightly higher fishing effort if fishermen choose to fish longer to attempt to catch more keeper size fish.

For **Action 2.2**, as previously stated, the primary effects of the recreational grouper sector on the physical environment generally result from fishing gear interactions with the sea floor. The longer fishing occurs, the greater the potential for gear interactions. In this respect, increasing the bag limit could encourage fishermen to fish longer on a trip in the expectation of catching more fish.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, leaves the red grouper bag limit at its current level of 2 fish, and provides no incentive for longer fishing trips. Therefore, this alternative will result in no change to the physical environment.

Alternative 2 raises the bag limit to 3 fish and could provide some incentive for fishermen who catch two fish to stay out longer, resulting in increased impacts with the physical environment.

Likewise, **Preferred Alternative 3**, which raises the bag limit to 4 fish, could provide even more incentive to stay out fishing longer and greater impacts on the physical environment.

However, under **Alternatives 2 and 3**, the assumption of greater impacts assumes that fishermen catch their bag limit of red grouper and stay out to catch more fish. Although anecdotal information suggests

that in the 1950s and 60s, headboat and charterboat anglers off southwest Florida were catching 4 or 5 red grouper per angler, by the 1980s catch rates had declined drastically (SEDAR 12, 2007a). During the period 1981-1985, the red grouper catch estimates off southwest Florida were 0.25 fish per angler trip from headboats, 0.579 fish per angler trip from charter boats, and 0.918 fish per angler trip from private boats (SEDAR 12, 2007a). Off northwest Florida, catch rates were even lower, and red grouper were rarely caught before Hurricane Camille in 1969 (personal comm., Bob Zales, SEDAR 12, 2007a). Although the red grouper stock has recovered since the 1980s as a result of the various management measures put in place under the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan, it remains unlikely that most anglers are able to catch even the current 2 fish bag limit. Thus, for most anglers, the bag limit is not the controlling factor in the length of a fishing trip, and an increase in bag limit will not affect the length of time fishing for most anglers. There will be some increase in length of fishing by some anglers, and thus some increase in impacts to the physical environment from **Alternatives 2 and 3**, but the increase will not be in proportion to the increase in the bag limit.

5.2.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

With respect to **Action 2.1**, the primary differences between the alternatives in this action are in the length and time of year of the fishing season. All of the alternatives retain the 2 fish gag bag limit and 4 fish aggregate grouper bag limit. All of the alternatives retain the 22 inch recreational minimum size limit for gag except for **Alternative 4, Option b**, which implements a 22 to 30 inch slot limit.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, will have the greatest negative impact on the gag stock. It will allow the recreational fishery to operate year round, except for a fixed February-March shallow-water grouper closed season (306 days). Gag harvest will exceed rebuilding levels and will not allow rebuilding to proceed. This alternative will not only result in the highest amount of landed catch, but also the highest amount of dead discards due to the increased effort relative to the other alternatives.

Alternative 2 retains the recreational season that was implemented by interim rule in 2011, September 16 through November 15. This alternative has 61 open days, which along with Alternative 3, is the shortest season length of the alternatives. This also occurs at a time of the year when gag effort is historically low. This alternative exceeds the reductions needed for gag rebuilding. At an effort shifting level of 1.5 (i.e., effort during the open season is assumed to be 150% of what it would have been during the same time period in a year-round fishery), this alternative is expected to achieve reductions in total gag removals of 60% under both baselines. This exceeds the reductions needed for rebuilding, and will provide positive benefits to the gag stock. However, this alternative, along with Alternative 3, also results in the greatest number of days closed to recreational gag fishing, which could result in increased effort shifting to red grouper or other species. Red grouper are neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, and the recreational sector has not caught its allocation in recent years, so while increased harvest of red grouper would be a negative impact, it is not expected to increase to the point where overfishing would occur.

Alternative 3 implements a split season, with part of the fishing season open in the winter (January 1-31), and part of the season open in the spring (April 1-30). This alternative also has 61 open days. However, the length of the season is not necessarily an indicator of the amount of fishing effort. Relative to **Alternative 2**, the open days for **Alternative 3** have historically had higher fishing effort. As a result, this alternative will achieve a smaller reduction in total removals, 52% to 56%. However, these reductions are still sufficient to achieve rebuilding. Along with **Alternative 2**, this alternative also results in the greatest number of days closed to recreational gag fishing, which could result in increased effort shifting to red grouper or other species. However, it is not expected to increase to the point where

overfishing would occur.

Preferred Alternative 4 establishes the longest recreational fishing season consistent with the rebuilding plan, July 1 through October 31. It has 123 fishing days, the next longest season after **Alternative 1**. However, this open season occurs during a period of relatively low gag fishing effort. Therefore the overall effort and impacts on retained gag and dead discards are likely to be similar to **Alternative 3**, with reductions of 50% to 56% depending upon which option is selected. However, this alternative results in the shortest closed season other than **Alternative 1** (which does not achieve rebuilding). Thus, it has the fewest number of days when effort shifting to red grouper or other stocks might occur, resulting in a more positive biological effect on those stocks than **Alternatives 2 or 3**.

Within **Preferred Alternative 4**, **Preferred option a** maintains the current 22 inch minimum size limit, while **Option b** implements a 22" to 30" slot limit. In terms of total removals of gag, **Preferred option a** produces a smaller reduction in removals (50% to 53%) than **option b** (54% to 56%). Both of these reduction are sufficient to achieve rebuilding. However, analysis of the retained catch vs. dead discards using the gag management analyses spreadsheets prepared by the Southeast Regional office indicates that, under **Preferred option a**, a smaller percentage of the total removals will consist of dead discards (59% to 67%) than under **option b** (66% to 73%). Furthermore, under option b, a portion of the dead discards will consist of larger fish above the slot limit. These fish produce more eggs in a spawning season. Thus, the slot limit could negatively impact the spawning potential ratio.

In terms of reductions to achieve rebuilding of gag, all alternatives except for **Alternative 1** meet or exceed the reductions needed to achieve rebuilding. **Alternative 2** achieves the greatest reduction, followed by **Alternative 4b**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4a**. However, in terms of minimizing dead discards or effort shifting to other stocks, **Preferred Alternative 4a** provides the greatest benefits, followed by **Alternative 4b**, **Alternative 2**, and **Alternative 3**.

For **Action 2.2**, as previously stated, the primary effects other than **Alternative 1** will be to allow an increase in the recreational harvest of red grouper.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, leaves the red grouper bag limit at its current level of 2 fish. There could be some increase in red grouper harvest due to effort shifting from gag during the closed season, but it is unlikely to result in the recreational red grouper allocation being exceeded, particularly if the red grouper annual catch limit is increased.

Alternative 2 raises the bag limit to 3 fish and could provide some increase in the number of red grouper caught. However, during 2009-2010 only 5% of MRFSS intercepts where red grouper were caught had landings of more than 1 red grouper (personal communication, Andy Strelcheck, May 25, 2011). Thus, an increase in the bag limit is unlikely to have a major impact on increasing the recreational harvest. Any increase in catches is likely to come more from effort shifting away from gag.

Likewise, **Preferred Alternative 3**, with raises the bag limit to 4 fish, could provide some increase in the number of red grouper caught. However, as noted above, less than 5% of fishermen who catch red grouper are reported to have caught more than one. Thus, this increase in the bag limit is unlikely to have a major impact on increasing the recreational harvest. Any increase in catches is likely to come more from effort shifting away from gag.

It is possible that, under **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3**, an increase in the bag limit could

provide an incentive for fishermen to stay out longer in order to attempt to catch more fish. Anecdotal information suggests that in the 1950s and 60s, headboat and charterboat anglers off southwest Florida were catching 4 or 5 red grouper per angler, but by the 1980s catch rates had declined drastically (SEDAR 12, 2007a). During the period 1981-1985, the red grouper catch estimates off southwest Florida were 0.25 fish per angler trip from headboats, 0.579 fish per angler trip from charter boats, and 0.918 fish per angler trip from private boats (SEDAR 12, 2007a). Off northwest Florida, catch rates were even lower, and red grouper were rarely caught before Hurricane Camille in 1969 (personal comm., Bob Zales, SEDAR 12, 2007a). Although the red grouper stock has recovered since the 1980s as a result of the various management measures put in place under the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan, it remains unlikely that most anglers are able to catch even the current 2 fish bag limit. Thus, for most anglers, the bag limit is not the controlling factor in the length of a fishing trip, and an increase in bag limit will not affect the length of time fishing for most anglers. There could be some increase in length of fishing by some anglers, but the increase will not be in proportion to the increase in the bag limit. A small number of anglers may catch their increased bag limits. Therefore **Preferred Alternative 3** might produce marginally higher total landings and greater impacts on the stock than **Alternative 2**. However, the difference in impacts between the alternatives will likely be so small as to be negligible, and unlikely to result in overfishing.

5.2.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

For **Action 2**, the potential economic effects on the recreational sector of **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)** on the gag component of the reef fish fishery are analyzed. Regarding the red grouper bag limit, the potential economic effects of **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)** on the red grouper component of the reef fish fishery are also analyzed.

Conceptual Model

The procedure for calculating the economic effects of these two sets of alternatives on the recreational sector, from the standpoint of costs and benefits to the nation, involves estimating the expected changes in consumer surplus (CS) of anglers (regardless of mode) and in producer surplus (PS) of the for-hire sector (charter vessels and headboats). CS per trip is the amount of money that an angler would be willing-to-pay for a fishing trip over and above the cost of the trip. The CS per fish measures how much the CS per trip changes when the number of fish that the angler is able to harvest changes by one. The CS per fish measure is assumed to be the same regardless of the number of fish caught per trip and the same for all anglers, regardless of mode, so that the change in CS for a change in the total harvest is measured as:

$$(1) \quad dCS = (H^1 - H^0) \cdot v^*$$

where H^0 and H^1 measure the total number of fish harvested by the recreational sector with the baseline (status quo) and proposed alternative, respectively, and v^* is the constant CS per fish harvested.¹⁸

¹⁸ The assumption of a constant CS per trip is common in popular travel cost models such as those based on count data or discrete choice specifications, especially when the assumption of repeated-choice is employed (Hellerstein and Mendelsohn

Producer surplus for a for-hire (charter or headboat) fishing trip is the amount of money the operator earns on the trip over and above the economic cost of providing the trip. In the case of a regulatory change, some trips that formerly targeted a species might now target other species and some trips might be canceled. Assuming the producer surplus per trip is constant regardless of the species targeted, for-hire operators would only lose value from the trips actually canceled. If the regulatory change allows for and induces additional trips, PS is gained by the sector. The change in PS for a change in the number of trips is measured as:

$$(2) \quad dPS = (X^1 - X^0) * r$$

where X^0 and X^1 measure the total number of for-hire fishing trips taken with the 2006-08 and 2009 baselines) and proposed alternatives, respectively, and r equals the constant producer surplus per trip. Note that the value for X^1 , X^0 , and r will be different for charter and headboats.

The information necessary to apply the above framework to the proposed action and its alternatives is as follows: 1) an estimate of the CS per fish harvested; 2) the estimated change in the total numbers of fish harvested under each alternative (regardless of mode); 3) an estimate of the PS per angler trip taken for charter and for headboats; and 4) the estimated change in the number of for-hire trips taken under each alternative, by mode.

Measuring Consumer Surplus

Consumer Surplus can be measured as a consumer's willingness to pay (WTP) more than the actual market price for a good or service. In a non-market setting, such as that of a recreational fishing trip, the WTP must be derived using non-market economic research methods, such as stated preference surveys or travel cost models. There are no specific estimates of the value of gag to anglers currently available; however, three potential measures of WTP per grouper are reported in Table 5.2.3.1.¹⁹ All of the estimates in the table are relatively close. For current purposes, the value from Carter and Liese (2010) is used because this estimate is based on a model where the angler has the option to take trips for another species (red snapper, dolphin, or king mackerel) or not to fish at all. The other estimates in Table 5.2.3.1 assume the angler will continue fishing for another species. The WTP estimate of \$85 (in 2008 dollars) is for the second fish kept on a trip targeting grouper. To evaluate a closed season (or zero bag limit), an estimate of the angler WTP for the first fish caught and kept would be needed, and it might be higher. However, the value of the first fish kept cannot be estimated from the data available in Carter and Liese (2010). On the other hand, note that trips not targeting gag will also be prevented from keeping gag during the closed season. The WTP per gag for anglers on these trips will likely be less than the \$85 estimated for anglers specifically targeting grouper.

1993; Morey 1994). A constant marginal utility of income is also assumed such that there is no difference between compensated or uncompensated measures of CS (Johanssen 1987 pp. 62-66).

¹⁹ For further details see also "Response to the 7/10/09 Data Request for Amendment 17a to the Snapper-Grouper Fishery Management Plan of the South Atlantic, 7/27/2009."

Table 5.2.3.1. Consumer Surplus Estimates: WTP for One Additional Keep of Reef Fish on Targeted Trips in the Southeast U.S.

Study	Study Year	Scope	Modes	Substitute Species	Quality measure	Starting # of fish	WTP (in \$2008)
Carter and Liese 2010	2003	Gulf & S. Atlantic	Private & Charter	Red snapper, dolphin, king mackerel, no trip	hypothetical keep	1	\$85 (78, 92)
Gentner 2009	2006	Gulf & S. Atlantic	Private & Charter	-none-	predicted keep	constant	\$104
Haab et al. 2009	2000	Gulf	Private & Charter	Red snapper, other snappers	5 year average keep	constant	\$124 (111, 140)

Notes: Willingness to pay (WTP) \$-values updated to June 2008 using the Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers (Series Id: CUUR0000SA0). The 95% confidence interval is provided in parentheses when available.

Changes in Gag Landings and Consumer Surplus

The underlying, biological modeling effort supporting this Amendment uses two baseline scenarios against which each alternative is evaluated: a) the years 2006 to 2008 (average) and b) the year 2009. The predicted change in landings between each of the four alternatives and the two baselines were provided by the Gulf of Mexico gag grouper recreational decision model (NMFS 2011). The primary data used by the model is MRFSS effort and catch data. The model generates landings on a gutted weight basis, which are here translated into number of fish in order to apply the WTP per fish estimate. The change in recreational gag landings and the associated change in CS for **Alternative 1 (no action)**, **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to the two baselines are shown in Table 5.2.3.2. Alternatively, Table 5.2.3.3 indicates the change in recreational gag landings and the associated change in CS for **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)**. These estimates are calculated according to equation (1) using the anticipated change in landings (converted to numbers of fish) and the constant CS per fish of \$85.

Table 5.2.3.2. Estimated Loss of Consumer Surplus in the Gag Recreational Sector Associated with Alternative 1, Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 Relative to the 2006-08 and 2009 Baselines

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<u>Relative to the 2006 to 2008 Baseline</u>				
Reduction in gag landings (gw lbs)	518,168	2,056,161	1,887,950	1,937,318
Reduction in landings (number of fish)	71,669	284,393	261,127	267,955
Reduction in Consumer Surplus (\$)	\$6,061,062	\$24,051,107	\$22,083,532	\$22,660,996
<u>Relative to the 2009 Baseline</u>				
Reduction in gag landings (gw lbs)	893	1,451,831	1,214,584	1,288,630
Reduction in landings (number of fish)	123	200,806	167,992	178,234
Reduction in Consumer Surplus (\$)	\$10,443	\$16,982,204	\$14,207,103	\$15,073,229

Notes: The estimated lost landings in gutted weight pounds are converted to numbers of fish using 7.23, the average pounds per landed gag from 2006 to 2008. The reduction in landings of fish is converted to the reduction in consumer surplus using a value of \$85 (in 2008 dollars) per gag (Carter and Liese 2010).

Table 5.2.3.3. Estimated Loss of Consumer Surplus in the Gag Recreational Sector Associated with Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 Relative to Alternative 1 for the 2006-08 and 2009 Baselines

	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<u>Relative to the 2006 to 2008 Baseline</u>			
Reduction in gag landings (gw lbs)	1,537,992	1,369,782	1,419,150
Reduction in landings (number of gag)	212,724	189,458	196,286
Reduction in Consumer Surplus (\$)	\$17,990,045	\$16,022,470	\$16,599,934
<u>Relative to the 2009 Baseline</u>			
Reduction in gag landings (gw lbs)	1,450,938	1,213,691	1,287,737
Reduction in landings (number of gag)	200,683	167,869	178,110
Reduction in Consumer Surplus (\$)	\$16,971,761	\$14,196,660	\$15,062,787

Notes: The estimated lost landings in gutted weight pounds are converted to numbers of fish using 7.23, the average pounds per landed gag from 2006 to 2008. The reduction in landings of fish is converted to the reduction in consumer surplus using a value of \$85 (in 2008 dollars) per gag (Carter and Liese 2010).

Measuring Producer Surplus

Conceptually, producer surplus (PS) is the difference between the price received by the producer for a good or service and the marginal cost of producing it. Empirically, variable costs are used to approximate marginal costs. Because the delineation of variable costs depends critically on the time horizon, the choice of time horizon is also critical to measuring PS. For this analysis, we assume a short-term perspective, where marginal costs are approximated by variable trip costs. As a result, PS can be approximated by the net operating revenue (NOR) or “cash flow” generated by a for-hire fishing trip for the operator. The cash flow is calculated as the difference between the fee paid for the trip and the non-labor variable costs, such as for fuel, ice, and bait.²⁰

Table 5.2.3.4 provides two estimates each for short-term NOR for charter and headboat trips. All of these estimates are in 2008 dollars. To account for different number of anglers per trip and to be consistent with MRFSS data, all measures are calculated on an angler trip basis. Given the Gulf of Mexico focus and large sample size of the data in Liese and Carter (2011), the estimate of \$148 NOR per angler trip is used to value changes in the number of charter vessel trips. For headboat trips, the estimate of \$49 per angler trip by Sutton et al. (1999) is used due to its Gulf focus.

Table 5.2.3.4. Producer Surplus Estimates: Net Operating Revenue (Cash Flow) for For-Hire Fishing Trips in the Southeast U.S.

Study	Study Year	Scope	Mode / Trip Types	Sample Size	Cash Flow (per angler) (in \$2008)
Liese and Carter 2011	2002/03	LA through east FL	Representative charter trip (FHS sample)	1,205	\$148 (136,158)
Dumas et al. 2009	2007/08	North Carolina	Representative charter trip	1-3 trips from 154 vessels	\$130
Sutton et al. 1999	1997	Gulf of Mexico	Representative headboat trip	1-3 trips from 73 vessels	\$49
Dumas et al. 2009	2007/08	North Carolina	Representative headboat trip	1-3 trips from 8 vessels	\$64

Notes: Cash Flow \$-values updated to June 2008 using the Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers (Series Id: CUUR0000SA0). The 95% confidence interval is provided in parentheses when available.

Changes in Gag Trips and Producer Surplus

The primary difficulty with estimating PS lies in correctly estimating the change in the number of trips associated with the regulatory change. Keeping a caught gag is only one element comprising a ‘for-hire fishing trip experience.’ A for-hire fishing trip is a recreational service provided by the captain/operator

²⁰ For further details see also “Response to the 7/10/09 Data Request for Amendment 17a to the Snapper-Grouper Fishery Management Plan of the South Atlantic, 7/27/2009.”

which involves, for the angler, experiencing the outdoors, the ocean, a boat, fishing, catching fish, keeping fish, and other factors. Further, for-hire anglers are heterogeneous with respect to the trip characteristics they value, ranging from those who only value keeping as many fish as possible of a specific species to those who value the overall experience independent of any specific trip characteristics. Research regarding if, when, and to what extent incremental changes in single-species regulations induce anglers to stop fishing (as opposed to switching to a different species) is not available. In its absence, assumptions and approximations must be made.

The underlying, biological model separates all recreational trips that catch (keep or release) any gag into two groups: those targeting or catching a lot of gag (target and directed trips for gag) and those where gag is an incidental catch. Presumably, on the latter type of trip, one or more other species were targeted or there was no target species. In either case, gag regulations are unlikely to affect the angler's choice about taking such a trip. On the other hand, anglers who target or catch a relatively large number of gag (gag directed trips) might cancel their fishing trips if faced with regulations that prevent them from keeping gag. The underlying, biological model assumes trips targeting or directed at gag will not be taken during a closed season.

Similarly, in the absence of specific research on how many trips will be canceled when regulation changes, the economic analysis assumes that all of the existing for-hire gag target and directed trips will be canceled. Because some of these trips would probably not be canceled, this assumption, in combination with constant estimates of consumer and producer surplus per trip, is expected to overestimate the reduction in consumer surplus and producer surplus (PS) associated with a shorter season.

The predicted decrease in gag directed and target trips during the closed season between each of the four alternatives and the two baselines were derived from the underlying, biological model (personal communication, Nick Farmer). The model uses MRFSS intercept sample data on species caught per trip linked to MRFSS aggregate effort estimates (at a monthly resolution). The underlying, biological modeling effort also assumes a 150% "effort intensification" during the open season under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. For simplicity, the model implements this assumption by scaling up removals (landings and discards) of gag by a factor of 1.5 without explicitly modeling a change in trips. From an economic perspective, additional trips during the open season will generate additional PS, which will partially compensate for the trips lost during the closed season.

However, the ad hoc, across-the-board 50% increase in landings (and discards) does not appear reasonable in an explicit trip model for two related reasons. First, consistent with an earlier assumption, the substantial number of trips catching gag incidentally is unlikely to increase due to changes in gag regulations. As a result, the number of target and directed trips for gag must increase proportionally more to account for a 50% landings increase. Second, by design, the relatively short open seasons under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are in months when gag landings per trip on target and directed trips for gag is quite low, and hence incidental gag landings are relatively high. As a result, again, the number of target and directed trips for gag must increase non-proportionally as many more trips are necessary to catch and land a given amount of gag during months when gag are not relatively abundant. Implementing the 50% landings increase requires a near doubling of target and directed trips for gag by private boats. Especially in the for-hire sector, where the operator is dependent on the demand for trips by anglers, the increase in target and directed trips for gag caused by the 50% landings increase assumption is unreasonable, requiring up to 860% more for-hire angler trips in months when gag abundance has historically been low.

The economic analysis could either strictly implement the 50% landings increase by increasing trips to an unreasonable level, or limit the increase in trips to a more number more consistent with the facts raised above. Although the latter approach introduces an inconsistency with respect to the 50% landings increase assumption used in the underlying biological model, this more literal interpretation of the term “effort shift” appears to be more consistent with the intent of the biological model and the Council’s understanding of that term. Further, the possible range of this effort shift is believed to lie somewhere between a 0 and 100% increase (i.e., effort would be scaled up by 100% or 200%). The upper limit, which doubles the average number of historically occurring gag target and directed trip, is the maximum number of additional trips allowed to occur during the open season. However, this limit is not binding on the number of private boat trips.

For each alternative and baseline, the number of angler trips lost in the for-hire sector during the closed season are reduced by the number of angler trips gained in the open season due to the 150% effort intensification assumption. The net trip loss is then multiplied by the appropriate per trip PS loss, \$148 or \$49 for charter or headboat angler trips, respectively. The estimated net change in charter and headboat angler trips and the change in PS associated with **Alternative 1**, **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to the two baselines are shown in Table 5.2.3.5. Alternatively, Table 5.2.3.6 indicates the estimated net change in charter and headboat angler trips and the associated change in PS for **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)**.

Table 5.2.3.5. Estimated Loss of Producer Surplus in the Gag For-hire Sector Associated with Alternative 1, Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 Relative to the 2006-08 and 2009 Baselines

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<u>Relative to the 2006 to 2008 Baseline</u>				
Reduction in charter boat trips (angler-trips)	4,053	11,851	7,032	12,862
Reduction in PS in charter sector	\$599,812	\$1,753,920	\$1,040,780	\$1,903,559
Reduction in headboat trips (angler-trips)	687	2,254	1,356	2,244
Reduction in PS in headboat sector	\$33,646	\$110,470	\$66,460	\$109,950
Total Reduction in Producer Surplus	\$633,458	\$1,864,390	\$1,107,240	\$2,013,509
<u>Relative to the 2009 Baseline</u>				
Reduction in charter boat trips (angler-trips)	2,631	8,972	5,957	10,023
Reduction in PS in charter sector	\$389,365	\$1,327,858	\$881,621	\$1,483,398
Reduction in headboat trips (angler-trips)	107	2,337	1,083	2,156
Reduction in PS in headboat sector	\$5,249	\$114,502	\$53,068	\$105,624
Total Reduction in Producer Surplus	\$394,614	\$1,442,360	\$934,689	\$1,589,022

Notes: The estimated losses in angler-trips are converted to a reduction in producer surplus using \$148 or \$49 (in 2008 dollars), the average net operating revenue per angler on a charter boat or headboat trip, respectively (Liese and Carter 2011 and Sutton et al. 1999).

Table 5.2.3.6. Estimated Loss of Producer Surplus in the Gag For-hire Sector Associated with Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 Relative to Alternative 1 for the 2006-08 and 2009 Baselines

	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<u>Relative to the 2006 to 2008 Baseline</u>			
Reduction in charter boat trips (angler-trips)	7,798	2,980	8,809
Reduction in PS in the charter sector	\$1,154,108	\$440,968	\$1,303,748
Reduction in headboat trips (angler-trips)	1,568	670	1,557
Reduction in PS in the headboat sector	\$76,824	\$32,814	\$76,304
Total Reduction in Producer Surplus	\$1,230,932	\$473,782	\$1,380,051
<u>Relative to the 2009 Baseline</u>			
Reduction in charter boat trips (angler-trips)	6,341	3,326	7,392
Reduction in PS in the charter sector	\$938,494	\$492,256	\$1,094,033
Reduction in headboat trips (angler-trips)	2,230	976	2,048
Reduction in PS in the headboat sector	\$109,253	\$47,819	\$100,375
Total Reduction in Producer Surplus	\$1,047,746	\$540,075	\$1,194,408

Notes: The estimated losses in angler-trips are converted to a reduction in producer surplus using \$148 or \$49 (in 2008 dollars), the average net operating revenue per angler on a charter boat or headboat trip, respectively (Liese and Carter 2011 and Sutton et al. 1999).

Summary of Economic Effects for Action 2 on Gag

The overall estimated change in economic value to the recreational sector for gag associated with **Alternative 1, Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Preferred Alternative 4** relative to the two baselines for gag is shown in Table 5.2.3.7. Alternatively, Table 5.2.3.8 indicates the overall estimated change in economic value to the recreational sector for gag associated with **Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)**. These estimates probably overstate actual economic effects as private anglers or for-hire operators will likely adjust their behavior to avoid or minimize adverse consequences to their welfare or profits, respectively. Finally, consumer surplus and producer surplus estimates are somewhat different in nature. CS attempts to quantify, in dollar terms, the expected loss of welfare experienced by anglers. These values correspond to no actual flows of dollars in the formal economy, though they clearly motivate economic behavior. In contrast, PS is represented in the formal economy by lower revenue and lower profits in the for-hire sector. However, to the extent consumers will spend their money elsewhere, other producers will gain by potentially similar amounts. In summary, the CS losses represent real welfare losses but are intangible in our formal economy, while PS losses represent a shift of revenue and profits away from the for-hire sector, but are a tangible economic loss for the for-hire sector.

Table 5.2.3.7. Estimated Total Loss of Economic Value in the Gag Recreational Sector Associated with Alternative 1, Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 Relative to the 2006-08 and 2009 Baselines

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<u>Relative to the 2006 to 2008 Baseline</u>				
Consumer Surplus: Anglers	\$6,061,062	\$24,051,107	\$22,083,532	\$22,660,996
Producer Surplus: Charter Boats	\$599,812	\$1,753,920	\$1,040,780	\$1,903,559
Producer Surplus: Headboats	\$33,646	\$110,470	\$66,460	\$109,950
Total	\$6,694,520	\$25,915,497	\$23,190,772	\$24,674,505

Relative to the 2009 Baseline

Consumer Surplus: All Anglers	\$10,443	\$16,982,204	\$14,207,103	\$15,073,229
Producer Surplus: Charter Boats	\$389,365	\$1,327,858	\$881,621	\$1,483,398
Producer Surplus: Headboats	\$5,249	\$114,502	\$53,068	\$105,624
Total	\$405,057	\$18,424,564	\$15,141,792	\$16,662,251

Notes: Estimates are in 2008 dollars.

Table 5.2.3.8: Estimated Total Loss of Economic Value by the Gag Recreational Sector Associated with Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 4 Relative to Alternative 1 for the 2006-08 and 2009 Baselines

	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<u>Relative to the 2006 to 2008 Baseline</u>			
Consumer Surplus: All Anglers	\$17,990,045	\$16,022,470	\$16,599,934
Producer Surplus: Charter Boats	\$1,154,108	\$440,968	\$1,303,748
Producer Surplus: Headboats	\$76,824	\$32,814	\$76,304
Total	\$19,220,977	\$16,496,252	\$17,979,985

Relative to the 2009 Baseline

Consumer Surplus: All Anglers	\$16,971,761	\$14,196,660	\$15,062,787
Producer Surplus: Charter Boats	\$938,494	\$492,256	\$1,094,033
Producer Surplus: Headboats	\$109,253	\$47,819	\$100,375
Total	\$18,019,508	\$14,736,735	\$16,257,195

Notes: Estimates are in 2008 dollars.

Changes in Red Grouper Landings and Consumer Surplus

Action 2 also proposes increasing the red grouper bag limit, which is currently two fish per person. However, because of a lack of recent catch data at increased bag limits, estimates of catch levels at different bag limits are not generated by the underlying, biological model. Because current landings are already below the recreational catch target and very few trips catch the bag limit, the additional economic value is likely to be limited. In order to estimate the possible economic consequences of increasing the bag limit for red grouper, an assumption must be made. Specifically, the number of trips in all modes is assumed to remain the same regardless of any change in the red grouper bag limit. Thus, no changes to PS or economic impacts are expected to result from a change in the red grouper bag limit.

Based on landings and trip data averaged across 2009 and 2010, when a 2-fish red grouper bag limit was in effect, less than 1% of trips catching red grouper landed the bag limit. Only these trips, estimated at 6,338 per year on average, are candidates for keeping one or two additional red grouper under **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3**, respectively. In Table 5.2.3.8, the additional landings are multiplied by the same \$85 per grouper CS estimate used for gag. These estimates likely overstate the actual increase in consumer surplus because: 1) the value of a 3rd or 4th fish on a trip is likely to be less than \$85, which is an estimate of the 2nd fish's value, and 2) not all of the candidate trips will actually catch enough additional, legal-size red grouper to keep a 3rd or 4th red grouper.

Table 5.2.3.8. Estimated Gain of Consumer Surplus in the Red Grouper Recreational Sector Associated with Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 Relative to Alternative 1

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Increase in landings (number of fish)	-	6,338	12,676
Increase in Consumer Surplus (\$)	-	\$536,005	\$1,072,009

Notes: The estimated increase in landings of fish is converted to a gain in consumer surplus using a value of \$85 (in 2008 dollars) per red grouper (Carter and Liese 2010).

Analysis of Economic Impacts

The procedure for estimating the economic impacts of the various alternatives on the recreational sector involves tracing the changes in regional or state economic activities from angler expenditures to the supporting industries that directly or indirectly conduct business related to recreational fishing. Economic impacts or activities are generally characterized in the form of FTE jobs, income impacts (wages, salaries, and self-employed income), output (sales) impacts (gross business sales), and value added impacts (difference between the value of goods and the cost of materials or supplies). Income and value-added impacts are not equivalent, though similarity in the magnitude of multipliers may result in roughly equivalent values.

The technique used in estimating economic impacts is the so-called input-output analysis. This technique exploits the relations among various sectors/industries, with an industry depending on input from another and supplying its output to another industry. These relations can track the changes ("ripple effects") in all industries due to changes in one or more industries. The input-output model used in this proposed rule was developed for and applied in NMFS (2009 and 2010). This model, however, includes only the

private/shore mode and charter mode, and thus does not account for economic impacts in the headboat sector. The general caveats in using this technique are discussed in GMFMC (2010) and are incorporated herein by reference.

Tables 9-12 and 13-16 present estimates of changes in angler trips and economic impacts on the gag component of the reef fish fishery by state and mode under **Alternative 1 (no action)**, **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to the two baselines (2006-08 and 2009 respectively). Alternatively, Tables 17-19 and 20-22 present estimates of changes in angler trips and economic impacts on the gag component of the reef fish fishery by state and mode under **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, and **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1, (no action)** under the two baselines (2006-08 and 2009 respectively). Because the number of trips in all modes is assumed to remain constant regardless of the red grouper bag limit, a change in the red grouper bag limit is not expected to generate any economic impacts.

Table 5.2.3.9. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 1 (no action) relative to the 2006-2008 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	9,361	0	0	9,361
Output Impact	\$0	\$634,386	\$0	\$0	\$634,386
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$368,558	\$0	\$0	\$368,558
Jobs	0	7	0	0	7
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	358	72,875	0	0	73,233
Output Impact	\$20,829	\$3,308,624	\$0	\$0	\$3,329,453
Value Added Impact	\$11,403	\$1,967,432	\$0	\$0	\$1,978,835
Jobs	0	33	0	0	33
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	52	4,001	0	0	4,053
Output Impact	\$27,074	\$1,256,341	\$0	\$0	\$1,283,414
Value Added Impact	\$14,903	\$744,881	\$0	\$0	\$759,784
Jobs	0	13	0	0	13
	All Modes				
Target Trips	410	86,237	0	0	86,647
Output Impact	\$47,903	\$5,199,351	\$0	\$0	\$5,247,254
Value Added Impact	\$26,307	\$3,080,870	\$0	\$0	\$3,107,177
Jobs	1	53	0	0	53

Table 5.2.3.10. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 2 relative to the 2006-2008 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	44,101	0	0	44,101
Output Impact	\$0	\$2,988,683	\$0	\$0	\$2,988,683
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,736,327	\$0	\$0	\$1,736,327
Jobs	0	32	0	0	32
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,687	343,304	0	0	344,991
Output Impact	\$98,152	\$15,586,469	\$0	\$0	\$15,684,621
Value Added Impact	\$53,736	\$9,268,299	\$0	\$0	\$9,322,035
Jobs	1	156	0	0	157
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	153	11,698	0	0	11,851
Output Impact	\$79,660	\$3,673,250	\$0	\$0	\$3,752,909
Value Added Impact	\$43,850	\$2,177,859	\$0	\$0	\$2,221,709
Jobs	1	38	0	0	39
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,840	399,103	0	0	400,943
Output Impact	\$177,812	\$22,248,402	\$0	\$0	\$22,426,213
Value Added Impact	\$97,586	\$13,182,485	\$0	\$0	\$13,280,071
Jobs	2	225	0	0	227

Table 5.2.3.11. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 3 relative to the 2006-2008 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	52,806	0	0	52,806
Output Impact	\$0	\$3,578,613	\$0	\$0	\$3,578,613
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$2,079,057	\$0	\$0	\$2,079,057
Jobs	0	38	0	0	38
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	2,020	411,072	0	0	413,092
Output Impact	\$117,526	\$18,663,228	\$0	\$0	\$18,780,755
Value Added Impact	\$64,343	\$11,097,856	\$0	\$0	\$11,162,199
Jobs	1	186	0	0	188
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	91	6,942	0	0	7,033
Output Impact	\$47,379	\$2,179,834	\$0	\$0	\$2,227,213
Value Added Impact	\$26,081	\$1,292,417	\$0	\$0	\$1,318,498
Jobs	1	22	0	0	23
	All Modes				
Target Trips	2,111	470,820	0	0	472,931
Output Impact	\$164,906	\$24,421,675	\$0	\$0	\$24,586,581
Value Added Impact	\$90,424	\$14,469,330	\$0	\$0	\$14,559,753
Jobs	2	247	0	0	249

Table 5.2.3.12. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Preferred Alternative 4 relative to the 2006-2008 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	28,112	0	0	28,112
Output Impact	\$0	\$1,905,124	\$0	\$0	\$1,905,124
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,106,814	\$0	\$0	\$1,106,814
Jobs	0	20	0	0	20
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,075	218,838	0	0	219,913
Output Impact	\$62,545	\$9,935,543	\$0	\$0	\$9,998,088
Value Added Impact	\$34,242	\$5,908,047	\$0	\$0	\$5,942,289
Jobs	1	99	0	0	100
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	166	12,696	0	0	12,862
Output Impact	\$86,428	\$3,986,628	\$0	\$0	\$4,073,057
Value Added Impact	\$47,576	\$2,363,660	\$0	\$0	\$2,411,236
Jobs	1	41	0	0	42
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,241	259,646	0	0	260,887
Output Impact	\$148,973	\$15,827,295	\$0	\$0	\$15,976,268
Value Added Impact	\$81,818	\$9,378,521	\$0	\$0	\$9,460,339
Jobs	2	160	0	0	162

Table 5.2.3.13. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 1 (no action) relative to the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	5,158	0	0	5,158
Output Impact	\$0	\$349,553	\$0	\$0	\$349,553
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$203,079	\$0	\$0	\$203,079
Jobs	0	4	0	0	4
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	197	40,152	0	0	40,349
Output Impact	\$11,462	\$1,822,955	\$0	\$0	\$1,834,417
Value Added Impact	\$6,275	\$1,083,998	\$0	\$0	\$1,090,273
Jobs	0	18	0	0	18
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	34	2,597	0	0	2,631
Output Impact	\$17,702	\$815,475	\$0	\$0	\$833,177
Value Added Impact	\$9,744	\$483,493	\$0	\$0	\$493,237
Jobs	0	8	0	0	9
	All Modes				
Target Trips	231	47,907	0	0	48,138
Output Impact	\$29,164	\$2,987,984	\$0	\$0	\$3,017,147
Value Added Impact	\$16,019	\$1,770,569	\$0	\$0	\$1,786,589
Jobs	0	30	0	0	31

Table 5.2.3.14. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 2 relative to the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	49,047	0	0	49,047
Output Impact	\$0	\$3,323,869	\$0	\$0	\$3,323,869
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,931,059	\$0	\$0	\$1,931,059
Jobs	0	35	0	0	35
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,876	381,811	0	0	383,687
Output Impact	\$109,148	\$17,334,739	\$0	\$0	\$17,443,887
Value Added Impact	\$59,756	\$10,307,886	\$0	\$0	\$10,367,642
Jobs	1	173	0	0	174
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	116	8,856	0	0	8,972
Output Impact	\$60,396	\$2,780,843	\$0	\$0	\$2,841,238
Value Added Impact	\$33,246	\$1,648,754	\$0	\$0	\$1,681,999
Jobs	1	29	0	0	29
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,992	439,714	0	0	441,706
Output Impact	\$169,544	\$23,439,451	\$0	\$0	\$23,608,995
Value Added Impact	\$93,002	\$13,887,699	\$0	\$0	\$13,980,701
Jobs	2	237	0	0	239

Table 5.2.3.15. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 3 relative to the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	53,473	0	0	53,473
Output Impact	\$0	\$3,623,815	\$0	\$0	\$3,623,815
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$2,105,318	\$0	\$0	\$2,105,318
Jobs	0	38	0	0	38
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	2,046	416,264	0	0	418,310
Output Impact	\$119,039	\$18,898,952	\$0	\$0	\$19,017,991
Value Added Impact	\$65,171	\$11,238,026	\$0	\$0	\$11,303,197
Jobs	1	189	0	0	190
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	77	5,880	0	0	5,957
Output Impact	\$40,090	\$1,846,359	\$0	\$0	\$1,886,449
Value Added Impact	\$22,068	\$1,094,701	\$0	\$0	\$1,116,769
Jobs	1	19	0	0	20
	All Modes				
Target Trips	2,123	475,617	0	0	477,740
Output Impact	\$159,129	\$24,369,126	\$0	\$0	\$24,528,255
Value Added Impact	\$87,240	\$14,438,044	\$0	\$0	\$14,525,284
Jobs	2	246	0	0	248

Table 5.2.3.16. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Preferred Alternative 4 relative to the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	31,131	0	0	31,131
Output Impact	\$0	\$2,109,719	\$0	\$0	\$2,109,719
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,225,677	\$0	\$0	\$1,225,677
Jobs	0	22	0	0	22
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,191	242,338	0	0	243,529
Output Impact	\$69,294	\$11,002,475	\$0	\$0	\$11,071,769
Value Added Impact	\$37,937	\$6,542,484	\$0	\$0	\$6,580,421
Jobs	1	110	0	0	111
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	129	9,894	0	0	10,023
Output Impact	\$67,164	\$3,106,782	\$0	\$0	\$3,173,946
Value Added Impact	\$36,972	\$1,842,002	\$0	\$0	\$1,878,973
Jobs	1	32	0	0	33
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,320	283,363	0	0	284,683
Output Impact	\$136,458	\$16,218,975	\$0	\$0	\$16,355,433
Value Added Impact	\$74,908	\$9,610,163	\$0	\$0	\$9,685,072
Jobs	2	164	0	0	166

Table 5.2.3.17. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 2 relative to Alternative 1 (no action) under the 2006-08 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	34,740	0	0	34,740
Output Impact	\$0	\$2,354,297	\$0	\$0	\$2,354,297
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,367,769	\$0	\$0	\$1,367,769
Jobs	0	25	0	0	25
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,329	270,429	0	0	271,758
Output Impact	\$77,323	\$12,277,845	\$0	\$0	\$12,355,168
Value Added Impact	\$42,333	\$7,300,867	\$0	\$0	\$7,343,200
Jobs	1	123	0	0	123
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	101	7,697	0	0	7,798
Output Impact	\$52,586	\$2,416,909	\$0	\$0	\$2,469,495
Value Added Impact	\$28,947	\$1,432,978	\$0	\$0	\$1,461,925
Jobs	1	25	0	0	26
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,430	312,866	0	0	314,296
Output Impact	\$129,909	\$17,049,051	\$0	\$0	\$17,178,960
Value Added Impact	\$71,279	\$10,101,615	\$0	\$0	\$10,172,894
Jobs	2	172	0	0	174

Table 5.2.3.18. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 3 relative to Alternative 1 (no action) under the 2006-08 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	43,445	0	0	43,445
Output Impact	\$0	\$2,944,227	\$0	\$0	\$2,944,227
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,710,499	\$0	\$0	\$1,710,499
Jobs	0	31	0	0	31
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,662	338,197	0	0	339,859
Output Impact	\$96,698	\$15,354,604	\$0	\$0	\$15,451,301
Value Added Impact	\$52,940	\$9,130,424	\$0	\$0	\$9,183,363
Jobs	1	153	0	0	154
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	39	2,941	0	0	2,980
Output Impact	\$20,305	\$923,494	\$0	\$0	\$943,799
Value Added Impact	\$11,177	\$547,537	\$0	\$0	\$558,714
Jobs	0	9	0	0	10
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,701	384,583	0	0	386,284
Output Impact	\$117,003	\$19,222,324	\$0	\$0	\$19,339,327
Value Added Impact	\$64,117	\$11,388,459	\$0	\$0	\$11,452,577
Jobs	1	194	0	0	195

Table 5.2.3.19. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Preferred Alternative 4 relative to Alternative 1 (no action) under the 2006-08 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	18,751	0	0	18,751
Output Impact	\$0	\$1,270,738	\$0	\$0	\$1,270,738
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$738,257	\$0	\$0	\$738,257
Jobs	0	13	0	0	13
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	717	145,963	0	0	146,680
Output Impact	\$41,716	\$6,626,919	\$0	\$0	\$6,668,635
Value Added Impact	\$22,839	\$3,940,615	\$0	\$0	\$3,963,453
Jobs	0	66	0	0	67
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	114	8,695	0	0	8,809
Output Impact	\$59,354	\$2,730,288	\$0	\$0	\$2,789,642
Value Added Impact	\$32,673	\$1,618,780	\$0	\$0	\$1,651,452
Jobs	1	28	0	0	29
	All Modes				
Target Trips	831	173,409	0	0	174,240
Output Impact	\$101,070	\$10,627,944	\$0	\$0	\$10,729,015
Value Added Impact	\$55,511	\$6,297,651	\$0	\$0	\$6,353,162
Jobs	1	108	0	0	109

Table 5.2.3.20. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 2 relative to Alternative 1 (no action) under the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	43,889	0	0	43,889
Output Impact	\$0	\$2,974,316	\$0	\$0	\$2,974,316
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,727,980	\$0	\$0	\$1,727,980
Jobs	0	32	0	0	32
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,679	341,659	0	0	343,338
Output Impact	\$97,687	\$15,511,783	\$0	\$0	\$15,609,470
Value Added Impact	\$53,481	\$9,223,888	\$0	\$0	\$9,277,370
Jobs	1	155	0	0	156
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	82	6,259	0	0	6,341
Output Impact	\$42,693	\$1,965,368	\$0	\$0	\$2,008,061
Value Added Impact	\$23,501	\$1,165,261	\$0	\$0	\$1,188,762
Jobs	1	20	0	0	21
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,761	391,807	0	0	393,568
Output Impact	\$140,380	\$20,451,467	\$0	\$0	\$20,591,847
Value Added Impact	\$76,982	\$12,117,129	\$0	\$0	\$12,194,112
Jobs	2	207	0	0	208

Table 5.2.3.21. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Alternative 3 relative to Alternative 1 (no action) under the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	48,315	0	0	48,315
Output Impact	\$0	\$3,274,262	\$0	\$0	\$3,274,262
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,902,239	\$0	\$0	\$1,902,239
Jobs	0	35	0	0	35
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	1,849	376,112	0	0	377,961
Output Impact	\$107,577	\$17,075,997	\$0	\$0	\$17,183,574
Value Added Impact	\$58,896	\$10,154,028	\$0	\$0	\$10,212,924
Jobs	1	170	0	0	172
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	43	3,283	0	0	3,326
Output Impact	\$22,388	\$1,030,884	\$0	\$0	\$1,053,272
Value Added Impact	\$12,324	\$611,208	\$0	\$0	\$623,532
Jobs	0	11	0	0	11
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,892	427,710	0	0	429,602
Output Impact	\$129,965	\$21,381,142	\$0	\$0	\$21,511,108
Value Added Impact	\$71,220	\$12,667,475	\$0	\$0	\$12,738,695
Jobs	1	216	0	0	217

Table 5.2.3.22. Reductions in Trips and Economic Impacts of Preferred Alternative 4 relative to Alternative 1 (no action) under the 2009 baseline. The dollar values are in 2008 dollars.

	Alabama	WFlorida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
	Shore Mode				
Target Trips	0	25,973	0	0	25,973
Output Impact	\$0	\$1,760,166	\$0	\$0	\$1,760,166
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$1,022,599	\$0	\$0	\$1,022,599
Jobs	0	19	0	0	19
	Private/Rental Mode				
Target Trips	994	202,186	0	0	203,180
Output Impact	\$57,832	\$9,179,520	\$0	\$0	\$9,237,352
Value Added Impact	\$31,662	\$5,458,487	\$0	\$0	\$5,490,149
Jobs	1	92	0	0	92
	Charter Mode				
Target Trips	95	7,297	0	0	7,392
Output Impact	\$49,462	\$2,291,307	\$0	\$0	\$2,340,768
Value Added Impact	\$27,227	\$1,358,509	\$0	\$0	\$1,385,736
Jobs	1	24	0	0	24
	All Modes				
Target Trips	1,089	235,456	0	0	236,545
Output Impact	\$107,294	\$13,230,992	\$0	\$0	\$13,338,286
Value Added Impact	\$58,889	\$7,839,594	\$0	\$0	\$7,898,483
Jobs	1	134	0	0	135

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Action 2.1 addresses the bag limits, size limits, and closed season for gag, and Action 2.2 addresses the bag limit for red grouper. Thus, this action directly affects recreational fisherman behavior on the water. For Action 2.1, **Alternative 1** is the no action rule, where the regulations for gag would remain those specified in Amendment 30B. The closed season under this alternative, from February 1 through March 31, represents the principal contrast with the remaining alternatives, each of which severely restricts the open season for landing gag. Thus, while this alternative would incur the least negative social impacts by allowing for the longest fishing season and not implementing further regulatory change, it is in conflict with the mandate of the Magnuson Stevens Act to rebuild the gag stock.

The remaining alternatives of Action 2.1 are likely to contribute to negative social impacts as each introduces a much longer closed season than **Alternative 1**. **Alternative 2** would establish a closed season as specified in the Interim Rule currently in place (a 61 day open season from September 16 through November 15). In developing the current Interim Rule, the season outlined by this alternative was selected as it was likely to incur the least negative impacts of the proposed alternatives. **Alternative 3** would establish a split season of the same duration as **Alternative 2**, allowing for the landing of gag the month before and after the closed season for all grouper (January 1 – 31 and April 1 – 30). This alternative is desirable by some anglers who note that gag move inshore in the cooler months, meaning that anglers' fuel expenses are lower when targeting gag during the winter. **Preferred Alternative 4** provides for the longest open season for gag while still operating under the parameters of the rebuilding plan outlined in Action 1. The open season under **Preferred Alternative 4** is twice as many days as **Alternatives 2** and **3**, but at times when there may be less angler effort. The Council selected this alternative as preferred because it provided for the greatest number of fishing days. Although fishermen expressed a preference for the longest fishing season possible, how fishermen's behavior will be impacted by the shortened season, during months typical of lower effort, remains unknown.

Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and Preferred Alternative 4, Option a specify a 22" minimum size limit for gag, which is in accordance with Amendment 30B. **Alternative 4, Option b** introduces a slot limit permitting landing of gag 22-30" in length, only. Other species currently managed with a slot limit include lesser amberjack and banded rudderfish²¹. For these species, both the commercial and recreational sectors share the same slot limit. A slot limit for gag is not proposed for the commercial sector at this time. It is likely that the implementation of a slot limit on the recreational sector, but not the commercial sector, could contribute to additional complaints by recreational anglers against the commercial sector. Gag is the most popular species of grouper among recreational fishermen and a slot limit is likely to be very unpopular. A slot limit also presents a problem for recreational fishing tournaments, where the goal is to catch the biggest fish. Fishing tournaments are important social events within the recreational community and implementing a slot limit on gag would create a legal problem for these events. After weighing these concerns, the Council removed **Option b** as preferred. The **Preferred Alternative 4, Option a** does not include a slot limit.

All four alternatives of **Action 2.1** specify equivalent bag limits for gag, as implemented in Amendment 30B. Thus no variations in social impacts are expected among the alternatives in relation to differing bag limits.

Action 2.2 consists of options for the red grouper bag limit. **Alternative 1** maintains the status quo of 2 red grouper per person, and would not be expected to incur any social impacts. The remaining two alternatives increase the red grouper bag limit to 3 fish per person (**Alternative 2**) or 4 fish per person (**Preferred Alternative 3**). In theory, the increase in bag limits for red grouper would offset some of the negative social impacts from restricting the harvest of gag during the rebuilding plan. However, red grouper is not as desirable as gag for recreational harvest. It remains unknown how the recreational community will respond to an increase in the red grouper bag limit, given that the total allowable catch has not been met in recent years.

²¹ Regulations for recreational fishing of snook and red drum include slot limits but are managed at the state level.

5.2.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Relative to **Action 2.1**, Under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, for a stock that has been declared to be undergoing overfishing, the Council must prepare and submit a plan to end overfishing immediately. In addition, National Standard 1 calls for conservation and management measures to prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, optimum yield. All of the alternatives both end overfishing and achieve rebuilding of gag. All of the alternatives will also achieve optimum yield based on the 2009 baseline for measuring percent reduction. Based on the 2006-2008 baseline, optimum yield may not be fully achieved, but the reductions needed for rebuilding will be achieved. Due to the current economic conditions and the increased cost of fuel, fishing effort in the near future is more likely to be similar to the 2009 baseline.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, would leave the gag recreational season open year round except for the February-march shallow-water grouper closed season. This is far too long to meet the reductions in harvest needed under the rebuilding plan. Under this alternative, the Regional Office would need to exercise its authority to close the fishery on the date when the sector's annual catch limit is projected to be reached. This will require increased administrative effort to calculate the appropriate date, publish closure notices, and inform the public of the closing date.

Alternative 2 would maintain the same fishing season and regulations in 2012 as in 2011. Since the regulations would not change, this would have minimal impacts on the administrative environment. However, since the gag population is expected to be higher in 2012 than in 2011, increased enforcement may be necessary to prevent harvest overages.

Alternative 3 would establish a split season. This could create confusion among the public and require additional administrative efforts to inform the public about the split season and to enforce the open and closed seasons.

Preferred Alternative 4 provides the longest season possible (123 days) while meeting the required harvest reductions. This allows for some stability in the open season, which may benefit both enforcement and voluntary compliance. Thus, effects on the administrative environment are expected to be minimal. **Option a** would leave the size limit at its current 22 inch minimum and would have no change to the administrative environment. **Preferred Option b** would establish a 22" to 30" slot limit for gag. This would require new regulations to be printed, efforts to inform the public both about the new slot limit and about the proper way to measure a fish, and additional enforcement efforts. Thus, this will have some negative effects of the administrative environment.

Red grouper is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing. An increase in the bag limit under **Action 2.2** is not expected to result in overfishing. Adaptive management protocols and accountability measures will restore the bag limit to previous levels if the annual catch limit is exceeded.

Alternative 1, the no action alternative, leaves the current 2 red grouper bag limit in place. This will result in no needed administrative actions nor any change to the administrative environment.

Alternative 2 would increase the bag limit to 3 fish, with contingent action to reduce the bag limit if the annual catch limit is exceeded. This creates a need to monitor the recreational red grouper harvest for possible post-season actions. However, this is necessary anyway under the accountability measures adopted in Amendment 30B and proposed for revision in this amendment. Therefore, while this may

have a presence in the administrative environment, it will not require any changes that are not already required by other actions.

Preferred Alternative 3 would increase the bag limit to 4 fish, with contingent action to reduce the bag limit if the annual catch limit is exceeded. Administratively, the impacts are no different than under **Alternative 2**, except that monitoring for a possible bag limit reduction may be required over a longer period than under the previous alternative.

5.3 Action 3. Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment to Account for Dead Discards

5.3.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

Gag are caught commercially by vertical line and longline gear. Longline gear can interact with the bottom, creating negative impacts if it becomes hung on hard bottom. Vertical lines also impact the bottom, but only at a small point of impact compared to longlines. **Alternative 1** allows the highest commercial gag quota, while **Preferred Alternative 2** allows a smaller quota that's been adjusted to account for dead discards. **Alternative 3** allows the smallest quota. To the extent that a larger quota allows more fishing and more interaction of the gear with the environment, **Alternative 1** would create the most negative impacts on the physical environment, while **Alternative 3** would create the least negative impact, and **Preferred Alternative 2** an intermediate impact. However, the gag quotas, at least in the initial years of the rebuilding plan, are small enough that gag will likely be a bycatch fishery, at least for longline vessels. Since longline vessel fishing times will likely be driven by the larger red grouper quota, the adjustment of commercial gag quota will have little or no direct or indirect changes to existing impacts on the physical environment.

5.3.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

The catch levels indicated by the stock assessment for rebuilding gag assume that landed catch and dead discards are linked. That is, reductions in the landed catch of gag will be accompanied by reductions in dead discards in the same proportion so that total removals are reduced by the desired amount. This linked scenario is unlikely. Once vessels fill their IFQ shares of gag, they will likely continue to fish for red grouper, with a bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag. The adjustments to the gag and shallow-water grouper quotas are intended to compensate for these dead discards. **Alternative 1** does not make any adjustment for dead discards, and will therefore have a negative effect on the biological/ecological environment. **Preferred Alternative 2** will reduce the commercial gag quota by 14%, and will positively benefit the gag resource by increasing the likelihood that rebuilding will occur as intended. **Alternative 3** will reduce the commercial gag quota by 53%, providing the greatest allowance for dead discards, and the highest likelihood of rebuilding successfully occurring. An explanation of how the percent reduction adjustments were derived for **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** is contained in the discussion of the alternative in Section 2.3. One caveat is that, if fishermen choose to target other species and catch gag only as a bycatch, the catch rate of gag may not change as a result of the quota adjustment. All that would change is how much of the catch can be kept and how much must be thrown back. If this occurs, then **Alternative 1** may provide the most positive benefits since it will allow the most efficient retained harvest with the smallest amount of discards. Likewise, **Alternative 3** may provide the most negative impacts since it would require the highest amount of discards, while **Preferred Alternative 2** would be intermediate in its impacts. Given the uncertainty as to which scenario is the more realistic (fishermen targeting gag until their quota is filled vs. catching gag only as bycatch), the intermediate effects of

Preferred Alternative 2 provide the most neutral overall benefits to the biological/ecological environment.

5.3.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Reductions in the commercial gag quota considered under this action are expected to contribute to overall decreases in total removals, potentially resulting in positive impacts on the gag stock in the future. These anticipated benefits to the gag resource cannot be quantified at this time. However, the adverse economic effects that would result from the precautionary reductions in commercial gag quota can be approximated by the associated decreases in economic value. The evaluation of yearly changes in aggregate lease value, i.e., the changes in the value of annual gag allocations, constitutes the appropriate approach to measure changes in economic value that are expected to result from this management action. This approach assumes that individual fishing quota shares and annual allocations, which are assets that can be freely exchanged, are traded in well-functioning markets. Average gag individual fishing quota allocation prices are currently estimated at approximately \$1.0 per pound gutted weight (Andy Strelcheck-NMFS, personal communication). Table 5.3.3.1 provides decreases in commercial gag quota and anticipated losses in economic value measured by changes in annual gag allocations. Present values of losses are computed based on 3% and 7% discount rates and assume that this amendment will be implemented in January 2012. Greater reductions in gag quota would logically be expected to result in greater losses in economic value.

Table 5.3.3.1: Decreases in gag commercial quota (gutted weight) and discounted losses in economic value based on 3% and 7% discount rates.

Year	Preferred Alternative 2			Alternative 3		
	Pounds (g.w.)	Present Value (3%)	Present Value (7%)	Pounds (g.w.)	Present Value (3%)	Present Value (7%)
2012	92,260	\$92,260	\$92,260	349,270	\$349,270	\$349,270
2013	115,220	\$111,864	\$107,682	436,190	\$423,485	\$407,654
2014	135,940	\$128,136	\$118,735	514,630	\$485,088	\$449,498
2015	152,880	\$139,907	\$124,796	578,760	\$529,647	\$472,441
Total	496,300	\$472,167	\$443,473	1,878,850	\$1,787,491	\$1,678,863

Alternative 1 would set commercial gag quotas at the full annual catch target, thereby assuming that dead discards would be reduced by the same proportion as landings. If this assumption does not hold, Alternative 1 could result in higher total removals than expected, potentially leading to adverse economic effects in the future due to the added pressure on the gag stock.

Preferred Alternative 2 would reduce commercial gag quotas by 14%. The reduction in commercial quota would account for potential increases in total gag removals that may result from higher proportions of dead discards. Between 2012 and 2015, the present value of losses in economic value expected to result from commercial quota reductions are estimated at \$472,167, based on a 3% discount rate. It follows that a greater discount rate would yield a smaller present value. It is expected that potential

economic benefits, stemming from the added protection to the gag stock during rebuilding, would result from precautionary reductions in commercial gag quota under **Preferred Alternative 2**.

Alternative 3 would further reduce commercial gag quota to 53% of the annual catch target. As expected, **Alternative 3** would result in greater losses in economic value. Relative to **Preferred Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3** would potentially grant greater protection to the gag stock during rebuilding. However, the Council decided that the proportion of dead discards assumed under **Preferred Alternative 2** would be more realistic and would lessen adverse economic effects.

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Action 3 addresses the gag and shallow-water grouper quota for the commercial sector which is currently under an individual fishing quota program. The proposal for a reduction in the gag quota is based on the level of dead discards not being reduced to levels sufficient to achieve the annual catch target. Thus, although **Alternative 1** provides the greatest amount of gag quota, and the least amount of social impacts as a result, this alternative would allow too many discards and not achieve the rebuilding of gag.

The remaining two alternatives reduce the annual catch target and will therefore incur negative social impacts on the commercial fleet. In addition to the new grouper individual fishing quota program, commercial longline fishermen have been negatively impacted by the restrictions on their gear type implemented by Amendment 31. Thus, due to multiple new regulatory changes, it is difficult to isolate social impacts from each regulation, and difficult to predict how a lowered gag quota, alone, will affect fishermen. Nevertheless, expected effects on the social environment parallel the effects on the economic environment. That is, the anticipated benefits (long-term) to the gag resource from the proposed reduction in commercial gag quota cannot be quantified at this time. However, the adverse economic effects that would result in the short-term from the precautionary reductions in commercial gag quota can be approximated by the associated decreases in economic value. Thus, negative short-term social impacts can be expected alongside the negative economic impacts from the reduction in gag quota under **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3**. The more extreme reduction to the commercial gag quota under **Alternative 3** would entail greater negative social impacts than the lesser reduction outlined in **Preferred Alternative 2**, and it is for this reason that the Council selected **Preferred Alternative 2**. It is also expected that in the long-term, potential social benefits will accompany economic benefits stemming from the added protection to the gag stock during rebuilding under either of these alternatives.

5.3.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

All of the alternatives in this action establish a 4-year stream of increasing commercial quotas. **Alternative 1** implements the full annual catch target yield stream while **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** implement yield streams where each year's quota is reduced from the full annual catch target to account for dead discards. The direct administrative effects of each alternative are the same, since each involves codifying the commercial quota yield stream and then issuing individual fishing quotas which will change each year as the quota changes. Indirectly, the more restrictive yield streams will result in individual quotas being filled more quickly, and may require increased enforcement to avoid illegal harvests. In addition, the more restrictive yield streams increase the possibility of overages occurring if fishermen inadvertently harvest in excess of their IFQ shares. Overages that exceed the sector annual catch limit would trigger accountability measures resulting in additional administrative impacts to implement the accountability measure actions. From this aspect, **Alternative 3** will have the

greatest negative effects on the administrative environment, **Preferred Alternative 2** will have an intermediate negative effect, and **Alternative 1** will have the least negative effect. However, in the short history of IFQ fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico there have been no overages, so the likelihood of this occurring is small.

5.4 Action 4. Adjustments to Multi-Use Individual Fishing Quota Shares

5.4.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

The alternatives in this section affect the administration of the multi-species grouper individual fishing quota system, and have no impact on the physical environment as described in Section 5.1.1.

5.4.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Under **Alternative 1**, at the gag quota levels during the early part of the rebuilding program, the amount of red grouper multi-use allocation could exceed the available gag commercial quota. This could reduce regulatory discards of both gag and red grouper due to having insufficient shares. However, this could result in gag harvest exceeding the rebuilding yield, which could delay rebuilding, or possibly completely negate the gag rebuilding program. Under the annual catch limit/annual catch target control rule in the Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment, IFQ fisheries will have little or no buffer. Even after the gag stock is rebuilt, the fixed 4% allowance for red grouper shares to be used as multi-use shares could exceed that buffer and result in the gag annual catch limit being exceeded. The effects from fishing are described in Section 5.1.2.

Alternative 2 would base the amount of red grouper multi-use allocation on the buffer between the gag annual catch limit and the annual catch target. The formula used provides that the amount of red grouper shares that can be used to harvest gag cannot exceed the buffer between the commercial annual catch limit and the commercial annual catch target. However, as discussed above, IFQ fisheries will have little or no buffer. Furthermore, the annual catch limit in this amendment is set at the level where there is only a 50% probability of meeting the target to rebuild the gag stock in 10 years or less. This alternative will have a more limited effect than **Alternative 1** on reducing regulatory discards of gag, but will result in a greater likelihood of success for the gag rebuilding plan. Once the gag stock is rebuilt, this alternative will continue to provide limited benefits to reducing regulatory discards of gag. With respect to red grouper, this alternative could result in a small reduction in the amount of red grouper caught. Red grouper is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, so this result, while beneficial, is of limited impact.

Preferred Alternative 3 would set the amount of gag multi-use allocation to zero while red grouper are in a rebuilding plan. Red grouper are currently neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, so this provision currently has no impact. If red grouper becomes overfished and is placed under a rebuilding plan in the future, this provision will provide positive impacts to the rebuilding plan by preventing any shares other than those specifically allocated under the red grouper annual catch target from being used to harvest red grouper commercially. However, there could be increased regulatory discards of red grouper relative to **Alternative 1**. For the current condition, i.e., red grouper not in a rebuilding plan, this alternative sets the amount gag multi-use allocation on the buffer between the red grouper annual catch limit and the annual catch target. The formula used provides that the amount of gag shares that can be used to harvest red grouper cannot exceed the buffer between the commercial annual catch limit and the

commercial annual catch target. This could reduce regulatory discards of red grouper by allowing a limited amount of red grouper to be retained under gag multi-use shares. For a healthy red grouper stock, occasional harvest at levels up to the annual catch limit will not cause a decline and is neutral in impact. However, it should be noted that continuously fishing above the annual catch target could exceed optimum yield on an ongoing basis. Any reduction in gag harvest as a result of using gag multi-use shares to harvest red grouper would be beneficial to the gag rebuilding program. Given the low levels of gag allocation, at least in the early years of the rebuilding program, this is an unlikely scenario. Even after being fully rebuilt, the gag annual catch limits and annual catch targets are expected to be lower than red grouper, so there is less likelihood of gag multi-use shares being used to harvest red grouper than vice-versa. As with **Alternative 2**, this assumes that there is a buffer, which may not exist in subsequent annual catch limits and annual catch targets after an annual catch limit/annual catch target control rule is adopted in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment. However, while there is a buffer, this could result in fewer gag being harvested, which would benefit the rebuilding plan. This could result in more red grouper being harvested than targeted under the annual catch target. However, red grouper is neither overfished nor going overfishing, and due to the small amount of gag quota available initially, any potential negative impacts on red grouper would be limited.

Preferred Alternative 4 would eliminate red grouper multi-use allocation while the gag rebuilding plan is in effect. With no allowance to retain excess gag caught under a multi-use red grouper share, this could result in increased regulatory discards of gag. This increase in dead discards, while likely under this alternative, is accounted for in Action 3 of this amendment, which adjusts the commercial gag quota downward to explicitly account for these increased discards. Because this alternative would allow the greatest amount of control over gag harvest, it would eliminate much of the management uncertainty and provide the greatest likelihood of the rebuilding plan succeeding. Once the gag stock is rebuilt, this alternative would allow red grouper multi-use shares to harvest gag using the same formula as in **Alternative 2**. Thus, for a rebuild gag stock, the biological impacts would be the same as **Alternative 2**. It will continue to provide limited benefits to reducing regulatory discards of gag. With respect to red grouper, this alternative could result in a small reduction in the amount of red grouper caught. Red grouper is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing, so this result, while beneficial, is of limited impact.

Overall, **Preferred Alternative 3** and **Preferred Alternative 4** in combination provide the greatest positive impacts to the biological/ecological environment, both during and after the gag rebuilding program. **Alternative 2** provides less beneficial impacts than, **Preferred Alternative 3** and **Preferred Alternative 4**, but more than **Alternative 1**. **Alternative 1** provides the least beneficial impacts, and may hinder the gag rebuilding plan. **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 4** will result in some increase in regulatory discards of gag, particularly during rebuilding, but this impact is mitigated by Action 3, which reduces the commercial gag quota to account for dead discards.

5.4.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Alternative 1 would continue to convert 4% of the red grouper allocation into multi-use allocation valid to harvest red grouper or gag. **Alternative 1** would provide flexibility to individual fishing quota participants by allowing them to adjust to geographical and temporal variations in the red to gag grouper ratio, possibly contributing to a reduction in the number of gag discards. However, due to the large decrease in the gag commercial quota expected under this amendment, the percentage of red grouper

allocation that will be converted into multi-use allocation could result in gag harvests that would exceed the gag annual catch limit. In addition to the detrimental effects on the gag stock, this scenario would result in adverse economic effects stemming from the corrective measures that would be implemented to address the over-harvesting of gag,

Alternative 2 would continue to convert a portion of the red grouper allocation into multi-use allocation valid to harvest red grouper or gag. However, the percentage of red grouper allocation to be converted would be based on the difference between the gag annual catch limit and allocation, and the red grouper allocation. Therefore, multi-use percentages would adjust following changes to the gag annual catch limit, allocation, or the red grouper allocation. Although **Alternative 2** would allow fishermen to benefit from the added flexibility multi-use shares may afford, the resulting added pressure on the gag stock could have adverse effects on the rebuilding of the resource, and thus be associated with negative economic effects.

If red grouper is under a rebuilding plan, **Preferred Alternative 3** would set the percentage of gag allocation converted into multi-use allocation valid to harvest gag or red grouper to zero, granting additional protection to red grouper stock while it rebuilds. This additional protection, which is assumed to yield biological benefits, would be anticipated to result in economic benefits in the long term.

Preferred Alternative 3 would, if red grouper is not under a rebuilding plan, continue to convert a portion of the gag allocation into multi-use allocation valid to harvest gag or red grouper. The percentage of gag allocation to be converted into gag multi-use allocation would be based on the relative magnitudes of the red grouper annual catch limit and allocation, and gag allocation. Multi-use percentages would thus adjust following changes to the red grouper annual catch limit and allocation, and gag allocation. Given the limited amount of gag multi-use allocation to be granted following the gag annual catch limit decrease expected under the gag rebuilding plan, it is likely that the totality of the gag allocation, including the portion converted into multi-use allocation, will be used to harvest gag. However, any amount of multi-use gag allocation used to harvest red grouper would lessen pressure on the gag stock, resulting in future economic benefits.

Preferred Alternative 4 would suspend the release of red grouper multi-use allocation until NMFS declares the gag stock rebuilt. It is important to note that the interim rule currently in effect has already suspended the issuance of red grouper multi-use shares. **Preferred Alternative 4**, which constitutes a continuation of the suspension of red grouper multiuse shares currently in effect, would limit the pressure on gag stock by preventing any harvest in excess of the specified gag quota. Although it restricts the flexibility that individual fishing quota participants would benefit from under **Alternatives 1, 2, and Preferred Alternative 3**, **Preferred Alternative 4** is expected to yield positive economic effects due to the anticipated beneficial impacts to the rebuilding of the gag stock which is currently overfished and is undergoing overfishing.

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Some social impacts may occur alongside changes in the multi-use provision within the IFQ program, as the multi-use provision provides flexibility to IFQ participants by allowing the retention of species caught incidentally while fishing for other species for which quota is held. Thus, fishermen are able to keep a proportion of gag or red grouper under their allocation of the other species, decreasing the relative discards of fish due to a lack of quota for that species. Fishing behavior may be impacted through an increase in the practice of discarding commercially valuable fish. However, because the grouper IFQ

program has only been in operation since January 2010, adjusting the multi-use provision is not likely to be more than minimally disruptive to fishing practices. Furthermore, any negative social impacts are likely to occur in the short-term only, while gag is under the rebuilding plan.

Under **Alternative 1**, the multi-use provision is maintained; however, the provision could permit the gag harvest to exceed the annual catch target and thus is not in line with the goals of the rebuilding plan.

The two preferred alternatives of this action would operate together to allow IFQ participants to continue landing red grouper under their gag allocation (**Preferred Alternative 3**), and prohibit them from landing gag under their red grouper allocation (**Preferred Alternative 4**). **Preferred Alternative 3** is desirable under the rebuilding plan, as it lessens pressure on the gag stock by prohibiting the landing of gag using red grouper quota. As under other actions within this amendment, it is expected that negative short-term impacts on fishing behavior will be justified in the long-term as the stock rebuilds. However, although this alternative allows IFQ participants to land red grouper with their gag allocation, fishermen are not expected to do so.

Alternative 2 would continue to allow some harvest of gag under an IFQ participant's red grouper allocation. Rather than a fixed percentage of the allocation, however, the red grouper multi-use allocation would be calculated in relation to the annual catch limit. By allowing a more restricted amount of gag to be landed under red grouper allocation than **Alternative 1**, this alternative would help mitigate the impacts that are possible under **Alternative 1**, while continuing to allow some harvest of gag under an IFQ participant's red grouper allocation. However, the Council ultimately decided to eliminate the red grouper multi-use provision entirely during the rebuilding plan (**Preferred Alternative 4**). It may be noted that in public comment, fishermen only offered support for suspending the multi-use provision while the rebuilding plan is in effect.

5.4.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

The administrative environment already accommodates multi-use shares for gag and red grouper. **Alternatives 1, 2, and 3** would maintain the existing multi-use shares, though in different proportions. If the buffer between annual catch target and annual catch limit is reduced or eliminated in a subsequent amendment by application of the annual catch limit/annual catch target control rule, the application of **Alternative 2 or 3**, which are dependent upon the buffer, could become problematic and may require modification through an amendment or framework action. **Preferred Alternative 4** would simplify the administrative environment by eliminating multi-use shares for the duration of the gag rebuilding plan.

5.5 Action 5. Commercial Gag Size Limit

5.5.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

Adjustments to the commercial minimum size limit will not change the gear or methods used to fish for gag. However, smaller size limits may allow fishermen to catch their individual quotas faster and spend less time targeting gag. Under this scenario, **Alternative 1** would have the most negative impact on gag habitat since it would result in the longest time needed to catch fish. **Preferred Alternative 2** would shorten the time and provide a less negative impact to gag habitat. **Alternative 3** would provide even less negative impacts to gag habitat, and **Alternative 4**, which eliminates the gag minimum size limit, would have the least negative impacts on gag habitat. Since fishermen would likely switch to red grouper once their gag quota is filled, the relative impacts on red grouper habitat would be the exact opposite. Longline

vessels already catch gag above the current minimum size limit on average, so any change in impacts would mainly come from the vertical line fishery. However, vertical lines have much less impact on the bottom habitat than longlines, so the relative impacts from best to worst would be small.

5.5.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Under **Alternative 1**, the current gag minimum size limit is 24-inches total length, which is slightly above the size at 50% female maturity. This will allow a majority of gag to enter the spawning biomass, although some of the undersized released gag will not survive. The release mortality rate for gag was treated in the SEDAR 10 assessment as a function of depth, with 50% release mortality occurring at 150 feet (25 fathoms) (Ortiz 2006). The estimated average release mortality rate for commercially caught gag was 67 percent (GMFMC 2008b).

Lower size limits would decrease the number of discarded grouper and the mortality associated with those discards. Yield-per-recruit (YPR) and spawning potential-per-recruit (SPR) analyses for gag and red grouper indicate lower minimum size limits could increase YPR but decrease SPR (Ortiz 2007; Walter 2007). However, it should be noted YPR-SPR analyses assume the grouper fishery is regulated through a constant fishing mortality policy rather than through a quota. The YPR and SPR results would likely be different under a quota regulated, with SPR reductions less than those estimated by these analyses. To the extent that reductions in dead discards offset the reduction in SPR, a lower minimum size limit may benefit the stock. However, the primary source of regulatory discards during the early years of the rebuilding plan is likely to be lack of individual quota shares rather than the size limit.

Given the high release mortality in the commercial fishery, **Alternative 1** is expected to have the greatest negative impact on the stock and the biological/ecological environment.

Preferred Alternative 2 would reduce the commercial minimum size limit to 22 inches total length, matching the recreational size limit. This is below the average size of female maturity, but given the high release mortality rate, the loss in spawning potential from a reduced size limit would be offset by a gain in yield per recruit as a result of fewer dead discards. Until individual gag quotas are reached, this is projected to reduce the number of discarded gag from the vertical line fishery by 31% while increasing the number of fish needed to meet the individual quota by about 15% (Table 2.5.2). In the longline fishery, the number of discards would be reduced by about 28%. However, because most of the gag caught by longline are already above the 24-inch size limit, a reduction to 22 inches would only increase the number needed to meet the quota by 0.5% (Table 2.5.2). Considering the tradeoff between loss of spawning potential and reduction in dead discards, this alternative will provide net positive benefits to the stock and the biological/ecological environment.

Alternative 3 would reduce the commercial minimum size limit to 20 inches total length, which was the size limit prior to 2000. Until individual gag quotas are reached, this is projected to reduce the number of discarded gag from the vertical line fishery by 62% while increasing the number of fish needed to meet the individual quota by about 30% (Table 2.5.2). In the longline fishery, the number of discards would be reduced by about 47%, while increasing the number needed to meet the quota by 0.9% (Table 2.5.2). At this size, very few gag have reached female maturity (Figure 2.5.1), so this size limit will likely have a greater negative impact on SPR than **Preferred Alternative 2**. Considering the tradeoff between loss of spawning potential and reduction in dead discards, this alternative would provide more net positive benefits to the stock and the biological/ecological environment than either **Alternative 1** or Preferred

Alternative 2. However, anecdotal information provided during Council meetings and at the April Reef Fish Advisory Panel meetings suggests that, at size limits below 22 inches, a differential price by size could develop, with larger fish being more valuable. This being the case, a 20 inch size limit could result in high grading, and resulting discards of smaller, but legal, fish. These are fish that would have to be discarded anyway under **Preferred Alternative 2**. Therefore, based on possible behavior of the fishermen, the impacts of this alternative on the biological/ecological environment would be similar to those from **Preferred Alternative 2**.

Alternative 4 would eliminate the minimum size limit entirely. Prior to the implementation of size limits in 1990, grouper were caught commercially down to about 11 inches, but below 18 inches the frequency of catches dropped significantly. Size limit analyses are only available to 18 inches, but the results of eliminating the size limit is likely to be only slightly different to the 18 inch analyses. At 18 inches, the number of discarded gag from the vertical line fishery until the quota is reached is projected to be reduced by 80% while the number of fish needed to meet the individual quota is projected to increase by about 38% (Table 2.5.2). In the longline fishery, the number of discards would be reduced by about 67%, while increasing the number needed to meet the quota by 1.3% (Table 2.5.2). As with **Alternative 3**, high grading could develop, but the fish that would be discarded are ones that would be required to be discarded under **Preferred Alternative 2**. Therefore, based on possible behavior of the fishermen, the impacts of this alternative on the biological/ecological environment would be similar to those from **Preferred Alternative 2**.

5.5.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Alternative 1, no action, would maintain the 24-inch commercial gag minimum size limit. As such, economic effects are not expected to result from **Alternative 1**. **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** would reduce the commercial size limit to 22 and 20 inches, respectively. **Alternative 4** would eliminate the commercial gag size limit. The implementation of **Preferred Alternatives 2** or **Alternatives 3** or **4** is expected to benefit the gag stock by allowing commercial fishermen to land a portion, if not the totality, of dead gag discards, thereby having positive impacts on the rebuilding plan. These beneficial impacts to the stock would, in turn, result in future economic benefits. However, potential benefits to the stock and associated economic benefits may be limited or negligible due to fishermen's preference for larger gag. To optimize economic returns derived from their gag allocation, fishermen would rather harvest larger fish because of their increased yield. Lowering or eliminating the commercial gag minimum size limit could therefore be ineffective or counterproductive due to incentives for highgrading.

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

The rationale behind the proposed change to decrease the commercial size limit of gag is to allow fishermen to keep smaller fish and avoid discards. This is expected to help the gag stock and ultimately provide long-term social benefits to fishermen. However, regulatory change to decrease the commercial gag size limit may incur effects on fishermen behavior in the short-term, depending on gear type and corresponding fishing depth. Commercial fishermen who fish in deeper waters (usually with longlines) are less likely to catch gag smaller than the current minimum size of 24 inches (**Alternative 1**). Therefore, minimal social impacts in fishing behavior are expected to occur among longliners under any of the alternatives, including eliminating the minimum size limit altogether (**Alternative 4**). On the other hand,

fishermen using vertical line tend to fish shallower than longliners and more often encounter the smaller gag they currently must discard. Thus, the decrease in the minimum size for gag is more likely to affect those fishing with vertical line, as opposed to longliners fishing in deeper waters.

While it may be assumed that allowing fishermen to keep smaller fish would be beneficial for fishing behavior since fishermen often decry the practice of throwing back fish as wasteful, it is likely that under the IFQ program, fishermen prefer to keep larger gag in order to optimize economic returns on their gag allocation. This calls attention to one social consequence of the IFQ program which limits the amount of gag an individual fisherman may land. Prior to the IFQ program, a fisherman harvested from the total allowable catch shared by the entire population of fishermen; under that scenario, a smaller size limit would be beneficial in decreasing discards as the individual fisherman sought to maximize his landings until the total allowable catch (shared by all fishermen) was met. Under the IFQ program, decreasing the minimum size could lead to the practice of highgrading as fishermen prefer to keep larger fish and discard smaller, newly legal fish. The smaller the minimum size (**Preferred Alternative 2** or **Alternative 3**), the more likely highgrading would occur. Eliminating the commercial gag size limit altogether (**Alternative 4**) would require IFQ participants to keep even the smallest gag caught inadvertently, in order to remain legal; this alternative is most likely to lead to non-compliant practices. Ultimately, the proportion of commercial vertical line fishermen who support the change in the size limit for gag is unknown.

Finally, it is worth noting that currently, recreational fishermen are permitted to land smaller gag than are commercial fishermen. The adoption of **Preferred Alternative 2** would bring the commercial size limit in line with the recreational size limit, currently in place. Thus, this alternative would not contribute to tensions between the two sectors. Reducing the commercial size limit below the recreational size limit (**Alternative 3**) or eliminating the size limit altogether (**Alternative 4**), is likely to be perceived by the recreational sector as unfair and may contribute to further hostility toward commercial fishermen.

5.5.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Currently gag and black grouper both have a commercial 24-inch minimum size limit. The size limit was implemented for black grouper because gag are sometimes referred to locally as black grouper. Having the same size limit for both species was implemented to reduce confusion due to local naming conventions. Setting the gag size limit different from black grouper could reintroduce that confusion and lead to enforcement and voluntary compliance difficulties.

Under **Alternative 1**, the gag and black grouper size limits would remain the same, minimizing confusion and optimizing enforceability. Those would provide the most positive benefits to the administrative environment by maintaining enforceability of the size limit and reducing confusion.

Preferred Alternative 2 and **Alternative 3** would both lead to different size limits for gag and black grouper. These differential size limits could introduce confusion and complicate enforcement, resulting in negative benefits to the administrative environment. However, **Alternative 4** would eliminate the gag size limit regulation entirely, simplifying the regulations. While there might still be some confusion from anglers who refer to gag as black grouper, the simplified regulations may offset any confusion from retuning the black grouper size limit.

5.6 Action 6. Time and Area Closures

5.6.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

Preferred Alternative 1 would maintain the existing levels of impact on the physical environment as described in Section 5.1.1. The Council selected no action as the preferred alternative because the positive ecological and biological benefits of closing a fishing area were difficult to quantify compared to the negative social and economic impacts. Direct and indirect effects on the physical environment would depend on which **Alternatives 2-4** and (**Options a-d**) are selected in various combinations or in total. Strictly based on the size of an area closure, the alternatives provide protection to the physical environment in the following order from largest to smallest: **Alternative 4**-the Edges (approximately 390 nm²), **Alternative 5**-Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps (approximately 119 nm² total), **Alternative 3**-Extension of the Edges (approximately 244 nm²), and **Alternative 2**-Extension of Madison-Swanson (approximately 70 nm²). The size of the closure has a direct effect on the physical environment primarily due to restricting the impacts from bottom fishing gear and anchoring which comes in direct contact with the substrate and can have negative impacts on the physical environment. These impacts are described in detail in Section 5.1.1.

Alternative 2, the extension of Madison-Swanson, is currently the smallest proposed time and area closure compared to the other alternatives. However, if **Alternative 2** were combined with the current Madison-Swanson closed area, effectively becoming one contiguous area, it would total approximately 185 square nautical miles comparable to **Alternative 3**, the extension of the Edges (i.e., approximately 244 square nautical miles). If the Council deemed it necessary to rebuild the gag stock they could select all of the proposed and current area closures, creating one contiguous area totaling 923 nm² off the west Florida shelf. This would provide the maximum benefits to the physical environment.

In addition to size of the closed area, the period and type of fishing that is prohibited has direct impacts on the physical environment. Currently, Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps are closed year round to bottom fishing and surface trolling is allowed May 1 through October 31 (**Option a**). This closure would reduce impacts to the physical environment for 8 additional months compared to **Option c**, which prohibits all fishing January 1 through April 30. **Option b** would also close the area for 6 months but potentially provide less benefits to the physical environment the rest of the year when all fishing is allowed (May 1 through October 31). Due to all fishing being allowed May 1 through October 31, there is a potential for other negative impacts to the physical environment, such as anchoring and damage to the substrate (see Section 5.1.1), compared to **Option a**. The cumulative effects of repeated anchoring could damage the hard bottom areas where fishing for reef fish occurs. **Option d** would provide the most benefits to the physical environment because all fishing is prohibited year-round. These impacts are based on studies of the gear in the southeast region.

5.6.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Section 5.1.2 describes the effects of fishing on the biological/ecological environment. **Preferred Alternative 1** (no action) would not create additional time and area closures in the Gulf of Mexico. Due to the positive ecological and biological benefits of closing a fishing area being difficult to quantify and the negative social and ecological implications of doing so the Council decided not to close any additional areas to fishing activities. Status quo would maintain the existing benefits to the biological and ecological environment and other actions may need to be taken to reduce gag bycatch and bycatch mortality as described in GMFMC (1999 and 2008a) and incorporated here by reference.

As discussed under the physical environment, positive impacts to the biological environment may be

expected simply based on size of the closed areas and listed in the following order: **Alternatives 4, 5, 3, and 2**. Based on size alone, an area protected from all or some human activity was not effective for a majority of marine species due to their mobility in and out of the closed areas (Shipp 2003).

The direct and indirect impacts on the biological environment of the various alternatives would depend on which series of **Options a-d** were selected. For example, **Option d** would provide the greatest benefits to the biological environment, because all fishing is prohibited year-round; whereas, **Options a-c** provide benefits to the biological environment by limiting fishing during the gag and red grouper spawning season. **Option a** provides a similar level of protection as **Option d** because the area is closed to reef fish fishing for the whole year and only allows trolling the rest of the year. **Option b** would allow reef fish fishing in addition to trolling for that time period. **Option c** is the shortest period of time the areas could be closed to all fishing and therefore would provide the least benefits to the biological environment compared to **Options d, a, and b**. However, compared to **Preferred Alternative 1**, status quo **Option c** is expected to provide numerous positive impacts to the biological environment, though not quantifiable.

The reproductive biology of gag may make them more susceptible to fishing pressure than most other reef fish species and area closures may mitigate these effects. Gag is a protogynous hermaphrodite, which means females change sex to males as they get older and larger. In addition to changing sex, gag form spawning aggregations similar to other species in the Family Serranidae (Domeier and Colin 1997). Male gag are especially at risk during spawning because they become aggressive feeders, increasing their susceptibility to fishing mortality (Coleman et al. 1996; Koenig et al. 1996). This susceptibility of male gag to fishing pressure during spawning, and potential loss of large dominant males within a spawning aggregation could be detrimental to the rebuilding plan for gag. Coleman et al. (1996) speculated that if either mature large females are not present or are unable to change sex in time to fertilize the other females within the spawning aggregation then the reproductive potential of the aggregation could be limited. Shapiro (1987) suggested that fishes with a protogynous hermaphroditic reproductive strategy may lend themselves to significant population level consequences when subject to high exploitation. Thus, time and area closures during the spawning season may be important to rebuild the gag stock by protecting large dominant males and spawning aggregations.

In addition to protecting spawning aggregations in areas where red grouper and gag coexist and are targeted, area closures may reduce discarding of gag by vessels fishing for red grouper or other reef fish. Therefore, due to the overfished status of gag and the limited release of individual fishing quota allocation to the commercial sector, closed areas, particularly in deeper waters, would provide the greatest positive benefit to the biological environment, thereby reducing bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag while targeting red grouper. Based on commercial landings from January 2008-August 2009, **Alternative 4**, the Edges, had the highest percentage of both gag and red grouper landings attributed to that area 8.9% and 2.4%, respectively (Table 2.6.1). If **Alternative 4** and **Option d** (all fishing prohibited year round) was selected as preferred then the maximum benefits to the biological environment would be expected. Both bycatch and bycatch related mortality of gag while fishers are targeting red grouper would be expected. The current closed areas (Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps, and the Edges) and the two additional alternatives for area closures (**Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3**) are within these statistical zones where both red grouper and gag were caught on a set (all gears) and documented by the Reef Fish Observer Program (A. Strelcheck 2011; Figures 2.7.1 and 2.7.2). However, the percentage of both red grouper and gag caught on a set were lower in the proposed **Alternative 3** compared to the Edges (**Alternative 4**) suggesting that the **Alternative 3** may not achieve as great a reduction in bycatch of gag while targeting red grouper, but would still provide numerous benefits to the biological environment by closing the area during peak spawning (**Option c**). Based on **Alternative 3 Option c** the percent landings for gag and red

grouper attributed to that area and time period are 3.2% and 0.3%, respectively (Table 2.6.1).

5.6.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Preferred Alternative 1, no action, would not modify existing time and area closures that prohibit fishing for gag and other reef fish species. Therefore, economic effects are not expected to result from **Preferred Alternative 1**. **Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** would expand existing area closures and close additional areas covering 70 and 244 nautical miles, respectively. **Alternatives 4** and **5** would modify the seasonal closure dates of the Edges and of Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps areas, respectively. The expansion of these closed areas and modifications to seasonal closure times considered are expected to reduce effort, thereby granting additional protection to spawning aggregations of gag and potentially reducing bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag while fishermen are targeting red grouper.

The magnitude of effort reductions that are anticipated to result from **Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5** is not known at this time. Therefore, expected beneficial impacts on the gag stock and future economic benefits that could potentially result from these alternatives are also unknown. The expansion of closed areas and/or modifications to seasonal closure times may adversely impact fishermen who typically harvest gag in those areas by leading them to search for alternative fishing grounds and/or time periods to harvest gag and other reef fish, possibly altering the revenue and cost structures of their fishing trips. Further, additional closed areas may lead some commercial fishermen to increase their effort in fishing grounds closer to shore, potentially increasing competition in those areas. On balance, the economic effects that would potentially result from **Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5** are not known. However, based on the relatively low percentage of landings recorded in each of the area considered for closure, economic effects that are anticipated to result from **Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5** are likely to be negligible. In addition, even if fishermen were not able to harvest a portion of their red grouper or gag allocation due to the proposed closures, they would sell or lease their allocation to fishermen operating in other parts of the Gulf.

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

This action proposes expansions to the marine protected areas offshore of west Florida (**Alternatives 2 and 3**) and the modification of seasonal closures for two established marine protected areas, The Edges (**Alternative 4**) and Madison-Swanson (**Alternative 5**). From public comment, fishermen broadly support closed areas for the purpose of protecting spawning aggregations, but are otherwise against closing spatial areas of the marine environment to fishing. Fishermen question the efficacy of marine protected areas as a management tool more than other effort restricting measures such as bag limits, seasons, and minimum sizes. Additionally, area closures displace effort which may lead to unintended consequences if effort concentrates in new areas, or if effort shifts to other species. Such effort shifts could necessitate further management.

The areas under consideration in this action are located far from shore meaning that only those fishermen capable of reaching the areas would be impacted directly. Commercial longliners are likely to be affected; they are currently restricted to fishing deeper than 50 fathoms west of Cape San Blas and deeper than 20 fathoms (35 fathoms from June through August) east of Cape San Blas. The additional closed areas (**Alternatives 2 and 3**) are located west of Cape San Blas and extend to waters deeper than 50 fathoms. Thus, commercial reef fish longliners, whose effort was severely restricted through

implementation of Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009), would be further displaced from fishing grounds.

Because of the distance from shore, those commercial vertical line fishermen and recreational fishermen with vessels capable of reaching these areas would also be negatively impacted by new or modified closures. It is unknown where fishing effort would be displaced and whether fishermen would switch target species. Unintended consequences are possible. **Alternative 2** would close a smaller area than **Alternative 3** and is slightly closer to shore, yet each borders the Madison-Swanson area closure. Fishermen would most likely be impacted through selection of the alternative closing the area closest to their port of origin; impacts would be geographically differentiated.

The same four options are provided for **Alternatives 2-5** and concern the time and type of fishing closure within the respective area of each alternative (Table 5.6.3.1). Of the options, **option c** would affect fishing effort the least, prohibiting all fishing within each respective area during the gag spawning season only. **Option d** would prohibit all fishing year-round and would incur the greatest impacts of the options for any selected alternative.

Table 5.6.3.1. Comparison of the periods and types of closures that can be selected with each option. An 'X' means all fishing is closed.

		Month											
		J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Option	a	X	X	X	X	Surface trolling permitted only					X	X	← Alternative 5 status quo (Madison-Swanson & Steamboat Lumps)
						X (other fishing prohibited) X							
	b	X	X	X	X	All fishing permitted					X	X	
	c	X	X	X	X	All fishing permitted							
d	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
		Gag spawning season											

The impacts from the alternatives and options within this action will vary given other pending actions within this amendment, particularly Action 2.1 which modifies the recreational fishing season. **Preferred Alternative 4** of Action 2.1 has been selected by the Council for final action, setting the recreational gag season at July 1 through October 31. Thus, should either **Alternative 2 or 3** (creating new closures), with **options b or c** of Action 6 be adopted, recreational fishing effort toward gag would not be further impacted, thus this action would not incur negative impacts for recreational fishermen targeting gag. However, these alternatives and options would implement a prohibition on surface trolling in these new

areas, thus negatively impacting fishermen who would not be likely to encounter gag when fishing in the area. On the other hand, if **Alternative 4, option d** under Action 6 was selected, this would incur additional impacts beyond the shortened season specified in Action 2.1 by further limiting where fishermen may fish during the newly restricted fishing season. These negative impacts would also occur if the split season outlined in **Alternative 3** of Action 2.1 were to be adopted alongside **Alternative 3, option c** of Action 6; again, recreational fishermen would be prohibited from harvesting gag in the proposed closed area during the entire open season for gag.

Under the IFQ program for grouper, commercial fishing effort is not restricted by a fishing season but rather, by the amount of quota available. Any of the area closures that are not closed year round would allow commercial fishermen to harvest gag within the area during some time of the year. Thus, negative social impacts are most likely to accrue to the commercial sector if **option d** alongside **Alternatives 2, 3, 4, or 5** was to be selected.

Ultimately, the Council selected **Preferred Alternative 1**, as the biological and physical benefits of additional closures were difficult to quantify, and commercial and recreational fishermen alike expressed opposition to additional closures before positive results from existing closures could be determined.

5.6.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Impacts on the administrative environment under **Preferred Alternative 1**, status quo would remain the same as current levels. **Alternatives 2 and 3** may require additional monitoring and law enforcement compared to **Preferred Alternative 1**. Since May 6, 2007, all commercial reef fish vessels are required to have a functioning vessel monitoring systems, which can assist law enforcement with monitoring fishing activities. Charter vessels and headboats are not required to carry a vessel monitoring systems unless they are dual-permitted vessels (have both a charter and commercial reef fish permit).

Alternatives 4 and 5 are currently closed areas and are unlikely to add additional burden to the administrative environment. However, depending on the period and type of fishing closure selected (**Options a-d**) there could be additional direct effects on the administrative environment. **Option a** would prohibit all fishing November 1 through April 30, but allow surface trolling May 1 through October 31. These regulations are identical to Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps regulations and may provide an additional burden to the administrative environment if selected as preferred for **Alternatives 2-4**. Allowing surface trolling in additional closed areas may require law enforcement and monitoring to use tools available such as aerial surveillance and VMS monitoring to ensure other types of fishing are not being prosecuted in the closed areas. Potential noncompliance with area closures was noted for 2005 via aerial surveys in waters within and adjacent to the Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps restricted fishing areas (Smith and Zurcher 2007). Both commercial and recreational vessels were observed inside the marine protected areas when all fishing was prohibited. Observations indicated 1.9% of commercial vessels and 5.3% of the recreational vessels were engaged in fishing activities inside these marine protected areas. When the areas were open to surface trolling, 1.7% of commercial vessels and 3.1% of the recreational vessels were observed engaged in fishing activities (Smith and Zurcher 2007). **Options b-d** would prohibit all fishing at various times of the year requiring monitoring and law enforcement involvement directly impacting the administrative environment.

5.7 Action 7. Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures

5.7.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

Actions 7.1 and **7.2** have no direct and little indirect effects on the physical environment. The effects of fishing on the physical environment is described in detail in Section 5.1.1. The proposed actions would either bring accountability measures into consistency with current regulations for the commercial sector (**Action 7.1**) or enhance current regulations for the recreational sector (**Action 7.2**). To the extent that accountability measures control commercial effort through individual fishing quota programs (GMFMC 2008b) and shorten recreational fishing seasons, small benefits to the physical environment may result from reduced effort under **Action 7.1**, **Alternative 1** and **Preferred Alternative 2**. It is difficult to discern comparatively whether one alternative or the other would result in a greater decrease or increase in fishing effort.

Under **Action 7.2**, **Alternatives 2-4** would provide further constraints on fishing effort than **Alternative 1**, and so would reduce any adverse effects to the physical environment. Depending on the circumstances of how a fishery is being prosecuted, the limitations on fishing effort under **Alternatives 2** and **3** is different. **Alternative 2** would limit effort and provide limits on fishing if the annual catch limit is projected to be exceeded. **Alternative 3** would only apply to stock in a rebuilding plan that exceeded their annual catch limit. **Preferred Alternative 4**, because it includes the components of both **Alternatives 2** and **3** would likely provide greater limits on fishing effort and thus greater protections to the physical environment from fishing.

5.7.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Action 7.1, Preferred Alternative 2 would bring accountability measures into consistency with current management practices for the commercial sector which constrains harvest to the quota via the individual fishing quota program. This provides greater protection to the stock than **Alternative 1** because monitoring of the harvest through the individual fishing quota program is more rigorous than through standard quota monitoring. However, because the individual fishing quota is in effect regardless of whether **Alternative 1** or **Preferred Alternative 2** are selected, any benefits to the stock from **Preferred Alternative 2** would be minimal. Because both **Alternative 1** and **Preferred Alternative 2** are designed to protect gag and red grouper stocks, any benefit to the biological/ecological environment would primarily benefit gag and red grouper, and should have minimal effects on other reef fish species. These effects are described in GMFMC (2008a) and incorporated here by reference.

Action 7.2, Alternative 1 would leave the current recreational post-season accountability measures in place and unchanged. These post-season accountability measures adjust the season length in the subsequent year if annual catch limits are exceeded in the current year. This provides positive benefits to the biological/environmental environment by creating a process for taking corrective action to restore catches to their appropriate limits. However, it does allow annual catch limits to be exceeded before taking action, which could have short-term negative effects. Furthermore, **Alternative 1** uses a moving average of recent landings to compare against a moving average of annual catch limits to determine if the accountability measures have been triggered. Although this has the benefit of reducing the imposition of accountability measures due to short-term fluctuations, it can also delay implementation of accountability measures in cases where catches rise only slightly above the annual catch limit, but on a persistent basis.

Compared to no action alternative, **Alternative 2** would provide some benefit to reef fish stocks under a rebuilding plan. The overage adjustment would mitigate any damage done to a stock's recovery in an annual catch limit is exceeded by reducing the annual catch limit for the following year by the size of the overage or by some other level depending on what the best available science advises to get a stock back into a condition consistent with the rebuilding plan. However, for stocks that are not in a rebuilding plan,

there would be no additional benefits compared to **Alternative 1**.

Alternative 3 would add an in-season accountability measure to the current gag and red grouper measures. In-season accountability measures are designed to prevent overages from occurring in the first place. For this reason, in-season accountability measures provide greater benefits to the biological/ecological environment of the species being managed under them. However, in-season accountability measures require in-season monitoring of landings, which is not feasible for all fisheries.

Preferred Alternative 4 would combine both the overage adjustment of **Alternative 2** and the in-season accountability measure of **Alternative 3** to the **Alternative 1** accountability measures. Therefore, the gag and red grouper stocks would benefit as described under these alternatives.

5.7.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic/Social Environment

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Accountability measures for the commercial sector are considered in **Action 7.1**. **Alternative 1**, no action, would maintain accountability measures implemented by Reef Fish Amendment 30B. These measures would close the shallow-water grouper fishery if commercial landings reach or are projected to reach the red grouper, gag, or other shallow-water grouper quota. **Alternative 1** is not compatible with the current individual fishing quota program. **Preferred Alternative 2** would use the individual fishing quota program in place as the accountability measure for the commercial sector. Under an individual fishing quota program, fishermen cannot legally exceed their annual allocation. Fishermen are allowed a 10% overage on their last trip. However, the overage is deducted from their allocation for the next year. **Preferred Alternative 2**, which would be consistent with the current management of the grouper and tilefish fisheries, is not expected to result in economic effects.

Action 7.2 considers alternatives that would potentially augment the current recreational red grouper and gag accountability measures (AMs). AMs are designed to prevent annual catch limits from being exceeded, and if exceeded, correct or mitigate any overages (50 CFR 600.310(g)). The National Standard 1 guidelines identify two types of AMs: in-season and post-season, the latter of which is invoked when an annual catch limit is exceeded. These two types of AMs are not mutually exclusive and may be used simultaneously when appropriate.

Establishing AMs for the recreational sector is not expected to generate direct, adverse effects on the economic environment in the short-term. Direct, adverse economic effects on fishing participants would only occur in the future if and when the AMs are actually triggered. However, because establishing AMs may result in future management actions, changes to the current AMs would be expected to result in indirect, adverse economic effects on fishing participants. Such actions could rebuild the gag stock from its present level, which would in turn allow the stock to support higher catch levels in the future without being overfished.

Alternative 1, no action, leaves the current AMs for the gag and red grouper recreational sectors in place. The nature of these AMs is discussed in section 5.7.2. Because AMs in the recreational sector would remain unchanged and the economic effects of these AMs were already analyzed in Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008a), **Alternative 1**, no action, is not expected to result in any indirect economic effects on fishery participants.

Alternative 2 would add an overage adjustment to the current AMs when the gag or red grouper stocks are overfished and under a rebuilding plan. Under this alternative, an overage adjustment could be applied to the gag recreational sector as soon as 2013, depending on whether the recreational sector exceeds its annual catch limit in 2012, because it is overfished and may be under a rebuilding plan if **Preferred Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, or **Alternative 4** is selected under **Action 1** in this Amendment. Further, the probability of the gag recreational sector exceeding its annual catch limit is dependent on which if any of those alternatives is selected. That is, the longer the rebuilding time period, the greater the annual catch limit in the early years of the rebuilding plan and thus the less likely an overage would occur and an overage adjustment would need to be applied.

In addition, recreational gag landings were trending upward through 2008, but then dropped precipitously in 2009. Even the reduced level of landings in 2009 are considerably above the recreational sector's annual catch limit for 2011 and 2012, which is the primary motivation for the harvesting restrictions implemented in the two recent interim rules and being considered under **Action 2** in this Amendment. The effectiveness of the measures potentially implemented under **Action 2** in this Amendment will determine whether the recreational sector exceeds its annual catch limit in 2012. With the exception of **Alternative 1**, the other alternatives under **Action 2** are expected to restrain landings in the gag recreational sector well below its 2012 annual catch limit, and in fact are intended and expected to constrain landings below the 2012 recreational annual catch target. Thus, the probability an overage adjustment will be required in 2013 is also minimal. Given current projections of expected recreational gag landings in 2012 under these alternatives, the same logic applies to the probability that an in-season closure of the recreational sector will be necessary in 2012. Thus, the likelihood that **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3**, or **Preferred Alternative 4** will generate indirect economic effects on recreational fishing participants is minimal. Whether that expectation will continue in future years partly depends on how participants in the gag recreational sector adjust their behavior to the new management measures and any additional changes in those measures in the future (e.g., a change in the recreational fishing season for 2013 and beyond). However, the planned increases in the recreational sector's gag annual catch limit from approximately 1.1 MP GW in 2012 to 1.7 MP GW in 2016 would presumably reduce the likelihood of an overage adjustment or in-season closure even more.

With respect to red grouper, it is not currently overfished or under a rebuilding plan. As such, **Alternative 2** would not apply to the recreational red grouper sector at present and is not expected to apply in the near future. Thus, no indirect economic effects on the recreational red grouper sector are expected under **Alternative 2**.

Further, the recreational annual catch limit for red grouper has not been met in recent years. Recreational red grouper landings averaged less than 1 MP (GW) between 2006 and 2009. With the planned increase in the red grouper total allowable catch, the recreational annual catch limit will be increased from 1.51 MP (GW) to 1.72 MP (GW), which will create a larger difference between the annual catch limit and the expected catch in 2012, even if the bag limit is increased under **Action 2** in this Amendment. Additional increases in the red grouper recreational annual catch limit are planned through 2016. Thus, the probability the recreational sector will exceed its red grouper annual catch limit in the near future is minimal. In turn, the likelihood that **Alternative 3** or **Preferred Alternative 4** will generate indirect economic effects on the recreational red grouper sector is also minimal.

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Action 7.1 addresses accountability measures for the commercial sector. The **Preferred Alternative 2**

establishes accountability measures for the commercial sector to be consistent with the individual fishing quota program currently in place. Thus, no additional social impacts are expected from this action as the commercial sector already operates under the individual fishing quota program.

Action 7.2 addresses accountability measures for the recreational sector. Accountability measures do not directly affect fishing behavior, as they are not modifications of fishing effort. Thus, no direct impacts would be expected from implementing an accountability measure. Furthermore, the adoption of an accountability measure does not mean that it will be applied to the sector. If the total allowable catch of the sector remains below its threshold, the accountability measure is not applied and therefore does not affect fishing in the future. Accountability measures may indirectly affect fishing behavior, should they be employed and close a season early (**Alternative 3**) or reduce the annual catch limit in a subsequent year (**Alternative 2**). The distinction is that this action is not likely to affect recreational fishing practices; individual recreational fishermen are not likely to adjust their fishing behavior because of a particular accountability measure. However, should the collective landings of the entire sector be determined to exceed the annual catch limit, the selected accountability measure would be applied, reducing the total harvest allowed to the sector as a whole. Should this occur, indirect negative impacts would accrue to the recreational sector as a whole by reducing the amount of fish that may be harvested after application of the accountability measure.

This action proposes both in-season (early season closure) and post-season (overage adjustment) procedures for when the gag or red grouper annual catch limit is exceeded or is predicted to be exceeded. This action does not affect fishermen behavior directly and no direct effects on fishing behavior are anticipated. Rather, the action could implement an early season closure (**Alternative 3**), a reduction in the following year's annual catch limit (**Alternative 2**), or both (**Preferred Alternative 4**), should a given season's annual catch limit be exceeded. Currently, when annual catch limits are exceeded a protocol is in place whereby the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries files a notification to maintain the prior year's target catch level and reduce the length of the fishing season for the following year (**Alternative 1**). This is a post-season accountability measure, although it does not mandate an overage adjustment through a reduction in the next year's annual catch limit. Compared with the no action **Alternative 1** where the next season's target catch level is kept constant, **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 4** would decrease the next fishing season's catch limit by the overage amount in the previous season. This adjustment would incur indirect negative social impacts by prohibiting fishermen from landing the same quantity of gag or red grouper the following year. The in-season, early season closures (**Alternative 3** and **Preferred Alternative 4**) would also incur indirect social impacts by closing the fishing season earlier than planned. These alternatives could result in an additional negative impact on charterboat and headboat operators and their customers who may have to cancel trip bookings due to an early season closure. Because both the in-season and post-season measures are included in **Preferred Alternative 4**, this alternative has the potential to incur the greatest negative social impacts, should the measures be deemed necessary to invoke.

A social issue that arises from these accountability measures, including the no action **Alternative 1**, is evidenced in fishermen's lack of trust in managers' determination that the annual catch limit has been reached. The accountability measures outlined in this action are designed to have positive benefits for the long-term which are expected to mitigate any short-term negative impacts. Nevertheless, ever tightening restrictions may ultimately promote non-compliant fishing behavior, thereby undermining the long-term goals of the rebuilding plan.

5.7.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Action 7.1 should not have an effect on the administrative environment. Quota monitoring (**Alternative 1**) and the individual fishing quota program (**Alternative 2**) are currently being applied to the commercial shallow-water grouper sector. **Action, 7.2, Alternatives 1** (no action) and **2** would have no immediate direct or indirect affect on the administrative environment. Measures to monitor landings and determine if an annual catch limit has been exceeded are currently in place. **Alternative 2** would just set a different overage adjustment than would be applied under **Alternative 1**. **Alternative 3** and **Preferred Alternative 4** would add to the administrative burden because gag and red grouper recreational landings would need to be monitored in-season. This would put a substantial burden on NMFS Enforcement, Southeast Regional Office, and Southeast Fishery Science Center staff to collate and verify landings information, file a notification of a closure, and enforce closures or quota reductions. Currently, a *Federal Register* notice and Fishery Bulletins are published by the Assistant Administrator to inform anglers of quota closures. Filing accountability measure notifications is expected to increase the burden on the Assistant Administrator and Southeast Regional Office. However, the administrative environment may be negatively affected if harvests are not sufficiently constrained within a year causing additional post-season action to be taken to ensure annual catch limits are not exceeded in subsequent years.

5.8 Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA)

As directed by NEPA, federal agencies are mandated to assess not only the indirect and direct impacts, but cumulative impacts of actions as well. NEPA defines a cumulative impact as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time” (40 C.F.R. 1508.7). Cumulative effects can either be additive or synergistic. A synergistic effect is when the combined effects are greater than the sum of the individual effects.

This section uses an approach for assessing cumulative effects that was initially used in Amendment 26 to the Reef Fish FMP and is based upon guidance offered in CEQ (1997). The report outlines 11 items for consideration in drafting a CEA for a proposed action.

1. Identify the significant cumulative effects issues associated with the proposed action and define the assessment goals.
2. Establish the geographic scope of the analysis.
3. Establish the timeframe for the analysis.
4. Identify the other actions affecting the resources, ecosystems, and human communities of concern.
5. Characterize the resources, ecosystems, and human communities identified in scoping in terms of their response to change and capacity to withstand stress.
6. Characterize the stresses affecting these resources, ecosystems, and human communities and their relation to regulatory thresholds.
7. Define a baseline condition for the resources, ecosystems, and human communities.
8. Identify the important cause-and-effect relationships between human activities and resources, ecosystems, and human communities.
9. Determine the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects.
10. Modify or add alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant cumulative effects.

11. Monitor the cumulative effects of the selected alternative and adapt management.

Cumulative effects on the biophysical environment, socio-economic environment, and administrative environments are analyzed below.

1. Identify the significant cumulative effects issues associated with the proposed action and define the assessment goals.

The CEQ cumulative effects guidance states this step is accomplished through three activities as follows:

- I. The direct and indirect effects of the proposed actions (Section 5.1-5.7);
- II. Which resources, ecosystems, and human communities are affected (Sections 3 and 4); and
- III. Which effects are important from a cumulative effects perspective (information revealed in this CEA)

2. Establish the geographic scope of the analysis.

The primary affects of the actions in this amendment would affect the physical, biological/ecological, socioeconomic environments of the Gulf of Mexico.

The geographic scope affected by this action is described in detail in Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and pertains directly to the Gulf of Mexico, particularly the west Florida shelf. Gag and red grouper comprise the bulk of the shallow-water grouper harvest. These species occur along the eastern seaboard from North America and South America and are common to the Gulf of Mexico. Larvae are pelagic and juveniles utilize coastal and nearshore waters. Adults differ in habitat use with red grouper generally occurring over low relief hard bottom and gag occurring over reef and shelf-break habitats.

Reef fish vessels and dealers are primarily found in Gulf states (GMFMC 2008b). Based on mailing addresses or home ports, 98% of historical charter captain reef fish, 96% of for-hire reef fish, 98% of commercial reef fish permitted vessels, and 100% of vessels with reef fish longline endorsements are found in Gulf States. For permitted reef fish dealers, 95 percent are found in Gulf States. With respect to eligible reef fish individual fishing quota shareholders, 96.5% of 1,171 have mailing addresses in Gulf States. For the 850 entities actually holding shares for reef fish species, 97.5% have mailing addresses in Gulf States.

3. Establish the timeframe for the analysis

The timeframe for this analysis is 1984 to 2014. Grouper have been managed in the Gulf of Mexico since the implementation of the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan in **1984** and the implementation of state regulations for some groupers in 1985. Grouper stocks have been periodically assessed since 1991. Most assessments have focused on gag and red grouper, but other grouper species have been assessed and are described in Section 3.2. The 2006 SEDAR 10 gag and SEDAR 12 red grouper stock assessments were the last benchmark assessments with update assessments occurring in 2009 (SEDAR 2009a, 2009b). These included data for analysis of stock status from 1963-2008 for commercial landings, and 1981-2008 for recreational landings. The catch data for both commercial and recreational fisheries included a conversion of a portion of black grouper landings to gag to reflect mis-identification of gag as black grouper, particularly during the 1980s and in the northern Gulf. In addition, most commercial grouper

landings were not identified to species prior to 1986. Unclassified grouper landings are available from 1963-1985.

The following is a list of reasonably foreseeable future management actions. These are described in more detail in Step 4. Note that the next gag and red grouper assessments are scheduled for 2013. Should new regulations be needed for the management of these stocks, they will likely not be implemented until **2014** at the earliest, or the end of the timeframe discussed in this analysis.

- Next assessments for gag and red grouper through SEDAR are scheduled to occur in 2013. SEDAR assessments for vermilion snapper and gray triggerfish are scheduled for 2011, red snapper for 2012, and greater amberjack and gray snapper for 2013.
- At their June 2011 meeting, the Council asked for a new regulatory amendment to increase the red grouper 2011 total allowable catch because estimates of 2010 landings overestimated the actual harvest. Actions in this regulatory amendment will evaluate increasing the total allowable catch and the recreational bag limit.
- The Council requested an emergency rule at their June 2011 meeting to suspend the September 30 closure date and assign the entire 345,000 pounds of increased TAC to the recreational sector for the 2011 season.
- The Council is developing a generic amendment to address annual catch limits and corresponding AMs. The reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act was enacted on January 12, 2007, and requires annual catch limits to be developed in 2010 for stocks subject to overfishing and 2011 for all other stocks.
- On January 1, 2012, red snapper individual fishing quota shares will be available for transfer to all U.S. citizens. Although persons without commercial reef fish permit will not be able to catch and sell fish, they will be able to buy and sell shares and allocation. Potentially persons could buy and hold onto shares without landing fish. This could reduce fishing effort.
- Amendment 28 to the Reef Fish fishery management plan was put on hold but is still under development. This amendment would examine fair and equitable ways to allocate all FMP resources between recreational and commercial fisheries.
- Amendment 33 to the Reef Fish fishery management plan is being developed to evaluate Limited Access Privilege Programs for reef fish species not currently covered under individual fishing programs.
- Amendment 34 to the Reef Fish fishery management plan is being developed to evaluate earned income and crew size requirements in the reef fish fishery.
- Amendment 35 to the Reef fish fishery management plan is being developed to evaluate total allowable catch options relative to the greater amberjack rebuilding plan.

4. Identify the other actions affecting the resources, ecosystems, and human communities of concern.

a. Past actions affecting grouper fisheries are summarized in Section 1.4. The following list identifies more recent actions (Note actions taken prior to Amendment 30B are described in detail in that amendment (GMFMC 2008b) and incorporated here by reference).

- Amendment 30B was approved by the Secretary in January 2009 and a final rule has published (effective May 18, 2009), except for the "Edges" portion for area closures, which was effective June 24, 2009. The purpose of the amendment is to end overfishing of gag, revise red grouper

management measures as a result changes in the stock condition, establish annual catch limits and AMs for gag and red grouper, manage shallow-water grouper to achieve optimum yield, and improve the effectiveness of federal management measures. In addition, Amendment 30B established management targets and thresholds for gag consistent with the requirements of the SFA, set the gag and red grouper TAC, and established interim allocations for the commercial and recreational gag and red grouper fisheries.

- Because regulations ending overfishing for gag were not expected to be implemented by January 1, 2009, the Council requested NMFS develop an interim rule to put in place such regulations for the 2009 fishing year. This interim rule published December 2, 2008, and was effective January 1, 2009.
- An emergency rule was requested by the Council restricting the bottom longline component of the reef fish fishery in the eastern Gulf to fishing outside of 50 fathoms until the deepwater grouper and tilefish quotas are filled. The quotas were filled in June 2009, at which point, the reef fish bottom longline component of the fishery was closed. The rule was effective May 18, 2009.
- Amendment 29 to the Reef Fish FMP was approved by the Secretary July 2009. This amendment establishes a grouper and tilefish individual fishing quota program for the commercial reef fish sector.
- The Generic Aquaculture Amendment was approved in September 2009. This amendment provides a programmatic approach to evaluating the impacts of aquaculture proposals in the Gulf and a comprehensive framework for regulating such activities.
- An interim rule to implement gag regulations by January 1, 2011, was requested by the Council to reduce gag overfishing. These measures included reducing the gag commercial quota to 100,000 pounds and closing the recreational sector.
- A regulatory amendment, effective January 1, 2011, reduced the red grouper commercial quota from 5.75 million pounds to 4.32 million pounds and revised the definition of buoy gear. Recreational regulations were not addressed in the amendment as recent harvest levels have been sufficiently below catch targets.
- Another interim rule to implement gag regulations by June 1, 2011, was requested by the Council to reduce gag overfishing. Measures were based on a revised assessment update and allowed for a gag commercial quota of 430,000 pounds and a September 16-November 15 recreational fishing season.

b. The following are recent reef fish actions not summarized in Section 1.4 but are important to the reef fish fishery in general (Note actions taken prior to Amendment 30B are described in detail in that amendment (GMFMC 2008b) and incorporated here by reference).

Regulatory amendments increasing the red snapper total allowable catch were approved for 2010 and 2011. Total allowable catches were 6.945 and 7.295 million pounds, respectively.

A 2011 regulatory amendment was approved that closed the recreational sector to harvesting greater amberjack in June and July. This measure was implemented on May 28, 2011, with the purpose of closing the sector in the summer to avoid closures in the fall and winter.

At their November 2007 meeting, the Council recognized the difficulties involved in decisions allocating reef fish total allowable catches between recreational and commercial fisheries. They established an

Allocation Ad Hoc Committee to examine fair and equitable ways to allocate all fishery management plan resources between recreational and commercial fisheries. Once they are completed, the principles for setting allocations should be more transparent and understandable to the various sectors in the fishery. Reef Fish Amendment 28 will likely be the amendment addressing allocation.

The Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act was enacted on January 12, 2007. It added provisions strengthening the requirements to end and prevent overfishing and rebuild U.S. stocks. It requires annual catch limits and corresponding accountability measures to ensure that overfishing does not occur. It also requires conservation and management measures be prepared and implemented within two years of notification that a stock is “overfished” or “subject to overfishing” in order to end overfishing immediately and begin rebuilding stocks. An annual catch limit means a specified amount of a fish stock (e.g., measure of weight or numbers of fish) for a fishing year that is a maximum amount of annual total catch that can be taken, taking into account projected estimates for landings and discard mortality from all user groups and sectors (total annual catch limits can be divided into sector annual catch limits, provided that the sum of all sector limits cannot exceed the total annual catch limit). The Magnuson-Stevens Act states that annual catch limits cannot exceed the recommendations of Council Scientific and Statistical Committees. Measures are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act to ensure accountability measures, to specify mechanisms for establishing annual catch limits, and to set annual catch limits. These measures need to be developed in 2010 for stocks subject to overfishing and 2011 for all other stocks. Either a plan amendment or a generic amendment would be necessary to establish annual catch limits and accountability measures for stocks in the fishery management plans included in this generic amendment that do not already have annual catch limits. Reef Fish Amendments 30A and 30B addressed catch limits and accountability measures for stocks undergoing overfishing, and a 2010 red snapper regulatory amendment established that the red snapper total allowable catch is functionally equivalent to an annual catch limit. The Gulf Council has taken final action on this generic amendment at their August 2011 meeting to set annual catch limits and accountability measures for many reef fish species currently without these measures.

The Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) is modifying the catch estimation method for recreational harvest from 2004-2010 to address improvements identified for estimation algorithms. The modifications will address concerns raised in the National Resource Council (2006) review that estimation methods may not be consistent with the sampling probabilities of individually sampled access sites and could result in biased estimates. Revised estimation procedures have been developed and will be applied to existing data going back to 2004. Correction of estimates prior to 2004 will also be considered in the future.

Due to planned changes in the estimation procedure, MRIP estimates of recreational catch for 2004-2010 are likely to change. Estimates for 2011 and beyond will be based on the new method. Changes in recreational catch estimates for 2004-2009 raise several concerns for developing Council amendments, the generic annual catch limit amendment in particular, since the new MRIP values could result in changes to the values of allowable biological catch, overfishing limit, and sector-based allocations and annual catch limits included in this document. If proposed annual catch limits, allowable biological catch, and overfishing limit values are not updated with the new MRIP estimates, there could be a disjunction between the information used to set targets and limits and the information used to evaluate current conditions to determine if annual catch limits are met and accountability measures are triggered.

While the Council is fully aware of these issues, the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens mandate of establishing annual catch limits and accountability measures by 2011 have not been revised to account for

the impending change to recreational data. Hence the Council and NMFS must still meet the 2011 deadline to establish the required limits and targets. The Council will take action as needed via plan amendment or framework amendment to revise the appropriate values as needed in 2012 and beyond.

c. The following are non-FMP actions which can influence the reef fish fishery.

Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) describes in detail non-FMP actions relating liquefied natural gas terminals, hurricanes, fuel prices, imports, and global climate change. These are as follows:

- Some liquefied natural gas terminals use sea water to heat the gas back to its gaseous phase. For open systems, high volumes of sea water are required and are likely to result in large mortalities of marine organism eggs and larvae.
- For hurricanes, direct losses to the fishing industry and businesses supporting fishing activities occur ranging from loss of vessels to destruction of fishery infrastructure (Walker et al. 2006). However, while these effects may be temporary, those fishing related businesses whose profitability is marginal may be put out of business should a hurricane strike.
- Rising fuel costs have negative impacts on communities by increasing business costs and lowering profits.
- Most seafood consumed in the United States is imported and the amount of imports have been steadily increasing. The effects of imports on domestic fisheries can cause fishermen to lose markets through commercial sector closures as dealers and processors use imports to meet demand, and limit the price fishermen can receive for their products through competitive pricing of imports.
- Global climate change can impact marine ecosystems through ocean warming by increased thermal stratification, reduced upwelling, sea level rise; and through increases in wave height and frequency, loss of sea ice, and increased risk of diseases in marine biota. Decreases in surface ocean pH due to absorption of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions may impact a wide range of organisms and ecosystems, particularly organism that absorb calcium from surface waters, such as corals and crustaceans (IPCC 2007, and references therein). These influences could affect biological factors such as migration, range, larval and juvenile survival, prey availability, and susceptibility to predators. At this time, the level of impacts cannot be quantified, nor is the time frame known in which these impacts will occur.

In 2005, a red tide event on the west-Florida shelf may have impacted gag and red grouper populations. It has only been in the last 10 years that mortalities of higher vertebrates have been indisputably demonstrated to be due to acute red tide blooms and their brevetoxins (Landsberg et al. 2009). The extent of this event and possible effects of fish community structure has been described in Gannon et al. (2009).

On April 20, 2010, an explosion occurred on the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil rig, resulting in the release of an estimated 4.9 million barrels of oil into the Gulf. In addition, 1.84 million gallons of Corexit 9500A dispersant were applied as part of the effort to constrain the spill. At its maximum extent, oil from the Deepwater Horizon MC252 incident has affected more than one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. The cumulative effects from the oil spill and response may not be known for several years.

The impacts of the oil spill on the physical environment are expected to be significant and may be long-term. However, the oil remained outside most of the west Florida Shelf area where shallow-water grouper

species are most abundant and where the primary fishery is prosecuted. Oil is dispersed on the surface, and because of the heavy use of dispersants, oil is also documented as being suspended within the water column, some even deeper than the location of the broken well head. Floating and suspended oil washed onto shore in several areas of the Gulf as well as non-floating tar balls. Whereas suspended and floating oil degrades over time, tar balls are more persistent in the environment and can be transported hundreds of miles. Oil on the surface of the water could restrict the normal process of atmospheric oxygen mixing into and replenishing oxygen concentrations in the water column. In addition, microbes in the water that break down oil and dispersant also consume oxygen; this could lead to further oxygen depletion. Zooplankton that feed on algae could also be negatively impacted, thus allowing more of the hypoxia-fueling algae to grow.

Oil present in surface waters could affect the survival of eggs and larvae, affecting future recruitment. Effects on the physical environment, such as low oxygen, could lead to impacts on the ability of larvae and post-larvae to survive, even if they never encounter oil. In addition, effects of oil exposure may create sub-lethal effects on the eggs, larva, and early life stages. The stressors could potentially be additive, and each stressor may increase the susceptibility to the harmful effects of the other. If eggs and larvae are affected, impacts on harvestable-size shallow-water groupers will begin to be seen when the 2010 year class becomes large enough to enter the fishery. For most species, recruitment to the fishery does not occur until ages 4-5; therefore, a year-class failure in 2010 would not be felt by the fishery until 2014-15. The impacts would be felt as reduced fishing success and reduced spawning potential, and would need to be taken into consideration in the next stock assessment. However, as mentioned above, the oil remained outside most of the area where these species are most abundant, and such effects would be expected only for that portion of the population existing in the north-central Gulf of Mexico.

Indirect and inter-related effects on the biological and ecological environment of the shallow-water grouper in concert with the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill are not well understood. Changes in the population size structure could result from shifting fishing effort to specific geographic segments of shallow-water grouper populations, combined with any anthropogenically-induced natural mortality that may occur from the impacts of the oil spill. The impacts on the food web from phytoplankton, to zooplankton, to mollusks, to top predators may be significant in the future. Impacts to shallow-water groupers from the oil spill may similarly impact other species that may be preyed upon by shallow-water groupers, or that might benefit from a reduced stock.

5. Characterize the resources, ecosystems, and human communities identified in scoping in terms of their response to change and capacity to withstand stress.

This step should identify the trends, existing conditions, and the ability to withstand stresses of the environmental components. According to the CEQ guidance describing stress factors, there are two types of information needed. The first are the socioeconomic driving variables identifying the types, distribution, and intensity of key social and economic activities within the region. The second are the indicators of stress on specific resources, ecosystems, and communities.

Reef Fish Fishery

Data used to monitor commercial reef fish effort includes the number of vessels with landings, the number of trips taken, and trip duration. Note that data is not available yet to effectively determine the effects from the individual fishing quota program. Declines in effort may be a signal of stress within the fishery. These trends are described in Sections 3.3, 6.0, 7.0, and briefly summarized here. Although landings in the sector have shown patterns of increases and decreases, the number of boats actively participating in the commercial reef fish sector (except for gag) show a pattern of decline over time. For shallow-water grouper and red grouper, the average number of boats with landings fell from 1,066 and 803, respectively for the time period 1993-98, to 712 and 609, respectively, for the time period 2005-08 (NMFS 2010). This same trend is reflected by the sector as a whole. The number of permitted vessels, which has remained relatively constant, is greater than the number of vessels having landings. This suggests there are permits not actively employed, but could be used in the event noticeable improvements in the sector arise. This reduction in the numbers of vessels participating in the sector also reflects a decline in the number trips taken and days away from port by the sector as a whole. This decline is not reflected for gag where the average number of vessels in the sector was 533 for 1993-98 and 536 for 2005-08.

There are several potential reasons for the decline in effort for reef fish and shallow-water grouper. These may include an increase in fishing costs, increases in harvesting efficiency, more restrictive regulations (particularly for grouper), and even improvements in the stock status of certain species (effort shifting). However, data currently is inadequate to determine which factors contribute the most to declines in fishing effort for reef fish and grouper, and what might be the causes for the apparent increase in fishing effort for gag.

Social and economic characteristics of recreational anglers are collected periodically as an add-on survey to the MRFSS. Data used to monitor recreational reef fish effort in the sector primarily comes from MRFSS and includes the number of trips and number of catch trips. Declines in effort may be a signal of stress within the sector. These trends are described in GMFMC (2010 and NMFS (2010a). The level and pattern of change in recreational effort has remained about flat from 1993 through 1996, fluctuated between 1997 and 1999, and then increased relatively fast because 2000. Private and charter fishing modes accounted for most of target trips, with the charter mode the most common mode for red grouper and private the most common for gag. For both species, Florida accounts for most landings; however, landings in Alabama have been increasing in recent years.

Summary characteristics of the for-hire fleet were analyzed as part of the analyses for the development of the current limited access system (GMFMC 2005c). These analyses indicated for-hire operations were generally profitable. Costs associated with these businesses include bookkeeping services, advertising and promotion, fuel and oil, bait expenses, docking fees, food/drink for customers and crew, ice expenses, insurance expenses, maintenance expenses, permits and licenses, and wage/salary expense. Most vessels

carry per trip about half of the maximum passenger capacity. Therefore, substantial excess capacity exists in the sector. As with the commercial sector, increases in fishing costs, increases in harvesting efficiency, more restrictive regulations (particularly for grouper), and changes in the stock status of certain species may affect effort in this sector.

Gag and Red Grouper

Major stresses to grouper stocks have primarily come from overfishing which has either occurred for red and goliath grouper, or is currently occurring for gag. In addition, in 2005, both stocks appeared to have suffered an episodic mortality event which has been speculated to have been caused by red tide. Trends in landings and the status of grouper stocks are based on NMFS and SEDAR stock assessments (summarized in Section 3.2) and incorporated here by reference.

Ecosystem

With respect to stresses to the ecosystem from actions in this amendment, changes in the gag and red grouper harvest are not likely to create additional stress. Vertical gear and longlines, the primary gear used by the fishery, can damage habitat through snagging or entanglement, however, as described in Section 5.1.1, these impacts are minimal. Changes in the population size structure as a result of shifting grouper fishing selectivities and increases in stock abundance could lead to changes in the abundance of other reef fish species that compete with grouper for shelter and food. Predators of grouper species could increase if grouper abundance is increased, while species competing for similar resources as groupers could potentially decrease in abundance if food and/or shelter are less available. Efforts to model these interactions are still in their development stages, and so predicting possible stresses on the ecosystem in a meaningful way is not possible at this time. As described in Part 4c of this cumulative effects analysis, the Deepwater Horizon MC252 incident has affected more than one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. The impacts of the oil spill on the physical and biological environments are expected to be significant and may be long-term. However, the oil appears to have remained outside most of the west Florida Shelf where gag and red grouper are particularly abundant and contains most of the essential fish habitat (EFH) for these species (GMFMC 2004b).

6. Characterize the stresses affecting these resources, ecosystems, and human communities and their relation to regulatory thresholds.

This section examines whether resources, ecosystems, and human communities are approaching conditions where additional stresses could have an important cumulative effect beyond any current plan, regulatory, or sustainability threshold (CEQ 1997). Sustainability thresholds can be identified for some resources, which are levels of impact beyond which the resources cannot be sustained in a stable state. Other thresholds are established through numerical standards, qualitative standards, or management goals. The CEA should address whether thresholds could be exceeded because of the contribution of the proposed action to other cumulative activities affecting resources.

Reef Fish Fishery

As indicated above, both commercial and for-hire fisheries are subject to stress as a result of increases in fishing costs, increases in harvesting efficiency, more restrictive regulations (particularly for grouper), and changes in the stock status of certain species (effort shifting). Reductions in dollars generated by these entities would likely be felt in the fishery infrastructure. For the reef fish fishery, an indicator of stress would be a decline in the number of permitted vessels. For the commercial sector, the number of vessels landing either shallow-water grouper or red grouper has been decreasing (see discussion above

and Section 3.3). However, the number of permitted vessels has remained the same at about 1,000 vessels over the past few years indicating not all permitted vessels are participating in the sector. Whether owners are holding their permits as speculation for selling their permit, or waiting until reef fish prices improve to a point where returning to the sector becomes more profitable is unknown.

For the for-hire sector, analyses conducted on the effects of a limited access program for for-hire vessels indicated operations were generally profitable (GMFMC 2005c). However, testimony from for-hire operators in light of recent red snapper regulations have suggested some for-hire operators may go out of business, particularly in the northeastern Gulf (GMFMC 2007c). Best available survey and modeling results indicate that relatively few trip cancellations were expected to occur as a result of this action. As an example from red snapper fishing, survey respondents indicated that when faced with a reduced or zero red snapper bag limit, they would either continue fishing for red snapper or fish for another species. Fishing for other species may generate distributional effects (i.e., the trips may occur from different ports, modes, or seasons, resulting in one port/entity/season losing business while another gains). These distributional effects, however, cannot be predicted with current data. Further, for at least red snapper trips, preliminary data through August 2007 do not support claims of widespread reductions in charter business as a result of more restrictive red snapper measures. Thus, based on inference from the red snapper for-hire sector, while it is possible some for-hire fishermen may go out of business as a result of actions in Amendment 30B or other reef fish amendments, the sector as a whole is not undergoing widespread harm.

Grouper

No thresholds or benchmarks have been set specifically for most grouper. Amendment 1 to the Reef Fish FMP, implemented in 1990 before the Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA) was passed, established the minimum spawning stock biomass at 20 percent SPR for all reef fish species. The Generic SFA Amendment proposed SFA definitions for optimum yield, minimum stock size threshold and maximum fishing mortality threshold for three reef fish species and generic definitions for all other reef fish. The definition of maximum fishing mortality threshold for other reef fish which includes grouper species, $F_{30\%SPR}$, was approved and implemented. Definitions for optimum yield and minimum stock size threshold were disapproved because they were not biomass-based.

A benchmark assessment was conducted for gag in 2006 under the SEDAR stock assessment process and was updated in 2009. SEDAR 10 methods, also used in the update assessment, and results are summarized in Sections 1.4 and 3.2. Based on the parameter estimates through 2008, the gag stock was found to be overfished and undergoing overfishing. A brief description of the stock and its status can be found in Section 3.2 and step 5 of this CEA. Measures proposed in this amendment are designed to immediately relieve stress on the gag stock over the next 10 years. Landings will initially be reduced depending on how dead discards are treated.

For red grouper, Sustainable Fisheries Act compliant thresholds and targets were defined in Secretarial Amendment 1. Maximum fishing mortality threshold is defined as the fishing mortality rate at maximum sustainable yield. Minimum stock size threshold is defined as $(1-M)*B_{MSY}$ with natural mortality (M) equal to 0.14. Maximum sustainable yield is the yield associated with F_{MSY} when the stock is at equilibrium and optimum yield is the yield associated with fishing at 75 percent of F_{MSY} when the stock is at equilibrium.

The most recent benchmark assessment for red grouper was completed in 2007 using an age-structured production model (SEDAR 12 2007). The 2009 update assessment used the same techniques. The results

of the assessments are summarized in Section 1.4 and 3.2. Based on landings data from 1986 to 2008, this assessment indicated the stock had recovered from an overfished state in 1999 and so is no longer considered overfished. The assessment also indicted the stock was no longer undergoing overfishing. However, due to an episodic mortality event in 2005, the population was depressed. Therefore, harvest constraints currently placed on the stock need not be changed to allow the stock to recover, however, as indicated in Item 3 of this CEA, the rerun of the assessment using landings data through 2010 allows a higher harvest.

Other grouper stocks that have been assessed include yellowedge grouper, goliath grouper, and black grouper (see Section 3.2). A review of the Nassau grouper's stock status was conducted by Eklund (1994).

7. Define a baseline condition for the resources, ecosystems, and human communities.

The purpose of defining a baseline condition for the resource and ecosystems in the area of the proposed action is to establish a point of reference for evaluating the extent and significance of expected cumulative effects.

The first stock assessment of gag was conducted in 1994 and then again in 1997, 2001, 2006, and 2009. An overview of the assessments is provided in Sections 1.4 and 3.2. The most recent assessment occurred in 2009 (finalized in 2011) through the SEDAR process and included data through 2008. The assessment shows trends in biomass, fishing mortality, fish weight, and fish length dating to the earliest periods of data collection. For this assessment, reliable commercial landings data were estimated back to 1963; however, grouper were not identified by species until 1986. Recreational data were available since 1981. Within this timeframe, gag have not been considered overfished until the 2009 update assessment, but some previous assessments indicated gag may have been undergoing overfishing.

The first stock assessment of red grouper was conducted in 1991 and then again in 1993, 1999, 2002, and 2007, with the 2007 assessment being updated in 2009. An overview of the assessments is provided in Sections 1.4 and 3.2. The most recent assessment was the update in 2009 through the SEDAR process. The assessment shows trends in biomass, fishing mortality, fish weight, and fish length dating to the earliest periods of data collection. For this assessment, reliable commercial and recreational landings data were estimated back to 1981. Within this timeframe, the 1999 red grouper assessment, 2000 re-evaluation of the 1999 assessment, and the 2002 assessment have indicated this stock has been undergoing overfishing and was overfished, but the 2007 assessment and subsequent 2009 update assessment indicates the stock has recovered to B_{MSY} .

Information is lacking on the social environment of these fisheries, although some economic data are available. Fishery-wide ex-vessel revenues are available dating to the early 1960s, and individual vessel ex-vessel revenues are available from 1993 when the logbook program was implemented for all commercial vessels.

8. Identify the important cause-and-effect relationships between human activities and resources, ecosystems, and human communities. Cause-and-effect relationships are presented in Tables 5.8.1 and 5.8.2.

Table 5.8.1. The cause and effect relationship of fishing and regulatory actions for gag within the time period of the CEA.

Time periods	Cause	Observed and/or expected effects
1986 -1989	Growth and recruitment overfishing	Declines in mean size and weight
1990	Minimum size limit of 20-inch; 5 aggregate grouper bag limit; 9.2 MP shallow-water grouper quota	Slight increase in commercial landings; decline in recreational landings
1999	22-inch recreational minimum size limit; 24-inch commercial minimum size limit; and 1 month commercial seasonal closure	Slight increase in both commercial and recreational landings
2005	Commercial trip limit and decrease in recreational aggregate bag limit	Slight decrease in commercial landings as quota filled and shallow-water grouper sector closed; significant declines in recreational landings; overfishing occurring
2009	Gag overfishing and stock declared overfished	End overfishing; reduce harvest; provide harvest limits to achieve sustainability; IFQ to further control commercial sector to prevent overages
2011	Overfishing continues; reduce quota and establish recreational fishing season	Reduce overfishing, prelude to a rebuilding plan

Table 5.8.2. The cause and effect relationship of fishing and regulatory actions for red grouper within the time period of the CEA

Time periods	Cause	Observed and/or expected effects
1986 -1989	Growth and recruitment overfishing	Declines in mean size and weight
1990	Minimum size limit of 20-inch; 5 aggregate grouper bag limit; 9.2 MP shallow-water grouper quota	Slight increase in both commercial and recreational landings
1999	1 month commercial seasonal closure	Increase in commercial and recreational landings
2005	Commercial trip limit; 1-fish red grouper bag limit; recreational seasonal closure	Decrease in commercial landings as quota filled and shallow-water grouper sector closed; significant declines in recreational landings; overfishing ended
2009	Red grouper stock recovery; set quota and bag limit; establish ACLs and AMs; establish TAC and interim allocation	Overfishing ended and stock rebuilt; reduce harvest; provide harvest limits to achieve sustainability
2010	Red grouper individual fishing program; reduce harvest	Further control commercial sector to prevent overages; prevent overfishing

9. Determine the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects.

The primary objectives of this amendment and associated EIS are to end overfishing of gag so that the stock can begin to rebuild and to develop red grouper management measures that will allow the optimum yield of red grouper to continue to be caught as the stock recovers from a 2005 episodic mortality event. Actions 1, 2.2, and 3-7 address the first objective and actions 2.2, 4, 6, and 7 address the second objective. The short- and long-term direct and indirect effects of each these actions are provided in Sections 5.1 through 5.7.

In Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b), important valued environmental components (VECs) were identified to examine the magnitude and significance of the cumulative effects. These have not changed for this analysis and so are incorporated by reference. An initial 25 VECs were identified, and the consequences of each alternative proposed in this amendment on each VEC were evaluated. Some of these VECs were combined into a revised VEC because many of the past, current, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (RFFA) were similar. Based on this analysis, seven VECs were determined to be the most important for further consideration. These are shown in Table 5.8.3.

Table 5.8.3. VECs considered, consolidated, or not included for further evaluation.

VECs considered for further evaluation	VECs consolidated for further evaluation	VECs not included for further evaluation
Habitat - hard bottom - EFH		
Managed resources - gag - red grouper - other reef fish species	Gag Red grouper Other shallow water grouper Deepwater grouper Other reef fish Prey species Competitors Predators	Sharks Protected species
Vessel owner, captain and crew - Commercial - For-hire	Crew Fishing Communities	
Dealers		Consumers
Anglers		
Infrastructure	Fishing Communities	
Administration	Federal Rulemaking Federal Permitting Federal Education State Rulemaking/Framework State Education	

Habitat

The past and present effects of different actions on habitat is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. Past management measures have provided protections to reef fish habitat compared to no regulations at all by constraining gear types to those that have lower adverse effects on habitat (e.g., vertical and longline) and outlawing gear types that damage habitat (e.g., roller trawls and fish traps). Current management measures of the reef fish fishery have likely been beneficial to hard bottom areas because they limit effort, thus restricting the amount of gear that interacts with the bottom. Reef fish essential fish habitat, particularly coral reefs and submerged aquatic vegetation, are particularly susceptible to non-fishing activities (GMFMC 2004b) such as dredge-and-fill activities, and oil and gas activities, and changes in freshwater inflows. As described in Part 4c of this cumulative effects analysis, the potential harm to reef fish habitat was highlighted by the Deepwater Horizon MC252 incident. EFH and HAPC designations described in Section 3.2 are intended to promote careful review of proposed activities that may affect these important habitats to assure that the minimum practicable adverse impacts occur on EFH. However, NMFS has no direct control over final decisions on such projects. The cumulative effects of these alternatives depend on decisions made by agencies other than NMFS, as NMFS and the Gulf Council have only a consultative role in non-fishing activities.

Managed Resources

The past and present effects of different actions on managed resources is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. In the past, the lack of management of reef fish has allowed many stocks to undergo both growth and recruitment overfishing. This has allowed some stocks to decline as indicated in numerous stock assessments (Section 3.2). Present management measures work to limit the harvest to sustainable levels; however, these measures may have redirected fishing effort towards other reef fish species. Reasonably foreseeable future actions are expected to benefit managed species as described in steps 3 and 4 of this cumulative effects analysis. These measures are intended to prevent overfishing and allow for sustainable fisheries. Non-fishing activities are likely to adversely affect reef fish stocks. These include loss of larvae by LNG facilities and damage to habitat through the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill. To mitigate the effects of the LNG facilities, closed- rather than open-loop systems are being called for. Efforts to remove oil from areas affected by the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill is ongoing.

Vessel Owner, Captain, and Crew (Commercial and For Hire)

The past and present effects of different actions on the commercial and for hire vessel owners, captains, and crew is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. Adverse or beneficial effects of actions to vessel owners, captains, and crew are tied to the ability for a vessel to make money. The greater the difference between expenses and payment for caught fish or services, the more revenue is generated by the fishing vessel. Relative to this amendment, both sectors have benefited from past actions in the reef fish fishery. By being able to harvest these species unhindered by regulations prior to 1990, many vessels have been able to enter the fishery. However, lack of management led to the depletion of many stocks. Current management measures have had negative, short-term economic impacts and have resulted in limiting fishing effort. Many reasonably foreseeable future actions are likely to continue these short-term negative impacts on the sectors. However, as stocks continue to improve, economic benefits are being realized by the sectors through increased harvest levels for some species. Non-management related reasonably foreseeable

future actions which could affect the sectors include hurricanes and increases in fishing costs (e.g., fuel). Hurricanes are unpredictable and localized in their effects. Increases in fishing costs, unless accompanied by a similar increase in price per pound of fish (commercial) or price per trip (for hire), are likely to decrease the profitability of fishing operations.

Dealers

The past and present effects of different actions on dealers is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. Reef fish vessels and dealers are primarily found in Gulf States. Relative to past actions, dealers have benefitted from actions that have allowed the commercial sector to expand. However, the affect of measures constraining commercial landings both in past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions may not have negative effects on dealers due to the availability of reef fish imports. Thus, they have the ability to substitute domestic product with imports and substitute other domestic seafood products for grouper in order to satisfy public demand for seafood. Because of this, the negative effects from management actions for the commercial sector may not necessarily translate into negative effects for dealers. As domestic fish stocks are rebuilt and management programs such as individual fishing quotas are instituted, a more stable supply of domestic reef fish will be available to dealers. This should improve their ability to market these products and improve profits they receive from handling these fish.

Anglers

The past and present effects of different actions on anglers is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. The effects of various past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on anglers are measured through levels of participation in the sector. It is difficult to assess what affects past and present management measures have had on anglers because the amount of effort by the private sector has continually increased where data were available. Therefore, it is difficult to link changes in participation to specific management actions. Likely the effects of how various management measures have affected participation by anglers is similar to the effects on the for-hire industry discussed above. This includes outside factors such as hurricanes and increasing fuel and other costs.

Infrastructure

The past and present effects of different actions on infrastructure is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. The infrastructure that supports fisheries is tied to the commercial and recreational sectors and can be affected by adverse and beneficial economic conditions in those fisheries. Therefore, the effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions to the infrastructure should reflect responses by the sectors to these actions as described above.

Administrative Environment

The past and present effects of different actions on the administration of fisheries is described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. Administration of fisheries is conducted through federal (including the Council) and state agencies which develop and enforce regulations, collect data on various fishing entities, and assess the health of various stocks. As more regulations are required to constrain stock exploitation to sustainable

levels, greater administration of the resource is needed. The NMFS law enforcement, in cooperation with state agencies, would continue to monitor regulatory compliance with existing regulations and NMFS would continue to monitor both recreational and commercial landings to determine if landings are meeting or exceeding specified quota levels. Further, stock status needs to be periodically assessed to ensure stocks are being maintained at proper levels. Some present actions have assisted the administration of fisheries in the Gulf such individual fishing quota programs and the use of vessel monitoring systems to track vessels. Reasonably foreseeable future actions are designed to improve stock status. This will require increases in the administrative burden to ensure harvest is constrained at a level maintaining stock sustainability.

10. Modify or add alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant cumulative effects.

The cumulative effects of the rebuilding plan for gag and constraining red grouper harvests from expanding on the biophysical and socioeconomic environments are positive because they will ultimately restore/maintain the stocks at a level that will allow the maximum benefits in yield and recreational fishing opportunities to be achieved. However, short-term negative impacts on the fisheries' socioeconomic environment may occur due to the need to limit directed harvest and reduce bycatch mortality. These negative impacts can be minimized for the recreational sector by using combinations of bag limits, size limits and closed seasons and for the commercial sector through individual fishing quota programs, size limits, and season-area closures.

11. Monitor the cumulative effects of the selected alternative and modify management as necessary.

The effects of the proposed actions are, and will continue to be, monitored through collection of landings data by NMFS, stock assessments and stock assessment updates, life history studies, economic and social analyses, and other scientific observations. Landings data for the recreational sector in the Gulf of Mexico is collected through MRFSS, NMFS' Headboat Survey, and the Texas Marine Recreational Fishing Survey. MRFSS is currently being replaced by Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP), a program designed to improve the monitoring of recreational fishing. Commercial data is collected through trip ticket programs, port samplers, and logbook programs. Currently, SEDAR assessments of Gulf of Mexico gag and red grouper are scheduled for 2013²².

5.9 Unavoidable Adverse Effects

Unavoidable adverse effects are described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. Catch quotas, minimum size limits, bag limits, and seasonal closures, are generally effective in limiting total fishing mortality, the type of fish targeted, the number of targeted fishing trips, and/or the time spent pursuing a species. However, these management tools have the unavoidable adverse effect of creating regulatory discards. Discard mortality must be accounted for in a stock assessment as part of the allowable biological catch, and thus restricts total allowable catches. Alternatives considered in this amendment that either directly or indirectly could reduce shallow-water grouper bycatch, include higher red grouper bag limits (Action 2.2), including an adjustment for discarded fish in setting the gag quota (Action 3), gag minimum size limits (Action 5), and time and area closures (Action 6). Other alternatives considered in this amendment that may increase grouper bycatch include a gag grouper slot limit (Action 2.1) and longer recreational closed seasons (Action 2.1 and 7.2).

²² SEDAR Web page <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>

Many of the current participants in the reef fish fishery may never recuperate losses incurred from the more restrictive management actions imposed in the short-term to end overfishing of gag. Because gag is but one of the reef fish species managed in the Reef Fish FMP, short-term losses are not expected to be significant, and other species may be substituted to make up for losses to the fishery. With the anticipated recovery of the stock, future participants in the reef fish fishery will benefit. Overall, short-term impacts of actions such as reductions in total allowable harvest for the directed fishery would be offset with much higher allowable catch levels as the stock recovers and is rebuilt.

Actions considered in this amendment should not have adverse effects on public health or safety because these measures should not alter actual fishing practices, just how, when, and where activities can occur. Unique characteristics of the geographic area are highlighted in Section 3. Adverse effects of fishing activities on the physical environment are described in detail in Sections 5.1-5.7. These sections conclude little impact on the physical environment should occur from actions proposed in this document. Uncertainty and risk associated with the measures are described in detail in the same sections as well as assumptions underlying the analyses.

5.10 Relationship between Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity

The primary objectives of this amendment and associated EIS are to end overfishing of gag so that the stock can begin to rebuild and to develop red grouper management measures that will allow the optimum yield of red grouper to continue to be caught as the stock recovers from a 2005 episodic mortality event. The objective related to gag management would require reducing fishing and bycatch mortality from both directed and incidental harvest sectors. The relationship between short-term economic uses and long-term economic productivity are discussed in the preceding section. However, because gag is but one species in the reef fish complex, these effects may be mitigated through effort shifting to other species and may not be significant.

No alternatives are being considered that would avoid these short-term negative effects because they are a necessary cost associated with rebuilding and protecting these stocks in the reef fish fishery. The range of alternatives has varying degrees of economic costs and administrative burdens. Some alternatives have relatively small short-term economic costs and administrative burdens, but would also provide smaller and more delayed long-term benefits. Other alternatives have greater short-term costs, but provide larger and more immediate long-term benefits.

5.11 Mitigation, Monitoring, and Enforcement Measures

Mitigation, monitoring and enforcement measures are described in detail in the cumulative effects analysis of Amendment 30B (GMFMC 2008b) and is incorporated here by reference. The process of ending overfishing on gag stocks, co-managing red grouper and gag, and expanding prior or creating new marine reserves are expected to have a negative short-term effect on the social and economic environment, and will create a burden on the administrative environment. Given the negative effects describe in Section 5.10, it is difficult to mitigate these measures and managers must balance the costs and benefits when choosing management alternatives for the reef fish fishery.

To ensure overfishing of gag ends and the red grouper harvest does not exceed optimum yield, periodic reviews of stock status are needed. These reviews are designed to incorporate new information and to address unanticipated developments in the respective fisheries and would be used to make appropriate

adjustments in the reef fish regulations should harvest not achieve optimum yield objectives. The details for how assessments are developed, reviewed, and applied are described in Amendment 30B, as are the rule-making options the Council and NMFS have for taking corrective actions (GMFMC 2008b).

Current reef fish regulations are labor intensive for law enforcement officials. NMFS law enforcement officials work cooperatively with other federal and state agencies to keep illegal activity to a minimum. Violators are penalized, and for reef fish commercial and reef fish for-hire operators, permits required to operate in their respective fisheries can be sanctioned.

Reef fish management measures include a number of area-specific regulations where reef fish fishing is restricted or prohibited in order to protect habitat or spawning aggregations of fish, or to reduce fishing pressure in areas that are heavily fished. Additionally, this amendment includes alternative to expand existing or create new marine reserves. To improve enforceability of these areas, the Council has established a vessel monitoring system program for the commercial reef fish sector to improve enforcement. Vessel monitoring systems allows NMFS enforcement personnel to monitor compliance with these area-specific regulations, and track and prosecute violations.

5.12 Irreversible and irretrievable Commitments of Resources

There are no irreversible or irretrievable commitments of agency resources proposed herein. The actions to change quotas/allocations, size limits, bag limits, and fishing seasons are readily changeable by the Council in the future. There may be some loss of immediate income (irretrievable in the context of an individual not being able to benefit from compounded value over time) to some sectors from the restricted fishing seasons.

5.13 Any Other Disclosures

CEQ guidance on environmental consequences (40 CFR §1502.16) indicates the following elements should be considered for the scientific and analytic basis for comparisons of alternatives. These are:

- a) Direct effects and their significance.
- b) Indirect effects and their significance.
- c) Possible conflicts between the proposed action and the objectives of federal, regional, state, and local (and in the case of a reservation, Indian tribe) land use plans, policies and controls for the area concerned.
- d) The environmental effects of alternatives including the proposed action.
- e) Energy requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- f) Natural or depletable resource requirements and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- g) Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures.
- h) Means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts.

Items a, b, d, e, f, and h are addressed in Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5.1-5.7. Items a, b, and d are directly discussed in Sections 2 and 5. Item e is discussed in economic analyses. Alternatives that encourage fewer fishing trips would result in energy conservation. Item f is discussed throughout the document as fish stocks are a natural and depletable resource. A goal of this amendment is to make these stocks

sustainable resources for the nation. Mitigations measures are discussed in Section 5.11. Item h is discussed in sections 3 and 5, with particular mention in Section 5.12.

The other elements are not applicable to the actions taken in this document. Because this amendment concerns the management of two marine fish stocks, it is not in conflict with the objectives of federal, regional, state, or local land use plans, policies, and controls (Item c). Urban quality, historic and cultural resources, and the design of the built environment, including the reuse and conservation potential of various alternatives and mitigation measures (Item g) is not a factor in this amendment. The actions taken in this amendment will affect a marine stock and its fishery, and should not affect land-based, urban environments.

With regards to the Endangered Species Act, the most recent biological opinion for the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan, completed on October 13, 2009, concluded authorization of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery managed under this management plan is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles (loggerhead, Kemp's ridley, green, hawksbill, and leatherback) or smalltooth sawfish. An incidental take statement was issued specifying the amount of anticipated take, along with reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions deemed necessary and appropriate to minimize the impact of these takes. Other listed species and designated critical habitat in the Gulf of Mexico were determined not likely to be adversely affected.

With regards to the Marine Mammal Protection Act, fishing activities under the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan should have no adverse impact on marine mammals. The proposed actions are not expected to substantially change the way the fishery is currently prosecuted (e.g., types of methods, gear used, etc.). The reef fish fishery was classified in the 2011 List of Fisheries (75 FR 68468, November 8, 2010) as a Category III fishery because it is prosecuted primarily with longline and hook-and-line gear. This classification indicates the annual mortality and serious injury of a marine mammal stock resulting from any fishery is less than or equal to one percent of the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortalities, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock, while allowing that stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population.

6 Regulatory Impact Review

6.1 Introduction

The National Marine Fisheries Service requires a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for all regulatory actions that are of public interest. The RIR does three things: 1) provides a comprehensive review of the level and incidence of impacts associated with a proposed or final regulatory action; 2) 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) 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 the proposed regulations are a "significant regulatory action" under the criteria provided in Executive Order (E.O.) 12866 and provides some information that may be used in conducting an analysis of impacts on small business entities pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). This RIR analyzes the impacts that the proposed management alternatives in this amendment to the Reef Fish FMP would be expected to have on the reef fish fishery.

6.2 Problems and Objectives

The problems and objectives addressed by this amendment are discussed in Section 1.2 of this document and are incorporated herein by reference. In summary, management measures considered in this amendment are intended to decrease or end overfishing of gag, develop red grouper management measures that will allow the optimum yield of red grouper to continue to be caught, adjust multi-use IFQ allocation percentages, and, minimize gag bycatch.

6.3 Description of the Fishery

A description of the fishery is provided in Section 2.3 of this document and is incorporated herein by reference.

6.4 Impacts of Management Measures

6.4.1 Action 1: Rebuilding Plan for Gag

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.1.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. **Preferred Alternative 2** establishes a rebuilding plan that will rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less. Specifying the rebuilding time to be 10 years or less allows a buffer to account for fluctuations in abundance due to unforeseen events (e.g., red tide) and leeway to take the needs of fishing participants into account when setting catch levels and management measures. **Preferred Alternative 2** would potentially result in more restrictive regulations and thus greater adverse indirect economic effects in the short-term relative to **Alternative 1 (No Action)**.

The rebuilding plan under **Preferred Alternative 2** will lead to different economic costs and benefits relative to **Alternative 1 (No Action)**. The actual costs and benefits associated with **Preferred Alternative 2** depend on the difference between current and target biomass level for gag and the length of the rebuilding period. In terms of productive capacity, a wide gap exists between current and potential

production of the gag stock, and this gap necessitates the introduction of more stringent measures in order to reach full productive capacity. The length of the rebuilding plan will determine how stringent the management measures will be. In general, the shorter the rebuilding period, the more stringent the required management measures will be, and thus the greater the indirect economic costs on fishing participants in the short-term. Because **Preferred Alternative 2** establishes a rebuilding plan while **Alternative 1 (No Action)** does not, the indirect economic costs on fishing participants in the short-term will be greater under **Preferred Alternative 2** than under **Alternative 1 (No Action)**. On the other hand, the indirect economic benefits resulting from larger yields will also accrue sooner and are expected to be greater under **Preferred Alternative 2** than under **Alternative 1 (No Action)**.

The long-term benefits from the fishery depend on, among other factors, the regulatory regime adopted over time. Regulatory regimes that promote economic efficiency generally have a higher likelihood of generating higher economic values while preserving the sustainability of the fish stock. Other regulatory regimes could very well erode the economic benefits over time, even at higher stock levels. For example, if regulations proposed in this amendment are successful in rebuilding the gag stock, higher levels of harvest approaching the chosen optimum yield (OY) would be allowed. However, if overcapacity and other open-access issues in the recreational sector are not addressed, the economic status of the gag component of the reef fish fishery could fall back to its current, or possibly worse, condition. Regardless, without knowledge of the actual management measures that would be implemented under **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 1 (No Action)**, and the associated estimates of indirect costs and benefits over time, the difference in net benefits between **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 1 (No Action)** cannot be measured.

However, some additional statements on relative costs and benefits can be made. Specifically, the commercial sector is currently managed under the grouper/tilefish individual fishing quota program. It is assumed the commercial sector for gag will continue to be managed under individual fishing quota program under **Preferred Alternative 2**. Further, the individual fishing quota program is assumed to keep the commercial sector operating within its quota. Economic theory suggests the average allocation price per pound approximates the average net revenue per pound harvested in the commercial sector. In 2010, the first year of the individual fishing quota program, the average price per pound of gag allocation was \$1.00. In each year, the expected total net revenue in the commercial sector would be estimated by multiplying its quota by \$1.00, assuming a constant average price per pound of gag allocation. The net present value (NPV) of the commercial sector's expected total net revenue would be estimated by discounting it by the appropriate rate, which is currently 3%.

Conversely, the recreational sector is currently managed through the use of a bag limit, size limit, and seasonal closures, which are intended to keep it from harvesting more than its allocation. Because the private and for-hire subsectors are not managed separately (for e.g., via allocations to each subsector), the allocation of landings between the two subsectors cannot be determined. Further, the management measures used to restrain the recreational sector's harvest and landings are subject to change under **Preferred Alternative 2**. As such, net operating revenue (NOR) for the for-hire sector cannot be estimated. However, Carter and Liese (2010) estimated the average consumer surplus (CS) per fish is \$85 (2008 dollars). The average weight per fish from 2006-2008 was 7.23 pounds GW. Thus, the average CS per pound of fish landed by the recreational sector is estimated to be \$11.76 (2008 dollars). Expected total consumer surplus in the recreational sector can be estimated by multiplying its landings in each year by \$11.76. As in the commercial sector, the net present value (NPV) of the recreational sector's expected total consumer surplus would be estimated by discounting it by the appropriate rate, which is currently 3%.

6.4.2 Action 2: Recreational Bag Limits, Size Limits, and Closed Seasons

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.2.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. For the action to establish the recreational fishing season for gag of July 1 through October 31, under the 2006-08 baseline, **Preferred Alternative 4** results in a reduction in CS of approximately \$16.6 million and a reduction in PS of approximately \$1.38 million relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)**. Conversely, **Preferred Alternative 4** results in a reduction in CS of approximately \$15.06 million and a reduction in PS of approximately \$1.2 million relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)** under the 2009 baseline. Thus, the overall estimated reduction in net economic benefits to the recreational sector associated with **Preferred Alternative 4** ranges from approximately \$16.26 million under the 2009 baseline to \$17.98 million under the 2006-08 baseline.

With respect to economic impacts, under the 2006-08 baseline, the estimated total reductions in output, value added, and employment are \$10.73 million, \$6.35 million, and 109 jobs under **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)**. Under the 2009 baseline, the estimated total reductions in output, value added, and employment are \$13.34 million, \$7.9 million, and 135 jobs under **Preferred Alternative 4** relative to **Alternative 1 (no action)**. No economic effects or impacts are expected to result from the action to maintain the minimum size limit of 22 inches for gag harvested by the recreational sector.

These estimates probably overstate actual economic effects as private anglers or for-hire operators will likely adjust their behavior to avoid or minimize adverse consequences to their welfare or profits, respectively. CS and PS estimates are somewhat different in nature. CS attempts to quantify, in dollar terms, the expected loss of welfare experienced by anglers. These values correspond to no actual flows of dollars in the formal economy, though they clearly motivate economic behavior. In contrast, PS is represented in the formal economy by lower revenue and lower profits in the for-hire sector. However, to the extent consumers will spend their money elsewhere, other producers will gain by potentially similar amounts. In summary, the CS losses represent real welfare losses but are intangible in our formal economy. On the other hand, PS losses represent a shift of revenue and profits away from the for-hire sector, but are a tangible economic loss for the for-hire sector.

Because the number of trips in all modes is assumed to remain the same regardless of any change in the red grouper bag limit, no changes to producer surplus or economic impacts are expected to result under **Preferred Alternative 3** for the action to change the red grouper bag limit. However, the increase in the bag limit from two fish to four fish is expected to increase annual recreational landings of red grouper by 12,676 fish, which is in turn expected to result in an annual increase in consumer surplus of approximately \$1.07 million. These estimates apply to 2012 through 2015.

6.4.3 Action 3. Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment to Account for Dead Discards

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.3.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. Reductions in the commercial gag quota considered under this action are expected to contribute to overall decreases in total removals, potentially resulting in positive impacts on the gag stock in the future. These anticipated benefits to the gag resource cannot be quantified at this time. However, the adverse economic effects that would result from the precautionary reductions in commercial gag quota can be approximated by the associated decreases in economic value. Greater reductions in gag quota would logically be expected to result in greater losses in economic value. **Alternative 1** would set commercial gag quotas at the full annual catch target, thereby assuming that dead

discards would be reduced by the same proportion as landings. **Preferred Alternative 2** would reduce commercial gag quotas by 14%. Between 2012 and 2015, the present value of losses in economic value expected to result from commercial quota reductions are estimated at \$472,167, based on a 3% discount rate. It follows that a greater discount rate would yield a smaller present value. It is expected that potential economic benefits, stemming from the added protection to the gag stock during rebuilding, would result from precautionary reductions in commercial gag quota under **Preferred Alternative 2**. **Alternative 3** would further reduce commercial gag quota to 53% of the annual catch target. As expected, **Alternative 3** would result in greater losses in economic value. Relative to **Preferred Alternative 2**, **Alternative 3** would potentially grant greater protection to the gag stock during rebuilding. However, the Council decided that the proportion of dead discards assumed under **Preferred Alternative 2** would be more realistic and would lessen adverse economic effects.

6.4.4 Action 4. Adjustments to Multi-Use Individual Fishing Quota Shares

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.4.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. Due to the large decrease in the gag commercial quota expected under this amendment, the percentage of red grouper allocation that will be converted into multi-use allocation under **Alternative 1** could result in gag harvests that would exceed the gag ACL. In addition to the detrimental effects on the gag stock, this scenario would result in adverse economic effects stemming from the corrective measures that would be implemented to address the over-harvesting of gag.

Alternative 2 would adjust red grouper multi-use percentages following changes to the gag annual catch limit, allocation, or the red grouper allocation. Although **Alternative 2** would allow fishermen to benefit from the added flexibility multi-use shares may afford, the resulting added pressure on the gag stock could have adverse effects on the rebuilding of the resource, and thus be associated with negative economic effects. If red grouper is under a rebuilding plan, **Preferred Alternative 3** would set the percentage of gag allocation converted into multi-use allocation valid to harvest gag or red grouper to zero, granting additional protection to red grouper stock while it rebuilds. This additional protection, which is assumed to yield biological benefits, would be anticipated to result in long economic benefits in the long term. **Preferred Alternative 3** would, if red grouper is not under a rebuilding plan, continue to convert a portion of the gag allocation into multi-use allocation valid to harvest gag or red grouper. Multi-use allocation percentages would adjust following changes to the red grouper annual catch limit and allocation, and gag allocation. Any amount of multi-use gag allocation used to harvest red grouper would lessen pressure on the gag stock, resulting in future economic benefits.

Preferred Alternative 4 would suspend the release of red grouper multi-use allocation until NMFS declares the gag stock rebuilt. **Preferred Alternative 4** would limit the pressure on gag stock by preventing any harvest in excess of the specified gag quota. **Preferred Alternative 4** is expected to yield positive economic effects due to the anticipated beneficial impacts to the rebuilding of the gag stock which is currently overfished and is undergoing overfishing.

6.4.5 Action 5. Commercial Gag Size Limit

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.5.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. **Alternative 1**, which would maintain the 24-inch commercial gag minimum size limit, is not anticipated to result in economic effects. **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** would reduce the commercial size limit to 22 and 20 inches, respectively. **Alternative 4** would eliminate the commercial gag size limit. The implementation of **Preferred Alternative 2** or

Alternatives 3 or 4 is expected to benefit the gag stock by allowing commercial fishermen to land a portion, if not the totality, of dead gag discards, thereby having positive impacts on the rebuilding plan. These beneficial impacts to the stock would, in turn, result in future economic benefits. However, potential benefits to the stock and associated economic benefits may be limited or negligible due to fishermen's preference for larger gag. To optimize economic returns derived from their gag allocation, fishermen would rather harvest larger fish because of their increased yield. Lowering or eliminating the commercial gag minimum size limit could therefore be ineffective or counterproductive due to incentives for highgrading.

6.4.6 Action 6. Time and Area Closures

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.6.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. **Preferred Alternative 1** would not modify existing time and area closures that prohibit fishing for gag and other reef fish species. Therefore, economic effects are not expected to result from **Preferred Alternative 1**. **Alternatives 2 and 3** would expand existing area closures and close additional areas covering 70 and 244 nautical miles, respectively. **Alternatives 4 and 5** would modify the seasonal closure dates of the Edges and of Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps areas, respectively. The expansion of these closed areas and modifications to seasonal closure times considered are expected to reduce effort, thereby granting additional protection to spawning aggregations of gag and potentially reducing bycatch and bycatch mortality of gag while fishermen are targeting red grouper. The economic effects that would potentially result from **Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5** are not known. However, based on the relatively low percentage of landings recorded in each of the area considered for closure, economic effects that are anticipated to result from **Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5** are likely to be negligible. In addition, even if fishermen were not able to harvest a portion of their red grouper or gag allocation due to the proposed closures, they would sell or lease their allocation to fishermen operating in other parts of the Gulf.

6.4.7 Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures

Action 7.1 Commercial Accountability Measures

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.7.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. **Alternative 1**, no action, would maintain accountability measures implemented by Reef Fish Amendment 30B. These measures would close the shallow-water grouper fishery if commercial landings reach or are projected to reach the red grouper, gag, or other shallow-water grouper quota. **Alternative 1** is not compatible with the current individual fishing quota program. **Preferred Alternative 2** would use the individual fishing quota program in place as the accountability measure for the commercial sector. Under an individual fishing quota program, fishermen cannot legally exceed their annual allocation. Fishermen are allowed a 10% overage on their last trip. However, the overage is deducted from their allocation for the next year. **Preferred Alternative 2**, which would be consistent with the current management of the grouper and tilefish fisheries, is not expected to result in economic effects.

Action 7.2: Recreational Accountability Measures

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 5.7.3 and is incorporated herein by reference. **Alternative 2** would add an overage adjustment to the current AMs for the recreational sector when the gag or red grouper stocks are overfished and under a rebuilding

plan. An overage adjustment could be applied to the gag recreational sector as soon as 2013, depending on whether the recreational sector exceeds its annual catch limit in 2012, because it is overfished and will be under a rebuilding plan (**Preferred Alternative 2** under **Action 1**). In general, the longer the rebuilding time period, the greater the annual catch limit in the early years of the rebuilding plan and thus the less likely an overage would occur and an overage adjustment would need to be applied. Thus, the probability of the gag recreational sector exceeding its annual catch limit is being reduced by the selection of **Preferred Alternative 2** under **Action 1**.

Recreational gag landings were trending upward through 2008, but then dropped precipitously in 2009. Even the reduced landings in 2009 are considerably above the recreational sector's annual catch limit for 2011 and 2012. The effectiveness of the measures potentially implemented under **Action 2** will determine whether the recreational sector exceeds its annual catch limit in 2012. **Preferred Alternative 4** for the action to establish the recreational fishing season for gag under **Action 2** is expected to restrain landings in the gag recreational sector well below its 2012 annual catch limit, and in fact is intended and expected to constrain landings below the 2012 recreational annual catch target. Thus, the probability an overage adjustment will be required in 2013 is also minimal. Given the current projection of expected recreational gag landings in 2012 under **Preferred Alternative 4** for the action to establish the recreational fishing season for gag under **Action 2**, the same logic applies to the probability that an in-season closure of the recreational sector will be necessary in 2012. Thus, the likelihood that **Preferred Alternative 4** under **Action 7.2**, which would add an overage adjustment and an in-season closure, will generate indirect economic effects on recreational fishing participants is minimal. Whether that expectation will continue in future years partly depends on how participants in the gag recreational sector adjust their behavior to the new management measures and any additional changes in those measures in the future (e.g., a change in the recreational fishing season for 2013 and beyond). However, the likelihood of an overage adjustment or in-season closure will be reduced further due to the planned increases in the recreational sector's gag annual catch limit from approximately 1.1 MP GW in 2012 to 1.7 MP GW in 2016.

With respect to red grouper, it is not currently overfished or under a rebuilding plan. As such, **Preferred Alternative 4** would not apply to the recreational red grouper sector at present and is not expected to apply in the near future. Thus, no indirect economic effects on the recreational red grouper sector are expected under **Preferred Alternative 4**. In addition, the recreational annual catch limit for red grouper has not been met in recent years. Recreational red grouper landings averaged less than 1 MP (GW) between 2006 and 2009. With the planned increase in the red grouper total allowable catch, the recreational annual catch limit will be increased from 1.51 MP (GW) to 1.72 MP (GW), which will create a larger difference between the annual catch limit and the expected catch in 2012, even if the bag limit is increased under **Action 2**. Additional increases in the red grouper recreational annual catch limit are planned through 2016. Thus, the probability the recreational sector will exceed its red grouper annual catch limit in the near future is minimal. In turn, the likelihood that **Preferred Alternative 4** will generate indirect economic effects on the recreational red grouper sector is also minimal.

6.5 Public and Private Costs of Regulations

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

Council costs of document preparation, meetings, public hearings, and information dissemination.....	\$160,000
NMFS administrative costs of document preparation, meetings, and review	\$70,000
TOTAL.....	\$230,000

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. There are no permit requirements proposed in this amendment. To the extent that there are no quota closures proposed in this amendment or other regulatory measures, no additional enforcement activity is anticipated. In addition, under a fixed budget, any additional enforcement activity due to the adoption of this amendment would mean a redirection of resources to enforce the new measures.

6.6 Determination of Significant Regulatory Action

Pursuant to E.O. 12866, a regulation is considered a “significant regulatory action” if it is likely to result in: 1) An annual effect of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; 2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; 3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights or obligations of recipients thereof; or 4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this executive order. Based on the information provided above, this action has been determined to not be economically significant for purposes of E.O. 12866.

7 Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) is to establish a principle of regulatory issuance that agencies shall endeavor, consistent with the objectives of the rule and of applicable statutes, to fit regulatory and informational requirements to the scale of businesses, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation. To achieve this principle, agencies are required to solicit and consider flexible regulatory proposals and to explain the rationale for their actions to assure such proposals are given serious consideration. The RFA does not contain any decision criteria; instead the purpose of the RFA is to inform the agency, as well as the public, of the expected economic impacts of various alternatives contained in the FMP or amendment (including framework management measures and other regulatory actions) and to ensure the agency considers alternatives that minimize the expected impacts while meeting the goals and objectives of the FMP and applicable statutes.

With certain exceptions, the RFA requires agencies to conduct an initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA) for each proposed rule. The IRFA is designed to assess the impacts various regulatory alternatives would have on small entities, including small businesses, and to determine ways to minimize those impacts. An 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 RIR, the IRFA provides: 1) A description of the reasons why action by the agency is being considered; 2) a succinct statement of the objectives of, and legal basis for, the proposed rule; 3) a description and, where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed rule will apply; 4) a description of the projected reporting, record-keeping, and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirements of the report or record; and, 5) an identification, to the extent practicable, of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rule.

7.2 Statement of the need for, objectives of, and legal basis for the rule

A discussion of the reasons why action by the agency is being considered is provided in Section 1.2 of this document. In summary, the purposes of this proposed rule are to decrease or end overfishing of gag so that the stock can begin to rebuild, develop red grouper management measures that will allow the optimum yield of red grouper to continue to be caught as the stock recovers from a 2005 episodic mortality event, and minimize gag bycatch consistent with the goals and objectives of the Council’s red grouper rebuilding plan and achieving the mandates of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The objective of this amendment is to prevent overfishing of the gag resource in the Gulf of Mexico and allow harvest of gag and red grouper at optimum yield. The Magnuson-Stevens Act provides the statutory basis for this proposed rule.

7.3 Description and estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed action would apply

This proposed rule is expected to directly affect commercial fishing vessels whose owners possess gag or red grouper fishing quota shares and for-hire fishing vessels that harvest gag. As of October 1, 2009, 970 entities owned a valid commercial Gulf reef fish permit and thus were eligible for initial shares and allocation in the grouper/tilefish IFQ program. Of these 970 entities, 908 entities initially received shares

and allocation of grouper or tilefish. More importantly, 875 entities specifically received gag shares and an initial allocation of the commercial sector's gag quota in 2010. These 875 entities are expected to be directly affected by the proposed actions to reduce the gag commercial quota to 86% of the ACT to account for dead discards, modify the percentages of red grouper and gag allocation that can be converted into multi-use allocation, and reduce the commercial size limit for gag. Of these 875 entities, 815 also received red grouper shares and an initial allocation of the commercial sector's red grouper quota in 2010.

Of these 875 entities, 215 were not commercially fishing in 2008 or 2009 and thus have no commercial fishing revenue during these years. On average, these 215 entities received an initial allocation of 874 pounds of gag in 2010. Eight of these entities also received a bottom longline endorsement in 2010. These eight entities received a higher initial allocation of gag in 2010, with an average of nearly 3,139 pounds. The other 660 entities that received gag shares and initial allocations in 2010 were active in commercial fisheries in 2008 or 2009.

Of the 660 commercial fishing vessels with commercial landings in 2008 or 2009, 139 vessels did not have any gag landings in 2008 or 2009. Their average annual gross revenue in these two years was approximately \$50,800 (2008 dollars). Their average allocation of gag in 2010 was approximately 540 pounds. The vast majority (85%) of these vessels' commercial fishing revenue is from landings of snapper, mackerel, dolphin, and wahoo.

The other 521 commercial fishing vessels did have landings of gag in 2008 or 2009. Their average annual gross revenue from commercial fishing was approximately \$71,000 (2008 dollars) between the two years. On average, these vessels had 2,375 pounds and 1,300 pounds of gag landings in 2008 and 2009 respectively, or 1,835 pounds between the two years. Gag landings accounted for approximately 8% of these vessels' annual average gross revenue, and thus they are somewhat though not significantly dependent on revenue from gag landings. These vessels' average initial gag allocation in 2010 was 2,121 pounds. Therefore, on average, their 2008 gag landings were very near but their 2009 gag landings were considerably less than their 2010 gag allocation. Fifty-two of these vessels also received a bottom longline endorsement in 2010. These particular vessels' average annual revenue was approximately \$156,000 (2008 dollars) in 2008 and 2009. Revenue from gag landings fell from approximately \$15,900 to \$8,400 in 2009 and thus they became relatively less dependent on gag landings. These vessels are highly dependent on revenue from red grouper landings, which accounted for 54% and 47% of their gross revenue in 2008 and 2009 respectively. Revenue from DWG landings decreased only slightly, from approximately \$36K in 2008 to \$31K in 2009, and thus these vessels became relatively more dependent on revenue from DWG landings. Their average initial 2010 allocation of gag was approximately 5,507 pounds while their average gag landings were 3,933 and 2,204 pounds in 2008 and 2009 respectively. Thus, they have been harvesting well within that allocation in recent years, particularly in 2009.

The for-hire fleet is comprised of charter vessels, which charge a fee on a vessel basis, and headboats, which charge a fee on an individual angler (head) basis. The harvest of gag in the EEZ by for-hire vessels requires a charter vessel/headboat (for-hire) for Gulf reef fish permit. On March 23, 2010, there were 1,376 valid or renewable for-hire Gulf reef fish permits. A valid permit is a non-expired permit. Expired reef fish for-hire permits may not be actively fished, but are renewable for up to one year after expiration. Because of the extended renewal period, numerous permits may be expired but renewable at any given time of the year. The majority (823, or approximately 60%) of the 1,376 valid or renewable permits were registered with Florida addresses. The registration address for the federal permit does not restrict operation to federal waters off that state; however, vessels would be subject to state permitting requirements, should such exist. Although the permit does not distinguish between headboats and charter

vessels, it is estimated that 79 headboats operate in the Gulf. The majority of these vessels (43, or approximately 54%) operate from Florida ports. Given that nearly 99% of target effort for gag and 97% of the economic impacts from the recreational sector for gag are in west Florida, it is assumed that the 823 for-hire vessels (780 charter vessels and 43 headboats) in Florida are expected to be directly affected by the proposed action to establish a recreational gag fishing season of July 1-October 31.

The Small Business Administration has established size criteria for all major industry sectors in the U.S. including fish harvesters. A business involved in fish harvesting is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual receipts not in excess of \$4.0 million (NAICS code 114111, finfish fishing) for all its affiliated operations worldwide. For for-hire vessels, the other qualifiers apply and the receipts threshold is \$7.0 million (NAICS code 713990, recreational industries).

In 2008 and 2009, the maximum annual commercial fishing revenue by an individual commercial fishing vessel with gag fishing quota shares was approximately \$606,000 (2008 dollars). The average charter vessel is estimated to earn approximately \$88,000 (2008 dollars) in annual revenue, while the average headboat is estimated to earn approximately \$461,000 (2008 dollars). Based on these values, all commercial and for-hire fishing vessels expected to be directly affected by this proposed rule are determined for the purpose of this analysis to be small business entities.

7.4 Description of the projected reporting, record-keeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for the preparation of the report or records

This proposed rule would not establish any new reporting, record-keeping, or other compliance requirements.

7.5 Identification of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed rule

No duplicative, overlapping, or conflicting federal rules have been identified.

7.6 Significance of economic impacts on small entities

Substantial number criterion

This proposed rule, if implemented, would be expected to directly affect 875 commercial fishing entities and 823 for-hire fishing entities. All affected entities have been determined, for the purpose of this analysis, to be small entities. Therefore, it is determined that the proposed rule will affect a substantial number of small entities.

Significant economic impacts

The outcome of “significant economic impact” can be ascertained by examining two factors: disproportionality and profitability.

Disproportionality: Do the regulations place a substantial number of small entities at a significant competitive disadvantage to large entities?

All entities expected to be directly affected by the measures in this proposed rule are determined for the purpose of this analysis to be small business entities, so the issue of disproportionality does not arise in the present case.

Profitability: Do the regulations significantly reduce profits for a substantial number of small entities?

Establishing a rebuilding plan for gag is an administrative action and is therefore not expected to generate direct, adverse economic effects on commercial or for-hire entities. Thus, the proposed action to establish a rebuilding plan for gag that would rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less is not expected to reduce profits for commercial or for-hire entities.

Net operating revenues (NOR) are assumed to be representative of profits for for-hire vessels. It is assumed that 823 for-hire vessels, 780 charter vessels and 43 headboats, participate in the recreational harvest of gag. Estimates of NOR from recreational fisheries other than gag and thus across all fisheries in which these charter vessels and headboats participate are not currently available. However, on average, NOR for charter trips targeting gag are estimated to be approximately \$1.56 million per year while NOR for headboat trips targeting gag are estimated to be \$91,300 per year. Thus, NOR for all trips targeting gag are estimated to be approximately \$1.65 million per year. The average annual NOR from trips targeting gag is estimated to be \$2,000 per charter vessel and \$2,124 per headboat.

When the length of the gag season is reduced and the daily bag limit for gag is set at zero, some trips that formerly targeted gag will instead target other species while other trips that formerly targeted gag will be cancelled. Assuming the NOR per trip is constant regardless of the species targeted, for-hire operators will only lose NOR from trips cancelled as a result of the shortened season length. Information regarding the number of trips cancelled as a result of the shortened season is not currently available. Thus, this analysis assumes that all of the current for-hire trips targeting gag will be cancelled when the recreational sector is closed. Because some of these trips would probably not be cancelled, this assumption is expected to overestimate the actual reduction in NOR associated with a shorter season. Thus, the following estimates of losses in NOR and profit for charter vessels and headboats should be considered maximum values.

Under the proposed action to establish a recreational gag fishing season of July 1 through October 31, the losses in NOR for charter vessels and headboats are estimated to be approximately \$1,304,000 and \$76,000, respectively. Thus, losses in NOR for all trips targeting gag is estimated to be approximately \$1,380,000. The average annual losses in NOR for trips targeting gag are estimated to be \$1,672 and \$767 per charter vessel and headboat, respectively. These losses in NOR represent a loss in profits of approximately 84% and 36% per charter vessel and headboat, respectively.

The estimated losses in NOR represent a loss in profit for all charter vessel and headboat trips targeting gag. The proposed action is not expected to affect profit from trips not targeting gag for charter vessels and headboats. For-hire vessel dependence on fishing for individual species cannot be determined with available data. Although some for-hire vessels are likely more dependent on trips that target gag than other for-hire vessels, overall, about three percent of for-hire anglers are estimated to target gag. As a result, while the proposed action would be expected to substantially affect the NOR derived from gag

trips, overall, gag trips do not comprise a substantial portion of total for-hire trips nor would they, by extension, be expected to account for a substantial portion of total for-hire NOR.

Under the proposed action to increase the recreational bag limit for red grouper from 2 fish to 4 fish, the number of trips in all recreational fishing modes is assumed to remain the same regardless of any change in the red grouper bag limit. As such, no changes to producer surplus in the for-hire sector are expected. Thus, the proposed action is not expected to reduce profits for for-hire entities.

Of the 875 entities that received gag shares and an initial allocation of the commercial gag quota in 2010, 215 entities did not participate in commercial fishing in 2008 or 2009. Thus, they have no commercial fishing revenue and did not earn profits from commercial fishing in those two years. On average, these vessels received an initial allocation of 874 pounds of gag quota in 2010. Under the proposed action to reduce the commercial gag quota to 86% of the ACT to account for dead discards, their average allocation of gag in 2012 would be reduced from 421 pounds to 362 pounds, or by approximately 59 pounds. Using the average 2008 price of \$3.52 per pound, this loss in allocation could potentially represent a loss of nearly \$208 (2008 dollars) in gross revenue per entity. Using the 2010 average price of \$1.00 per pound of gag allocation, this loss in allocation could potentially represent a loss of \$59 (2008 dollars) in net revenue per entity. For eight of these 215 entities that also possess longline endorsements, their average allocation of gag in 2012 would be reduced from 1,512 pounds to 1,300 pounds, or by 212 pounds. Thus, their potential losses in gross revenue and net revenue, estimated to be \$746 and \$212 (2008 dollars) respectively, are expected to be somewhat higher.

However, in general, these potential losses in gross revenue and net revenue would only be realized if these 215 entities not only become active in commercial fishing but also specifically intend to harvest gag in 2012 and at a level above their reduced allocation. That is, a reduction in allocation can only lead to a reduction in landings, and thus gross revenue, if these entities intend to harvest at levels above their reduced allocation. Alternatively, losses in gross and net revenue could be due to these entities' inability to sell the allocations they are losing under the proposed action, though this possibility presumes that a demand for these allocations exists. Regardless, the significance of these potential losses in gross revenue and net revenue to these 215 entities cannot be evaluated given the lack of information on potential gross revenue, net revenue, and profits from commercial fishing in general and specifically for gag.

Similarly, for the 139 entities with gag shares that commercially harvested other than gag, they earned approximately \$50,800 in annual gross revenue on average in 2008 and 2009. Profit estimates for these vessels are not currently available. However, because they did not have any gag landings, none of their gross revenue and thus none of their potential profits were the result of gag harvests. Under the proposed action to reduce the commercial gag quota to 86% of the ACT to account for dead discards, their average allocation of gag in 2012 would be reduced from 260 pounds to 224 pounds, or by 36 pounds. Using the average 2008 price of \$3.52 per pound, this loss in allocation could potentially represent a loss of \$127 (2008 dollars) in gross revenue per entity. Using the 2010 average price of \$1.00 per pound of gag allocation, this loss in allocation could potentially represent a loss of approximately \$36 (2008 dollars) in net revenue per entity.

However, these potential losses in gross and net revenue could only lead to a loss in profits if these entities intend to become active in the reef fish fishery harvesting gag in 2011 and at a level above their reduced allocation. That is, a reduction in allocation can only lead to a reduction in landings and thus gross revenue if these entities intend to harvest at levels above their reduced allocation. Thus, for example, if these vessels intended to harvest gag in 2012 at a level equivalent to their 2012 allocation, and

this harvest was in addition to rather than in place of their recent commercial fishing activities, the reduction in allocation could lead to a maximum loss of approximately .3% in gross revenue, which could in turn reduce net revenue and profits. Alternatively, losses in gross and net revenue could be due to these entities' inability to sell the allocations being lost under the proposed action, though this possibility presumes that a demand for these allocations exists.

For the 521 entities with gag shares that participated in the commercial harvest of gag in 2008 or 2009, they earned approximately \$71,000 (2008 dollars) in annual gross revenue on average in 2008 and 2009. Profit estimates for these vessels are not currently available. However, gag landings accounted for approximately 8% of these vessels' annual average gross revenue, and thus they are somewhat but not significantly dependent on revenue from gag landings. Under the proposed action to reduce the commercial gag quota to account for dead discards, these vessels' 2012 gag allocations would be reduced from 1,022 pounds to 879 pounds, or 143 pounds on average. As these vessels have been harvesting at levels near their 2010 allocation in recent years on average, this reduction in gag allocation is likely to lead to an equivalent reduction in gag landings and therefore gross revenue. Using the average 2008 price of \$3.52 per pound, it is estimated that these vessels could lose nearly \$503 (2008 dollars), or approximately .7%, in annual gross revenue on average. Using the 2010 average price of \$1.00 per pound of gag allocation, this loss in allocation would represent a loss of \$503 (2008 dollars) in net revenue per entity. Since net revenue is assumed to be representative of profits for commercial vessels, these vessels are expected to experience a reduction in profits.

However, 52 of these 521 vessels also received a bottom longline endorsement in 2010. These particular vessels' average annual gross revenue was approximately \$156,000 (2008 dollars) in 2008 and 2009, with gag landings accounting for approximately 8% of that gross revenue. These vessels are highly dependent on revenue from red grouper rather than gag landings. Under the proposed action to reduce the commercial gag quota, their allocation of gag in 2012 would decrease from 2,749 pounds to 2,364 pounds, or by 385 pounds. As these vessels have been harvesting at levels near their 2010 allocation in recent years on average, this reduction in gag allocation is likely to lead to an equivalent reduction in gag landings and therefore gross revenue. Using the average 2008 price of \$3.52 per pound, it is estimated that these vessels could lose \$1,355 (2008 dollars), or approximately .9%, in annual gross revenue on average. Using the 2010 average price of \$1.00 per pound of gag allocation, this loss in allocation would represent a loss of approximately \$1,355 (2008 dollars) in net revenue per entity. Since net revenue is assumed to be representative of profits for commercial vessels, these vessels are expected to experience a reduction in profits.

No additional economic effects would be expected to result from the revised SWG quota because the updated SWG quota simply reflects the reduction in the commercial gag quota, the effects of which have already been discussed.

Given the proposed action to establish a rebuilding plan for gag, the conversion of red grouper allocation into multi-use allocation valid toward the harvest of red grouper or gag would be suspended under the proposed action to modify the percentages of red grouper and gag allocation that can be converted into multi-use allocation. Because red grouper is not under a rebuilding plan at this time, gag shareholders would be allowed to convert 8% of their gag allocation into multi-use allocation and thus no adverse economic effects are expected. However, minimal adverse economic effects are expected as a result of commercial fishing entities not being allowed to convert 4% of their red grouper allocation into multi-use allocation. Multi-use allocation that has been converted from red grouper allocation can only be used to possess, land, or sell gag after an entity's gag and gag multi-use allocation has been landed, sold, or

transferred. Given the proposed reduction in the commercial gag quota due to dead discards, it is possible these entities will exhaust their gag and gag multi-use allocations. Gross revenue from gag landings is greater than gross revenue from an equivalent amount of red grouper landings because gag commands a relatively higher market price. Thus, gross revenue from commercial fishing and therefore profits per vessel and could be slightly lower than if the conversion were allowed to continue.

Under the proposed action to reduce the commercial size limit for gag from 24 inches to 22 inches total length, commercial fishing entities would be allowed to retain more and discard less of the gag they catch and thus are expected to be economically better off relative to the status quo. However, if commercial fishermen prefer to harvest larger gag due to a higher market demand for larger fish, then additional high-grading may be possible because the commercial sector is managed under the IFQ program. As such, few additional gag may be retained and thus the potential increases in gross revenue, net revenue, and profits per vessel are likely minimal.

Establishing AMs is not expected to generate direct, adverse economic effects on commercial or for-hire entities. Direct, adverse economic effects would only occur if and when the AMs are actually triggered. This action would replace current AMs for the commercial sector established under Amendment 30B with the current IFQ program because an IFQ functions as an AM. This action would also add an overage adjustment and an in-season closure to the current AMs for the recreational sector when the gag or red grouper stocks are overfished and under a rebuilding plan. Because red grouper is not overfished or under a rebuilding plan, this action does not currently apply to the red grouper component of the reef fish fishery. The action to establish a recreational fishing season of July 1 through October 31 for gag is expected to restrain landings in the gag recreational sector well below its 2012 annual catch limit, and in fact is intended and expected to constrain landings below the 2012 recreational annual catch target. In turn, the probability an overage adjustment or in-season closure will be required in 2013 is also minimal. Thus, the proposed action to establish new AMs for the commercial and recreational sectors of the gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper component of the reef fish fishery is not expected to reduce profits for commercial or for-hire entities.

7.7 Description of significant alternatives to the proposed action and discussion of how the alternatives attempt to minimize economic impacts on small entities

Three alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to establish a rebuilding plan for gag that would rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less. In the absence of all fishing mortality, including bycatch mortality, the shortest possible time in which the gag stock can rebuild is 5 years. Under the National Standard 1 guidelines, the maximum time allowed for rebuilding the gag stock is 10 years. In the Generic ACL/AM Amendment, the proposed ACLs are based on yields that are projected to rebuild the stock in 10 years, while the proposed ACTs are based on yields that are projected to rebuild the stock in 7 years.

The first alternative, the status quo, would not have established a rebuilding plan for gag. The fishing mortality rate for gag has shown an increasing trend over time and fishing mortality rates in recent years are not consistent with rebuilding or maintaining the gag stock at its maximum sustainable yield level. Moreover, because the gag stock has been determined to be overfished and undergoing overfishing, this alternative does not comply with Magnuson-Stevens Act requirements regarding rebuilding plans.

The second alternative would have established a rebuilding plan that would rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 7 years or less. Seven years is the

estimated time to rebuild if the stock is managed at a fishing rate corresponding to optimum yield (F_{OY}) rather than the rate corresponding to a 10-year rebuilding plan ($F_{rebuilding}$). Although the yields under a 7-year rebuilding plan would eventually catch up to those for a 10-year plan, the initial catch targets in the early years would be smaller under a 7-year rebuilding plan relative to a 10-year rebuilding plan. Thus, this alternative would potentially imply more restrictive regulations and thus more adverse indirect economic effects in the short-term relative to the proposed action.

The third alternative would have established a rebuilding plan that would rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 5 years. If this alternative were adopted, strong measures to reduce bycatch of gag in other fisheries would also need to be considered. Because a total elimination of discard mortality is unlikely to be achieved, this alternative would likely result in the stock being slightly under the rebuilding target at the end of five years. Most importantly, this alternative would require a complete closure of the gag component of the reef fish fishery for at least 5 years. Therefore, this alternative would eliminate all net revenue from the commercial sector and all consumer and producer surplus from the recreational sector for at least 5 years and, as such, would lead to the most restrictive regulations and thus considerably greater adverse indirect economic effects in the short-term relative to the proposed action.

Four alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to establish a recreational gag fishing season of July 1 through October 31. The first alternative, the status quo, would maintain a year-round gag recreational fishing season, with the exception of the current February 1 through March 31 closed season for shallow-water grouper. This alternative would be expected to result in a 14% reduction in gag removals relative to the 2006-08 baseline and a 1% increase in gag removals relative to the 2009 baseline. As such, this alternative does not achieve the necessary reduction in removals to rebuild the gag stock, contrary to the Council's goals and objectives and Magnuson-Stevens Act requirements.

The second alternative, which would establish a gag recreational season of September 16 through November 15, would reduce gag removals by 60% relative to the 2009 baseline, which exceeds the annual catch target reduction of 47%. Relative to the 2006-08 baseline, this alternative also reduces removals by 60%. Therefore, this alternative does not fully meet the annual catch target of 61% relative to the 2006-08 baseline, but does exceed the annual catch limit and rebuilding yield reduction level of 53%. This alternative is more conservative biologically than the proposed action, but only allows a 61-day fishing season as opposed to the 123-day fishing season allowed under the proposed action.

The third alternative, which would establish a gag recreational season of January and April, would reduce removals by 52%, which exceeds the annual catch target reduction target of 47%. Relative to the 2006-08 baseline, this alternative reduces removals by 56%. This alternative does not fully meet the annual catch target of 61% relative to the 2006-08 baseline, but it does exceed the annual catch limit and rebuilding yield reduction level of 53%. This alternative is similar to the second alternative in that it allows 61 days of fishing, and thus is shorter than the 123-day fishing season allowed under the proposed action, but it splits the season into two segments to provide more fishing opportunities. Biologically, this alternative is as conservative as the proposed action.

The fourth alternative would establish the same gag recreational season of July 1 through October 31 as the proposed action. However, rather than maintain the current 22 inch recreational minimum size limit, it would implement a 22-30 inch slot limit. Although this alternative would achieve a larger reduction in removals relative to the proposed action, a larger percentage of those removals would consist of dead discards. Further, a portion of those additional dead discards would consist of larger fish above the slot

limit. These larger fish produce more eggs in spawning season. Thus, this alternative could negatively impact the spawning potential ratio and in turn the rate of rebuilding.

Two alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to increase the recreational bag limit for red grouper from 2 fish to 4 fish. The first alternative, the status quo, would retain the current recreational bag limit for red grouper of 2 fish. The recreational annual catch limit for red grouper has not been met in recent years. Recreational red grouper landings averaged less than 1 MP (GW) between 2006 and 2009. With the planned increase in the red grouper total allowable catch, the recreational annual catch limit will be increased from 1.51 MP (GW) to 1.72 MP (GW), which will create a larger difference between the annual catch limit and the expected catch in 2012, and additional increases in the red grouper recreational annual catch limit are planned through 2016. This alternative would not allow for-hire entities to increase their landings per trip even though the recreational sector's harvest has been and is expected to be well below its allocation. As such, opportunities to increase the economic value of red grouper harvests in the recreational sector would be unnecessarily foregone.

The second alternative would increase the recreational bag limit for red grouper from 2 fish to 3 fish. This alternative would allow for-hire entities to increase their landings per trip, but would not enhance their opportunities to increase the economic value of red grouper harvests to the same extent as the proposed action. Such opportunities should be enhanced as much as possible given the large difference between the recreational sector's annual catch limit and the expected catch under the current bag limit. Like the proposed action, this alternative includes an adaptive feedback mechanism that would adjust the bag limit if the recreational sector exceeds its annual catch limit, though it would not be a two stage process as under the proposed action.

Two alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to reduce the gag commercial quota to 86% of the ACT to account for dead discards. The first alternative, the status quo, would not adjust the gag commercial quota to account for dead discards. This alternative would set the gag commercial quota at the current ACT. The ACT assumes dead discards in the commercial sector will be reduced by the same proportion as landings. If this assumption is not valid, then total removals of gag will exceed the harvest levels projected in the assessment. The ACT provides a buffer against reaching the ACL, but this buffer may not be sufficient to offset increased removals due to dead discards.

The second alternative would reduce the gag commercial quota to 47% of the ACT to account for dead discards. This alternative represents the worst case scenario, under which dead discards are assumed to remain at their 2006-08 level. Analyses associated with the 2011 gag interim rule indicated that, if dead discards remain at their 2006-2008 levels, the gag commercial quota would need to be reduced to 47 percent of the ACT in order to compensate for the increased removals. Although this alternative would provide the greatest allowance for dead discards and thus the highest likelihood of rebuilding the gag stock successfully, it is based on the unlikely assumption that dead discards will remain at their 2006-08 levels. Longline vessels have historically landed about 34 percent of the commercial gag harvest. As a result of the longline endorsement requirements implemented in 2010, the number of reef fish longline vessels has decreased substantially. Of the 908 initial grouper/tilefish shareholders in 2010, 293 vessels used bottom longline or trap gear for commercial reef fish harvesting purposes between 1999 and 2007. However, only 62 of these vessels qualified for the bottom longline endorsement. Given the substantial reduction in the number of longline vessels, dead discards are expected to be considerably less now and in the future compared to their 2006-08 levels. As such, reducing the gag commercial quota to 47% of the ACT would unnecessarily impose more significant economic and social impacts on commercial harvesters and associated communities relative to the proposed action.

Two alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to modify the percentage of red grouper allocation that can be converted into multi-use allocation if a rebuilding plan for gag is in effect. The first alternative, the status quo, would allow 4% of the red grouper allocation to be converted into multi-use allocation at the beginning of each year. Under this alternative, the amount of red grouper multi-use allocation could exceed the available gag commercial quota, thereby leading to harvests that exceed the ACL. Such a result is contrary to the purposes of the action to establish a rebuilding plan for gag that would rebuild the gag stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less and is therefore inconsistent with Magnuson-Stevens Act requirements and National Standard 1 guidance.

The second alternative would base the amount of red grouper multi-use allocation on the buffer between the gag ACL and ACT. Subsequent ACLs and ACTs may be set by the ACL/ACT control rule adopted in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment. Although a control rule has not been adopted yet, the alternatives currently under consideration would have little or no buffer for individual fishing quota fisheries, which would render this alternative unusable. Furthermore, the gag ACL is set at the level where there is only a 50% probability of meeting the target to rebuild the gag stock in 10 years or less. Thus, this alternative will reduce the probability of the rebuilding plan being successful.

One alternative, the status quo, was considered for the action to modify the percentage of gag allocation that can be converted into multi-use allocation if a rebuilding plan for red grouper is in effect. Under this alternative, 8% of the gag allocation would be converted into multi-use allocation. If a rebuilding plan for red grouper was necessary in the future, this alternative could result in red grouper harvests that would exceed the commercial ACL in the future, which would in turn trigger AMs and reduce the ability of the red grouper stock to rebuild.

Three alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to reduce the commercial gag minimum size limit from 24 to 22 inches total length. The first alternative, the status quo, would maintain the commercial gag minimum size limit at 24 inches total length. The size at 50% female maturity is approximately 24 inches total length. Under this alternative, regulatory discards due to the minimum size limit would continue at the current rate, which is contrary to the Council's goal of reducing gag discards.

The second alternative would reduce the commercial gag minimum size limit from 24 inches to 20 inches total length. Until a commercial fisherman's individual fishing quota allocation is reached, this alternative is expected to reduce total gag discards by 62% for the vertical line component of the commercial sector and by 47.2% for the longline component. At the same time, the number of gag needed to fill an individual fishing quota allocation is expected to increase by 29.7% for the vertical line component and by 0.9% for the longline component. This alternative has a greater likelihood of creating a price differential by size, which would in turn likely result in additional high-grading as fishermen attempt to maximize the economic return on their individual fishing quota shares. Additional high-grading would lead to higher rather than lower levels of gag discards, which is contrary to the Council's goals.

The third alternative would eliminate the minimum size limit and thus would effectively require all commercially caught gag be retained regardless of size. As a result, this alternative also effectively requires that each commercial fisherman possess sufficient gag allocation to cover all harvest of gag. Grouper sizes in the commercial sector have been recorded as small as 11 inches prior to the implementation of size limits, but the numbers landed are few below 18 inches. At a minimum size limit

of 18 inches, the expected reduction in total gag discards is 79.9% for the vertical line component and 66.7% for the longline component. At the same time, the increase in number of gag needed to fill an individual's allocation of gag is expected to be 38.2% for the vertical line component and 1.3% for the longline component. At minimum size limits less than 18 inches, these values will change little because both gears become less selective for gag at smaller sizes. To the extent a market demand for larger fish exists, this alternative is likely to create a price differential for larger size fish. Given the limited amount of gag allocation expected to be distributed under the proposed gag commercial quota, this alternative could encourage high-grading by commercial fishermen, which would lead to higher rather than lower levels of gag discards, contrary to the Council's goals.

Four alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to expand the current time and area closures off the west coast of Florida. The first alternative would expand the current closed areas of Madison-Swanson and the Edges by approximately 70 square miles. Four options were considered under this alternative. The first option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow surface trolling from May 1 through October 31. The second option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through October 31. The third option would prohibit all fishing from January 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through December 31. The fourth option would prohibit all fishing year-round. The percentage of gag and red grouper commercial landings coming from this area ranges from .55% for gag and .06% of red grouper under the third option to 1.25% and .39% for gag and red grouper respectively under fourth option. These numbers indicate it is unlikely that gag and particularly red grouper are being targeted in this area. Thus, the expected reduction in gag bycatch is relatively small and thus so are the biological benefits.

The second alternative would expand the current closed areas of Madison-Swanson and the Edges by approximately 244 square miles. Four options were considered under this alternative. The first option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow surface trolling from May 1 through October 31. The second option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through October 31. The third option would prohibit all fishing from January 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through December 31. The fourth option would prohibit all fishing year-round. Gag bycatch is expected to increase as a result of the proposed action to reduce the gag commercial quota and the resulting reduction in the gag to red grouper quota ratio. The percentage of gag and red grouper commercial landings coming from this area ranges from 3.23% for gag and .26% of red grouper under the third option to 5.92% and .93% for gag and red grouper respectively under fourth option. If this alternative was selected, by limiting where recreational fishermen may fish, the adverse economic and social effects incurred as a result of the proposed recreational fishing season for gag would be amplified, particularly under the fourth option. Furthermore, the Council determined that these additional adverse economic and social effects on the recreational sector outweighed the biological benefits to the gag stock.

The third alternative would modify the seasonal closure dates of The Edges 40 fathom contour area, which is approximately 390 square miles in size and currently prohibits all fishing from January 1 through April 30 and allows all fishing from May 1 through December 31. Four options were also considered under this alternative. The first option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow surface trolling from May 1 through October 31. The second option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through October 31. The third option would prohibit all fishing from January 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through December 31. The fourth option would prohibit all fishing year-round. This alternative would close a larger area than the other alternatives that would expand the existing closures. Because The Edges 40

fathom contour area is relatively large, the percentage of gag and red grouper commercial landings coming from it is greater than under the other alternatives that would expand the existing closures, ranging from 4.13% for gag and .57% of red grouper under the third option to 8.92% and 2.41% for gag and red grouper respectively under fourth option. Thus, the expected reduction in gag bycatch is greater than under the other alternatives that would expand the existing time area closures. If this alternative was selected, by limiting where recreational fishermen may fish, the adverse economic and social effects incurred as a result of the proposed recreational fishing season for gag would be amplified, particularly under the fourth option. Furthermore, the Council determined that these additional adverse economic and social effects on the recreational sector outweighed the biological benefits to the gag stock.

The fourth alternative would modify the seasonal closure dates for the Madison Swanson and Steamboat Lumps closed areas, which cover approximately 219 square miles. At present, these closures prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30 but allow surface trolling for species other than reef fish from May 1 through October 31. The first option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow surface trolling from May 1 through October 31. The second option would prohibit all fishing from November 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through October 31. The third option would prohibit all fishing from January 1 through April 30, but allow all fishing from May 1 through December 31. The fourth option would prohibit all fishing year-round. Because Madison Swanson and Steamboat Lumps have been closed to reef fish fishing for an extended time period, no data is available to determine how much harvesting activity may occur in these areas. As such, it is not possible to determine the potential effects from closing them for a longer time period and thus considerably uncertainty exists regarding those potential effects. However, it is highly likely the biological benefits to the gag stock would be minimal at best.

One alternative, the status quo, was considered for the action to replace the current AMs for the commercial sector of gag, red grouper, and shallow-water component of the reef fish fishery with the IFQ program. By retaining the current AMs, this alternative would close the commercial shallow-water grouper fishery if commercial landings of red grouper, gag, or shallow-water grouper reach or are projected to reach their respective quotas. As such, these measures are inconsistent with the Council's management goals and objectives for the commercial sector of the reef fish fishery, as reflected by the IFQ program. Furthermore, concerns regarding the need for additional AMs appear to be unfounded given that, to this point, commercial landings have been less than the quotas for all individual species and species complexes managed under the IFQ program.

Three alternatives, including the status quo, were considered for the action to establish additional AMs for the recreational harvest of gag and red grouper. The first alternative, the status quo, would retain the existing accountability measures for the recreational harvest of gag and red grouper. The current accountability measures do not include in-season management measures or an overage adjustment if either the gag or red grouper stocks are determined to be overfished. The gag stock is currently overfished. Thus, this alternative would allow the recreational ACLs to be exceeded before taking action, which could have short-term negative effects on the red grouper stock and particularly the gag stock. These additional AMs are recommended by the National Standard 1 guidance and are currently being considered by the Council for the management of other reef fish species in the Generic ACL amendment.

The second alternative would add an overage adjustment to the existing accountability measures if gag or red grouper are determined to be overfished. This alternative would provide some benefit to the gag and red grouper stocks if they are under a rebuilding plan. The Council is proposing an action to establish a rebuilding plan for gag, and thus this alternative would be expected to apply immediately to the gag recreational sector. If the recreational ACL is exceeded, the overage adjustment would mitigate any

damage done to a stock's recovery by reducing the ACL for the following year by the size of the overage or by some other level depending on what the best available science indicates will place the stock back on its rebuilding path. However, relative to the proposed action, this alternative would not allow in-season closures as a result of projections indicating the recreational sector will exceed its red grouper or gag ACL. Thus, this alternative would allow the recreational ACLs to be exceeded before taking action, which could have short-term negative effects on the red grouper stock and particularly the gag stock.

The third alternative would add in-season accountability measures to the existing accountability measures that would allow the gag or red grouper recreational fishing seasons to close early if necessary. This alternative would provide some benefit to the gag and red grouper stocks. However, this alternative does not add an overage adjustment as per National Standard 1 guidance. Moreover, by not requiring an overage adjustment, this alternative would allow overages to occur from one year to the next if the in-season closures are implemented after the ACL has been exceeded. If these overages consistently occur over time, the cumulative effect could be sufficient to preclude rebuilding if a stock is under a rebuilding plan. As such, this alternative is not as beneficial to the red grouper and gag stocks as the proposed action.

8 Other Applicable Law

The MSFCMA (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) provides the authority for fishery management in federal waters of the exclusive economic zone. However, fishery management decision-making is also affected by a number of other federal statutes designed to protect the biological and human components of U.S. fisheries, as well as the ecosystems that support those fisheries. Major laws affecting federal fishery management decision-making are summarized below.

Administrative Procedures Act

All federal rulemaking is governed under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (5 U.S.C. Subchapter II), which establishes a “notice and comment” procedure to enable public participation in the rulemaking process. Under the APA, NMFS is required to publish notification of proposed rules in the Federal Register and to solicit, consider, and respond to public comment on those rules before they are finalized. The APA also establishes a 30-day waiting period from the time a final rule is published until it takes effect.

Coastal Zone Management Act

Section 307(c)(1) of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), as amended, requires federal activities that affect any land or water use or natural resource of a state’s coastal zone be conducted in a manner consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with approved state coastal management programs. The requirements for such a consistency determination are set forth in NOAA regulations at 15 C.F.R. part 930, subpart C. According to these regulations and CZMA Section 307(c)(1), when taking an action that affects any land or water use or natural resource of a state’s coastal zone, NMFS is required to provide a consistency determination to the relevant state agency at least 90 days before taking final action.

Upon submission to the Secretary, NMFS will determine if this plan amendment is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management programs of the states of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas to the maximum extent possible. Their determination will then be submitted to the responsible state agencies under Section 307 of the CZMA administering approved Coastal Zone Management programs for these states.

Data Quality Act

The Data Quality Act (DQA) (Public Law 106-443) effective October 1, 2002, requires the government to set standards for the quality of scientific information and statistics used and disseminated by federal agencies. Information includes any communication or representation of knowledge such as facts or data, in any medium or form, including textual, numerical, cartographic, narrative, or audiovisual forms (includes web dissemination, but not hyperlinks to information that others disseminate; does not include clearly stated opinions).

Specifically, the Act directs the Office of Management and Budget to issue government wide guidelines that “provide policy and procedural guidance to federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated by federal agencies.” Such guidelines have been issued, directing all federal agencies to create and disseminate agency-specific standards to: (1)

ensure information quality and develop a pre-dissemination review process; (2) establish administrative mechanisms allowing affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information; and (3) report periodically to Office of Management and Budget on the number and nature of complaints received.

Scientific information and data are key components of FMPs and amendments and the use of best available information is the second national standard under the MSFCMA. To be consistent with the Act, FMPs and amendments must be based on the best information available. They should also properly reference all supporting materials and data, and be reviewed by technically competent individuals. With respect to original data generated for FMPs and amendments, it is important to ensure that the data are collected according to documented procedures or in a manner that reflects standard practices accepted by the relevant scientific and technical communities. Data will also undergo quality control prior to being used by the agency and a pre-dissemination review.

Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended, (16 U.S.C. Section 1531 et seq.) requires federal agencies use their authorities to conserve endangered and threatened species. The ESA requires NMFS, when proposing a fishery action that “may affect” critical habitat or endangered or threatened species, to consult with the appropriate administrative agency (itself for most marine species, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for all remaining species) to determine the potential impacts of the proposed action. Consultations are concluded informally when proposed actions may affect but are “not likely to adversely affect” endangered or threatened species or designated critical habitat. Formal consultations, including a biological opinion, are required when proposed actions may affect and are “likely to adversely affect” endangered or threatened species or adversely modify designated critical habitat. If jeopardy or adverse modification is found, the consulting agency is required to suggest reasonable and prudent alternatives. A summary of the most recent biological opinion for the reef fish fishery can be found in Section 3.2.2. NOAA Fisheries Service, as part of the Secretarial review process, will make a determination regarding the potential impacts of the proposed actions.

Marine Mammal Protection Act

The Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) established a moratorium, with certain exceptions, on the taking of marine mammals in U.S. waters and by U.S. citizens on the high seas, and on the importing of marine mammals and marine mammal products into the United States. Under the MMPA, the Secretary of Commerce (authority delegated to NMFS) is responsible for the conservation and management of cetaceans and pinnipeds (other than walruses). The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for walruses, sea and marine otters, polar bears, manatees, and dugongs.

Part of the responsibility that NMFS has under the MMPA involves monitoring populations of marine mammals to make sure that they stay at optimum levels. If a population falls below its optimum level, it is designated as “depleted,” and a conservation plan is developed to guide research and management actions to restore the population to healthy levels.

In 1994, Congress amended the MMPA, to govern the taking of marine mammals incidental to commercial fishing operations. This amendment required the preparation of stock assessments for all marine mammal stocks in waters under U.S. jurisdiction, development and implementation of take-reduction plans for stocks that may be reduced or are being maintained below their optimum sustainable

population levels due to interactions with commercial fisheries, and studies of pinniped-fishery interactions.

Under section 118 of the MMPA, NMFS must publish, at least annually, a List of Fisheries (LOF) that places all U.S. commercial fisheries into one of three categories based on the level of incidental serious injury and mortality of marine mammals that occurs in each fishery. The categorization of a fishery in the LOF determines whether participants in that fishery may be required to comply with certain provisions of the MMPA, such as registration, observer coverage, and take reduction plan requirements. The conclusions of the most recent List of Fisheries for gear used by the reef fish fishery can be found in Section 3.2.2.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) regulates the collection of public information by federal agencies to ensure the public is not overburdened with information requests, the federal government's information collection procedures are efficient, and federal agencies adhere to appropriate rules governing the confidentiality of such information. The PRA requires NMFS to obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget before requesting most types of fishery information from the public. Alternatives that might have PRA consequences include Action 6.1, Alternatives 2 and 3; Action 6.2, Alternative 2; and all alternatives in Action 7 with the exception of Alternative 1, no action.

Executive Orders

E.O. 12630: Takings

The Executive Order on Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights that became effective March 18, 1988, requires each federal agency prepare a Takings Implication Assessment for any of its administrative, regulatory, and legislative policies and actions that affect, or may affect, the use of any real or personal property. Clearance of a regulatory action must include a takings statement and, if appropriate, a Takings Implication Assessment. The NOAA Office of General Counsel will determine whether a Taking Implication Assessment is necessary for this amendment.

E.O. 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review

Executive Order 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review, signed in 1993, requires federal agencies to assess the costs and benefits of their proposed regulations, including distributional impacts, and to select alternatives that maximize net benefits to society. To comply with E.O. 12866, NMFS prepares a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for all fishery regulatory actions that either implement a new fishery management plan or significantly amend an existing plan. RIRs provide a comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits to society of proposed regulatory actions, the problems and policy objectives prompting the regulatory proposals, and the major alternatives that could be used to solve the problems. The reviews also serve as the basis for the agency's determinations as to whether proposed regulations are a "significant regulatory action" under the criteria provided in E.O. 12866 and whether proposed regulations will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities in compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Analysis. A regulation is significant if it a) has an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affects in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments and communities; b) creates a serious inconsistency or otherwise interferes with an action taken or planned by another agency; c) materially alters the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or d) raises novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

E.O. 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations

This Executive Order mandates that each Federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions. The Executive Order is described in more detail relative to fisheries actions in Section 3.3.3.3.

E.O. 12962: Recreational Fisheries

This Executive Order requires federal agencies, in cooperation with states and tribes, to improve the quantity, function, sustainable productivity, and distribution of U.S. aquatic resources for increased recreational fishing opportunities through a variety of methods including, but not limited to, developing joint partnerships; promoting the restoration of recreational fishing areas that are limited by water quality and habitat degradation; fostering sound aquatic conservation and restoration endeavors; and evaluating the effects of federally-funded, permitted, or authorized actions on aquatic systems and recreational fisheries, and documenting those effects. Additionally, it establishes a seven-member National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council responsible for, among other things, ensuring that social and economic values of healthy aquatic systems that support recreational fisheries are considered by federal agencies in the course of their actions, sharing the latest resource information and management technologies, and reducing duplicative and cost-inefficient programs among federal agencies involved in conserving or managing recreational fisheries. The Council also is responsible for developing, in cooperation with federal agencies, States and Tribes, a Recreational Fishery Resource Conservation Plan - to include a five-year agenda. Finally, the Order requires NMFS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to develop a joint agency policy for administering the ESA.

E.O. 13089: Coral Reef Protection

The Executive Order on Coral Reef Protection requires federal agencies whose actions may affect U.S. coral reef ecosystems to identify those actions, utilize their programs and authorities to protect and enhance the conditions of such ecosystems, and, to the extent permitted by law, ensure actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out do not degrade the condition of that ecosystem. By definition, a U.S. coral reef ecosystem means those species, habitats, and other national resources associated with coral reefs in all maritime areas and zones subject to the jurisdiction or control of the United States (e.g., federal, state, territorial, or commonwealth waters).

Regulations are already in place to limit or reduce habitat impacts within the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. Additionally, NMFS approved and implemented Generic Amendment 3 for EFH, which established additional HAPCs and gear restrictions to protect corals throughout the Gulf. There are no implications to coral reefs by the actions proposed in this amendment. The alternatives in Action 8 (Time and Area Closures) will reduce impacts in the areas of proposed time/area closures, but although those areas contain hard bottom habitat, they are not areas of living coral reefs.

E.O. 13132: Federalism

The Executive Order on Federalism requires agencies in formulating and implementing policies, to be guided by the fundamental Federalism principles. The Order serves to guarantee the division of governmental responsibilities between the national government and the states that was intended by the framers of the Constitution. Federalism is rooted in the belief that issues not national in scope or significance are most appropriately addressed by the level of government closest to the people. This Order is relevant to FMPs and amendments given the overlapping authorities of NMFS, the states, and local authorities in managing coastal resources, including fisheries, and the need for a clear definition of responsibilities. It is important to recognize those components of the ecosystem over which fishery managers have no direct control and to develop strategies to address them in conjunction with appropriate state, tribes and local entities (international too).

No Federalism issues have been identified relative to the action proposed in this amendment. Therefore, consultation with state officials under Executive Order 12612 is not necessary.

E.O. 13158: Marine Protected Areas

This Executive Order requires federal agencies to consider whether their proposed action(s) will affect any area of the marine environment that has been reserved by federal, state, territorial, tribal, or local laws or regulations to provide lasting protection for part or all of the natural or cultural resource within the protected area. There are several MPAs, HAPCs, and gear-restricted areas in the eastern and northwestern Gulf. Actions 8 does contain alternatives regarding the establishment of additional time/area closures. The existing and proposed areas in these actions are entirely within federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico. They do not affect any areas reserved by federal, state, territorial, tribal or local jurisdictions.

Essential Fish Habitat

The amended MSFCMA included a new habitat conservation provision known as EFH that requires each existing and any new FMPs to describe and identify EFH for each federally managed species, minimize to the extent practicable impacts from fishing activities on EFH that are more than minimal and not temporary in nature, and identify other actions to encourage the conservation and enhancement of that EFH. To address these requirements the Council has, under separate action, approved an EIS (GMFMC 2004b) to address the new EFH requirements contained within the MSFCMA. Section 305(b)(2) requires federal agencies to obtain a consultation for any action that may adversely affect EFH. An EFH consultation will be conducted for this action.

9 LIST OF PREPARERS (INTERDISCIPLINARY PLANNING TEAM)

Name	Expertise	Responsibility	Agency
Steven Atran	Biologist	Co-Team Lead – Amendment development, Introduction, Purpose and need, Gag rebuilding plan, Commercial gag quota adjustment	GMFMC
Peter Hood	Biologist	Co-Team Lead – Amendment development, Accountability measures, Summary, Bycatch practicability analysis, Cumulative effects analysis	SERO
Carrie Simmons	Biologist	Recreational management scenarios, Time and area closures	GMFMC
Assane Diagne	Economist	Economic analyses, Adjustments to multi-use IFQ shares	GMFMC
Ava Lasseter	Anthropologist	Social analyses	GMFMC
Steve Bortone	Biologist	Reviewer	GMFMC
Rick Leard	Biologist	Reviewer	GMFMC
David Dale	Biologist	EFH review	SERO
Jennifer Lee	Protected Resources	Protected species review	SERO
Mike Travis	Economist	Economic analyses	SERO
Rich Malinowski	Biologist	Reviewer	SERO
Shepherd Grimes	Attorney	Legal Compliance	SERO
Andrew Strelcheck	Biologist	Scientific analyses	SERO
Cynthia Meyer	Biologist	Reviewer, GIS	SERO
Noah Silverman	Natural Resource Management Specialist	NEPA compliance	SERO
Anik Clemons	Regulations Writer	Reviewer	SERO
Scott Sandorf	Regulations Writer	Reviewer	SERO
Brian Linton	Assessment Analyst	Stock Assessment	SEFSC
Brent Stoffle	Social Scientist	Social analyses	SEFSC
Larry Perruso	Economist	Economic analyses	SEFSC
Christopher Liese	Economist	Economic Analyses	SEFSC

10 List of agencies, organizations, and persons to whom copies of the amendment / DEIS are sent

List of Agencies:

Federal Agencies

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's

- Scientific and Statistical Committee
- Socioeconomic Assessment Panel

National Marine Fisheries Service

- Southeast Fisheries Science Center
- Southeast Regional Office

U.S. Coast Guard

Environmental Protection Agency

State Agencies

- Texas Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
- Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
- Mississippi Department of Marine Resources
- Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

List of Organizations:

- Coastal Conservation Association
- Environmental Defense
- Fishermen's Advocacy Organization
- Fishing Rights Alliance
- Gulf Fishermen's Association
- Ocean Conservancy
- Pew Environment Group
- Recreational Fishing Alliance
- Southeast Fisheries Association
- Southern Offshore Fishing Association

Responsible Agencies:

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Lead Agency for FMP)
2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100
Tampa, Florida 33607
813-348-1630

NOAA Fisheries Service (Lead Agency for Environmental Impact Statement)
Southeast Regional Office
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
727-824-5305

11 Public Hearing Locations and Dates

Public hearings were held at the following locations:

Tuesday May 3, 2011

Hilton St. Petersburg Carillon Parkway
950 Lake Carillon Drive
St. Petersburg, FL

Clarion Hotel
12635 South Cleveland Ave
Fort Myers, FL 33907

Wednesday May 4, 2011

Banana Bay Resort
4590 Overseas Hwy
Marathon, FL

Monday May 9, 2011

Amendment 32 and ACLs/AMs Amendment

Renaissance Riverview Plaza
64 South Water Street
Mobile, AL

Tuesday May 10, 2011

Amendment 32 and ACLs/AMs Amendment

Hilton
5400 Seawall Blvd
Galveston, TX

Tuesday May 10, 2011

Amendment 32 and ACLs/AMs Amendment

Four Points Sheraton
940 Beach Blvd.
Biloxi, MS

Boardwalk - Royal American Beach Getaways
9400 S. Thomas Drive
Panama City Beach, FL

Wednesday, May 11, 2011

Harte Research Institute
Conference Room
6300 Ocean Drive
Corpus Christi, TX

Amendment 32 and ACLs/AMs Amendment

Crowne Plaza NOLA Airport
2829 Williams Blvd.
Kenner, LA

Additional public hearings will be held at the following locations:

Monday, August 1, 2011

Hyatt Place Ft. Myers
2600 Champion Ring Road
Fort Myers, FL 33905

Tuesday, August 2, 2011

Hilton St. Petersburg
Carillon Park
950 Lake Carillon Drive
St. Petersburg, FL 33716

Wednesday August 3, 2011

Boardwalk Beach Resort
9400 S. Thomas Drive
Panama City Beach, FL 32408

Final Testimony was heard on:

August 18, 2011

Crowne Plaza
6121 North IH-35
Austin, TX 78752

12 Alternatives Considered but Rejected

12.1 Bycatch Issues

The following bycatch issues were considered, but were determined to be either unfeasible, or would take too long to implement through this amendment, whose primary objective is to implement a rebuilding plan for gag as soon as possible. One alternative under commercial bycatch, to reduce the commercial minimum size limit of gag (which had been Alternative 5 in the commercial bycatch section), was retained and remains in the amendment as a separate action.

12.1.1 Commercial Bycatch

Alternative 1: No action. Do not implement any of the commercial bycatch reduction alternatives in this section.

Alternative 2: Establish a commercial gag bycatch quota. Analyses and projection of the bycatch observer data will be made at a time during the current year to provide sufficient time to adjust the commercial quota in the following year. If the gag bycatch quota is projected to be exceeded in the current year, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries will file a notification that will reduce the red grouper commercial quota in the following year by the amount necessary to ensure that the gag bycatch quota is not exceeded for that fishing year. The bycatch quota (in numbers of fish) will be:

- a. 4,000 fish per year (18% reduction from the 2000-2008 average of 4,871 fish)**
- b. 3,000 fish per year (38% reduction from the 2000-2008 average of 4,871 fish)**
- c. 2,000 fish per year (59% reduction from the 2000-2008 average of 4,871 fish)**

Alternative 3: Establish an electronic or video monitoring system for commercial reef fish vessels in the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

Option a: Request that the National Marine Fisheries Service develop a protocol for using video monitoring in combination with VMS to identify areas with high gag bycatch. The Assistant Administrator for Fisheries would then be authorized through notice action, to close areas with gag bycatch levels that exceed a threshold (to be determined) to bottom fishing for a period of up to 90 days.

Alternative 4: Set aside a portion of the commercial gag quota to account for bycatch.

Alternative 6: Reduce the commercial red grouper quota to reduce commercial dead discard of gag. With respect to dead discards, optimum yield in the red grouper fishery is defined as a catch level that produces dead discards of gag reduced from the 2000-2008 average of 4,871 fish to no more than:

- d. 4,000 fish per year (18% reduction)**
- e. 3,000 fish per year (38% reduction)**
- f. 2,000 fish per year (59% reduction)**

12.1.2 Recreational Bycatch

Alternative 1: No Action. Do not implement any of the recreational bycatch reduction alternatives in this section.

Alternative 2: Prohibit recreational fishing for

- a. gag
- b. all grouper
- c. all bottom fishing

within an area east and south of the Mobile Bay (or other region defined by the Council) encompassing a depth range of

- d. deeper than 15 fathoms (26% release mortality rate or higher)
- e. deeper than 25 fathoms (50% release mortality rate or higher)
- f. deeper than 35 fathoms (75% release mortality rate or higher)

With the closed area to be in effect during

- g. January through April (gag spawning season)
- h. Whenever the recreational fishing season for gag is closed
- i. Whenever the recreational fishing season for gag is open
- j. Year-round

Alternative 3: Reduce the recreational minimum size limit for gag from 22 inches total length to

- a. 20 inches total length
- b. 18 inches total length
- c. no minimum size limit

Alternative 4: Establish a recreational slot limit for gag, with the minimum and maximum sizes defined as

- a. 19 - 27 inches total length
- b. 20 – 29 inches total length

12.2 Recreational Data Collection and Monitoring Programs

This action was considered to be beyond the scope of this amendment. It was removed from Amendment 32 with the intent that it be placed in a more appropriate amendment.

Alternative 1. No Action. Do not implement new data collection and monitoring programs for the recreational grouper fishery.

Alternative 2. Collaborate with the states to establish a recreational fish tag program. Reporting of MRIP-consistent data will be required for each tagged fish. The program will be implemented no later than 2012:

- a. gag
- b. gag and red grouper
- c. all shallow-water grouper
- d. all grouper

with the number of tags issued to be:

- e. no limit, issue tags for monitoring and data collection purposes only
- f. the number of fish estimated to fill the annual catch target

Alternative 3: By 2012, Require that permitted reef fish for hire vessels operating in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone participate in an electronic logbook program that includes catch and bycatch reporting consistent with the recommendations of MRIP*. Vessel permits will not be renewed for vessels that fail or refuse to participate in the program. The electronic logbook program will apply to:

- a. All permitted reef fish for hire vessels
- b. A sub-sample of all permitted reef fish for hire vessels.

*Note this requirement would not be effective until NMFS develops and certifies an electronic logbook system which meets the needs of MRIP.

Alternative 4: Collaborate with the states to establish a telephone or web-based system to report MRIP-consistent data. The program will be implemented no later than 2012. Reporting will be:

- a. Voluntary
- b. Required

The reporting program will be for:

- c. the private recreational reef fish fishery
- d. the for-hire reef fish fishery
- e. both the private and for-hire reef fish fisheries

13 REFERENCES

- Ault, J. S., S. G. Smith, G. A. Diaz, and E. Franklin. 2003. Florida hogfish fishery stock assessment. University of Miami, Rosenstiel School of Marine Science, Contract No. 7701 617573 for Florida Marine Research Institute, St. Petersburg, FL. 45 p.
- Bacheler, N.M., and Buckel, J.A. 2004. Does hook type influence the catch rate, size, and injury of grouper in a North Carolina commercial fishery? *Fisheries Research* 69: 303-311.
- Barnette, M. C. 2001. A review of the fishing gear utilized within the Southeast Region and their potential impacts on essential fish habitat. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-449. National Marine Fisheries Service, 263 13th Avenue, South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701. 62 pp
- Bullock, L.H., and G.B. Smith. 1991. Seabasses (Pisces: Serranidae). *Fla. Mar. Res. Inst. (Part II)* Vol. VIII, 243 p.
- Burns, K.M., C.C. Koenig, and F.C. Coleman. 2002. Evaluation of Multiple Factors Involved in Release Mortality of Undersized Red Grouper, Gag, Red Snapper and Vermilion Snapper. Mote Marine Laboratory Technical Report No. 814 funded by NOAA under MARFIN Grant # NA87FF0421.
- Carter, D. W. and C. Liese. 2010. The Economic Value of Catching and Keeping or Releasing Saltwater Sportfish in the Southeast United States. (in review)
- Cass-Calay, S. L., and M. Bahnick. 2002. Status of the yellowedge grouper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. Contribution SFD 02/03 – 172. 67 p.
- Clapp, R. B., R. C. Banks, D. Morgan-Jacobs, and W. A. Hoffman. 1982. Marine birds of the southeastern United States and Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Dept. of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington D.C. FWS/OBS-82/01. 3 vols.
- Coleman, F.C., and S.L. Williams. 2002. Overexploiting marine ecosystem engineers: potential consequences for biodiversity. *TRENDS in Ecology & Evolution*, Vol.17:No.1 (January 2002):40-44
- Coleman, F.C., C.C. Koenig, and L.A. Collins. 1996. Reproductive styles of shallow-water groupers (Pisces: Serranidae) in the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the consequences of fishing on spawning aggregations. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 47: 129-141.
- Collins, L. A., G. R. Fitzhugh, L. A. Lombardi-Carlson, H. M. Lyon, W. T. Walling, and D. W. Oliver. 2002. Characterization of red grouper (Serranidae: *Epinephelus morio*) reproduction from the eastern Gulf of Mexico: 1992-2001. NMFS SEFSC Panama City Lab Contrib. Ser 2002-07. 10 p + 4 tables + 6 figures.
- CEQ. 1997 Considering cumulative effects under the National Environmental Policy Act. Council on Environmental Policy, Executive Office of the President. 64 pp. + appendices. Available at <http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/ccenepa/ccenepa.htm>.

Domeier, M.L., and P.L. Colin. 1997. Tropical reef fish spawning aggregations: defined and reviewed. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 60: 698-726.

Dumas, C.F., J.C. Whitehead, C.E. Landry, and J.H. Herstine. 2009. Economic Impacts and Recreation Value of the North Carolina For-Hire Fishing Fleet. North Carolina Sea Grant FRG Grant Report 07-FEG-05.

Eklund, A. M. 1994. (editor) Status of the stocks of Nassau grouper, *Epinephelus striatus*, and jewfish, *E. itajara*- Final Report. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. Contrib. No. MIA-94/95-15. 170 p.

Farmer, N.A., R.P. Malinowski, and M.F. McGovern. 2010. Species groupings for management of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery. NOAA Fisheries Service. SERO-LAPP-2010-03: Species groupings for Gulf Reef Fish FMU. 79 pp.

Fitzhugh, G.R., H.M. Lyon, W.T. Walling, C.F. Levins, and L.A. Lombardi-Carlson. 2006a. An update of Gulf of Mexico red grouper reproductive data and parameters for SEDAR 12. Draft working document for SEDAR 12 Data Workshop. 17p. SEDAR 12-DW-04.

Fitzhugh, G.R., H.M. Lyon, L.A. Collins, W.T. Walling, L. Lombardi-Carlson. 2006b. Update of gag reproductive parameters: Eastern Gulf of Mexico. NMFS Panama City Lab Contribution 05-06. 25p SEDAR10-DW3.

Gannon, D. P., E. J. Berens McCabe, S. A. Camilleri, J. G., Gannon, M. K. Brueggen, A. A. Barleycorn, V. I. Palubok, G. J. Kirkpatrick, and R. S. Wells. 2009. Effects of *Karenia brevis* harmful algal blooms on nearshore fish communities in southwest Florida. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 378:171–186.

Gentner, B. 2009. Allocation Analysis of the Gulf of Mexico Gag and Red Grouper Fisheries. Prepared for Coastal Conservation Association. Gentner Consulting Group, Silver Spring, MD.

Gilmore, R.G., and R.S. Jones. 1992. Color variation and associated behavior in the Epinepheline groupers, *Mycteroperca microlepis* (Goode and Bean) and *M. phenax* (Jordan and Swain). *Bulletin of Marine Science* 51:83-103.

GMFMC. 1981. Fishery management plan for the reef fish fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and environmental impact statement. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida.

GMFMC. 1998. August 1998 report of the reef fish stock assessment panel. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, FL. 19 p.

GMFMC. 1999. Regulatory amendment to the reef fish fishery management plan to set 1999 gag/black grouper management measures (revised). Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 84 p.

GMFMC. 2004a. Secretarial Amendment 1 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan to set a 10-year rebuilding plan for red grouper, with associated impacts on gag and other groupers. NOAA, NMFS, SERO, 263 13th Ave. South, St. Petersburg, Florida 33701. 262 pp.

GMFMC. 2004b. Environmental Impact Statement for the Generic Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf): Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, Red Drum Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, Coral and Coral Reef Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, Spiny Lobster Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, Florida 33607. 118 pp.

GMFMC. 2004c. Final Amendment 23 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan to set vermilion snapper Sustainable Fisheries Act targets and thresholds and to establish a plan to end overfishing and rebuild the stock. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, Florida 33607. 202 p.

GMFMC. 2005a. Final Regulatory Amendment to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan to Set Recreational Management Measures for Grouper Starting in 2006. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 124 p.

GMFMC. 2005b. Amendment 18a to the Reef Fish FMP for resolving enforcement of regulations, for updating the framework procedure for setting total allowable catch, and to reduce bycatch mortality of incidentally caught endangered sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, Florida 33607. 192 pp with appendices

GMFMC. 2005c. Amendment to the FMPs for: Reef Fish (Amendment 25) and Coastal Migratory Pelagics (Amendment 17) for extending the charter vessel/headboat permit moratorium. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, Florida 33607. 80 pp. with appendices.

GMFMC. 2007. Amendment 27 to the Reef Fish FMP and Amendment 14 to the Shrimp FMP to end overfishing and rebuild the red snapper stock. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, Florida 33607. 490 pp with appendices

GMFMC. 2008a. Reef Fish Amendment 29: Effort Management in the Commercial Grouper and Tilefish Fisheries. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, FL 33607. 484 pp with appendices.

GMFMC. 2008b. Final Amendment 30B to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, FL 33607. 427 pp with appendices.

GMFMC. 2008c. Report of the ecosystem modeling workshop #3, Tampa, Florida, May 6-7, 2008. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, FL. 12 p.

- GMFMC. 2009. Final Amendment 31 to the Fishery Management Plan for Reef Fish Resources in the Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, FL 33607. 261 pp with appendices.
- GMFMC. 2010. Regulatory amendment to the reef fish fishery management plan to set 2011 total allowable catch for red grouper and establish marking requirements for buoy gear. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 125 p.
- GMFMC and SAFMC. 1982. Environmental impact statement and fishery management plan for Coral and Coral Reef resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida.
- Gore, C. H. 1992. The Gulf of Mexico. Pineapple Press Inc. Sarasota, Fl. 384 p.
- Habb, T., R. Hicks, K. Schnier, and J. C. Whitehead. 2009. Angler Heterogeneity and the Species-Specific Demand for Recreational Fishing in the Southeast United States. National Marine Fisheries Service Marine Fisheries Initiative Grant Report #NA06NMF4330055.
- Hamilton, A. N., Jr. 2000. Gear impacts on essential fish habitat in the Southeastern Region. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 3209 Frederick Street, Pascagoula, Mississippi 39567. 45 pp.
- Harrison, P. 1983. Seabirds: an identification guide. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA. Field Notes 48: 976-978.
- Harter, S., and A. David. 2009. Examination of proposed additional closed areas on the west Florida shelf: A report to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Panama City Laboratory.
- Hellerstein D. and R. Mendelsohn. 1993. A Theoretical Foundation for Count Data Models. American Journal of Agricultural Economics 75(3): 604-611.
- IPCC, 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Johanssen, P. 1987. The economic theory and measurement of environmental benefits. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Koenig, C.C., and F.C. Coleman. 1998. Absolute abundance and survival of juvenile gags in sea grass beds of the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 127: 44-55.
- Koenig, C. C., F. C. Coleman, L. A. Collins, Y. Sadovy, and P. L. Colin. 1996. Reproduction in gag (*Mycteroperca microlepis*)(Pisces: Serranidae) in the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the consequences of fishing spawning aggregations. In F. Arraguin-Sánchez, J. L. Munro, M. C. Balgos, and D. Pauly, editors. Biology, fisheries and culture of tropical groupers and snappers. ICLARM Conf. Proc. 48:307-323.NOAA.

- Landsberg, J.H., L.J. Flewelling, J. Naar. 2009. *Karenia brevis* red tides, brevetoxins in the food web, and impacts on natural resources: Decadal advancements. *Harmful Algae* 8:598–607.
- Larkin, S. L., S. Gil, M. Harte, and K. Quigley. 2006. Optimal Rebuilding of Fish Stocks in Different Nations: Bioeconomic Lessons for Regulators. *Mar. Res. Econ., Mar. Res. Found.* 21(4).
- Legault, C.M., and Eklund, A.-M. 1998. Generation times for Nassau grouper and jewfish with comments on M/K ratios. Sustainable Fisheries Division Contribution SFD-97/98-10A. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149.
- Legault, C.M. and V.R. Restrepo. 1998. A flexible forward age-structures assessment program. *International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, Collective Volume of Scientific Papers* 49(2):246-253.
(http://iccat.int/Documents/CVSP/CV049_1999/no_2/CV049020246.pdf)
- Liese, C. and D.W. Carter. 2011. Collecting Economic Data from the For-Hire Fishing Sector: Lessons from a Cost and Earnings Survey of the Southeast U.S. Charter Boat Industry. 14 p. in Beard, T.D., Jr., A.J. Loftus, and R. Arlinghaus (eds). 2011. *The Angler in the Environment: Proceedings of the Fifth World Recreational Fisheries Conference*. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 75, Bethesda, Maryland. (in press)
- Lombardi-Carlson. L.A., G.R. Fitzhugh, B.A. Fable, M. Ortiz, C. Gardner. 2006b. Age, length and growth of gag from the NE Gulf of Mexico 1979-2005. NMFS Panama City Lab Contribution 06-03.57 p. SEDAR10-DW2.
- McEachran, J. D. and J. D. Fechhelm. *Fishes of the Gulf of Mexico, Volume 2: Scorpaeniformes to Tetraodontiformes*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2005. 1014 pp.
- McGovern, J.C., D.M. Wyanski, O. Pashuk, C.S. Manooch & G.R. Sedberry. 1998. Changes in the sex ratio and size at maturity of gag, *Mycteroperca microlepis* from the Atlantic coast of the southeastern United States during 1976-1995. *Fishery Bulletin* 96: 797-807.
- McGovern, J.C., G.R. Sedberry, H.S. Meister, T. M. Westendorff, D.M. Wyanski, and P.J. Harris. 2005. A tag and recapture study of gag, *Mycteroperca microlepis*, off the Southeastern U.S. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 76:47-59.
- Moe, M.A., Jr. 1969. Biology of red grouper (*Epinephelus morio* Valenciennes) from the eastern Gulf of Mexico. *Prof. Pap. Ser. Mar. Lab. Fla.* 10, 95 p.
- Morey, E.R. 1994. What is Consumer Surplus *Per Day of Use*, When is it a Constant Independent of the Number of Days of Use, and What Does it Tell Us about Consumer Surplus? *J. Env. Econ.Manag.* 26: 257-270.
- Muller, R. G., M. D. Murphy, J. de Silva, and L. R. Barbieri. 2003. Final Report Submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, and the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council as part of the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) III. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, FWC-FMRI Report: IHR 2003-10. Florida

Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, St. Petersburg, Florida. 217 p. + 2 appendices.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 1995. Characterization of the Reef Fish Fishery of the Eastern U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Report to Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. NOAA. NMFS. SEFSC. 43p.

National Research Council. 2006. Review of Recreational Fisheries Survey Methods. National Academies Press, 500 Fifth Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001, 202 pp.

NMFS. 2002. Status of red grouper in United States waters of the Gulf of Mexico during 1986-2001, revised. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. Contribution No. SFD-01/02-175rev. 65 p.

NMFS. 2007. Final model for Gulf of Mexico gag grouper as recommended by the SEDAR Grouper Review Panel: revised results and projections. NOAA Fisheries Service, SEFSC, Miami, Florida. 34 pp.

NMFS. 2009. Fisheries Economics of the United States 2006. U.S. Dept. Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum F/SPO-97, 158 p. Available at: <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/index.html>.

NMFS. 2010a. Environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis for a temporary rule to implement measures to limit the Gulf of Mexico gag commercial and recreational harvests and suspend the red grouper individual fishing quota multi-use allocation. Southeast Regional Office, St. Petersburg, FL. 156 p.

NMFS. 2010b. Population projections of Gulf of Mexico red and gag grouper with preliminary 2009 landings estimates. NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida. 5 pp.

NMFS. 2010c.

NMFS. 2011. An overview of the Gulf of Mexico gag grouper recreational decision model – February 3, 2011 draft. Southeast Regional Office, St. Petersburg, FL. 11 p.

Ortiz, M. 2006. Preliminary status of gag grouper In the Gulf of Mexico, SEDAR-10. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Miami, FL. Sustainable Fisheries Division Contribution SFD 2006-019 (SEDAR10-AW-02). 65 p + figures.

Ortiz, M. 2007. Analysis on the effects of yield per recruit of alternative minimum size limit regulations for the fisheries of gag grouper Gulf of Mexico. NOAA Fisheries Service, SEFSC, Miami, Florida. SFD Contribution No. SFD-2007-030. 10 pp.

Porch, C. 2002. PRO-2BOX User's guide v2.01. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. Sustainable Fisheries Division Contribution No. SFD-02/03-182. 43 p. (http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/pro2-box%20vers%202_01.pdf?id=DOCUMENT)

Porch, C. E., and S. L. Cass-Calay. 2001. Status of the vermilion snapper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. Assessment 5.0. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. Contribution: SFD-01/02-129. 42 p. + Figures.

Porch, C. E., A. M. Eklund and G. P. Scott. 2003. An assessment of rebuilding times for goliath grouper. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. Contribution: SFD 2003-0018. 25 p.

Robins, C. R., G. C. Rey, and J. Douglass. 1986. A field guide to Atlantic coast fishes. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York City, NY. 354 p.

Schirripa, M.J. and C.P. Goodyear. 1994. Status of the gag stocks of the Gulf of Mexico: Assessment 1.0. NMFS SEFSC Miami Lab MIA-94/94-61. 155 pp.

Schirripa, M.J. and C.M. Legault. 1997. Status of the gag stocks of the Gulf of Mexico, Assessment 2.0. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. 136 p.

Schirripa, M.J., C.M. Legault & M. Ortiz. 1999. The red grouper fishery of the Gulf of Mexico: Assessment 3.0. Southeast Fisheries Science Centre, Sustainable Fisheries Division Contribution SFD-98/99-56.

Shipp, R.L. 1986. Dr. Bob Shipp's guide to the fishes of the Gulf of Mexico. 20th Century Printing Company, Mobile, Alabama. 256 p.

SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment Division, NOS). 1998. Product overview: Products and services for the identification of essential fish habitat in the Gulf of Mexico. NOS, Silver Spring, Maryland; NOAA Fisheries, Galveston, Texas; and GMFMC, Tampa, Florida (available at <http://biogeo.nos.noaa.gov/projects/efh/gom-efh/>)

SEDAR. 2007a. SEDAR grouper assessment review, SEDAR supplement 1. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. 63 p.

SEDAR. 2007b. SEDAR Grouper Assessment Review Section II, Review Panel Report. SEDAR, North Charleston, SC. 24 p.

SEDAR. 2009a. Stock assessment of gag in the Gulf of Mexico – SEDAR update assessment. Report of assessment workshop, Miami, FL, March 30-April 2, 2009. 171 p.

SEDAR. 2009b. Stock assessment of red grouper in the Gulf of Mexico – SEDAR update assessment. Report of assessment workshop, Miami, FL, March 30-April 2, 2009. 143 p.

SEDAR 3. 2003. SEDAR Peer Review of yellowtail snapper assessment, with comments on goliath grouper. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina. 12 pp+ appendices.

SEDAR 6. 2004a. The hogfish in Florida: Assessment review and advisory report. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina. 12 p.

SEDAR 6. 2004b. The goliath grouper in southern Florida: Assessment review and advisory report. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina. 15 p.

- SEDAR 7. 2005. Stock assessment report of SEDAR 7 Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina. 480 p.
- SEDAR 7. 2009. Update stock assessment report of SEDAR 7 Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina.
- SEDAR 9. 2006a. SEDAR 9 Gulf of Mexico vermilion snapper assessment report 3. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina. 231 p. SEDAR 10. 2006.
- SEDAR 9. 2006b. Stock assessment report of SEDAR 9: Gulf of Mexico gray triggerfish. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review, Charleston, South Carolina. 195 p.
- SEDAR 9. 2006c. Stock assessment report of SEDAR 9: Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review, Charleston, South Carolina. 178 p.
- SEDAR 10 Gulf of Mexico Gag Grouper Stock Assessment Report. (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina. 250 p.
- SEDAR 12. 2007. SEDAR12-Complete Stock Assessment Report 1: Gulf of Mexico Red Grouper. SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>), Charleston, South Carolina.
- SEFSC. 2007. Final model for Gulf of Mexico gag grouper as recommended by the SEDAR Grouper Review Panel: revised results and projections. NOAA Fisheries Service, SEFSC, Miami, Florida. 34 pp. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/download/Gag-revised-analyses-Sept-2007-1.pdf?id=DOCUMENT>
- SERO. 2007. Gag and red grouper bag limits. Report to the SEDAR Grouper Review dated April 26, 2007. Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, St. Petersburg, FL. 4 pp. + appendix.
- Shapiro, D.Y. 1987. Reproduction in groupers. In J.J. Polovina and S. Ralston (editors), Tropical snappers and groupers: biology and fisheries management. Westview Press, Boulder.
- Shipp, R.L. 2003. A perspective on marine reserves as a fishery management tool. Fisheries 28:10-21
- Smith, S.G., and N. Zurcher. 2007. Quantifying fishing activity within and adjacent to NE Gulf of Mexico marine protected areas. University of Miami, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, Miami, Florida. Draft Technical Report Project Phase 1, NOAA Contract No. NA17RJ1226. 27 p.
- Strelcheck, A. and N. Farmer. 2010a. Amendment 32 management measure analyses. PowerPoint presentation at February 2011 GMFMC Meeting, Gulfport, MS.
- Strelcheck, A. and N. Farmer. 2010b. Amendment 32 management measure analyses. PowerPoint presentation at August 2010 GMFMC Meeting, Pensacola, FL.
- Strelcheck, A.J., G.R. Fitzhugh, F.C. Coleman, C.C. Koenig. 2003. Otolith-fish size relationship in juvenile gag (*Mycteroperca microlepis*) of the eastern Gulf of Mexico; A comparison of growth rates between laboratory and field populations. Fish. Res. 60 (2-3): 255-265.

Sutton, S.G., R.B. Ditton, J.R. Stoll, and J.W. Milon. 1999. A Cross-sectional Study and Longitudinal Perspective on the Social and Economic Characteristics of the Charter and Party Boat Fishing Industry of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Texas A&M University Human Dimensions Lab, Report ID HD-612.

Turner, S. C., N. J. Cummings, and C .P. Porch. 2000. Stock assessment of Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack using data through 1998. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. SFD-99/00-100. 27 p.

Turner, S.C. C.E. Porch, D. Heinemann, G.P. Scott and M. Ortiz. 2001. Status of Gag in the Gulf of Mexico, Assessment 3.0. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Center, Miami Laboratory, Miami SFD-2000/2001-118

Valle, M., C.M. Legault, and M. Ortiz. 2001. A stock assessment for gray triggerfish, *Balistes capriscus*, in the Gulf of Mexico. NMFS/SEFSC, Miami Laboratory. Sustainable Fisheries Division Contribution SFD-00/01-124. 50 p. + app.

Walker, B. M., R. F. Zales II, and B. W. Rockstall. 2006. Charter fleet in peril: losses to the Gulf of Mexico charter fleet from hurricane storms during 2005. National Association of Charterboat Operators. 208 pp.

Walter, J. 2007. Yield per recruit analysis for red grouper. NOAA Fisheries Service, SEFSC, Miami, Florida. 21 pp.

Walter, J. 2011. Rerun of Gulf of Mexico red grouper assessment and projections with observer-derived discard estimates (revised). NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, Florida. 19 p.

14 INDEX

- ABC, iv, 18, 19, 65
Acceptable biological catch, iv
Accountability measure, xi, 56, 144, 192
ACL, iv, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27, 28, 132, 169, 179, 181, 182, 184, 185
ACT, iv, 18, 19, 25, 27, 65, 174, 177, 181, 182
Annual catch limit, iv, xi
Annual catch target, iv
B, iv, 22, 23, 199, 200, 201, 203, 204, 207
Bag limit, v, viii, ix, xiii, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 59, 74, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 95, 101, 102, 111, 112, 127, 145, 156, 158, 162, 164, 167, 171, 207
Biomass, iv, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 14, 22, 23, 64, 65, 79, 84, 90, 92, 93, 94, 97, 156, 157, 166
Biomass (B), 6, 79, 84, 199, 200, 204
BMSY, 90
Bottom longline, 92
Bycatch mortality, x, xi, xii, 5, 12, 22, 38, 39, 45, 50, 51, 52, 74, 78, 79, 81, 86, 94, 138, 139, 140, 162, 163, 170, 179, 201
Bycatch reduction, 11, 83, 195, 196
Circle hooks, 80, 84
Closed season, v, viii, ix, xiii, 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 25, 26, 29, 52, 79, 82, 83, 85, 86, 90, 102, 106, 107, 162
Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 147, 148, 154, 155, 164, 200
Cumulative effects, xii, 89, 138, 147, 148, 152, 155, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 200
Dehooker, 91
Direct effects, 90, 93, 142
Discard, 1, 3, 20, 24, 25, 28, 34, 35, 38, 41, 48, 49, 64, 75, 77, 82, 94, 137, 151, 180, 195, 208
Discard mortality, 24, 25, 38, 48, 49, 75, 76, 77, 82, 94, 151, 180
EA, iv, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 69, 70
EEZ, iv, 9, 10, 13, 15, 29, 174
Environmental assessment, iv, 204
Environmental impact statement (EIS), iv, v, vi, viii, 6, 201
Environmental justice, 71, 189
Essential fish habitat (EFH), 61, 63, 155, 160, 199, 202, 206
Exclusive economic zone (federal waters), iv
F, iv, viii, 3, 23, 45, 55, 58, 141, 147, 186, 199, 200, 203, 204, 207
FEIS, iv, v, vi, 11
Final environmental impact statement, iv
FIS, iv
Fishing mortality, iv, viii, 2, 3, 8, 15, 22, 23, 24, 29, 39, 52, 54, 55, 61, 64, 74, 77, 79, 84, 86, 90, 93, 94, 139, 156, 157, 162, 179
Fishing mortality (F), 74, 79, 84, 86, 200, 203, 207
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, iv, 193, 204
FMSY, 90
Framework, 150
Fuel, 85
FWCC, iv, 6
GMFMC, iv, vii, 1, 12, 17, 20, 36, 45, 54, 55, 58, 61, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 75, 78, 79, 83, 84, 88, 89, 91, 92, 112, 135, 138, 141, 143, 144, 148, 149, 150, 152, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 191, 192, 201, 202, 206, 207
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, iv, v, vii, 192, 193, 201, 202, 203, 204
Gutted weight, iv
GW, iv, 4, 12, 14, 62, 64, 65, 93, 96, 145, 167, 171, 181
IFQ, iv, xiv, xv, xvi, 14, 34, 36, 40, 128, 130, 131, 133, 134, 137, 142, 158, 166, 173, 179, 184, 192
Indirect effects, 138, 148, 153, 159
Individual fishing quota, iv, v, vii, ix, x, xii, xiii, 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 54, 55, 69, 78, 80, 85, 95, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 139, 143, 144, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 154, 161, 162, 167, 170, 182, 204
Individual fishing quota (IFQ), 78, 150
Marine mammals, 68, 74, 77, 85, 165, 187, 188
Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey, iv, 1, 61
Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), 79, 80

Marine Recreational Information Program, iv, 77, 151, 162
 Marine reserves, xi, 10, 11, 12, 51, 58, 59, 82, 163, 164, 207
 Maximum fishing mortality XE "Fishing mortality" threshold, iv, 156
 Maximum sustainable yield, iv, viii, 4, 9, 14, 22, 23, 24, 79, 90, 93, 94, 156, 166, 176, 179, 180, 182
 MFMT, iv, 9, 65, 90
 Minimum stock size threshold, iv, 156
 MRFSS, iv, 1, 28, 29, 61, 79, 80, 100, 103, 105, 106, 154, 162
 MRIP, iv, 151, 162, 196, 197
 MSST, iv, 9, 65, 90
 MSY, iv, 65, 90, 93
 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), vi, 147, 192, 200
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, iv
 Natural mortality, 19, 20, 62, 63, 64, 79, 93, 153, 156
 Natural mortality (M), 79, 199, 200, 204, 205
 NMFS, iv, v, vii, xii, xiii, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 19, 20, 22, 28, 29, 34, 35, 45, 62, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 75, 76, 78, 92, 97, 103, 111, 129, 133, 147, 150, 152, 154, 155, 160, 162, 164, 169, 172, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 197, 199, 200, 201, 202, 204, 205, 207
 NOAA, iv, v, xiv, 16, 35, 53, 67, 73, 92, 186, 187, 189, 193, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208
 NOAA Fisheries, 160
 OFL, iv, 3, 17, 18, 19, 62, 64, 65
 Optimum yield, iv
 Optimum yield (OY), v, vii, viii, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 20, 21, 23, 24, 31, 54, 55, 62, 64, 84, 90, 94, 95, 127, 150, 156, 159, 163, 166, 167, 173, 180, 195
 Overfished, v, vii, ix, x, xv, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 14, 22, 23, 32, 55, 56, 62, 64, 68, 78, 84, 85, 93, 127, 132, 133, 139, 145, 151, 156, 157, 158, 169, 170, 171, 179, 184
 Overfishing, v, vii, ix, x, xii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 20, 22, 32, 55, 62, 64, 68, 78, 79, 83, 84, 85, 90, 92, 93, 96, 127, 132, 133, 149, 150, 151, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 163, 166, 169, 173, 179, 201, 202
 Overfishing limit, iv
 OY, iv, 18, 19, 62, 65, 90, 95, 167
 Protected areas, 45, 51, 52, 53, 142, 207
 Quota, iv, v, vii, ix, x, xii, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 25, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 45, 54, 55, 69, 71, 80, 82, 85, 86, 93, 95, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 144, 146, 147, 150, 158, 162, 167, 168, 169, 170, 181, 182, 184, 192, 195
 RA, iv, 9
 Rebuilding plan, vii, viii, x, xii, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 40, 55, 56, 57, 68, 84, 90, 93, 94, 95, 96, 132, 133, 136, 139, 143, 145, 158, 162, 166, 167, 170, 171, 179, 180, 182, 184, 185, 192, 195, 201
 Regulatory flexibility analysis, iv
 Regulatory impact review, iv
 RFA, iv, 166, 173
 RIR, iv, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 166, 173, 189
 Scientific and Statistical Committee, iv, 2, 3, 14, 63, 151, 192
 Sea turtles, 11, 13, 68, 69, 77, 80, 92, 165, 201
 SEDAR, iv, 1, 2, 4, 10, 19, 22, 38, 40, 45, 51, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 75, 76, 78, 79, 84, 88, 93, 99, 101, 135, 148, 149, 155, 156, 157, 162, 200, 204, 205, 206, 207
 SEFSC, iv, 2, 4, 22, 28, 61, 64, 192, 199, 200, 202, 204, 205, 207, 208
 Size limit, v, viii, x, xi, xiii, 1, 3, 6, 10, 11, 12, 20, 25, 29, 30, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 64, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 95, 136, 137, 158, 162, 164, 167, 169, 182, 195, 196, 205
 Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review, iv, 204, 206
 Southeast Fisheries Science Center, iv, 1, 4, 19, 20, 23, 54, 55, 56, 62, 64, 77, 192, 203, 205, 208
 Spawning potential ratio, iv
 SPR, iv, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 135, 156
 SSC, iv, 2, 4, 5, 17, 18, 19, 20, 61, 62, 63, 64
 Stock assessment, vii, viii, xiii, 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 14, 22, 24, 61, 62, 64, 68, 75, 84, 148, 153, 155, 156, 157, 160, 162, 187, 199, 201, 206, 207
 Stock recovery, 86, 158
 Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA), 150
 TAC, iv, 4, 6, 7, 10, 62, 64, 84, 93, 95, 149, 150, 158

TL, iv, 6, 12, 29, 75, 78

Total allowable catch, iv, 1, 4, 5, 6, 14, 20, 31,
93, 95, 96, 145, 150, 162, 171, 181, 201, 202

Total allowable catch (TAC), 84, 150

Total length, iv

Venting tool, 80, 84, 91

Vessel monitoring system, iv, 164

VMS, iv, 9, 10, 142, 195

APPENDIX A SCOPING MEETING SUMMARIES AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

SUMMARY REPORT SCOPING MEETING – KEY WEST, FL REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32 January 11, 2010

Attendance:

Ed Sapp, Gulf Council
Steven Atran, Gulf Council Staff
Trish Kennedy, Gulf Council Staff

21 Members of the Public

The scoping meeting was convened by Chairman Ed Sapp at 6:00 p.m. Steven Atran reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the public. The public was then invited to participate in an informal question and answer session. Following that public testimony began.

Chris Johnson – SeaSquared Charters, Marathon, FL, opposed VMS for charter/head boats. He believed it was ridiculous for commercial vessels to have to use them and VMS does not help with tracking quota, only allows enforcement to keep track of them. He felt that fish traps are bad based on his experience in the Northeast. He stated the fish traps were a constant killing machine. He noted there are a few still being used illegally. If the stock required cut back on commercial hook-and-line fishing then why would regulators allow an overfishing opportunity via fish traps that indiscriminately fish. He was opposed to sector separation since they are fishing the same regulations and methods.

Jeff Glidewell – recreational fisherman, Key West, FL, was opposed to fish traps noting it took 10 years of a painstaking process to get rid of them and now they were being reconsidered. He felt that fish traps were a killing machine with no telling of what goes in/out. In the keys there are a lot of reefs and shoreline that is protected and if a storm comes in it could drag the traps across the protected areas and considerable damage could be done. He opposed recreational VMS feeling that it would only track what he was fishing for and where. He does not want to pay for VMS and he would either not fish that species or sell his boat. The current regulations were already economically hurting the general public, commercial, charterboat, recreational. Regarding electronic reporting of catch, he would support it if it was free and if it was by choice.

Rob Harris – owner of two charter boats, Key West, FL read a prepared statement (see attached). He opposed sector separation, VMS on for-hire vessels, and fish traps. He favored keeping the recreational black and gag grouper season open for as long as possible.

Don DeMaria - charterboat operator, Key West, stated he had experience with fish traps in Haiti in 1975 and he saw fish traps in many other countries. He pointed out that lost traps, dying fish, difficult to enforce. Florida banned the fish traps in 1981 and it took the federal system one quarter of a century to get rid of them. He believed bandit fishing is a more sustainable type of fishing. Regarding comments made that fish traps could work in the northern Gulf since the studies that showed negative results for fish traps were only done in the Keys; he compared that logic to dynamite fishing, it's bad no matter where you do it.

While diving he found 4 lost traps with incredible amounts of bones in them. The escape panels were held shut by non-destructible latches. They filmed them twice, over a 4 year period. The next dive a

portion of the material was cut away to determine how long the trap would last as constructed. Two independent tests were done and one report stated the traps could last 20-25 years and the other was indefinitely. This information was previously provided to the Council and he will provide it again here (attached). He noted that the traps being proposed now were not functional, i.e., the legs on the bottom would raise it up off the ground to prevent crabs, but the height was not enough to prevent crabs from getting in. The panels were so flimsy that the fish could push them open. The response was that the sides could be closed with a fixture. He was told that the fish trap design by WWF was award winning but his research found that the trap did not win any awards as advertised.

In 1978 when he began fishing in the Gulf there were no longline vessels, only bandit boats that were displaced with longlines entered the fishery. At the end of the qualifying years there were no landings for the historical fishery and the reward went to longliners who did the most damage to the resource. The current proposed fish trap was patented so it would have to be purchased from the original creator not on the open market.

Greg Oropeza – recreational angler, Key West, FL, noted that fishing was important part of society and when distributing fishing it should be fair and equitable. Fish traps are not fair and equitable with recreational fishermen. Fish traps are not sustainable. There are 120 longliners being forced out of an area, that they have an opportunity to fish by using vertical lines, so they should not be allowed to use fish traps that will cause harm to other areas.

Good data is available on fish traps from FFWCC which have cameras on them to do research on what the traps do/catch. He believed that using funds on fish traps would be better used on enforcing current regulations. Regarding regional management, gag grouper were not really targeted in the Keys like red grouper and that the Keys would be a good place to try out concept. He added that Riley's Hump is a great example of spawning aggregations and is an area that could be considered regional management.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act needs some amending and he encouraged the Council be proactive in having the MSA amended.

Scott Donahue - Associate Science Coordinator for Keys National Marine Sanctuary stated he represented them and the SE Region of the National Marine Sanctuary, and they are not supportive of reintroduction of fish traps due to indiscriminate catch and potential damage.

Peter Bacle - Key West, FL, noted that fish traps was an experimental method in the early 1970s and saw firsthand how destructive they were in shallow water. He opposed the use of fish traps thereafter.

The commercial industry was forced to have VMS and he opposed them. He noted then that whatever the commercial industry got the other industries would get. He noted that the SAFMC was starting video monitoring for "observer" coverage but he felt they would be forced on every boat. He believed that IFQs were a disaster for small boat businesses. Once instituted in every fishery then the commercial fisherman's income will be completely limited. The IFQs usually landed in a few large corporate entities and a few individuals and was not conducive to small boat businesses in the Keys.

Randall Painter - Cudjoe Key, FL held a commercial fishing license since they first came out. He only fished in the wintertime in Gulf and Atlantic and followed all the rules and regulations. Now that he is retired and could afford to fish the rules have changed and are based on landing history. When quotas only go out to large vessels, the small boats will never give respect to the Council. Small boats will respect the fish and preserve their catch unlike larger vessels. He felt that fish traps were absurd and no

true fisherman would support to them.

Lee Starling - commercial fisherman, guide fisherman, charterboat fisherman, Key West, FL stated that years ago at the start of licensing and permitting he told everyone to get them to legitimize their business. He felt that those licenses were not being used to punish them and are rewarding the people who hurt the fishery the most, longliners and fish trappers. Their effort caught the most of the fish and they got the most of the quota. He tried to buy some quota and it was being offered for \$10 per pound and he should not have to pay to catch the fish that were free to him before the system started. He noted that 2 years ago the longliners were complaining they were going broke and now they are millionaires since they can sell their quota for \$10 for gag grouper and \$5 for red grouper. He pointed out that longliners were now asking for economic relief to stop using their longlines and to convert to fish traps. Meanwhile the individual fishing quota system would put 750 boats out of business who did not get quota shares due to fishery consolidation and they were not receiving any economic relief.

He hated his VMS and it killed a battery in his boat every 8 months. If the VMS breaks, he cannot leave the dock and has to make a call. He opposed VMS for the charterboats and felt it was creating something out of nothing. If he thought that VMS was a safety feature he could have bought it.

He favored regional management and eco-based management. When killing a spawning fish there was repercussions down the line.

Gordon Sharp - Key West FL, related he recently retired from FFWCC. He heard many years ago that commercial fishing would be outlawed in the state of Florida within 20 years and now he sees that end coming. Public outcry in the Atlantic fishery caused a closed area quickly because the area to fish was so limited. In the Gulf the fishing area is so expansive, there is little to no monitoring of the fishery. Regarding fish traps, if a 10% loss of gear per year was allowed, the results would be severe. The golden crab trap fishery was impossible to monitor and a trap lost out in those depths of water would cause great deaths.

In his career he's seen large amounts of illegal harvest, gear, fish, etc. There was still illegal catch of any fish that has a closure. There are still fish traps in the Atlantic fishery even though it's been closed for 20 years.

He noted that fish traps were an efficient and effective method of catching fish but any reef that had legal fish traps had become void of fish because of the traps.

Mutton snapper was closed to commercial due to the spawning season but was open to recreational fishermen and that did not seem to be logical.

During the last 5 years of employment with FFWCC he avoided the commercial fishermen out of pity since they were so singled out of fishing and put out of business. One of the most successful fishermen in the Keys Peter Bacle showed him about maintaining a quality fish and now he was being regulated out of the fishery. He strongly opposed fish traps.

Additional people attended and completed cards but did not speak:

Mark DeLorenzo

Bill Weldbr

Marlin Scott

Frank Wassen

Doug Gregory

Richard Quail

James McKillip

Ray Shimukuso

Gill Geeslin

Harry Kennedy

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING – BILOXI, MS
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
January 12, 2010

Attendance:

Kay Williams, Gulf Council
Dr. Assane Diagne, Gulf Council Staff
Karen Hoak, Gulf Council Staff

3 Members of the Public

The public hearing was convened by Chairwoman Kay Williams at 6:00 p.m. Dr. Diagne reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the public. The public was then invited to provide comments and ask questions.

There were questions about why fish traps were withdrawn in the first place and how allocation was originally set for the two sectors. There were also comments regarding the survivability of red grouper, especially since sharks were a problem, even if the fish survived being brought to the surface. Regarding the first fish caught option, some felt that even after the bag limit was caught, fishing would continue and highgrading would inevitably occur since enforcement of laws prohibiting that practice would be virtually unattainable.

Mr. Voght commented that since the phase-out process for fish traps took so long, he felt it was very illogical to even consider allowing them again after all the time and money spent.

Charlie Bergmann, who spoke neither for nor against traps, explained for the sake of discussion that if a red grouper entered a trap, nothing else would enter. Gag grouper do not normally go into a fish trap. This information was found based on work done at the Panama City lab.

Ms. Williams asked for alternative ideas on how the commercial industry could continue to fish without catching gag. Fish traps would not be reinstated unless there was a lot of public support and scientific information that made it feasible. Currently it was just one option to consider for the scoping document.

Mr. Eicke also spoke against fish traps citing that resources are wasted collecting derelict traps and present safety hazards to people, other fish, and turtles. He wondered about the economics of the current allocation set-up and cited the Gentner report. He commented that the recreational sector clearly produced more economic gains for the coastal communities than the commercial sector did but the commercial fishery was often given as much, if not more consideration in management measures. Catch shares could make reconsideration of allocation even less likely.

Further comment regarding overfishing by the recreational fishery, the reliability of the MRFSS data, and the possibility of revisiting allocation were exchanged. **Ms. Williams** commented that the Genter report had been reviewed by the SEP and they did not support those findings. She explained the concept of “values added” and how those values distorted the economic impacts, therefore, per the MSA, our management measures may not be based solely on economics alone. She noted we needed better real-time data in the recreational fishery and both sectors needed to concentrate on finding ways to get answers that would allow fishermen, both recreational and commercial, to fish.

Ever declining fish populations was the issue to be tackled. Ground-truthing would be necessary, so discussions occurred on how to accomplish the task of improving the data collected. Ms. Williams also asked if they were speaking in support of the first fish caught option, and as mentioned above, enforcement would be an issue with this measure. Then the option of tagging was brought up. **Mr. Eicke** felt that since closed seasons lasted most of the year, tagging would not lead to improvement anyway.

Dr. Diagne commented that over time, improved fishing practices and better equipment have lead to ever increasing catch probability, but the fish stocks have not improved in their ability to reproduce. **Mr. Voght** agreed, stating that the biggest detriment to fish populations was GPS. **Ms. Williams** asked what proposals might lead to recreational fishers being able to go fishing when the conditions were right for them. Tags were mentioned as well as lottery style shares. In other areas, open-ended hunting was all but done away with, but not for fish. Another proposed idea was large scale area closures. Enforcement might still be difficult, but not as difficult as looking in every fish box out on the water. Where to put the closed areas always becomes the issue. Putting a closed area outside one state while leaving another state wide open would pose inequities in the fishery. All agreed that it was an extremely difficult task at hand.

Similar to hunting, **Dr. Diagne** inquired about whether they would be in favor of a system that required everybody to pay some type of fee for using the resource. **Mr. Eicke** replied that for-hire captains would rebel against that idea because that would add additional expense for them. Lottery style shares would not work for them either. He proposed a licensing system similar to moose or elk licensing. The variance in how much people fish is great. Some fish daily, some several times a week, while others fish a couple of times a year. He also questioned the concept of leasing shares and whether allocating part of a public resource for the financial gain of one individual was right.

Ms. Williams expounded that one concept being considered was for the sectors to be able trade shares between the two sectors, incorporating some type of tagging system to account for commercial shares that moved to the recreational fishery to be fished. There would have to be monies collected to administrate a program to monitor the recreational catch as happens in the commercial IFQ programs.

Mr. Eicke did not express much confidence in the ability of the two sectors to trade shares because the recreational fishery was too disjointed.

Going back to the analogy of hunting, **Ms. Williams** recalled that some areas were considered open hunting areas using tags and the fees were relatively small, while other areas were more restricted and hunting in those areas was more expensive. She pondered whether a similar tagging system might work for fish, so that people can fish when it is convenient for them. **Dr. Diagne** stated that a tagging system would probably be more effective in a contained environment, such as a lake, rather than the entire Gulf.

Deep water fishing is always difficult to discuss because deep water fish die when caught and brought to the surface. When talking about tagging, a lot of issues would have to be worked out in order for this idea to work. Ms. Williams asked for everyone to ponder these concepts and encouraged them to come back to the Council with any ideas that may surface.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING – GALVESTON, TX
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
January 11, 2010

Attendance:

Joe Hendrix, Gulf Council
Assane Diagne, Gulf Council Staff
Karen Hoak, Gulf Council Staff

12 Members of the Public

The scoping meeting was convened by Chairman Joe Hendrix at 6:00 p.m. Assane Diagne reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the public. The public was then invited to provide comments and ask questions.

David Conrad- A captain for Circle H Charters, indicated that for accountability purposes, he is in favor of sector separation for the recreational sector.

Scott Hickman – Also a captain for Circle H Charters, spoke in favor of implementing accountability measures, and therefore sector separation. He commented that the purely recreational sector continues to grow every year, but the for-hire sector is not growing due to the moratorium on permits. He noted that the remaining for-hire businesses needed to be protected by way of sector separation and accountability for all in the recreational fishery.

Dan Bulla – Representing the Recreational Fishing Alliance spoke against the current data collection methods. Regarding catch shares, he commented that they drove some fishers out of the commercial industry while making the remaining fishers quite wealthy. He felt the same thing would happen in the for-hire industry. He also indicated that it was unwise to separate the recreational fishery, as purely recreational fishers would get an unreasonably small portion of the allocation. He went further by saying that the purely recreational fisher has never been responsible for the problem of overfishing. It has always been due to fishing practices of the commercial or for-hire fishers (testimony attached).

Marc Wilkerson – Owner of Blue Streak Fishing Charters spoke in favor of sector separation. He noted that accountability should be from the use of VMS or some other web based reporting system or the use of logbooks (testimony attached).

Tom Hilton – Supported GOMARS and fish stamps for data collection only, but not for limiting entry into the fishery. He supported a first fish caught rule. He supported telephone or web based reporting systems. He also asked if the SOS plan was a done deal to which Assane Diagne answered no. He did not support VMS and saw them as unnecessary. He did not support catch shares or sector separation (testimony attached).

Others who were present but did not speak included Dave McKinney, Jeff Barger, Keith Roberts, and Monty Weeks.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING – ST. PETERSBURG, FL
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
January 12, 2010

Attendance:

Julie Morris, Gulf Council
Ed Sapp, Gulf Council
Steven Atran, Gulf Council Staff
Charlene Ponce, Gulf Council Staff
Charlotte Schiaffo, Gulf Council Staff
Dr. Carrie Simmons, Gulf Council Staff

53 Members of the public

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ed Sapp at 6 p.m. He read the Chair Statement and identified the Council Staff present. He then reviewed the format of the meeting, explaining that Mr. Atran would first give a PowerPoint presentation on Amendment 32, and then the meeting would be split into two rooms- one for a round table discussion, and one for public testimony.

Mr. Atran then reviewed the presentation for the audience. He explained that Gag was overfished and undergoing overfishing and that red grouper stock had declined since 2005. He added that the current annual catch target exceeded both the 2010 optimum yield and the 2010 acceptable biological catch. He noted that Amendment 32 would include a rebuilding plan for gag, adjust gag and red grouper annual catch limits and possibly annual catch targets, and explore other management changes.

The meeting then broke up into two rooms; the round table discussion was not formally recorded. Below is the public testimony which was recorded.

Mr. Spaeth, of the **Southeastern Fishing Alliance** stated that there was more information on fish traps now than in the past and that Reef Fish Amendment 16 of the South Atlantic Council had shown retrieval of traps had improved, adding that there were more turtles since the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council had renewed traps, noting that there was more interaction because there were more turtles. He explained that formerly, trap regulations could not be enforced so they received a bad reputation. He noted that new designs worked well and lowered bycatch and mortality, and stated that he would show designs at the next Council meeting. He stated that less than 1% of gag were caught in traps, and that the Council needed to make sure decisions were based on science and not politics, adding that traps would reduce gag and turtle mortality. He supported vessel monitoring systems (VMS), stating that they helped keep boats out of sensitive areas.

Mr. Rodriguez of Economy Tackle in Sarasota stated that data being collected on catch quotas showed less grouper being caught, and that this was due to fewer people fishing because of the economy. He pointed out that less fishers = less catch, not less fish, especially with the lower bag limits that had been enacted. He added that red snapper predation also hurt the gag fishery, and that the commercial fishery was overharvesting gag, not the recreational fishery, and asked why more limits were being imposed on the recreational fishery and not the commercial. He stated that the recreational fishery was a multi-billion dollar industry, and if the fishery was shut down, there would be deep economic impacts. He suggested

that the allocation between the fisheries should be split more fairly; noting that numerous other businesses that depended on the recreational fishery would go out of business if the proposed rules were enacted.

On the data collection issue he said that information on red snapper was incorrect, that they were numerous and were decimating the grouper population. He advised increasing the size limit, and stated that longliners were responsible for a majority of grouper mortality and bycatch. He emphasized that the collection methods currently used must be improved, that extending the closed season or dropping the recreational quota would be devastating and that the stock could be managed more wisely. He closed by stating that if the stock was so low, commercial harvest should not be allowed.

Ms. Fetherston, of the **Ocean Conservancy** testified that she would be submitting detailed comments to the Council. She noted that the overfishing shown in the data was more than two and half times the allowable threshold, and that the ratio of male to female was thus skewed in the data. She urged the Council to take measure to end the overfishing and added that data collection needed to be dramatically improved. She noted that January of 2011 was the Council goal to end overfishing and that a 50% chance of rebuilding had been recommended, adding that allowing ten years for rebuilding to occur was too risky. She stated that annual catch limits and annual catch targets needed to be considered to end overfishing and ensure future recruitment of gag. She added that bycatch of the fishery was a major cause of turtle mortality. She recommended lowering the size limit to lower bycatch and opposed allowing fish traps back in the fishery, explain that there needed to be a demonstration of how they performed before allowing them back in the fishery.

Mr. Twinnan, a commercial fisher, stated that he agreed with the idea of a recreational grouper stamp, and noted that there needed to be better information collected on the recreational sector. He explained that stamps would give an accurate count of recreational fishers in the Gulf so accurate data could be recorded. He supported separation of the recreational and charter industries, and added that they all be required to have VMS and electronic logbooks.

Mr. Jim Gillepsie, a writer and member of the **Sarasota Sports Fishing Club**, stated that the red snapper population had exploded and added that venting killed more fish than it saved, according to Mote Marine Laboratory studies.

Mr. Sapp interjected that venting issues would have to be readdressed, and that new information would probably require changes in methods.

Mr. Furr, a marine repair and tackle store owner, stated that red snapper were so numerous they had forced gag out of many of their normal spots. He added that a closure would cause people to sell their boats, and thousands of people would lose their livelihoods. He stated that economic factors were not figured in to the amendment.

Mr. Hilton, a charterboat owner, stated that the data used in the amendment was flawed and had no basis in fact. He opposed the reintroduction of fish traps, stating that they had destroyed reefs in the Keys, and promoted bad fishing habits. He posited that bycatch by recreational anglers was lower than commercial fisheries, and stated that there were new tools that ensured fish survival without venting. He was for sector separation, but opposed to VMS requirements, stating that they were an extra expense. He supported electronic logbooks, stating they would help stop misreporting. He questioned why the recreational fishery was closed during spawning, but the commercial fishery was not. He suggested that red tide data showing that it had supposedly decimated the red grouper fishery were incorrect, since the fishery could not have recovered if the recreational sector had depleted it so badly.

Mr. Fischer, a commercial fisherman, supported a fish tag for the recreational sector, and stated that science based models needed to be used to gather data, since data gathered by the *Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey* (MRFSS) was questionable. He stated that reintroducing fish traps would create conflict within the fishery and that bandit rigs could not get grouper because of traps, and that if they were approved, a few people would benefit while the majority of the fishery would not. He added that enforcement of trap regulations would be difficult. He supported individual fishing quotas (IFQs) adding that there needed to be a threshold per boat. He supported any fishing method that did not hurt the fishery. He urged the Council to address how people cheated the system and noted that declarations of gear time could be manipulated. He suggested that if longline gear was on a boat there needed to be a process to show the gear was not being used out of season.

Mr. Hernandez, a recreational fisher, supported grouper tags and stated that statistics used in the amendment were based on flawed data, noting that only 1% of fishers were surveyed to get the data. He objected to more stringent regulations being placed on the recreational fishery and not the commercial.

Mr. Bryant of the **Fishing Rights Alliance (FRA)**, urged the Council not to repeat the mistakes made in the red grouper fishery that were due to bad data, adding that any actions taken needed to consider the economic implications on the recreational fishery. He agreed that MRFSS data was severely flawed and was never designed as a management tool. He noted that other methods had been suggested in 2006 to improve data collection, but the Council still insisted on using flawed MRFSS data. He pointed out that there had been a large reduction in bag limits and an increase in size limits since 2004, however, these measures had not been given enough time to see if they worked. He stated that recreational fishing was a discretionary activity, and was one of the first to go in an economic downturn. He emphasized that the economic impact on an \$800 million industry for the state of Florida needed to be considered.

Mr. Mahoney, a charterboat owner, supported sector separation. He felt the current data collection methods were flawed, and that VMS and electronic logbooks would improve data collection.

Mr. O'Hern, president of the **FRA**, stated that he had grave concerns over the fatally flawed MRFSS and red tide data, adding that the recreational fishing and landing figures were highly overestimated, and that annual catch limits and annual catch targets were inaccurate without better data collection methods. He stated that allowable biological catch was a shell game and that accountability measures only went against recreational fishers, not commercial, and emphasized that recreational estimates must be improved. He bemoaned anti-fishing groups' actions that skewed data collection, and stated that IFQs have higher discards than were shown in current data. He advocated a 24" minimum size limit for gag, but opposed a "first fish caught" rule, stating it would hurt the biological quota. He did not support tags until the flawed data system was fixed, and noted that some of the same people responsible for the data collection were on the Data Collection Committee, and that there was no recreational representation, adding that 97% of fishing trips in the recreational sector were taken on private boats, and only 3% on charterboats. He adamantly opposed sector separation, stating that the recreational side kept the fishery afloat. He opposed the reintroduction of fish traps and longline gear. He was disappointed that Ms. Morris had not answered concerns about these questions when asked before, and recommended that at future public hearings, the presentation be done on a rolling basis, as people came in, and not just one time at the start. He explained that the SAFMC did it this way and it worked well for them, adding that the GMFMC needed to adjust how it did its public hearings.

Mr. Paladeno, a charterboat captain, supported grouper stamps, and VMS, adding that data collection needed to be better.

Mr. Walker, a fishing guide, argued that the data from the 2005 red tide occurrence was flawed, and that using it to bring down the total allowable catch had been a bad idea. He stated that the new quotas proposed would not be enough to make a living. And that the red tide model was unreliable. He suggested enacting whatever size and bag limits would be the least painful to the fishery and that keeping the season open longer would be beneficial to charterboats. He advocated raising the size limit on gag to 26", stating this would reduce bycatch mortality, and that having a one fish limit would keep the season open longer. He suggested using prepaid postcards for people to report their catches instead of grouper tags, and disagreed with the MRFSS data. Even though he owned a VMS, he was against wide-spread implementation of their use, stating they were more trouble than they were worth. He suggested making the penalties stricter instead of requiring VMS on charterboat, and that any closures needed to include spearfishing.

Mr. Brooks, a charter boat captain, supported the use of fish traps if supported by science, however, he did not think many people would use them.

Mr. Brunington, a spearfisher, noted that the dive industry was seasonal, and that a grouper closure would be devastating to the industry, with the 8 month closure being suggested a sure way to close down his business permanently. He noted that it cost a bare minimum of \$6000 to operate a vessel in addition to a \$4000 per trip expense, and these costs could not be recouped in a short season, and strongly emphasized that there should be no closure between April 1st and October 1st, suggesting that if there had to be a closure, to make it during October through January. He noted that his business had seen a 50% drop in the last 5 years. Mainly due to less fishing effort, and that more control did not make sense. He added that the data used was incorrect and illogical, and that the Council needed to talk to people in the industry to get accurate data. He stated that MRFSS data showing an increase in effort was statistically impossible with all the sales, trips, and effort down so significantly.

Mr. Furman, a member of the **Conservation Coastal Alliance (CCA)**, stated that he was against fish traps unless new traps are proven to be better than the old ones. He would prefer no longline gear and clearer regulations. He suggested using tackle shops as sources of data, and supported grouper stamps. He disagreed with data showing an increase in effort in the recreational fishery.

Mr. Tice, a tackle shop owner, said that MRFSS showed skewed data, and that fishing effort was down, not up. He questioned why NMFS data did not reflect a decrease in effort. He felt that anecdotal evidence was not given enough weight, and noted that his business was down by \$300,000 from just three years ago. He stated that the random phone calls used by MRFSS were useless, noting that even though fishers did not go out for grouper, MRFSS still counted all trips taken as grouper trips. He questioned how the biomass could be down if more fish were being caught. He offered to take Council members on trips to show them the stock had increased. He insisted that the gag population was phenomenal, and that the fishery was not overfished. He expressed frustration for what he saw as Council and NMFS disregard of recreational anglers input.

Mr. Schmidt a charterboat owner testified that it was not possible for recreational effort to be up, and that the data used was severely flawed. He noted that anglers did not want bycatch, but to be able to catch grouper and make sure the fishery was rebuilt. He proposed limited support for fish traps if they could be shown to be changed from previous designs, adding that ghost traps (traps that had been abandoned were a concern. He suggested that traps be numbered and serialized in order to be tracked, and that traps would be a less harmful method than some others. He stated that the new designs showed very rare interaction with turtles and other non-targeted species.

Mr. Dorst, a charterboat operator, suggested using a lower quota for gag now instead of waiting until 2011 to prevent an 8-month closure. He feels that better data is needed on red grouper before a decision is made, and supports electronic logbooks and sector desperation. He urged accountability for the recreational sector, noting that charterboats were already required to have federal permits. He also agrees with the idea of stamps and/or permits for recreational anglers. He proposed that if a quota were unused, it could be turned in to get a credit for the next year.

He stated that dolphin predation was a major cause of grouper mortality, and added that the mortality from catches on his boat was less than 10%. He concurred that closed seasons might be a good idea in some areas, but not a wholesale closure. He advised keeping a closure during spawning season for both commercial and recreational. He also suggested having a slot program similar to the one in the snook fishery.

Mr. Foster, a charter boat operator, stated that gag were in trouble, especially outside the 20 fathom area. He agreed that many areas were overrun with red snapper, which were having a deleterious effect on gag. He did not feel IFQs were fair, and he supported sector separation.

Mr. Erwin a recreational fisher, testified that red grouper was not overfished, and that red tide had a very small effect, although it was given much weight in models. He agreed that gag was overfished and suggested the proposed size and limits be instituted. He noted that the recreational fishery had a major impact on red grouper, while gag was more affected by the commercial fishery. He advocated more regulation of the recreational fishery.

Mr. Koweck, a recreational and commercial fisher, referred to the New England fishery having the same problems that were now happening in the Gulf. He urged the sectors to come together instead of fighting with each other, and suggested that spearfishers should have to abide by commercial and recreational regulations. He agreed with closures during spawning season, but was adamantly against fish traps, stating that they destroyed habitat. He reiterated earlier testimony that dolphin predation was a major concern, adding that cormorants also had an effect on the fishery. He noted that there were too many people in both fisheries who broke the law, and urged better enforcement. He closed by saying a sustainable fishery was the most paramount issue, and that livelihoods, while important could not be the main issue.

Mr. Pecknold, a spearfisher, stated that the Gulf of Mexico needed enforceable legislation to maintain a sustainable fish stock. He referred to a 5-year study that showed hunting and fishing had a 35 billion dollar impact and supported over 80,000 jobs in 2007. He proposed having more artificial reefs to give shelter to spawning and juvenile fish and to provide coral a base on which to thrive. He advised that care be taken with anchors to minimize reef destruction, and suggested marine preserves as another way to help the stock. He emphasized the need for harsher punishments and more education, and stated that management of the commercial fishery was not working. He opined that bycatch was the major issue of commercial fishing, and that allowing different weight and size limits for the commercial fishery was not a good idea. He noted that closures were not a cure-all, because closing one fishery put more pressure on other species. He supported grouper permits and opposed fish traps.

Mr. Blue, a charterboat captain, reiterated that the data presented was deeply flawed. He noted that he had worked with NMFS on several studies, mainly on red drum, and that the red grouper studies had been done in the same, incorrect way which gave skewed results. He stated that more fishing did not mean the fish population had changed, and that looking at fish I only one area would give inaccurate results. He

agreed that there had been a large increase in the red snapper population, and that data showing fewer red snapper in the panhandle had been extrapolated incorrectly for the entire Gulf. He added that Goliath groupers were voracious eaters which affected other fish populations.

Mr. Weible, a commercial and recreational angler, was against sector separation, adding that the commercial fishery was more detrimental to fishing than the recreational fishery. He noted that new technology made commercial fishers more effective.

Mr. Sam Maisano, a charter boat operator said that a grouper closure would be detrimental to tourism and other industries that depended on fishing. He stated that effort was down due to the economy, not because of less fish, and noted his opposition to wholesale closures. He agreed with spawning season closures.

Mr. Pecknold clarified his earlier testimony. He wanted to emphasize that he had been talking about recreational anglers who had commercial licenses they used for their own gain, he was not trying to vilify the regular commercial fishing industry.

Mr. Joe Maisano, a charterboat captain, suggested concentrating on fish closures in shallow water, not in deeper areas. He stated that the red snapper population was overwhelming the grouper fishery, and agreed with previous comments that a wholesale closure would kill businesses that depended on the recreational fishery.

Mr. Kein, a recreational angler, felt that data used in the closure proposals was flawed, and that flawed data permeated fishery management. He believed this flawed data, along with no restrictions on commercial gear, accelerated the bycatch problem. He added that the economic impact would be devastating to Florida. He agreed that red snapper were affecting the grouper population, and that new data collection methods were needed. He felt that a 66% reduction was an overreaction, and that there was no scientific data to support the red tide model. He disagreed with the idea that the Council was only enforcing federal mandates and had no control over the outcome, since the Council sent the federal government flawed data, it was responsible for what they decided on the fisheries. He suggested more artificial reefs to help stock biomass.

Mr. Sapp adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Mr. Pecknold and Mr. Furman also submitted statements which are attached.

Members of the public who did not speak:

Raymond Bourge
Bennie Falou
Bill Fehl
Alexi Fowler
Chris Gauer
Kristie Gifford
James Gillepsie
Sanford Haggart
Brad Gorst
Frank Helies
TJ Marshall

Eric Rilenreud
Joshua Smith
Robert Smith
Sonia Smith
Andy Strelcheck
Mark Turner
Khana Vixayo

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING – FT. MYERS, FL
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
January 13, 2010

Attendance:

Julie Morris, Gulf Council
Ed Sapp, Gulf Council
Steven Atran, Gulf Council Staff
Trish Kennedy, Gulf Council Staff

96 Members of the Public

The scoping meeting was convened by Chairman Julie Morris at 6:00 p.m. Steven Atran reviewed the scoping document with the public. The public was then invited to participate in an informal question and answer session. Following that public testimony began.

Sean Gucken, St. Petersburg, FL, represented CCA and he had several concerns about the actual discussion of fish traps. The longliners pushed out to 35 fathoms would like to access those fish. If they want to they can do it like others – handlining. The waters can no longer support factory fishing. If not, there will be no fishing. Also, he opposed the give-away of a public resource to a few individuals or corporations with exclusive access where no one else can have. Sector separation appears to be a divide and conquer process to get rid of the individual recreational fisherman by pitting the recreational fishermen against each other. There is a clause that says the individual fishing quotas can be taken away but like taxes he did not think they would be taken away. He pointed out that the recreational quota stays the same, and the commercial guys now that they own it, can sell it, lease it, bequeath it to their heirs. Their quota can be reduced but they still have the right. The recreational industry as it expands still will not have the quota for that expansion. The recreational industry value is 3x that of the commercial.

Thomas Kasprzak, Punta Gorda, FL, CCA Charlotte Chapter President, stressed that care was taken by the recreational fishermen to protect the fish and release them alive. He questioned who owned the fish in the Gulf and he could not find a law that says the commercial fishermen were entitled to receive a share of the public resource. The Magnuson-Stevens Act does not say they have the entitlement.

He questioned who sponsored the LAPP program. Ms. Morris responded that the LAPP was proposed by the government. Mr. Atran noted that the LAPP program was just a beginning idea with only one meeting trying to determine the goals. Mr. Kasprzak was concerned that the public resource was handed over to a commercial interest.

Per the Gentner study, the annual recreational economic value was 223 million, commercial 94 million. The commercial fishery should have to stay out to 50 fathoms and there was no need to use fish traps in 35 fathoms. He spent 32 years as a marine enforcement agent in the northeast. He has been checked by Florida Fish and Wildlife officers, but not by federal officers. Some of the data used was faulted because of the lack of real input from avid recreational fishermen. He fished approximately 4 times per week.

He felt that the Council needs to rethink the “give-away” program (grouper individual fishing quotas) and accurately gather information for the recreational sector or there would be further litigation.

He believed that the surveys were not in tune with the fishing effort.

Charles Mann, recreational fisherman, Cape Coral, FL, stated he was a grouper fisherman his whole life

and fished on the west coast of Florida since 2000. He observed that the fishery was much better this year, and it would take less than an hour to limit out on gag and red grouper. On the reefs he dove there were so many fish he could not believe how the reefs could support any more fish. The data collection needs to improve, noting he has never been surveyed. He supported electronic logbooks and was surprised that they were not already required. He noted he had never been surveyed. He believed the fishery cannot be overfished since all people along the coast report more fish than ever.

Regarding the options paper, many of the citations were listed as personal communications and not on data documents that were available to the public to review. Looking at Table 9 on mortality rates he could not believe where the rates were from. For 70 feet or less of water there was no way that the mortality rate would be 10%. He thought he has seen maybe 1 in 100 or 200 give the appearance that they may not survive.

He opposed sector separation. He did not want to provide input on further restrictions, but size increase would be the only one he would consider.

He also opposed fish traps.

Emily Hutson, Lady Renee Charterboat, Ft. Myers Beach, FL, chartered for 41 years out of Ft. Myers Beach. Many speaking prior to her touched on her points already. She stressed that Florida was the main area where grouper were caught. The panhandle area and the big bend area were shallow water. The central, west central part had much deeper waters. The Ft. Myers area had shallow water. Grouper were 20 to 50 miles out, in 50 to 80 feet of water, mortality was a factor for deep water but it is a lot less in their area since the water is so shallow. The implementation of venting tools, circle hooks, and dehooking devices are meant to help with mortality. All those participating in the charter fishery take effort to reduce mortality.

The Ft. Myers area/southwest Florida, has a natural closure of gag grouper from October to April. The red grouper have a natural closure in the summer. Those in attendance agreed with her. In the summer, their area was a nursery for small red grouper. This information needs to be publicized, which she presented a year ago, but there are very few Council members left from that time.

She was opposed to fish traps and stressed the mortality was very high using them.

Gary Colecchio, Bonita Springs, FL, Charter Captain, stated he was the SW Regional Director for the Florida Guides Association, which is five times larger than the SOS group and the largest guide association. He opposed changing the rebuilding times, if the stock assessment has not been validated and populations were not agreed upon providing large allocations to the commercial sector in the face of rebuilding would prevent stock rebuilding success.

1.3.1 No change in allocations. No target should be changed until a data methodology has been changed and is defensible. The current data is unsound and fundamentally absurd. Those in the room do not measure their fish in numbers of pounds rather in numbers of fish and it would be impossible to make that calculation.

1.3.2 No targets should be changed until a data collection methodology has been changed and verified. There was no way to really convert size of fish to pounds of fish and no fisherman measured his yearly collection of fish in pounds.

1.3.4 Yes, conversion to multi-use shares should be eliminated for red grouper, but not for gag grouper.

1.3.5. Bad assessments should not be used to adjust the seasons and there was no verifiable data to base that decision upon.

1.3.6 For bycatch issues, he supports time and area closures for commercial fishermen, electronic VMS, and set aside.

1.3.6.1 He felt that reducing the commercial size limits to reduce bycatch was a joke.

1.3.6.2 He was absolutely opposed to fish traps.

1.3.6.3 Regarding keep the first fish – he cannot determine what the recreational bycatch was and it could not be calculated for this section.

1.3.7 He supported implement fish tag programs. How they would be allocated and enforced – he had no idea since there was no enforcement now.

He would support the fish stamp program for data collection only not as a method to implement an allocation or individual fishing quota program.

1.3.8 He felt that MPAs are not an effective management tool.

1.3.9.1 He opposed sector separation, some charterboat operators use both recreational and commercial licenses. There should be no commercial entitlement to recreational fisheries.

1.3.9.2 He also opposed VMS on charterboats.

1.3.9.3 and 1.3.9.4 He supported the telephone reporting system and electronic logbooks.

1.3.9.5 He did not support the grouper endorsements.

Richard Cain, charterboat operator, Ft. Myers Beach, FL, fished for over 50 years. Regarding the financial end of the for-hire sector he had to speak for his own interest. He sympathized with recreational fishermen but for him to get a grouper he must run someone else's boat or buy the fish from Publix. It was time for the charterboats to be their own sector to preserve their industry. He would prefer to keep the grouper fishery open year round and he can sell a trip if they can catch grouper, whereas he cannot if there was a grouper closure. He must cooperate to get better data, and no one agrees with the data. The credibility was reduced since the stock assessment said the stock was bad, then once sued, the assessment was redone and it came back that the stock was in good shape.

He favored a charterboat days-at-sea program. This southwest region's tourist season was from November through April and the fishery needs to be open then. The closure in February and March was to protect the spawning aggregate that was fished in areas reached by Florida recreational fishermen, not charterboats. The grouper fish were not seen in this area in spawn during February and March.

Fish caught in Ft. Myers do not exceed 30 inches, when the fish get bigger they go offshore where the commercial sector then catches them. He supported the commercial sector being pushed to 50 fathoms.

He stressed that fish traps were the most destructive method of fishing in this area and it took 20 years to get them out. Longlining was also very destructive and should be prohibited. The Gulf Council had many opportunities over the years to manage the fishery. Dr. Crabtree who oversees the fishery should not receive a pension after 30 years of service unless the stocks are recovered which would prove he did a good job. The stock assessments were not valid. He currently had 17 licenses/permits on his boat, Coast Guard, Captain License, state, county, etc. and did not need any more to manage.

John Gettinger, Punta Gorda, FL, stated he was 68 yrs old and just a recreational fisherman. He has lived in Florida his entire life living on the east coast. He used to go to the “snook hole” in Marco Island to catch his grouper in the ‘50s and ‘60s. Upon retirement he moved to the west coast to catch fish. In the last year there’s been more big grouper caught in Charlotte Harbor than since he had moved here in 1990. He felt that the regulations could be reduced since the fish were coming back. He believed the data must be flawed if an old fisherman like him was able to go out and fish and fill his limit any time he wanted.

Kevin Shimp, Punta Gorda, FL, relayed that due to the manatee situation inshore he moved to offshore fishing. He does 10-15 fishing trips per year in approximately 100 feet of water. The data was awful and he did not see what he read that the stock was down. This year was the best fishing he’s ever seen, especially big fish. Duck hunting, buy tackle, rods, reels, bait, gear, etc. to try to catch grouper, regardless if

When he completed his duck hunting form he would note that he shot at about 300 but only killed about 2 since he was not good at it, but fills out a survey every year and suggested that reporting system should be used for recreational fishing. He questioned how he was allowed to take only 2 or 3 fish per trip was taking too many fish when there were boats who were allowed to land 35,000 pounds. The number of recreational fishers was increasing in Florida and they should be allowed to fish.

He did not fish where there were fish traps because there were not any fish there. He opposed fish traps and felt that the longliners should be out at 50 fathoms. He opposed replacing one bad fishing method with another bad fishing method.

James Collier, Cape Coral, FL, agreed with those who spoke before him. He was a charterboat captain who was trying to make a living. The recreational impact was much greater than the commercial impact. By shortening the season and only allowing them to go target fishing was not good.

He referred to Table 12, page 32, recreational gag landings in pounds. The data seems to indicate that the commercial take of gag was less than the recreational take which he disagreed with. Those in the room agreed with him.

He asked why there did not have regional management by at least county or by larger regions like a southwest quota/season. On page 7, the graph looked to be about the same, he had a hard time believing the commercial sector took 2 times more than the recreational sector.

He has seen longline boats at the dock, loading and unloading, and seem them fishing, and it was a very efficient method. He favored a stamp of some kind but questioned what they would do with the money. He supported the longliners fishing out at 50 fathoms and strongly opposed fish traps. All fish traps catch fish, not all come back on the boat and he was opposed to them. He supported a larger season, and noted he could sell a trip on being allowed to catch even one grouper rather than no grouper.

Regarding the keep the first fish idea, he opined there will not be any fish left or saved because any fish caught will go in a box on the boat and high grading would occur.

He did not believe there was a 67 % mortality rate as noted in the document.

He favored opening the goliath grouper fishery.

Frank McCallister, Fort Myers, FL, represented the Southwest Florida Spearfishing Club, he agreed with many of the points already made about the invalidity of the data. He favored size limit increases rather than closures. He opposed the keep the first fish caught idea since it would limit the effort of the fishermen and the spirit of fishing. He felt the Council needed to fix the fatally flawed data estimates. He pointed out that the new Data Collection Committee was stacked with catch share advocates.

He opposed sector separation, or appointment of any recreational shares to the commercial sector.

James Hoffman, Punta Gorda, FL, represented the Punta Gorda Isles Fishing Club and was a recreational fisherman in this region since 2003. Starting in 2004 he ran offshore to catch grouper and it was hard work to catch grouper. In 2008 it was easier to catch grouper anywhere he wanted to fish. Due to the hurricanes and the price of gas in the last few years the effort has been down and the grouper stock must have rebuilt itself during that time.

He objected to the current data particularly the estimates of fishing effort after the multiple-hurricane season Florida had. Circle hooks, venting tools, have improved the mortality of the fish he released. He had used venting tools ever since he started fishing for grouper.

To collect better data, he would support a grouper stamp, for one dollar and have that money used to mail postcards to those stamp holders and to receive the responses back on their fishing effort.

He wants to be able to know what data was being used and how to track it so he can keep the documents (amendments) honest. He requested staff put a link on the Council website directing them to the sources of the data collection, like MRIP and MRFSS, etc.

He referred to Table 2 on page 28, showing red grouper proposed allocation, and stated the recreational grouper attribution to the economy of Florida far exceeds the commercial economic impact. The Council needs to get credibility and that could be achieved if the data could be presented in black and white to the fishermen. When the commercial gets 76 percent and the recreational sector gets 23 percent the recreational sector will not be willing to accept any further reductions.

Marty McCaffrey, Punta Gorda, FL, was a recreational fisherman who retired to Florida 5 years ago to fish. He appreciated having materials at the meeting for them to take home and study.

He was appalled that in 27 years the commercial sector had 76 percent of the quota, while there are millions of retirees in Florida who wanted to fish for grouper. He would like to see the data of where the grouper were caught by region and post it on the Council website, i.e., make the data or links on the site so they can easily find the data without having to know all the programs like MRIP, etc. and find their web sites.

He would like the demographics of the fisheries in Florida to be considered and regionally modified. He suggested a recreational closure of two different months rather than two consecutive months.

When the regulations changed to allow two red grouper he appreciated that change in his favor which made the trips more cost effective. He questioned how the commercial sector could be allowed to catch smaller fish and especially not smaller than the recreational fish. He noted that small recreational fish would not have much meat on them and would be less desirable.

To gather data he suggested surveying people who attended the meetings, using say 5 questions, and gather that data, which would be better than no data. He would support a grouper tag if the funds collected for that tag would go for data collection.

Paul Caruso, North Ft. Myers, FL, represented the Coastal Angler Magazine and noted he was on board of directors for the Snook Foundation as a non-paid position. The board was mostly comprised of charter and recreational anglers rather than scientists. He believed the data was flawed. By changing the regulations so frequently it makes it difficult to see the results of the regulations and therefore harder to gather support for any further changes.

He opined that slot limits seemed to make the most sense and would be more favorable than closures.

To be allowed to catch goliath grouper would bring people from around the world to target that large of a fish and would provide a great economic boom to the area.

He opposed fish traps and felt that when they were taken out of the document the commercial sector would then ask what would they be given since the fish traps were taken away; even though it was just included as a concept for discussion.

Jim Joseph, Port Charlotte, FL was a charterboat fisherman and participates in stock assessments in a local level. He was confused by the data in Table 12 on page 23 and the statements below the chart. Ms. Morris explained that the bycatch amount was factored into the total amount of fish allowed, so if the bycatch was lower than the quota would be higher. Mr. Joseph stated that was not clear on page 23.

He asked if there was sector separation and the charterboats have to have VMS and similar regulations as being a commercial fisherman, could he then lease shares from a commercial fisherman and fish them on his charterboat. Ms. Morris noted that the Council had just begun conversations about that option or some method of transferring shares.

He supported a grouper stamp if the money collected was directed to data collection, and those with stamps were actually surveyed.

Adam Wilson, stated that the stock assessments do not seem accurate. He fully supported a grouper stamp. He did about 150 dives in the Gulf from January to November and gag grouper were everywhere, from Steinhatchee to Ft. Myers in deep and shallow water. On single dives, he would shoot his two gags and be swarmed by many other groupers. He would like to have his 5 gags back and he did not favor red grouper because he did not like worms in his fish. He had never seen a red grouper without worms. He opposed closed areas. If he had to give something back, he would probably agree with the higher size limit. He opposed fish traps and noted they only stop ghost fishing once they are so full of fish bones that no more fish could fit into them. Additionally he supported the FRA's positions.

Paul Giordano, Ft. Myers, FL spoke on behalf of CCA Florida and read a prepared statement (attached). The CCA opposed fish traps. The CCA favored the grouper allocation being divided more fairly between sectors.

Jack Thomas, Ft. Myers, FL, also believed the data was based on flawed science. He has seen the fishery in its good days in the 1970s then bad days in the 1980s and now it was much better. He noted that fishing in 150 feet of water as people in his area do would not create as high of a mortality rate as being used in the document.

He opposed a seasonal closure. He supported the current size limits and he would only consider raising the size limit if he had to give something up.

Due to the bad economy he figured many more people were not fishing. After going out past 10 miles it was possible to not see another boat especially on a week day, due to the costs of fishing that far out. He suggested the Council give the current regulations a chance to work and stop making changes every year or so.

He opposed fish traps saw firsthand their destruction in the Keys when he fished there. He supported keeping the longliners out past 50 fathoms.

He supported a grouper stamps and supported a harvest permit if the money collected would go for strong data collection.

Ozzy Fisher, Ft. Myers, FL, stated he was a 2nd generation captain and he and his father guided from this region since 1971. He always fished within 10 miles. He has seen when the stock was down and currently the stock was as good or better than in the mid 1980s. His largest gag caught was 18 pounds. He felt that if his son turned in a school science project based on the type of data included in the document his son would get an F grade.

If the commercial catch mortality was only 11 percent how could it be that the commercial size limit was reduced to stop dead discard because the fish they caught were dead since they were caught so deep.

He supported regional management and Council members being selected by region rather than scientists that do not know anything about actual fishing.

He noted that charterboat captains were a dying breed, and none were entering the industry.

He opposed any closed area, and opposed a closed area in his area due to a natural closure since the fish did not come in during the summer.

Charles Sabczuk, Sanibel, FL, represented Sanibel Fishing Club with 75 members, and he agreed that the data was flawed. He noted that those in the room has responded to a question earlier that no one had been asked about their catch and only two had been asked about their fishing effort but not about their catch. With that in mind he strongly urged that grouper be managed by zones. He pointed out that duck, deer, etc. were zoned. He felt that the data was from the panhandle and not his region.

He opposed closures, but suggested reducing the limit for a short period of time if a reduction was required.

He opposed fish traps stressing it was a horrible idea. He supported banning longliners. He believed in a grouper stamp.

He felt that more of the fisheries would be replaced by aquaculture as the shrimp industry was being decimated by aquaculture shrimp.

He felt that the fishery was so good due to the two red and two gag limit and the Council should be commended for that effort and improvement.

Tony Agin, Ft. Myers, FL, owned Captain Tony's Fishing Adventures which provided party and private charter boats from Ft. Myers Beach. He opposed fish traps. He captained boats that fish trapped and his opinions are from his own experience. The fish traps were too efficient, and would take too many fish.

He opposed longlines and had fished them so he knows their efficiency. Longlines should only be allowed out at 50 fathoms.

He opposed the first fish caught due to high grading. He was against the fish tag, fish stamp program, time and area closures. He supported bag limits. He opposed mixing sectors, either recreational or commercial.

He supported electronic logbooks for the for hire sector. Landings for the commercial sector may be accurate but was not accurate for the recreational fishery.

No need for additional endorsements, since he already had a license to catch grouper and coastal migratory pelagic.

People who attended and completed cards but did not speak:

Taylor Brown
Brent Argabright
Christopher Nappi
Ron Anderion
Dan Maloney
George Bobku
Frank Gable
Robin Leonard
James Glenn
Ken Dieffenbach
Gordon Mull

Richard Brennan
Jack Spies
Wayne Parker
Len Harris
Henry Rossi
Bill Schwartz
Russ Toops
Roy Bennett
Fred Milleman

The meeting adjourned at
9:12pm

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING – ORANGE BEACH, AL
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
January 14, 2010

Attendance:

John Greene, Gulf Council
Dr. Carrie Simmons, Gulf Council Staff
Phyllis Miranda, Gulf Council Staff

9 Members of the Public

The public scoping meeting was convened by Chairman John Greene at 6:00 p.m. Dr. Carrie Simmons reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the public. The public was then invited to provide their comments.

Ben Fairey, charterboat captain, Pensacola, FL. He felt that there was an urgency in the for-hire industry because many fishermen were in dire straits due to financial issues from loss of business. He added that the Council needs to move forward as quickly as possible to help those fishermen. He stated that there needed to be accountability for both for-hire and recreational sectors to get accurate data of how many people are fishing and how many fish are being caught so that the Council could make informed decisions. He was in favor of sector separation and felt that the Council would be able to develop better management plans for the for-hire industry which had its own unique needs compared to the purely private recreational sector. He felt there should be a limited entry system for the private recreational fishers as well. He believed that there would be a benefit in considering a the stamp program to provide accurate data on what was being caught. He was in favor of VMS for the for-hire industry, not only for law enforcement purposes, but so that there would be more flexibility in the fishery so fishermen could come and go when they had business instead of having a limited season. He stated that he was in favor of keeping the first fish caught for grouper fishing. He felt that release mortality was too high and that the size limits needed to be looked at with a possible consideration of no size limit on deep-water grouper to reduce fish mortality. He stated that the seasons for the for-hire industry were too short and should be longer. He was not in favor of fish traps if the commercial fishermen would also still be able to use their longline gear. He would like to see further research work on fish traps to develop the technology of the gear. He voiced concern about fish traps tearing up the bottom and that if there was a way to make a better fish trap that did not damage the bottom, it would be a more favorable idea.

Michael Sprinkle, recreational fisherman, Pensacola, FL. He stated that he was for sector separation and that the Charterboat should be separated from commercial fishermen and also from the recreational sector. He felt that for-hire manages their own fish because they do not overfish their spots or they would not have repeat customers. He was in favor of keeping the first fish caught for all reef fish and felt that when they were thrown back in the either would die or were eaten by other fish. He would also be in favor of website reporting.

Tracy Redding, charterboat captain, AAA Charters, Foley, AL. She stated that she supported a four grouper aggregate limit, one grouper per person to extend the fishing season. She was in favor of sector separation, electronic logbooks, and VMS units in the for-hire sector. She felt that sector separation was a top priority. She added that the fish needed to be counted and that real-time electronic logbooks should be mandatory on all boats, possibly linked with GPS. She felt that VMS had helped with enforcement.

She stated that the Council should look at the closed seasons for grouper and amberjack and see how they affect each other. For example, open one and possibly close the other.

Tom Ard, charterboat captain, Orange Beach, AL. He was in favor of a smaller bag limit, a longer season, and keeping the first fish caught. He felt that would reduce bycatch mortality. He was unfamiliar with fish traps, but felt that if the commercial sector used it as a tool to decrease bycatch, that it would be beneficial. He was in favor of sector separation, VMS, and electronic logbooks as long as the true private recreational fishermen would also have some kind of accountability measures.

Allen Kroscoe, charterboat captain, Orange Beach, AL. He felt that it is imperative to manage the fishery to enable the for-hire sector to stay in business. He stated that good data was needed to be able to manage the business, and was in favor of electronic logbooks and VMS. He added that the Gulf was getting very crowded because recreational sector keeps growing and also needs to be limited. He stated that short fishing seasons have hurt many fishermen. He felt that the for-hire sector do a great job managing their own sector. He was in favor of a reduced bag limit for grouper if the season was extended.

Others who attended but did not speak:

Chris Blankenship

Robert Turpin

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING – PANAMA CITY, FL
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
January 14, 2010

Attendance:

Bill Teehan, Gulf Council
Ed Sapp, Gulf Council
Dr. Steve Branstetter, National Marine Fisheries Service
Dr. Carrie Simmons, Gulf Council Staff
Charlene Ponce, Gulf Council Staff
Phyllis Miranda, Gulf Council Staff

65 Members of the Public

The public scoping meeting was convened by Chairman Bill Teehan at 6:00 p.m. He then reviewed the format of the meeting, explaining that Dr. Carrie Simmons would first give a PowerPoint presentation on Amendment 32, and then the meeting would be split into two rooms. The first room would be for a round table discussion Chaired by Ed Sapp, and the second room would be for public testimony Chaired by Bill Teehan.

Dr. Simmons reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the public. The public was then invited to provide their comments.

Gerard Ramsden, recreational fisherman, Panama City Beach, FL. He stated that he was concerned about annual catch limits for red grouper and gag. He noted that fishing is the main thing that many of the snow birds that come to Florida and contribute to the economy come to do. He was concerned that if the season was to be changed from beginning in April to beginning in June, the snow birds would lose out on the season and would need to look elsewhere for recreational fishing. He stated that he would like to see the grouper season remain opening April 1st so that they would still have an opportunity to fish.

Capt. Mike Eller, Destin Charterboat Assoc. He noted that the reason for the recreational sector not catching their quota in 2009 is because the fish were not there to be caught. He stated that the back-to-back storms in 2005 moved and buried large quantities of adult groupers out of their traditional habitat, and that the recreational fishermen were catching more than 20 groupers on their trips because groupers were pushed in toward shore. He added that following those storms there was also almost a year-long red tide episode. He believed that these combined events had caused a decrease in population of groupers. He questioned why in Section 1.3.9.1, “providing a consistent allocation for recreational and for-hire” was in the scoping document because it did not make sense. He stated that he believes that the recreational and for-hire sector already have a consistent allocation. He was against fish traps because he did not believe that fish traps were the solution. He felt that if a fish trap that could not be lost or broken off could be devised that he would be more receptive to the idea. He added that he felt if commercial fishermen were allowed to use fish traps, then recreational fishermen should also be able to use fish traps. He felt that there should be eligibility requirements for grouper endorsements and participation in the reporting process. He was against catch shares but felt that sector separation would be a possible management tool in the future. He stated that if the sectors were separated, then each sector would not get enough fish. He stated that 10 years for the rebuilding of the fishery was a better idea than 5-7 years. He

felt that keeping the first fish was not the way to go and believed there were better ways to reduce bycatch mortality, such as education on the boats and slowing down how quickly the fishermen catch fish. He supported the use of electronic logbooks. He felt that there should be some type of federal license, permit, or stamp needed to participate in the fishery in federal waters so that those who are fishing federal waters would be identified and it could be tracked who is catching what type of fish. He felt that there should be a longer grouper season, even if it meant having a smaller bag limit. He was not opposed to time area closures and felt that spawning sites should be protected.

Capt. Chuck Guilford, charterboat captain, Mexico Beach, FL. He stated that he had been in the fishery business for 33 years, was retired from the U.S. Army, was a graduate of the University of Nebraska, and currently his business was living off of a bank loan due to changes in regulations, the restrictions on catch limits, and the decline in the economy. He added that he had seen fish stocks decrease and bounce back because of natural forces of nature and was surprised to see that was recognized in our summary of Amendment 32. He noted that he believed size limits and catch limits had caused the fishermen to kill more fish than they could possibly have caught because of bycatch mortality. He believed that the data that is being used by the Council and NMFS was insufficient and flawed in many areas. He stated that the required VMS system was installed on his boats and that it was required to retain his commercial permits. He felt that longlining had killed more in-shore and deep-water grouper than any other method. He added that he was against sector separation.

B.J. Burkett, charterboat captain, Panama City, FL. He was of the opinion that nature should be regulating the fishing. He was against catch shares, but was in favor of logbooks and felt that the recreational sector should also be required to use them. He was against sector separation. He added that he would rather have a reduced bag limit than a shorter season. He believed that the dolphins are a problem contributing to bycatch mortality and something needed to be done. He also felt that there was a need for more enforcement.

Deborah Logan, My-Way Seafood, Panacea, FL. She felt that with the IFQ system just implemented, if further restrictions were put on the fishermen, many businesses would close. She noted that many fishermen did not receive enough shares to stay in business under the IFQ system.

Samuel Logan, Seaweed, Inc., Panacea, FL. He stated that he owns two reef permits which allowed him a fair amount of grouper allocation. He felt that further changes in the regulations would put a strain on the fishermen and would cause many businesses to close. He felt that there was a lot of snapper and that the limit should be increased.

Benjamin Kelley, charterboat captain, Panama City, FL. He felt that sector separation would not reduce the grouper catch and that sector separation had nothing to do with good management. He noted that catch shares was not enforceable because the people with more money would own most of the shares and those who did not have a lot of money would not be able to own shares. He added that a closed season was the worst possible thing to do for grouper fishermen. He believed that a reduction in the bag limit would be more beneficial. He stated that a longer season for snapper and grouper was needed to keep the fishermen in business. He added that he is opposed to catch shares.

John Law, charterboat captain, Panama City Beach, FL. He stated that he was against sector separation and that the fishermen could not tolerate a shorter season or closures. He was also against trip shares.

John Geisler, recreational fisherman, Panama City Beach, FL. He stated that he is a snow bird from Michigan and has had a Florida recreational fishing license for the past 5 years. He believed that shorter fishing seasons would harm the tourist industry. He felt that if season could be extended in to April and May, it would be beneficial because of the tourist dollars spent in the state of Florida.

Bart Niquet, Niquet Fisheries, Lynn Haven, FL. He stated that the grouper issue is overwhelming everybody and that there is a lot of red snapper. He felt that the red snapper bag limited to should be increased to 3 on recreational boats and that the season should be extended to six months long. He added that checking the recreational boats before they come through the passes would help with enforcement. He stated that instead of shortening the grouper season, the bag limit could be decreased.

D. Kirt Senft, Quincy, FL. He stated that he was against fish traps. He felt that turtles would get caught in the lines, and that there was no way to discourage gag grouper from going into the traps instead of red grouper. He was against sector separation and felt that it would not be accepted. He stated that the red snapper eat the grouper as they are being caught. He questioned if the data was being collected at different times in the same areas. He felt it would be a good way to tell differences in the stock of an area. He felt that collecting the data randomly does not work. He added that Internet surveys of the fishermen would be a good idea. He was in favor of extending the season.

Patrick Green, dive operator, Panama City, FL. He stated that he felt there were better ways to calculate effort. He noted that Federal excise tax has to be filed on fishing tackle and that could be included in the numbers. He added that random surveys of pay-for-parking or pay-for-access launch sites would also give an idea of who is fishing.

Tom Carpenter, recreational fisherman, Marianna, FL. He felt that Florida fishermen would be willing to pay more for a fishing license to create more revenue and that out of state fishermen should pay a higher fishing license fee. He stated that more reefs should be established and that there was too much sand and not enough habitat for the fish.

Fred Carpenter, recreational fisherman, Marianna, FL. He was in favor of increasing the bag limit on red snapper. He noted that there were areas where there was an ample supply of grouper. He believed that a lot of the data on grouper is coming from spots where the grouper are not. He felt that the grouper season should be lengthened.

John Brady, Lynn Haven, FL. He read into the record a written statement, which is attached. In summary, he was against a year-round closed season and felt that the data collection system needed to be improved. He was against adjusting the current catch limits, sector separation, a fish tag or stamp program for grouper, the reintroduction of fish traps, and the catch share program. He was in favor of a February through March closure, an increase in size limits for gag and black grouper, and the removal of the MRFSS system.

Paul Erben, recreational fisherman, Panama City, FL. He stated that he did not understand how quotas, bag limits, and sizes of grouper can be changed without understanding the impact of the explosion of red snapper population. He felt that the sampling techniques were not working and that decisions were being made without having good data. He was against fish traps and felt that longlining should be done away with.

Ted Forsgren, CCA Florida. He emphasized CCA's objections to the grouper IFQ and catch share program. He felt it should be more fair and equitable for all those involved. He questioned why 65% of red and gag grouper were given to the commercial fishing industry. He stated that catch shares are not about conservation, but more about allocation and access to public fishing areas. He noted that fish traps should not be considered instead of longlines because it was a bad piece of gear, it gets lost and continues to kill. He stated that they do not support sector separation within the recreational fishery.

Jim Clements, Carabelle, FL. He expressed surprise that the Council would consider bringing back a fishery that was banned 3 years ago. He felt that if the fish traps were allowed, they should be able to be used by all fishermen, not just commercial fishermen. He supported a time area closure in spawning grounds when fish are spawning. He felt that use of multi-use shares for gag grouper should be reduced or should be used to catch red snapper and that the shares should be used only for healthy species. He also felt that gag catch could be reduced and replaced with red snapper catch since that fishery is healthier.

Mark Kelley, charterboat captain, Panama City, FL. He stated that he was against catch shares, sector separation, and bringing back the fish traps.

Holly Binns, Pew Environment Group. She noted that gag and red grouper are two of the most important shallow-water groupers off the coast of Florida and must be protected. She stated that red grouper population had also declined sharply, but remained just above the overfishing level. She felt that the current population level of red group should be considered when making revisions to management measures.

Charlie Paprocki, charterboat captain, Panama City Beach, FL. He was opposed to the IFQs. He felt that shares are being bought but not being fished and that it was hurting the smaller fishermen that do not have the shares to fish. He was against sector separation and felt that it weakens the separated groups. He added that the red snapper are eliminating the grouper and that something would need to be done.

Pam Anderson, Panama City Boatman Assoc., Panama City, FL. She was opposed to catch shares as well as sector separation. She stated that a lot of inexpensive programs could be used, such as a stamp program, that would not be invasive to the fishermen's privacy. She noted that data could be collected the day of the trip and did not have to be done by the expensive VMS system, but instead could use a telephone or web-based reporting system. She added that fuel sales were down 70% from 2005 to 2009, which meant that effort was down. She was in favor of electronic logbooks as long as there was not a VMS requirement.

Frank Bowling, recreational fisherman, Panama City Beach, FL. He felt that if it was necessary to compete to get a catch share, then he would no longer be able to fish because he was a recreational fisherman and felt that he was the small guy at the end of the line. He stated that released fish are eaten by dolphins or sharks which adds to the bycatch mortality. He was in favor of keeping the first fish regardless of size and felt that it would cut down on the mortality rate. He noted more abundance of red snapper than he had ever seen. He stated that he would like to see the bag limit of red snapper increased as the population was there to support it.

Henry Hunt, charterboat captain, Panama City, FL. He was opposed to sector separation and catch shares, as well as VMS. He also noted an opposition to fish traps re-entering the fisheries as well as longlining.

David Singley, commercial fisherman, Apalachicola, FL. He stated that he was opposed to fish traps. He noted that red grouper size was down to 5½ pounds prior to the removal of fish traps and that, in 2007, the first year after traps were eliminated, there was over a pound increase size as well as the next year. He noted that this year he was seeing much bigger red grouper. He felt that fishermen should not have been awarded IFQs based on previous catch from the use of the fish traps as it would be unfair to those who had not used fish traps.

Others who attended but did not speak:

John Patronis
William Shackelford
Roger Wilbourn
John Lee
H.D. Adams, Jr.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

SUMMARY REPORT
SCOPING MEETING - KENNER, LA
REEF FISH AMENDMENT 32
JANUARY 19, 2010

Attendees:

Damon McKnight, Gulf Council
Steven Atran, Gulf Council Staff
Charlotte Schiaffo, Gulf Council Staff

17 Members of the Public

Chair Damon McKnight called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and read the Chair Statement.

Mr. Atran then gave a PowerPoint presentation outlining the issues contained in the scoping document.

An audience member asked if the stock assessments shown were Gulf-wide or only from certain areas.

Mr. Atran replied that for the red grouper, the assessment was Gulf-wide; although he conceded that red grouper were not plentiful in the western Gulf.

Mr. Zelenka, a member of the Fishing Rights Alliances (FRA) noted that he had been fishing for 40 years, and him and many people he knew spent much money on fishing and diving. He stated that the data used for the recommendations was faulty and he wanted no more regulation on the fishery until better data was available. He was opposed to any closures, fish traps; catch shares, or separating the sectors.

Mr. Stone, a spearfisher, reminded the Council that they worked for the public, and that recreational anglers numbered in the millions. He stated he was contacting Congress to let them know the Council was using bad data, and that the Council was not following the mandates of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. He added that Congress could disband the Council if it did not follow the rules or produce good data. He pointed out that the Council's data had been wrong on red grouper and red snapper and that the data sampling methods used needed to be changed. He expressed frustration that the Council website was hard to navigate, with too many links and added that MRFSS data was highly inaccurate.

Mr. McKnight interjected to explain how to send comments to the Council.

Mr. Stone then asked who the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) members were.

Mr. Atran explained the SSC function and where its members were recruited.

Mr. Carpenter, a charterboat operator, had concerns about a fish tag program, stating that it seemed geared towards a limited access program, and that unused tags could create a problem. He added that the stamps were not grouper specific, and that a reef fish stamp was already being considered, so a grouper stamp was not needed in addition. He stated that extra fees and licenses were too much of a burden. He felt that the grouper tag did not belong in the scoping document, that it should be in a separate paper. He reiterated other statements about the need for better data, and noted that Internet service, especially on the water could be spotty, thus giving inaccurate data. He suggested that a paper system be used as a backup. He also took issue with some of the wording in the document, stating that the phrase "grouper specific" be

changed to “regulated species,” and that the recommendations for electronic logbooks and vessel monitoring systems (VMS) should also avoid such wording. He felt there were too many rules; however, he would support electronic logbooks if they were used for the entire fishery, not just charterboats, noting that dockside surveys would be helpful with logbooks. He was opposed to grouper endorsements, and noted that grouper was a good fish to fall back on if other species were not available, suggesting that an allotment system would be useful,

Mr. Sagerhalm, a member of the 100 Fathom Fishing Club, was opposed to the sector separation. He stated that it was a ploy to divide and conquer the sectors and set them against one another. He had concerns about VMS and grouper endorsements stating that VMS was a bad idea and prohibitively costly, over \$10,000 each, and unnecessary. He felt that endorsements were just individual fishing quotas (IFQs) disguised, and that fish traps were damaging and unneeded. He added that if the head and charterboat industries were forced to use VMS, then the rest of the recreational fishery would eventually be required to do so. He expressed concern that environmental groups could buy up fish stamps and prevent anglers from fishing. He thought that the data collection methods were unreliable and that more scientific data and research was needed. He was not sure about keeping the first fish recommendation for gag, while he thought it might be a good idea, he stated that further research was needed.

Mr., Trascher, a Coastal Conservation Association (CCA) member, was opposed to fish traps, saying they would contribute to overfishing, and that alternatives were needed to destructive commercial fishing methods. He stated that the recreational fishery was the most valuable to the Gulf, and that the commercial fishery was only marginal. He noted that 5 years ago, the CCA had requested a different allocation to reflect this, yet nothing had changed, adding that the data used to determine allocations was bad, and that the Council was giving away a public resource to commercial interests.

Mr. Huge, a CCA member, opposed fish traps, stating that they had a history of being lost and unattended and that they killed fish. He opposed sector separation, saying that it would pit anglers against each other. He stated that data collection was horrendous, and that there were major problems with dockside surveys. He suggested using web and telephone surveys instead. He feared that unless recreational anglers participated in surveys and let their wishes be known, their fishery could be taken away.

Mr. Rossignol, a member of the HellDivers Spearfishing Club, stated that at the first Council meeting he attended, a Council member told him his presence did not matter, so there was no need for him to show up, since the Council would do whatever they wanted, no matter what angler input they received. He supported the current Fishing Rights Alliance (FRA) lawsuit against the Council. He was opposed to fish traps and sector separation. He stated that the data was fatally flawed, and that effort in the fishery was way down.

Mr. Migaud, a member of the HellDivers Spearfishing Club, stated that red tide had supposedly decreased the red grouper fishery, and referred to a St. Petersburg, Florida article that noted the fishery had recovered from a similar red tide in 1971 in 18 months. He did not understand how the 2005 red tide event did not show fish coming back after 5 years. He felt that the method of random phone calls to collect data was a terrible idea.

Mr. Atran said it would be interesting to see if the red tide fish recovery happened in state or federal waters.

Mr. Migaud replied that the results would have to have been taken in deep water where grouper congregated. He added that the Council was using bad data as criteria for their effort figures. He was against fish traps and sector separation, and stated that too much of the fishery was given to the commercial sector.

Mr. Atran noted that offshore MRFSS data numbers every year since 2005 had shown a decrease in effort.

Mr. Armstrong, owner of Pelagic Products, said better management was needed of the gag fishery. He was opposed to sector separation and supported closures during spawning season. He urged that bycatch issues in the commercial fishery be studied and that better data collection methods be implemented.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Several attendees stayed for a question and answer session, which was not recorded.

Mr. Williams, a charterboat captain, testified that extra license fees were onerous, and while he supported VMS, he did not believe it belonged in this amendment.

Mr. Atran explained that the scoping meetings in Florida had involved round table discussions, and that some had worked out well, and others had not. He noted that key concerns of those meetings were fish traps and data collection reliability. He asked for suggestions on how public input could be improved.

One audience member requested that concerns expressed at meetings be put on the Council website.

Mr. Atran replied that briefing books contained public testimony and were available on the website.

Another person suggested that surveys be split between the Eastern and Western Gulf.

Mr. Rossignol and Mr. Zelenka gave written statements which are attached.

Members of the Public who spoke:

Toby Armstrong
Daryl Carpenter
George Huge
Terry Migaud
Lois Rossignol
Mark Sagerhalm
Walter Stone
Rod Trascher
Mandy Tumlin
Steve Zelenka

Gulf Council Members,

My name is Rob Harris and I live in Key West, Florida. In addition to owning/operating two charter vessels I also own/operate Conchy Joe's Marine and Tackle here in Key West. I also am the Chairman of the Board for the Key West Fishing Tournament and Vice Chairman of the Monroe County Tourism Development Council Fishing Umbrella. I also hold a seat on the SAFMC Grouper/Snapper Advisory Panel. And of course I am also a recreational fisherman in the waters surrounding the Lower Keys.

I am painfully aware of the scientific data being used in stock assessments. I have been, and will continue to be very skeptical of the data sets being used to close our fisheries. I am also aware of the anvil known as Magnuson/Stevens being held over the council's head.

As you may or may not know, the Florida Keys are the only waters that are managed by three separate governing bodies. We have the Gulf Council, South Atlantic Council and our own State Agency (FWC). We are also the only group of fishermen that can fish all three areas in the course of a single day.

When trying to prioritize seasons, bag limits, size limits and Total Allowable Catches, I think that the Council needs to step outside the box it has itself closed in and think of things in a different way. With every assessment, there is a EIS (economic impact study). The council needs to re-think how it views this document and place the betterment of the whole at the forefront.

Communities such as those that line the Florida Keys are prime examples of how the economic impact of the recreational angler is being set aside for the sole economic gain of the few commercial interests. The Keys as a whole are suffering from a lack of recreational fishing based tourist which effects every aspect of every person living in the island chain. For-Hire fishermen are seeing record lows for bookings and are having to resort to commercial fishing to pay their bills. When this happens hotel reservations plummet, restaurants sit empty, local attractions falter and eventually core business fail. Electricians, plumbers, distributors and the like begin to fall like dominoes.

To summarize my comments so that nothing gets lost in translation:

I am against any use of community resources that does not maximize it's potential economic gain for every member of a community. Emphasis must be placed on keeping recreational fishermen involved in their pastime for the longest period of time while maximizing their catching opportunity. Until the Council is willing to adopt a regional management method, you will continue to punish one community over others. Due to the large commercial interests in the Northern Regions of the Gulf, the mid to south Florida region and the Florida Keys will always be second in line and like the young child in "Oliver Twist", we will be left asking for more soup.

I am against taking the For-Hire "Charter" boats out of the Recreational Sector. Doing so would place them directly in the line-of-fire of every other known sector and environmental groups. They would instantly become the smallest sector and open to allocation attacks from the larger groups.

I am against even considering allowing Fish Traps being placed in any body of water.

What I am in favor of is better management tools in our fisheries. We as Americans strive everyday to use the best possible scientific advances to further our knowledge of the world around us. We see this in space exploration, medical advances and the like. Yet here we are, using outdated studies and formulas, some from the 1970's, to ascertain fish stocks in our waters. Until we update our methodology, we will continue to have knee-jerk reactions that are only proven to hurt our communities. We further convolute that information by using it to maximize catch shares for the few at the expense of the many.

Thank You for your time,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Robert W. Harris". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Robert" being more prominent.

Capt Rob Harris, Key West

What the Council needs to be looking at is how to best use the available resources to their maximum extent. Recreational fishing is a multi-billion dollar sector to Florida alone. We have already seen the impacts of Catch Shares allocations working against the small commercial fishermen and to the benefit of the larger operations. The larger Commercial operations are now making a move to absorb every pound they can get in allocation, even at the expense of members of their own sector.

Now there is a move to include the "For-Hire" fishermen into their own sector which would be a complete dis-service to the Charterboat operator. By moving the For-Hire sector into the Commercial sector you will only force a further reallocation of assets already not being utilized to it's fullest.

Also, by placing VMS on For-Hire vessels you will be placing an already stressed sector into increased financial burden with no possible gain. These systems would be required to remain on at the dock as well as in Atlantic waters causing a financial drain on a already choked industry in the Keys. Any reporting system under consideration for the recreational sector should only be on a volunteer basis.

The Gulf Council now believes that Red Grouper, while not in an over-fished status, is on the decline. Could that have anything to do with the Council reducing the commercial minimum size limit on Red Grouper to 18" while maintaining a 20" minimum for recreational anglers? Since we have hard evidence that each fish has a much higher value to the communities and industries revolving around recreational fishing, we shouldn't allow the commercial sector to harvest anything that is off limits to the recreational sector. If anything, the limits should be stricter on the commercial sector as they do with Black and Gag Grouper. Every effort should be made to keep the much more economically valuable recreational season open for as long as possible to achieve maximum benefit for everyone involved, either directly or indirectly, in the fishery.

To even consider allowing the use of Fish Traps may be most absurd notion that I have ever borne witness to coming from such a knowledgeable group of people. Taking into consideration the painstaking measures we all endured to remove the traps from our waters, the time/effort that went into that undertaking. Now here we are again discussing the possible use of traps again. And to who do we have to thank for this devolution?

Dr. Samuel W. Smith
11642 Pamela Lane
Youngstown, Florida 32466

14 April 1994

Dr. Andrew Kemmerer
Director, Southeast Region
National Marine Fisheries Service
Duval Building
9450 Koger Boulevard
Saint Petersburg, Florida 33702

Dear Sir:

This letter represents a quick look at the expected life of a sample of wire mesh supplied by Mr. Don DeMaria. The exposure environment is seawater at depths of 200 to 400 feet.

The mesh appears constructed of steel wire which has been galvanized and coated with a plastic film. The wire is 0.083 inches in diameter and the plastic film is 0.022 inches in thickness. Sections of the wire mesh are joined by stainless steel "hog rings".

The normal life expectancy of the galvanized coating on the steel is about one year per mil of thickness (1 mpy). Although I could not measure the thickness on the sample provided, typical coatings are on the order of five mils, resulting in an expected life of five years. The uniform corrosion rate of uncoated steel in seawater is 4.6 mpy. This will tend to vary in this case because of limited exposure areas (exposure areas will result from breaks in the plastic coating) and the interaction with other metals (such as the stainless clips). The low temperatures in this environment will result in a lower corrosion rate than would be predicted from typical test data. Normally tests are run at temperatures in the range of 80 degrees Fahrenheit in Florida. The temperatures at these depths are approximately 60 degrees. This would lower the corrosion rate by approximately 25%.

This is not, however, the main issue in the life of the mesh. The mesh, as used in fish traps, fails from corrosion locally where the plastic film and galvanized coating is damaged. As long as the plastic film remains undamaged, the mesh and therefore the traps, will last indefinitely. While in use the traps are damaged during deployment and recovery and consequently have reduced lives. If relatively new traps are lost, there is nothing to damage the film and the traps last practically forever.


This is true in any seawater environment, for example both the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. There is no difference. The only way to insure a known, limited life for these traps is to outlaw the use of plastic or otherwise coated mesh (bare

metal), external zinc or other sacrificial anodes, and to prorated the corrosion rate for the temperatures at the depth of deployment on at least a panel on the trap. If anodes or galvanized coatings are used on the rest of the trap there can be no electric contact between the panel and the rest of the trap.

My understanding is that biodegradation of a hemp twine is currently expected to open a panel on lost traps. Aside from the fact that this is very easily circumvented, biodegradation, especially in deeper waters, is unpredictable. In deeper cold waters organic materials can survive much longer than expected based on shallow water data.

If I can provide further information or help in any other way please feel free to ask. My daytime phone is (904) 235-5803.

Sincerely,



Samuel W. Smith, Sc.D., P.E.

About the author:

Dr. Smith has a Doctorate in Ocean Engineering jointly from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution awarded in 1981. He was a Professor of Ocean Engineering at Florida Atlantic University in Marine Corrosion from 1981 to 1988. Since 1988 he has worked on special projects in ocean engineering for the US Navy at the NSWC Coastal Systems Station in Panama City, Florida.

Varne Linkhorn
124 Ngapuhi Road,
Remuera, Auckland,
NEW ZEALAND

5th January, 1994

Mr. Don DeMaria,
P.O. Box 420975,
Summerland Key, FLORIDA

Dear Don,

Thank you very much for your letter and video about the fishing traps. Yes, it was enjoyable to talk on the flight to Los Angeles. I watched the video with great interest, because most people in New Zealand are very protective about what goes on with our surrounding waters, especially ecology wise. We have very strict laws controlling both the commercial and recreational fishing of our waters. It is indeed sad that the fish trap is in use and the operators of such devices flaunt the rules about the containment of the escape panels. A few years ago in this country we had problems with commercial fishing being carried out in some areas using box net traps. These were quite large and inevitably some were lost and continued to trap fish, including young dolphins. Parliament was lobbied very strongly and the use of such practice was totally banned. You are probably also well aware of the use of drift nets by the Japanese in the Pacific area. These were labelled "The wall of death" and were very indiscriminate in the size or species of fish that were caught. A lot of these were Marlin, all kinds of Bill-Fish and worst of all Dolphins. I am a recreational game-fisher but also are very serious about the practice of catching and tagging all types of fish. Fortunately the practice of drift fishing has abated in the South Pacific, due, I believe, to most Nations in the area making great protests to the Japanese Government. We in New Zealand have a 200 mile Economic Zone around our country as do most other Pacific places. Is this not so in the U.S.A. as well?

Now for the bad news! The piece of fish trap that you sent me, I have studied for a period of time and have come to the following conclusions.


It is manufactured from galvanised steel wire that has been heavily and well coated with a plastic material. The stainless steel rings that are used to hold all the panels of the trap together, are of a very high grade and if the specimen that you sent me has been in the salt water for at least the period of 4 years, is showing little or no signs of corrosion. Normally, stainless steels that are used in this type work are of a poor grade, such as 302 or 304, and deteriorate quite rapidly due to crevice corrosion.

As was shown in the video, the traps are in very good condition and with the help of the crabs etc. are kept clean of marine growth. This also will help the traps to be corrosion free. Especially the stainless steel rings. As you mentioned in your letter, some of these traps have zinc anodes attached which will further lengthen the life of the device. As far as I can ascertain, I would put the probable life of these traps at 20 to 25 years before they begin to deteriorate. This, along with the methods of keeping the escape hatches closed, will be devastating on fish breeding processes if these items cannot all be recovered.

I hope this information, even though depressing, is of help to you. Please keep in touch and I look forward to being of some help to you in the future.

I wish you and yours a very Happy New Year.

Kindest regards,



Verne Linkhorn
Marine Corrosion Consultant

MARINE CORROSION SERVICES

VERNE LINKHORN
CONSULTANT

124 NGAPUHI ROAD
REMUERA, AUCKLAND
NEW ZEALAND

PHONE (09) 520-0052
FAX: (09) 520-0052
011 649 5200052



Texas Recreational Fishing Alliance

Jim Smarr, Texas State Chairman

jimsmarr@charter.net

www.rfatexas.org

RFA / TEXAS

P.O. Box 58

Fulton TX 78358



January 14, 2009

Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council

RE: Scoping Document for Reef Fish Amendment 32

Public Comment- Galveston, Texas

Chairman Shipp,

This document includes a statement on page 11 – This document includes a consideration of further subdividing the recreational allocation into a for hire (Charterboat and Headboat) allocation and private recreational sectors.

The Recreational Fishing Alliance is opposed to any sector separation for any species within the recreational user groups.

The Recreational Fishing Alliance is opposed to Catch Shares-IFQ's for any species. We feel giving a public resource that belongs to all Americans as the Council and NMFS has done for the Commercial sector violates the Tenants in Commons going back to the Magna Carta.

We believe the NMFS needs to follow the intent of the Magnuson Act. First by waiting until Recreational catch data problem is solved before pushing forward with any further plan amendments. Secondly abandon any sector separation, IFG or Catch Share plans for the recreational sector.

RFA Texas appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments for your consideration

Sincerely,

Jim Smarr
Chairman
Texas R.F.A.
P.O. Box 58
Fulton, Texas 78382

Gulf Of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100
Tampa, FL 33607


I am Captain Marc Wilkerson owner of Blue Streak Fishing Charters in Freeport Texas.

I am here to make public comment that I am in favor of sector separation of the for- hire sector.

Accountability should be from the use of vessel monitoring systems, a telephone or web based reporting system; and or the use of electronic log books.

I support the sector separation of the for- hire sector because there will be 100% accountability of the fish that will provide the NMFS data that will be used to insure the future of my business and other for-hire business and their families.

Captain Marc Wilkerson

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Captain Marc Wilkerson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

41 Marlin
Freeport, TX 77541
979-236-8368

January 11, 2010

Dear GOMFMC Members,

I am here today to address my opposition to the proposed implementation of catch shares and/or sector separation in the Gulf of Mexico recreational fishing sector. Both ideas will drastically change our fishing rights and our heritage as we know it, are uncalled for, unneeded, and un-American.

Many researchers have concluded, including the National Research Council, that Catch Shares are an economic allocation tool not a conservation tool. Just look at the instant millionaires that the commercial IFQ system created when you "gifted" a portion of our public natural resource to a select few commercial snapper fishermen. There are still many unanswered questions regarding whether or not IFQs are actually benefitting the fishery, and whether there is justification for privatizing of the fishery - U.S. fish resources belong to the public.

Catch Shares are an economic tool that revolves around the privatization of a public resource which could then be traded and sold as commodities, an ideology pushed hard by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF). Given our nation's recent disastrous experience with the unintended and negative consequences of deregulation and poor oversight of financial and real estate markets, I do not trust our federal government to introduce any economic concept into the fisheries, especially when cloaked as a conservation tool.

This "paradigm shift" in the approach to managing the fisheries, is being pushed by EDF-affiliated financial advisers with ties to Milken and Lehman Brothers - 2 of the most notable names related to FAILED financial schemes. Incredibly, people are actually listening to them; "Two months before the Environmental Defense Fund achieved a political policy triumph with the vote last week to transform the New England groundfishery from a commonly held resource into negotiable commodities, a bullish EDF executive was urging institutional investors to buy these catch shares. EDF vice president David Festa's projection was a 400 percent return on the investment, based on what he said was recent experiences with the imposition of catch shares in other fisheries. All of this will be funded by picking the pockets of every recreational fisherman and our children.

Currently, as you know, the Gulf snapper quota is divided into 51% commercial and 49% recreational portions. The "SOS Plan", which is again being pushed by EDF to carve out a 57% portion of the recreational quota and gift it to the charter-for-hire industry through Sector Separation. The SOS Plan would reduce the CFH sector by eliminating most of the part-time charter operators. This plan would unfairly restrict access to the fishery to private recreational fishermen which would then be limited to 21% of the total Gulf quota even though they are the majority stakeholder in the fishery. This has HUGE economic consequences which have not been addressed at all, which goes against what is mandated in the MSA. It's also un-needed as there has been an 18% drop in recreational saltwater fishing participation in the years 1996 to 2006, with a 15% decline from 2001 to 2006, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2008pubs/fhw06-nat.pdf> published by the USFWS.

This federal study shows a steep downward trend in recreational participation in the latter half of that 10 year span. This SHARPLY contradicts what the environmental.orgs and thus NMFS claims to be happening.

In fact, the NMFS seems to have no sense of accountability whatsoever — no sense of the need to back up its business-killing tactics with viable data, and no sense of the need to hold off on any regulatory changes until it at least validates the records used to put these new limits in place.

NMFS must get its house and data in order before making wholesale changes in the regulation of the Gulf of Mexico fisheries — and any move to recreational fishermen's catch shares and/or sector separation must be held until there's a sense they are based on true and credible data.

Federal regulators, such as yourselves, are citing the Magnuson-Stevens Act as reason for pushing Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures even though the same MSA has mandated implementation of a better data collection system PRIOR to such action. The NMFS has thumbed its nose at Congress by ignoring this Congressional mandate even though it was required to be in place by January 1, 2009. Congress understood the importance of upgrading the existing MFRSS system (which data has been proven to be fatally flawed), prior to implementing any new Annual Catch Limits or Accountability Measures such as Catch Shares. It is negligence to the highest degree to continue to use outdated data collection methods, especially when directed by Congress to cease doing so, AND to base your management decisions knowingly on this outdated information.

Please implement the new MRIP program and give it time to produce accurate, timely data, as mandated by Congress, before even considering ACLs or AMs such as Catch Shares and/or Sector Separation.

Sincerely,



Thomas J. Hilton

5310 East Plantation Oaks

Arcola, TX 77583

713 530-2267 hilton@rt-nav.com

P.S. / support GOMARS
/ support fish stamps for data collection purposes
but not for limiting the entry into the fishery.
/ support first fish caught
/ support telephone or web-based reporting system
/ do not support VMS in recreational sector.

**Coastal Conservation Association
Comments on the
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
Gag/Red Grouper Amendment Scoping Document
(Reef Fish Amendment 32)**

The Coastal Conservation Association, representing more than 80,000 members in state chapters along the Gulf Coast, has major concerns about several aspects of Amendment 32 dealing with new regulations to end overfishing for gag grouper.

According to the results of last year's stock assessment developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), it appears that reductions in harvest on the order of 75 percent may be considered for this fishery. Additionally, at the last meeting of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, the issue of allowing fish traps to be reintroduced into the commercial grouper fishery was added to the current round of public hearings as an alternative gear to reduce sea turtle mortality associated with bottom longline gear. CCA wants the fish trap issue removed from the amendment and destructive longline gear eliminated from the grouper fisheries

Fish traps were removed from the Gulf of Mexico in 2007 after years of controversy over their destructiveness and have also been outlawed in the Atlantic and state waters. This gear is "invisible" once deployed and ample evidence has been supplied by state and federal law enforcement agents to conclude that it is nearly impossible to observe the gear and enforce any escape gap or panel regulations. The traps have a high rate of loss and, once lost, they become ghost traps, filling with fish that die and attract other fish in a long-lasting cycle. The traps fish 24 hours a day and can out-compete other gears.

Further, the traps are not needed in the commercial fishery as a substitute for longline gear as ample effort exists in the vertical line (bandit or hook-and-line gear) sector to take the allowable catch. Allowing any use of fish traps in the Gulf will create conflicts and make it difficult to enforce their prohibition from state waters, the Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary and South Atlantic waters. There exists ample evidence of the destructive and uncontrollable nature of fish traps in the record of the Gulf Council's previous deliberations that resulted in the banning of this gear. Nothing has changed since that time and the use of this gear should not even be considered. CCA urges the Council and the NMFS to focus on alternatives that effectively reduce destructive commercial fishing effort to the greatest extent possible rather than searching for ways to perpetuate a marginal commercial fishery.

Regarding any proposed regulations to end overfishing of gag grouper, CCA requested five years ago that the Gulf Council develop formal allocations for grouper based on maximizing the value and benefits of this common property resource. The Council began an amendment to do this and formed committees to set standards for this issue. However, for the past two years no further action has been taken. Given the apparent necessity of future restrictions on gag harvest, we believe that it is absolutely necessary for the Council to finally include allocation of this resource in Amendment 32. The Gulf Council's Grouper IFQ program allocates and grants exclusive right of access to more than 65 percent of all the Gulf red and gag grouper to a limited number of commercial interests. The magnitude of this giveaway of a public fishery is unprecedented. NMFS must stop enacting programs which subsidize marginal commercial fisheries while strangling the much more valuable recreational grouper fisheries.

CCA will develop a formal position on new quotas, size limits, bag limits and seasons for gag in the coming months and will bring these ideas back to the public hearings on this amendment. In the meantime, CCA urges the Council to act responsibly and not risk destroying the very valuable economic benefits that flow into the Gulf states and this nation from recreational fishing for grouper and other reef fish.

For more information, contact:

Ted Venker, CCA Communications Director

1-800-201-3474

twvenker@JoinCCA.org

More than 30 Years of Conservation
Dedicated to the Conservation and Protection of Marine Life
6919 Portwest Drive, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
Fax (713) 626-5852
Phone (713) 626-4234
www.JoinCCA.org

First let me thank you for your time to speak on this matter.

Fishing and spearfishing have been coastal traditions for thousands of years. We must find a way to keep these traditions alive. There is no doubt The Gulf of Mexico is in serious need of enforceable legislation regarding sustainable fishing practices. Data and reports of fish stocks clearly show that our current measures and proposed future measures are not and will not work for the good of the fish or the good of the people. We need to explore different ways to ensure there is a future for these great traditions.

The definition of insanity is repeating the same action multiple times and expecting a different outcome each time. Why would this be any different?

As you are aware, every five years the Census Bureau conducts the "National Survey of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife-Associated Recreation." The economic impact for 2007 through saltwater fishing alone was over \$3.5 Billion Dollars in retail sales for the Gulf States and had an overall impact of over \$5 Billion dollars and created over 80,000 jobs. Add to the boating industries impact of \$18.5 billion and 220,000 jobs. This is a matter that requires a great deal of deliberation.

I don't have the answers nor do I pretend to. But I propose a few ideas to consider.

Around the world since the 1600's artificial reefs are posing a solution for coastal communities. As Neville Copperthwaite, who is the pioneer for lobster restocking in the U.K. said, *"We unbalance nature by fishing the seas, and while we might restrict and manage fishing, we will never stop. Terrestrial farming would not be sustainable without putting something back into the land, but unlike terrestrial farming precious little is being done to replace what we have taken from the sea. Artificial reefs are one of the few proactive tools currently employed within the marine environment that help to give nature a helping hand."* Artificial reef systems work for two reasons. First, they provide shelter in an otherwise barren seafloor. Second, they provide a hard substrate for marine life to colonize and thrive. The Japanese introduced artificial reefs to improve fish stocks and it worked. Canada, New Zealand, Australia and even places in the US use them to attract divers, anglers and fish by purposing sinking shipwrecks and it works. Portugal and India developed a reef system using large concrete cubes, balls and triangles as restocking and reef restoration tools. Even here in the US, The Reef Ball Foundation in Georgia is making a global impact with natural reef restoration in 59 countries, with more than 3,500 projects totaling some half a million reef balls. Taylor County Florida along with the University of Florida has recently used this practice with state funding and approval and has developed the Taylor County Reef Deployment Team and we see it working. Without reefs, reef fish species have no home, no nursery, and no protection. Not only do we need to redress the damage that has been done by destructive practices such as trawling, long lining and even anchoring, we need to protect their future.

Anchoring can be quite destructive to reefs. If we are to examine the importance of reefs, we need to examine how to keep from destroying what we are trying so hard to fix. A simple use of mooring balls on all new and repaired reefs would almost eliminate the pressure for new damage that boaters could cause by using an anchor. Most importantly, they work.

Another solution being effectively used to improve fish stocks and biodiversity around the world are marine sanctuaries. When implemented on current or newly placed targeted reefs it will allow a safe haven for colonies to grow, attract fish, and allow fish to thrive. If we harvest the starters of a colony, the colony will be unable to fully flourish. No fishing, spearfishing or harvesting of anykind on any new reef restoration projects for several years, until the community has become established. Unfortunately, this solution is one that is one of the more difficult to enforce, but over time, it will be worth it.

Started now, these can provide wonderful results for the future. However, we do need some immediate results and for that I propose better enforcement.

No more warnings. We need to re-educate anglers and instill respect for the laws. Harsher punishments, historically, deter people from doing wrong. As local and state police cracked down on seat belt violations, more people started wearing their seat belts which resulted in less fatal accidents being recorded. Why would this be any different? As anglers learn a new respect for the laws, the next generations will have the same respect. This is where we mentor our children to be responsible and ethical anglers for the future. As a bonus, those that wish to disregard the law, their fines will help create more funding for better enforcement and reef restorations.

A current practice that also is not working is the management on commercial fisheries. We need to study the way commercial fishing is practiced. As the commercial industry grows, the fish harvested are getting smaller. On top of an already fragile situation, modern innovation has unfortunately allowed for greater efficiency and with it, greater destruction. One example of this destruction is by-catch. By-catch is not just fish that are in the wrong the place at the wrong time. By catch is a home, nourishment for other fish and even fertile and active reproducing species. All of this puts an unprecedented pressure on the underwater ecosystem that has never been seen or tested before. If they continue to harvest smaller and smaller fish, there is no chance for them to get bigger. Our current practice does not solve the sustainable fishing dilemma that we so desperately need solved. The stocks still deplete, and without fish there is no fishing. I understand that the commercial fishing industry contributes over \$575 million dollars and provides 10,000 jobs yearly. But allowing their weight limits to be larger and/or size limits to be smaller is not the answer. I'm certain if a case study was done to compare the evolution of commercial fishing and the size of fish harvested over the past 5 decades, it would show a remarkable coincidence. A trend that can not continue.

We also need to be stricter in the distribution of commercial fishing licenses and re-evaluate the ones currently in use. I am certain there are violations of commercial licenses and we need to examine those that are taking advantage of our fragile system, and revoke those licenses and impose harsh fines.

Regardless of closures or not, some of the elements I have discussed should not be ignored. Reef restoration is a necessity to protect the future of our oceans. It is not new information that reefs have vitals roles in all aspects of our oceans, so let's look there first. Fish closure are not a cure all, they only give a temporary fix to a long term problem.

I do agree that our resources are in need of proper management, but not at the risk of our residents nor our resources. Responsible management is the key, but I believe that closing a season on one specie only puts undo pressure on other species which creates a cycle where every year we are at risk of closing and harming other species and our state's economies. We need to focus more on ethical anglers, controlling commercial fisheries AND controlling the recreational anglers, while mentoring new anglers and enforcing stricter laws. Lets work together and change the cycle of our insanity and focus on other options that work. Keeping our seasons open and alive will benefit the community at large by continuing our tax revenues, tourism dollars as well as help us find more reliable and proper management techniques. As a Florida native, current Dive Store Owner and growing up in the Florida Keys, I have a love and personal investment in our oceans. Since I was 5 years old I have enjoyed everything these waters have to offer both above

and below the surface including spearfishing and I pray my Children's children will have the resources to enjoy the same activities as well.

Thank you for your support.

Jason Pecknold
3498 S Byron Butler Pkwy
Suite #3
Perry, FL 32348

(Information statistics gathered from fishingcapital.com/economics and The 2006 Economic Report National Survey supplied by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service)

**ECONOMICS OF FISH AND WILDLIFE RECREATION
FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSRVATION COMMISSION
ESTIMATES FOR 2007**

Category	Retail Sales	State and Local Taxes	Economic Impact	Jobs
Hunting	\$411,861,741	\$44,615,542	\$719,066,045	10,313
Freshwater Fishing	\$1,415,175,234	\$132,376,942	\$2,423,337,458	23,480
Saltwater Fishing	\$3,067,387,722	\$318,522,000	\$5,243,450,735	51,588
Wildlife Viewing	\$1,895,916,551	\$210,357,192	\$3,226,164,233	34,523
Total	\$6,790,341,248	\$705,871,676	\$11,612,018,471	119,904

Category	Economic Impact
Commercial Fishing	\$576 Million 9,787 jobs
Seafood Processing Industry	\$629 Million 3,108 jobs
Boating Industry	\$18.5 Billion 220,000 jobs

NOTE: The expenditure data for fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing are derived from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; 2006 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife – Associated Recreation. Economic impact data are derived from the American Sportfishing Association; Sportfishing in America, An Economic Engine and Conservation Powerhouse; International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies; Hunting in America, An Economic Engine and Conservation Powerhouse by Southwick and Associates; and Southwick and Associates; The 2006 Economic Benefits of Watchable Wildlife Recreation in Florida. Estimates for the boating industry are derived from the Marine Industries Association of Florida (Boating is Big Business In Florida 2005). The estimates for the Marine Industry include \$10.5 billion direct output and \$7.9 billion indirect output. Estimates for commercial fishing are from the University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Dr. Alan Hodges Principal Investigator. The baseline for the expenditure data and economic impact data are for 2006. Estimates for 2007 are adjusted to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) through December 2007 with the exception of jobs which reflect the 2006 baseline data. The exception to this rule is for the estimates for the Marine Industry and the Commercial Fishing and Seafood Processing industries. Estimates for the marine industry are based on information provided by the Marine Industries Association of Florida, Inc. for 2005. The Commercial Fishing and Seafood Processing Industry were updated using CPI estimates through 2005.

Limitations of the Analysis

1. The sample frame for Hunting is limited to 57 observations statewide.
2. Participant values (number of individuals participating in a particular activity) are tied to the formulas used to calculate the economic analysis for hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing and reflect the baseline year of 2006.
3. Consumer behavior is not static. It is simply impossible (without conducting a major statewide study every year) to accurately predict consumer behavior. For instance, are consumers spending more or less and are consumers participating more or less in hunting, fishing and wildlife viewing activities. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume there is a measure of variability within the range of economic estimates provided for this analysis.
4. Economic impact figures for commercial fishing and the seafood processing industry historically demonstrate considerable variability from year to year.

The purpose of this document is to provide economic estimates for hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing, commercial fishing, the seafood processing industry and the boating industry beyond the baseline study for these activities. Use of these data should take into consideration the variables and limitations listed in this document.

Here we are again. Hard to believe it has been almost 2 years since the last public comment event here in Panama City. A lot of things have transpired since your last visit. We have had the pleasure of having

- size limit of Amberjack changed
- a shortened Amberjack season (now back open)
- size limit change and shortened Red Snapper Season (Total BS)
- annual catch limit reduction of grouper
- implementation of circle hooks and venting tools

It appears that we are right back here again after only a short time. I am sure much of the public testimony you will hear today will resemble what was said back in 2008 with the exception that more people are getting wise to the NMFS agenda. Gag grouper hard to believe that we still have a problem with them being overfished after all the measures that have been implemented over that last year and the down turn in the economy. And let's not talk about the Red Grouper that was undergoing overfishing or then again was it. To imagine that a fish can rebound in such a short time frame and not the 20 plus years according to the NMFS rebuilding plan.

On the table is Amendment 32 targeting Gag and Red Grouper. As I understand it Annual Catch limits and bycatch reduction are the major issues that the council must address.

It was just last year the annual catch limits were adjusted to 2 fish hardly enough time to adequately see any results before starting another flawed collection of data. And now the council is looking for more cuts. It takes time to see results and to move so quickly without fixing the data collection process is a waste of tax payer money and a disservice to the general public and recreational angler.

Bycatch is an issue and should be addressed where the majority of the problem is occurring. To penalize the recreational fisherman for a morality rate of 25% (+/-) is just absurd. I would be very interested in seeing the actual numbers and collection methods used to determine the effects the recreational angler has had over the last year.

So let get down to business, the bottom line of what I will and won't support for the recreational angler.

I Will Not

- I will not support in any way a year round closed season
 - Improve or replace the data collection system. The data process has to get fixed before further restrictions are put in place. Additionally, additional time is needed to see how current measures work before change them. Not enough spawning and growing seasons have taken place to rethink the process
- I will not support adjusting the current catch limits

- Again, not enough time has transpired since the last implementation of restrictions before changing to a more restricted one. If the data is wrong in the first place shortening the time between additional restrictions is just a waste of time.
- I will not support separating the allowable catch limit between the paid-for hire recreational sector and the individual recreational angler. We are one big family and I will not allow anyone to steal my fish
- I will not support a fish tag or fish stamp program for grouper.
 - The National Saltwater Angler Registry needs to be implemented and deemed valuable. I would recommend additional expansion for individual recreational anglers to voluntarily submit reports to assist in the accurate collection of data
- I will not support the reintroduction of fish traps
 - It only adds to the problem
- I will not support Catch Shares
 - The TAC is the TAC. A 20% flexibility should not be part of the equation. This amounts to TAC abuse and if given a chance it will be.

I Will

- I will support the Feb to March Closure
- I will support an increase in size limits to both gag and black grouper to 24" or 26". It has been proven over and over that changing the size limit will not only reduce the harvest number but lower the fishing pressure.
- I will support the removal of MRFSS and the implementation of better data collection methods.

Finally my question to the NMFS are what has not happened since your last visit.

- The science has not gotten better
- The data has not gotten any better (Red tide killed how many grouper in 2005)
- The NMFS is not listening to the public and is doing nothing more than checking the box regarding taking public input into account before putting additional restrictions on fishing
- So, you are trying to rebuild these fisheries but who exactly is going to benefit from a rebuilt fishery if nobody is allowed to catch anything. The NMFS is famous for taking but not giving back.

This is all evident in the numerous lawsuits that have been filed on behalf of the recreational fisherman over the last couple of years. NMFS, I am mad as hell about what you are doing to my heritage and your desire to put a stop to my right to harvest fish. I refuse to allow you to give my rights to those that have the political funding, clout, and alternative agenda.

If it was not for the various organization founded on the premises of protecting the rights of the recreational fisherman no one would own a boat, enjoy our God given right to hunt and fish.

What will it all boil down to? Will we be subjected to buying our fish from what will be left of the local fish markets or even worse support the economy of some other third world nation that does not subscribe to the same BS science that we do.

It is perfectly clear that the NMFS is out of control and not fearful of the public and what we are willing and not willing to do in the name of OUR fishery. It is time that Congress wakes up and listens to what we have to say. And that day is coming remember Feb 24, 2010.

John Brady
Lynn Haven, FL

Comment taken from the St Petersburg meeting from an anonymous attendee.

Morris refused to answer Denny's question about MRFFS. I don't remember the exact question but I do remember it had to do with the criteria used in MRFFS data collection and was certainly worthy of a response. Once she heard the question she appeared quite annoyed by it, pointed to another person in the audience and said "next question". I got the feeling that there was some prior history/friction between Denny & Julie which may have been a factor in her decision not to answer. I found her behavior quite disrespectful and it pretty much lit my fuse. By the time she finally called on me I was absolutely steaming. Their responses to my questions did little to calm me down and as a result I did get a little heated in my exchanges with them. I apologize if I was out of line and I did not mean any disrespect. I guess that is why (in the past) I have always gone to the podium with a carefully written statement and I just read it as written. This new open forum was definitely better than just walking up to a podium, making a statement, they thank you for your input, and you sit back down. However, The more questions they answered the worse it got IMO.

I think the response that bothered me the most was this:

Everyone was telling them that Red Snapper are so think it is difficult to catch anything else. Of course Julie Morris saw this as an opportunity to pat herself on the back by saying that she felt the one species they knew the most about (from a management standpoint) was Red Snapper. Therefore all these Red Snapper we are seeing are a direct result of their superior management skills.

I saw this as an opportunity to lay the foundation for a little negotiating down the road. We all know that amendment 32 is calling for a drastic cut in Gag Grouper. Probably a 1 fish limit or possibly a complete closure. I figured that I could maybe get them to trade 2 Red Snappers for 1 Gag. The current limit on Gags is 2 and if they cut it to one, maybe we could get them to give us back the 2 Red Snapper they took away a couple years ago. This would soften the blow of a 1 fish limit while Gags are rebuilding. Since Red Snapper have made such a successful rebound it seemed like a reasonable trade off if they sincerely wanted to maintain a successful offshore fishery.

So I asked Julie: "Since Red Snapper have made such a miraculous recovery, when can we expect you to give us back the 2 Red Snapper you took away and increase the length of the season?"

Julie's response: "Well we might be willing to consider that action at the end of the rebuilding plan which is 2032." I kid you not.....that is exactly what she said!

Then Andy (another scientist) immediately chimed in: "We have to keep the bag limits low and the season short because as the fish recover it becomes much easier to catch them and therefore fishermen are more likely to catch their limit on each trip which increases the pressure on the fishery."

I was so dumbfounded by their answers I couldn't even muster a cynical response. At that point I saw absolutely no reason at all to even mention the Gag for Red Snapper exchange I

had envisioned. So basically, once they take something away.....THEY ARE NEVER GOING TO GIVE IT BACK.

So the conclusion that I draw from their response is: If there are not enough fish we need to have low bag limits and short seasons to protect the fishery and allow them to rebuild. If there are plenty of fish we need to have short seasons and low bag limits to protect the fish from overfishing. Are we beginning to see a pattern developing here? Are Gags heading for a 1 fish limit and a 6 week season just like Red Snapper? Sure sounds like it! Are Aj's, Mangos, Reds, Scamp, Cobia, Triggerfish, & Hogfish destined for the same management fate? There is about 22 years left until 2032 when the current rebuilding plan is due to mature.

If this seriously ticks you off then I strongly suggest that you go to the FRA web site right now and make a donation. Denny and several others are heading to Washington very soon to lobby congress and make a passionate plea for common sense to prevail. I am convinced that there is absolutely no relief to be gained for fishermen at the public input or Gulf Council level. This problem comes from much higher up than that. The only way to stop this steamroller is at the Congressional level. Congress mandates that these actions be taken and therefore Congress can mandate they cease. Call or write to your Congressman and let them know what you think. They actually do listen.

The crux of the problem with fisheries management is this: We have a problem with how the data that is collected, the criteria used for the collection, the range of the sampling, the sources of the sampling, the science, and the statistics. If the data you plug into an equation is fundamentally flawed and incomplete.....the results are going to be unreliable. Sadly, this unreliable data is currently being used to manage our fishery and all it amounts to is "dartboard" fisheries management.

They (fisheries managers) reason that they are required (by Congress) to take action in spite of the less than perfect data and we say "garbage in.....garbage out". The data they are using to declare a fish as "overfished" is fundamentally flawed. Therefore, any and all fisheries management action taken once a fish is declared overfished is also fundamentally flawed. We need Congress to step in and halt this nonsense and appropriate the money to collect reliable data. This would allow us to make sound management decisions based on accurate data that all of us agree is reliable. Congressman Young is on our side and Denny told me he has been a good friend to the fisherman of Florida. Hopefully he can work some of his "Washington Magic" and fix this problem for us once and for all.

As for the use of fish traps, it surprises me that the Gulf Council would bring back a fishery that they banned just three years ago. If these new traps do prove to be safe and reduce gag grouper bycatch, and indeed a new fishery, then they should be allowed to be used by all grouper fishermen, not just fishermen with a certain endorsement. If fish traps are approved and used by all fishermen, then the Council will be allowing a tremendous shift of effort and a faster depletion of the red grouper stocks will occur. I would like to use 25 or 30 traps myself while I am bandit fishing. They can soak for as long as it takes to catch all the grouper on that spot, but I do not wish to be denied the use of traps and have to pull up on a spot with bandit gear **and compete with a trap.**

I support a time area closure on the gag spawning grounds when they are spawning. I do not support closing shelf areas that have previously been introduced and denied by the Gulf Council.

It seems there is plenty of red snapper in the Gulf. The Gulf Council is expected to increase the TAC for red snapper next month in its Mobile meeting. According to the SSC, gag grouper are not so lucky. There are alternatives in Amendment 32 to reduce the multi shares for gag and red grouper. I do not agree with reducing multi shares for red grouper, since the SCC determined they were no longer overfished and not approaching overfishing. I agree that the use of multiuse shares for gag grouper should be reduced. With an abundance of red snapper and the scarcity of gag grouper, there **is a scenario** of how to reduce gag catch and replace it with red snapper catch.

Do not reduce the multiuse shares for red or gag grouper, but don't allow them to be used for gags. Instead, let all multiuse shares be used to catch red snapper. This will help the gag groupers and at the same time allow fishermen to harvest the increased quota of red snapper. If this scenario is used, and factored into the gag grouper TAC, the gag TAC **cut** will not have to be so severe. Multi use shares should also be extended to all IFQ reef fish and require that these shares be used only for the healthy species, mainly red snapper. This will further reduce bycatch.

As you know, fishermen in the eastern Gulf received very little red snapper IFQ shares because red snappers were not abundant during the qualifying years. They are now. If you require that no multi use shares be used for gags, but allow them to be used for red snapper, you will not only reduce the take of gag grouper while reducing the red snapper bycatch, but you will also help the fishermen, **especially the small fishermen in the eastern Gulf, and lord knows they need help.**

**Coastal Conservation Association
Comments on the
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
Gag/Red Grouper Amendment Scoping Document
(Reef Fish Amendment 32)**

The Coastal Conservation Association, representing more than 80,000 members in state chapters along the Gulf Coast, has major concerns about several aspects of Amendment 32 dealing with new regulations to end overfishing for gag grouper.

According to the results of last year's stock assessment developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), it appears that reductions in harvest on the order of 75 percent may be considered for this fishery. Additionally, at the last meeting of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, the issue of allowing fish traps to be reintroduced into the commercial grouper fishery was added to the current round of public hearings as an alternative gear to reduce sea turtle mortality associated with bottom longline gear. CCA wants the fish trap issue removed from the amendment and destructive longline gear eliminated from the grouper fisheries.

Fish traps were removed from the Gulf of Mexico in 2007 after years of controversy over their destructiveness and have also been outlawed in the Atlantic and state waters. This gear is "invisible" once deployed and ample evidence has been supplied by state and federal law enforcement agents to conclude that it is nearly impossible to observe the gear and enforce any escape gap or panel regulations. The traps have a high rate of loss and, once lost, they become ghost traps, filling with fish that die and attract other fish in a long-lasting cycle. The traps fish 24 hours a day and can out-compete other gears.

Further, the traps are not needed in the commercial fishery as a substitute for longline gear as ample effort exists in the vertical line (bandit or hook-and-line gear) sector to take the allowable catch. Allowing any use of fish traps in the Gulf will create conflicts and make it difficult to enforce their prohibition from state waters, the Florida Keys Marine Sanctuary and South Atlantic waters. There exists ample evidence of the destructive and uncontrollable nature of fish traps in the record of the Gulf Council's previous deliberations that resulted in the banning of this gear. Nothing has changed since that time and the use of this gear should not even be considered. CCA urges the Council and the NMFS to focus on alternatives that effectively reduce destructive commercial fishing effort to the greatest extent possible rather than searching for ways to perpetuate a marginal commercial fishery.

Regarding any proposed regulations to end overfishing of gag grouper, CCA requested five years ago that the Gulf Council develop formal allocations for grouper based on maximizing the value and benefits of this common property resource. The Council began an amendment to do this and formed committees to set standards for this issue. However, for the past two years no further action has been taken. Given the apparent necessity of future restrictions on gag harvest, we believe that it is absolutely necessary for the Council to finally include allocation of this resource in Amendment 32. The Gulf Council's Grouper IFQ program allocates and grants exclusive right of access to more than 65 percent of all the Gulf red and gag grouper to a limited number of commercial interests. The magnitude of this giveaway of a public fishery is unprecedented. NMFS must stop enacting programs which subsidize marginal commercial fisheries while strangling the much more valuable recreational grouper fisheries.

CCA will develop a formal position on new quotas, size limits, bag limits and seasons for gag in the coming months and will bring these ideas back to the public hearings on this amendment. In the meantime, CCA urges the Council to act responsibly and not risk destroying the very valuable economic benefits that flow into the Gulf states and this nation from recreational fishing for grouper and other reef fish.

For more information, contact:

Ted Venker, CCA Communications Director

1-800-201-3474

twvenker@JoinCCA.org

More than 30 Years of Conservation
Dedicated to the Conservation and Protection of Marine Life
6919 Portwest Drive, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
Fax (713) 626-5852
Phone (713) 626-4234
www.JoinCCA.org



**CCA FLORIDA
SPECIAL REPORT**

**TRUTHS, MISCONCEPTIONS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS
ABOUT
CATCH SHARES AND IFQ'S**

"Catch shares are obviously a major focus for this Administration and we are concerned not only about the impact they have on recreational fisheries, but also at the pace with which they are being pushed into the management system. Catch shares are on a fast track and are a real threat to the future of a number of recreational fisheries and they are not going to just go away anytime soon. We are going to stay very active on this issue to make sure recreational anglers are not left out of the debate...and out of the fishery."

Chester Brewer
CCA National Government Relations Committee

"The evolution of exclusive fishing rights for commercial fisheries is colliding with a large and growing recreational angling population."

Matthew Paxton – CCA Federal Lobbyist

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is intensively promoting and implementing programs which grant exclusive access privileges to public fishery resources to private individuals and corporations. Several national environment groups and the commercial industry are also promoting catch shares. Unfortunately, in mixed fisheries where there is a large and growing recreational sector, exclusive fishing rights proposals maximize benefits to the commercial fishing industry while ignoring the participation and beneficial economic impacts of recreational fishing. Damaging impacts on recreational fisheries are being disregarded.

Recreational fisheries will not be allowed to expand because too many of the fish will be "locked up" in the commercial catch shares. As populations increase and more people try to fish, the bag limits and seasons will be even more restrictive until the recreational fishery is no longer viable. The more valuable recreational fisheries will be strangled.

The controversy over catch share programs, also known as IFQ's (Individual Fishing Quotas), ITQ's (Individual Transferrable Quotas) and LAPP's (Limited Access Privilege Programs) is spreading as more fisheries are targeted for such programs. Gulf of Mexico red snapper is in an IFQ program. The Gulf of Mexico red and gag grouper IFQ program recently received final approval and legal challenges against it have been filed. The Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council is looking at all the reef fish species for a new catch shares program. King mackerel has also recently been added to the catch share discussions. Many of the following truths, misconceptions, and misrepresentations come from the ongoing debates and catch share battles in the Gulf of Mexico.

The NMFS has approved and is implementing the largest public resource giveaway in Florida's history.

True. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has expedited the implementation of an IFQ (Individual Fishing Quota) program for exclusive access privileges for Gulf grouper. The Gulf Council's Grouper IFQ program will allocate and grant exclusive right of access to more than 65 percent of all the Gulf red and gag grouper. This exclusive right of access will be given to a limited number of commercial interests. The magnitude of this giveaway is unprecedented. It is the largest public fishery giveaway in Florida's history!

Commercial fishers argue that they, and the consumers they sell to, have a right to take grouper, snapper and other fish.

False. They do not have "the right." Neither commercial nor recreational fishers have a right to take fish. All citizens have a constitutional right to vote and to bear arms but there are no constitutional rights to fish. All marine fisheries are publicly owned resources, just like ducks, deer and wild turkeys, and access to those resources is a privilege granted by public trustees established by law to manage those public resources.

"On the argument that the U.S. federal government is the steward of the resources for all its citizens and the commercial fishermen is providing consumer access to that resource, the U.S. is the steward of all its resources – sunfish, ducks, deer, and striped bass – all of them. The concept that a private commercial enterprise is necessary to provide the public with the enjoyment of those resources by selling them to consumers so they can eat them was rejected by the federal government and state wildlife managers before 1900. There is no basis in any federal common law, any wildlife law or the constitution for such proposition."

Robert Hayes, CCA Legal Counsel, 2008

The NMFS says that an IFQ does not convey title, or ownership of the resource, to the commercial fishers. However, the commercial fishers will be allowed to take, sell, lease, broker and even bequeath quota shares. For this privilege the commercial interests will pay absolutely nothing.

True. The NMFS also claims that the IFQ program can be ended anytime. However, once the commercial interests are given the individual rights to millions of dollars of grouper and they sell, lease, buy or broker those millions of dollars of grouper, it is clear that the public, the true owners of the resource may never get any of those fish back. There has never been an IFQ program that has been discontinued. The NMFS also says the grouper allocation in the IFQ can be reallocated to other commercial and recreational fishers in the future; that is extremely unlikely after shares have been bought, sold and leased. There has never been any reallocation in any existing IFQ, and the Council has thus far refused to include a provision for future reallocation in the plan.

Those who support the resource giveaway to commercial interests argue that recreational fishers do not pay anything for the fish either.

False. In Florida, recreational fishers pay more than \$22 million annually for saltwater fishing licenses for access to marine fisheries. These fees are used for marine fisheries research, management and law enforcement. Commercial fishers pay only \$3.5 million in annual license fees. Most of the fees are for the trap limitation programs for stone crabs, spiny lobster and blue crabs which were requested by the industry.

Recent amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Federal Fisheries Act require the establishment of catch share programs in federal fisheries.

False. The Magnuson Act does not require adoption of catch shares or IFQ's nor is there any deadline for adoption. These programs are being promoted and pushed by several national environmental groups and the current Administration.

Catch shares are an effective new tool to manage and restore depleted fisheries.

False. The catch share debate is not about conservation, it is about allocation and access to public resources. The most important management measures to restore and protect fisheries are scientifically determined total allowable catches (TAC) with effective and enforceable implementing regulations. Catch share supporters have stated that in a number of fisheries, ITQ (catch share) programs have halted, and reversed, declining fish stocks. However, further reviews show that in those recovering fisheries scientifically determined total allowable catches have been established. Catch share critics argue that the implementation of scientifically determined total catches was the critical factor in restoring those fisheries.

Catch shares and IFQ's can be valuable tools in fisheries that are predominantly commercial with little or no recreational component.

True. Catch shares can benefit commercial fisheries by allowing fishers to take fish at the most economically valuable time of the year and increase safety by eliminating the race for fish before quota closures. The large commercial operators who receive the tremendous windfall profit of the initial catch shares, are the ones who benefit the most. However, experiences in British Columbia indicate that the quota leasing component of the programs hurt the financial performance of other working fishermen. The large operators, sometimes referred to as "armchair fishermen" and "slipper skippers," stopped fishing and began leasing their initial windfall gifts of quota shares to working commercial fishermen who did not receive shares, or not enough shares. The creation of such middleman leasing did not enhance the overall value of the fishery.

Some have stated that conveyance of the huge windfall profit of the initial commercial catch shares is necessary to get the support of the commercial fishers. It is, in effect a "bribe" for their support.

True. Despite objections from recreational and other interests, the catch share programs continue to give away the initial commercial catch share and supporters insist that it is necessary to establish the program. However, others disagree.

Having received this enormous free income stream, embodied in something they imagine to be a 'right,' renders them more willing to accept hard TACs We might, to good effect, understand this to be a form of bribery: We will give you, for free, all of that wealth and all we ask in return is that you now behave better than you have heretofore."

Daniel Bromley, 2009

The Gulf of Mexico grouper recreational fishery generates nearly three times the economic value than that of the commercial fishery; however, the Gulf grouper IFQ gives 65 percent of the total allowable catch to the commercial fishery.

True. The recreational grouper fishery is far more valuable than the commercial fishery. A recent economic analysis (Gentner, 2009) established the annual economic value of the Gulf red and gag grouper recreational fishery at \$223 million annually. The commercial fishery was \$94 million. Florida has a major interest in the fishery because 96 percent of all the Gulf red and gag grouper are caught off of and landed on the west coast of Florida. The Grouper IFQ Program will reduce the economic value of this resource to Florida and the nation.

In the Gulf grouper IFQ, 57 percent of the catch shares are being given to the commercial longline boats that are killing large numbers of threatened loggerhead sea turtles.

True. There is a huge loss of sea turtles each year to bottom longline gear. Recent research has revealed that bottom longline gear for reef fish, along with longline gear set for sharks, is taking much larger numbers of endangered loggerhead and other sea turtles than anticipated by the 2005 Biological Opinion required by the Endangered Species Act. The information extrapolated from the recent survey indicates 974 interactions of endangered sea turtles and bottom longline gear with 433 turtles released. 325 released dead and 216 status unknown.

Catch share supporters mistakenly point to upland game management programs such as deer tags and duck stamps and to the Florida tarpon tag program as examples of successful catch shares programs.

True. Those people either misunderstand or are misrepresenting the facts. There is no commercial take or sale of publicly owned deer, ducks or wild turkeys. Commercial exploitation and sale of such species was prohibited more than 100 years ago. Those species have been successfully managed for many years allowing public harvest using size, species and bag limits, closed seasons and no commercial sale.

“States began to eliminate the commercial exploitation of wild resources beginning early in the 19th century. The federal government stepped in to prevent the commercial harvest of ducks, geese and buffalo. The commercial take of deer, elk, quail, pheasant, wild turkeys, bass, sturgeon and trout was eliminated in favor of conservation and providing increased public access to public resources. As an unexpected but welcome bonus, governments quickly realized that doing so brought the highest economic return in the form of revenue and taxes.”

Ted Venker – CCA Tide Editor, 2009

Many of the catch share supporters, particularly those in environmental organizations, have little or no understanding of, or experience with, recreational fisheries.

True. One of the best examples of this lack of knowledge is the reference to the Florida tarpon tag as a successful catch share program. Adopted in 1989, the tarpon tag was not implemented to reduce the take or control effort. Tarpon is a highly valued gamefish, there is no commercial take allowed and they are not a food fish. The problem was the wasteful display of tarpon on the docks to promote more charters. With replica mounts none of the tarpon are needed for mounting purposes, it is just measured and released

alive to fight again. The \$50 tag and replica mounts stopped the wasteful activity and virtually eliminated the killing of tarpon.

Supporters say that IFQ's establish a free market program with transferability that allows other users, like recreational fishers to purchase catch shares, to participate in the program.

False. That is not allowed in the current Gulf of Mexico red snapper or grouper IFQ's. There is no open market or any public lottery or auction involved in distributing the quota shares, the shares go only to the commercial interests. The Gulf grouper and red snapper IFQ's have been designed by commercial interests to have quota shares retained in perpetuity by commercial interests. One of the restrictions established in the red snapper IFQ, and also in the IFQ for grouper, prohibits the use of quota shares unless the individual also possesses a federal commercial reef fish permit. The issuance of these permits was halted in 1992. Therefore, even if another user, or group of users, bought quota shares they could not use them without also finding and buying a reef fish permit. Additionally, to obtain such a permit, the individuals must demonstrate that at least 50 percent of their income is in commercial fishing. This requirement immediately "locks out" a substantial alternative group of resource users.

Other programs, such as grazing and timber leases, which give exclusive commercial access to publicly owned natural resources require some form of resource rent or other payment to the public trust for such use.

True. However, the IFQ's give exclusive access privileges to millions of dollars worth of red snapper and grouper and the commercial fishers pay nothing for the gift. There is no open market or any public auction involved in distributing the initial quota shares to the commercial interests. In addition, public auctions involving commercial and recreational users would place recreational interests at a financial disadvantage because they do not, and are prohibited from, selling their catch.

References

1. Bromley, Daniel W. 2009. "Abdicating Responsibility: The Deceits of Fisheries Policy." *Fisheries*, Vol. 34, No. 6, June 2009.
2. Gentner, Brad. 2009. Allocation Analysis of the Gulf of Mexico Gag and Red Grouper Fisheries.
3. Johnston, Robert Et.Al. (2009) "Fish Harvest Tags". Evolving Approaches to Managing Marine Recreational Fisheries. PERC (Property and Environmental Research Center).

4. National Marine Fisheries Service. Fisheries Management Plan for Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico. Data and Regulations from Amendments 29, 30B and 31.
5. Paxton, Matthew. 2009 "The History of Exclusive Fishing Rights." Tide Magazine. March/April 2009.
6. Venker, Ted. 2009. "What's Good for the Goose....." Tide Magazine. July/Aug. 2009

For More Information Go To:

- CCA National website at www.joincca.org and visit the Newsroom Feature.
- CCA Florida website at www.ccaflorida.org and visit the press release and position statements areas.

Special Report prepared by: CCA Florida 11/3/09
Tallahassee Advocacy Office
Ted Forsgren
Trip Aukeman
(850)224-3474



12/03/09

CCA FLORIDA COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

IN OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL PROPOSAL TO ALLOW FISH TRAPS IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

1. INTRODUCTION AND RECOMMENDATION

Commercial longliners in the Gulf of Mexico are killing excessive numbers of threatened loggerhead sea turtles. Regulations on longlines are being proposed to reduce the impacts on sea turtles in Reef Fish Amendment 31. The commercial longline fleet has requested the use of fish traps in return for reducing the longline fishing effort. The Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council has agreed to place the use of fish traps as an alternative in their proposals.

CCA Florida is adamantly opposed to any changes in the current ban on commercial fish traps in any state or federal waters.

We urge the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to maintain its longstanding opposition and express strong opposition to the use of fish traps in federal waters.

2. FISH TRAPS HAVE BEEN BANNED FOR MANY YEARS.

- Fish traps, in various forms, have led to overfishing damage and waste wherever they have been used in the marine environment.
- In 1980, the Florida Legislature banned all fish traps in all Florida coastal waters (except for small pinfish and sea bass traps).
- In 1990, the country of Bermuda banned fish traps.
- In 1991, the South Atlantic Federal Fishery Management Council banned the use of fish traps in South Atlantic federal waters from North Carolina through Florida's Atlantic Coast.
- In 1996, the Gulf of Mexico Federal Fishery Management Council banned the use of fish traps in federal waters off of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas. In Florida, the Gulf Council enacted a moratorium on fish trap permits and a phase out which banned all fish traps in Florida's west coast federal waters in the year 2006.
- Opposition to fish traps in the South Atlantic and Gulf came from a broad base of commercial hook and line fishermen, recreational fishermen, marine life collectors, conservation and environmental groups.

3. LOST “GHOST” TRAPS-UNNECESSARILY KILL AND WASTE MARINE LIFE

- Lost and abandoned traps become “ghost” traps which continue to catch and kill untold numbers of fish and other marine life for years. Carelessness, storms, deliberate abandonment, or illegal traps; whatever the reason, lost “ghost” traps were in all areas where they were fished.
- In the South Atlantic region, when fish trappers were allowed to leave traps out in the water, tremendous losses of traps were documented by the Florida Department of Natural Resources (DNR). At that time the DNR documented loss rates of 25%, 63% and 100% per year!
- Since new fish “victims” and other marine life are attracted to “ghost” traps to feed on captured or dead fish in the trap, or to aggregate with other fish in trap for shelter, the lost traps continue to rebait themselves and continue killing for many years. (see attached photo)

4. OVERFISHING

- Fish traps are capable of exerting more harvesting pressure than traditional hook and line gear because the traps are left in the water to continue “fishing” for hours or days at a time. Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) fishery managers characterized fish traps in the snapper and grouper fisheries as the “climax” fishing gear; gear which is used to continue catching substantial commercial quantities on depleted fish populations when catch from other traditional gear is declining.
- In the South Atlantic and Florida Keys, fish traps not only took excessive numbers of grouper, snapper and other predators, they also took algae eating herbivores which were essential to the natural balance of Florida’s coral reef ecosystem.
- In Bermuda, fish trappers overharvested snapper and grouper stocks, then switched to parrotfish and overfished that species.


5. CLOSING COMMENT

The pick your poison approach of substituting one very damaging and banned gear (fish traps) for another damaging gear (bottom longlines) is completely unacceptable.

Fish traps and bottom longlines should not be allowed in any marine environment.

Attachment: Abandoned “ghost trap” photo

Prepared by: Ted Forsgren – Executive Director
CCA Florida



Main Identity

From: "Louis Rossignol" <dclouis@cox.net>
 To: <undisclosed-recipients:>
 Sent: Monday, January 18, 2010 4:40 PM
 Subject: January 19th Public Input in Kenner- Be there Tomorrow

Reef Fish
35 year Biomass

Yep, Tuesday, tomorrow,

F.R.A.

ND
LCUAE
F.R.A.

Tuesday January 19, 2010

Crowne Plaza
 2829 Williams Road
 Kenner, LA 70062
 504-467-5611

All meetings begin at 6:00 p.m. & conclude no later than 9:00 p.m.

The Gulf Council will be taking Public Comment on reef fish ammendment 32. Once this ammendment is done, you may never be able to harvest a gag grouper again.

Louis

Tracy
Separation - agree chutes but + demand
Report
reasonable way of doing it

REVISED TALKING POINTS HERE Text is below.


Recreational grouper anglers unprecedented new restrictions on Gag grouper in the Gulf of Mexico. The proposed 80% reduction in landings will cause untold economic and social devastation while while being biologically unnecessary. With the gag biomass (estimated total weight of all gag in the Gulf of Mexico) at a 35 year high and continuing to expand, we face total recreational closure for a year or more.

Base on fatally flawed data and ridiculous assumptions, the Gulf faces a loss of \$2 billion dollars in economic activity per year. Sound science, not science fiction, needs to guide decisions.

Do you believe that effort has not gone down? These are the numbers that are being used to estimate how much fish the recreational sector landed. These estimates are obviously wrong, yet they are used to close down healthy fisheries.

Trips in Gulf	<!--[if !vml]-->
---------------	------------------

Year	Number Trips
2003	22,956,673
2004	24,355,357
2005	21,871,448
2006	23,862,890
2007	24,267,431
2008	24,108,842




--[endif]-->

<!--[if !vml]-->

WAVE 3 May and June only

Number of trips in the Gulf

2003	4,256,988
2004	5,920,320
2005	4,983,704
2006	5,406,969
2007	5,594,340
2008	4,688,855
2009	5,642,607



--[endif]-->

Examples of best available SCIENCE FICTION:

Red tide killed ONE THIRD of all Gulf grouper in 2005.

Individual Fishing Quotas are good for fishermen and the fish

Recreational fishing effort remains high through 2009

Recreational data collection has improved

The issue of a few charter captains stealing your right to fish, which they will

then rent back to you, is coming at us under 'sector separation'. We are recreational or commercial. There is no middle ground. Time to make that point clear.

The National Marine Fisheries Service claim of improving data collection is a broken record that has played for a decade. There is no excuse for this failure to improve data collection.

Hear more during our live broadcast this Sunday, January 10th at 7PM, when the FRA presents a live explanation of the issued while offering you tools with which to take action. [Click here for the live broadcast page, which is password protected.](#) The password will be sent to FRA mailing list members. Not on our mailing list? email us [here](#)

We will post talking points here for you to download or print. In the meantime, here is the scoping document

SCOPING DOCUMENT AMEND 32

The FRA will broadcast live on Sunday night, delivering an explanation of the issues as well as how you can defend your right to fish. We will also be attempting to broadcast all of the meetings through our expanding video associate network. The FRA is always looking for new video associates who can broadcast or record various meetings.

Short version of FRA suggested talking points for Gulf Amendment 32

Say it five times fast

MAGNUSON – STEVENS ...

Surprising how many people who are in the process mistakenly say stevenson when referring to the act.

Again- five times fast

MAGNUSON-STEVENSON...

The points

Fatally flawed MRFSS data and Red Tide science fiction are about to unnecessarily cause a \$2 billion dollar annual loss to Gulf States, including thousands of jobs.

Red Tide DID NOT kill 20-30% of all gulf grouper in 2005.

Fatally flawed data is overestimating recreational fishing effort and landings. These fatally

flawed overestimates are about to cause damaging closures.

Annual Catch Limits (ACL), Annual Catch Targets (ACT) and the resulting Accountability Measures (AM) cannot rely on fatally flawed data, nor can ACL's, ACT's and AM's be developed until information from the new rec reporting system is useable, according to Magnuson-Stevens Reauthorization Act.

There are two pending lawsuits regarding this ignoring of Magnuson. We will not be taken for a ride.

The attempt to hide a reduction in our Maximum Sustainable Yield through the use of the ABC-acronym shell game did not go unnoticed.

Efforts should be made in improving data collection and recreational estimates, per the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Why do accountability measures only go one way – against the angler?

When accountability measures are created, they must include not just taking away but giving back.

Current rec estimates are not even complete until halfway through the following year. Better estimates are years away. No Accountability Measures would be reliable or acceptable until recreational estimates are improved.

Commercial Red Snapper discards due to IFQ's are ignored. WHY? It has been reported as excessive by most commercial operators.

This is a whitewash job that ignores HUGE numbers of dead discards.

We have called for a 24" gag minimum size for years. Discard mortality will not cause the landings to increase.

We feel ignored on this issue.

Keeping the first fish caught is another attempt to kill recreational fishing effort.

Individual fish tags for use in identifying legal possession of recreational catch have no history and hold no promise. Spend the money fixing the fatally flawed system of recreational estimates.

The Council's new data collection committee is stacked with catch share advocates and non-resident advocates.

97% of Gulf recreational fishing trips are shore or private/rental boat trips captained by non-professional anglers. Where is the 33 to 1 ratio of private to pro/hired captains?

Individual Fishing Quotas have caused the HUGE commercial bycatch of Red Snapper in the Gulf of Mexico to be ignored. Why?

First fish caught is another attempt to eliminate fishing effort at all costs. The idea completely ignores the biological implications, much like the commercial Red Snapper IFQ idea.

Sector separation – 97% of Gulf recreational anglers and 90% of licensed professional captains agree-

Separate what? The recreational angler from his right to fish? From his money when he

has to rent that right to fish from another?

Separate those greedy individuals from the recreational angler.

There are only two sectors where catch is concerned: Commercial and recreational. For profit or for fun.

Stephen M. Zelenka
14 Belle Grove Drive
Destrehan, LA 70047
504-628-1174

January 19, 2010

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100
Tampa, Florida 33607
Sent VIA email: charlotte.schiaffo@gulfcouncil.org

Re: Scoping Meeting for Reef Fish Amendment 32

Sirs:

My name is Steve Zelenka, 44 years old, married with three kids between 10 and 19 years old and I live in Destrehan, Louisiana. I am a Past President of the Hell Divers Spearfishing Club and active member of the Fishing Rights Alliance

As a boat-owning, family of five, we fish and dive over 40 days per year in the Gulf of Mexico. I have been an active recreational fisherman for almost 40 years. Money not spent on family bills is spent on fishing and speardiving. We spend time(and money) at the camp and on the boat instead of going off on vacations. WE LOVE IT! It is an important part of our lives and it is our heritage.

We see plentiful fish in Louisiana and are successful harvesting these fish and are teaching our children about good stewardship of our shared natural resources. We demand this of the Gulf Council.


No further Regulations should be placed on Recreational Fishing until there is better data collected. The Gulf Council is using bad science to determine that Gag Grouper are overfished and undergoing overfishing, yet full weight isn't being given the downturn in effort caused by the downturn in the economy. Further cuts to the Recreational Fishing sector will devastate the ancillary industries associated with recreational fishing as well as devastate the already strapped coastal communities that service the recreational fleet.

- We SUPPORT the Fishing Rights Alliance' positions.
- We SUPPORT better reporting mechanisms being implemented. Good data is key. The old saw holds true, "Garbage in – garbage out." We are overwhelmed with garbage data and feel that no new regulations should be added until this is fixed. This is not an open endorsement of a Fish Tag Program nor is in an endorsement of the LAPP AP.

- We SUPPORT the splitting of the Gulf of Mexico into separate management zones. Anecdotal evidence shows that the Eastern and Western Gulf of Mexico have distinctly different bottom structure and hold different populations of fish.
- We OPPOSE any idea of sector separation. Recreational fishermen, regardless of their means of conveyance, are catching recreational fish. This is where this effort should be counted.
- We OPPOSE VMS and Grouper Endorsements. These will prove to be a tremendous burden on the For-hire Recreation Fishing Industry. The initiatives listed in the Scoping Document to improve data collection appear to be more about control of the fishery as opposed to control of the data.
- We OPPOSE catch shares in any way, shape or form in the recreational industry. Do not steal my rights to engage in the recreational harvest of fish, only to sell them to the highest bidder.
- We OPPOSE fish traps. These devices are easily lost at sea and will continue to kill fish for many years after.
- We OPPOSE fish stamps. Entry and participation limits should not be put on the recreational sector. The costs of recreational fishing are high enough.
- We OPPOSE any Area Closures placed on recreational fishing.
- We DEMAND the return of our fish!

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Stephen Zelenka & Family

APPENDIX B PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARIES AND WRITTEN COMMENTS

Summary of the Public Hearing on Reef Fish Amendment 32 Fort Myers, Florida May 3, 2011

Council and Staff:

Ed Sapp

Dr. Carrie Simmons

Phyllis Miranda

20 Members of the Public in Attendance

Robert Leonard, Punta Gorda, FL – Coastal Conservation Association – He provided a written statement and the following additional comments. He felt that after discussion it is difficult to figure out how to accommodate everyone with the proposed closure dates for the gag recreational season. He stated that one single 5-year plan needs to be in place as to allow fishermen to be able to plan ahead. He added that the economic impact of not opening the fishing season, particularly in the tourist areas, would cause big problems to the fishermen, restaurants, and bait shops.

Tony Petrella, Venice, FL – Sarasota Herald Tribune –

Action 2.2.1 (gag scenarios) Prefers Alternative 3, a split season, because the people he has spoken with agree that in the Bradenton/Sarasota county area that would provide for open seasons January 1-31 and April 1-30. He added that they would gladly accept a one fish bag limit if clients could have the opportunity to fish during those times. He mentioned that the fishermen are worried about losing their livelihood having the January-April closure when they cannot catch grouper. He felt that split seasons should not be a factor (based on geography) and that there was no reason that the northern part of Florida could not be managed separately from the southern peninsular part of Florida. He added that regional management has been accomplished by the state of Florida for spotted sea trout.

Charles Mann, Cape Coral, FL – recreational angler – He stated that the amendment documents were not available early enough and that was not in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act. He felt that the Council should consider extending the time for final adoption of the amendment to the August Council meeting. He added that red grouper is not overfished or undergoing overfishing.

Action 2.2.2 (Red grouper bag limit) Prefers alternative 3, to increase the bag limit for red grouper from 2 fish to 4 fish.

He stated that he did not believe that gag is overfished or undergoing overfishing. He noted that a new full benchmark assessment on gag and red grouper was needed as soon as possible.

Action 2.2.1 (Gag scenarios) Prefers alternative 1, no action for gag recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons.

Action 5 (Commercial gag size limit) Opposes the preferred alternative 2, to reduce the commercial size limit from 24 inches to 22 inches. He felt that would be taking too many fish out of the population before they had a chance to breed.

He stated that there is no way to accurately measure in-season accountability for the recreational sector.

Action 7.2 (Gag and red grouper recreational accountability measures) Prefers alternative 1, recreational accountability measures. He added that he believes that the fishery is underutilized. He noted that the

amendment had an incomplete cumulative effects analysis, no regulatory impact review as required, and no regulatory flexibility act analysis was provided.

Daniel Ferraris, Punta Gorda, FL – Coastal Conservation Association – He stated that the amendment was not presented early enough to be fully evaluated prior to the public hearing. He noted that the central issue regarding gulf grouper management to the CCA is allocation, which they believe is arbitrary and capricious. He added that the Gulf stock had been substantially reduced due to the mixture of fishing and red tide; however, action was initiated for grouper over 3 years ago and that the Council has only recently started to set committee meetings to deal with the issue. He strongly recommended that the Council postpone decisions on grouper until the August Council meeting.

Paul Giordano, Ft. Myers, FL – Vice President, CCA Florida – He read into the record a written statement, which is attached.

Gary Colecchio, Bonita Springs, FL – Florida Guides Association – He stated that Amendment 32 was not provided at least 15 days before the public hearing, which is the Council's rule. He was in support of postponing final action on Amendment 32 until the August Council meeting and having another round of public hearings. He felt that a red tide event affected the benchmark assessment from 2006 and skewed things out of proportion. He felt that another stock assessment needed to be performed as was recommended by our own Scientific and Statistical Committee and the Reef Fish Advisory Panel. He noted that maximum sustainable yield (overfishing limit) is being reduced by 25% and that it seemed like an arbitrary figure. He stated that the slot limit is confusing and that the Reef Fish Advisory Panel had a unanimous rejection of the slot limit. He supported a 24" minimum size limit for recreational anglers and felt that would result in a 30% reduction in landings because two-thirds of gag landings are in state waters. He added that the concept of recapturing a previously released fish is not considered in the stock assessments and that daily recapture of undersized fish was a common occurrence. He felt that should be a consideration.

Action 2.2.1 (Gag scenarios) Preferred alternative 1, no action on gag recreational bag limits, size limits, and seasons, and added that a new full benchmark stock assessment needed to be conducted. He felt that no commercial fishing should be allowed for any species undergoing overfishing or that is considered overfished.

Action 2.2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) He was in favor of Preferred Alternative 3, increase bag limit to 4 fish per person.

Action 5 (commercial gag size limits) He recommended Alternative 1, no action, leave at a 24" minimum size limit. He felt that increasing the minimum size would keep breeding fish from being kept.

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) Preferred Alternative 1, no action. He added that there was not enough data to accurately assess the stocks. He stated that the MRIP program really needs to incorporate the saltwater fishing registry to include old and young people.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Members of the Public who did not speak:

George Doster, Punta Gorda, FL
Ken Dieffenbach, Punta Gorda, FL
Pete Herber, Punta Gorda, FL
Tom Parsons, Punta Gorda, FL
Peter McGregor, Punta Gorda, FL – CCA
George Bobko, Port Charlotte, FL

Dan Ferraris, Punta Gorda, FL
Randy Urst, Ft. Myers, FL
Don Jones, Ft. Myers, FL
Kevin Bellington, Ft. Myers, FL
Sharon McBreen, Orlando, FL – PEW
Environment Group

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
St. Petersburg, Florida
May 3, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Bill Teehan
Steven Atran
Ava Lasseter
John Froeschke
Emily Muehlstein

29 Members of the Public in Attendance

William R. Causey, Perry, FL, recreational fisherman – Does not agree with anything the Council is doing. He feels the Council has created confusion and apathy among the recreational community. As an example, there is overwhelming testimony against any new IFQs, yet his tax dollars are being used by NMFS lawyers to disagree with Congress. He felt that, in the section about alternatives to explore, one alternative not listed is to talk to your elected official. He disagreed with Amendment 32. If a stock is in such dire straits that it needs a closure, then do not allow a special interest group to continue to fish it. He felt that gag and red grouper should be treated as a single management unit. If one is closed, close both regardless of IFQs. Right now, the regulations are so confusing that law enforcement officials can't figure them out. When one sector can land fish and the other can't, that creates more confusion. He felt that IFQs are the worst tool for fisheries management, are ripe for abuse, and need to go. If they are used, commercial fishermen should pay for the IFQ by year. It costs tremendous money to pay our salaries and law enforcement, and IFQs should be paid for by people who are making money off them.

Roy Coykendall, New Port Richey, FL, charterboat operator, Miss Virginia – Referred to a letter to the editor that he had published in the St. Petersburg Times in 2009 calling for an end to longline fishing (<http://www.tampabay.com/opinion/letters/article973978.ece>). He felt that mechanized fishing including longlines, nets and fish traps are what kills the fish. He felt that a gag open season in July – October was a bad idea. Gag is 90% of his fishing, and he would rather have a two month closed season even if it meant going to a 1 gag bag limit. He felt that, in 2005, the red tide may have destroyed habitat, but the gag just moved around. He fished mostly off grunts and hog snapper while throwing back 30" to 34" gag, but he has to go out 30 miles to find red grouper. He asked that we consider economic impacts and reevaluate the data.

Lawrence Coles, St. Petersburg, FL, recreational fisherman – He had looked forward to being able to fish for 1 or 2 fish. It used to cost \$299 for 3 people to go out fishing, but today he can't afford it. He objected to commercial fishermen being allowed to fish year-round when the recreational sector couldn't.

Don Roberts, Tampa, FL, representing Coastal Conservation Association (CCA) – Reiterated that there was not enough time to review the amendment. He felt that if the recreational sector is closed to fishing, the commercial sector should be closed as well.

Chuck Weddel, Tampa, FL, representing Fishing Rights Alliance (FRA) – He just moved to Tampa from Colorado, and thought he could go fishing but there are so many things going on politically that it's got him ruffled. He noted that the Council is under a deadline to solve a problem, but one that people don't feel is valid. He asked the Council not to make decreases in fishing based on innuendo and invalid

statistics. He felt that the people are being railroaded.

Libby Fetherston (address on file), representing Ocean Conservancy – She will provide a written statement later. She noted that gag are at 2 ½ times the maximum fishing mortality threshold and biomass is less than half the minimum stock size threshold.

Action 1 (Rebuilding Plan) – Supports Alternative 3, 7-year rebuilding plan. This is consistent with F_{OY}.

Action 2.1 (Gag Scenarios) – Cautioned that if effort shifting is higher than assumed, the scenarios may not achieve the reduction objectives. Also, she is concerned about mortality from the slot limit.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) – Supports the adaptive management approach, but increasing the red grouper bag limit may lead to increased gag bycatch from fishermen targeting red grouper. Therefore, she supports Alternative 2, a 3 fish bag limit.

Action 3 (Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2, 14% reduction.

Action 4 (Multi-Use IFQ shares) – Supports Preferred Alternative 4, suspend red grouper multi-use shares while gag rebuilding is in effect.

Action 5 (Commercial Gag Size Limit) - Tentatively supports the Preferred Alternative 2 (22 inches), but cautioned that this is below the average size of female maturity and could reduce spawning potential.

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – Time and Area Closures are an appropriate way to protect spawning aggregations, and were supported by the Reef Fish Stock Assessment Panel in 1999. She supports Alternative 3 (close area between Edges and Madison-Swanson) with option c (all fishing prohibited Jan-April, allowed May-Dec) or d (all fishing prohibited year round).

Action 7.1 (Commercial Accountability Measures) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2 (IFQ is the accountability measure).

Action 7.2 (Recreational Accountability Measures) – Supports Preferred Alternative 4 (add an overage adjustment to overfished stocks and authority for AA to close recreational season when annual catch limit is projected to be reached).

Ocean Conservancy also supports the use of ACT.

Jeff Miller, Ocala, FL, representing Coastal Conservation Association (CCA) – Read a prepared statement (attached). In brief, the hearing documents, having just been posted, are not conducive to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions. In Amendment 32, the most central issue is allocation. The current allocation was made in an arbitrary and capricious fashion, and the Council is just now getting around to addressing an allocation amendment.

Action 1 (Gag Rebuilding Plan) – CCA supports Preferred Alternative 3 (10 years) and supports basing management on the ACL rather than the ACT. An ACT is not necessary.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) CCA supports Preferred Alternative 3 (4 fish bag limit with scaling back if necessary).

CCA does not support closing any season for groupers other than gag.

Additional comments on the prepared statement pertain to the Generic ACL/AM Amendment.

The following are Mr. Miller's personal comments.

The gag decline is not due to overfishing. A different term should be used.

A 30" maximum size limit for gag will create problems for salt water fishing tournaments. If adopted, consider having a tournament permit that would allow one gag over the size limit.

The Council is avoiding the issues of allocation and flawed science.

There is no room for commercial harvest if the recreational sector is only getting 61 or 123 days of fishing.

Accountability is linked to IFQs, but there is a lawsuit going on against IFQs, and they may not stand.

James Holder, Clearwater, FL – Given the questionable data, he recommended that the Council adopt the smallest closed season and the highest bag limit until there is better data. Having a split fishing season would be confusing. He recommended leaving the gag season open through the summer. Rising gas prices will reduce the fishing pressure so the gag stock won't be hurt. He supports the bag limit increase on red grouper.

Dennis O'Hern, St. Petersburg, FL, representing Fishing Rights Alliance (FRA) – Read from a prepared statement. Comments included:

Amendments are copied in black & white, but they contain color graphics that can be hard to read.

Why were documents not available until Wednesday? The public is offended by the lack of time to review the document. They should be available 2 to 3 weeks in advance.

No announcement was made when the documents were available. This shows a lack of respect and disdain for the public.

The recreational sector has said no to catch shares.

Professional fishermen who take people out for hire should be held to a higher standard, but not different rules.

If sector separation goes forward, that will be a slap in the face of the recreational community, and FRA will litigate.

The amendment renames MSY to OY and reduces it by 25%. There is nothing in the Magnuson-Stevens Act that says OY should be reduced from MSY. This makes it easier for anti-fishing groups to claim overfishing. OY should be set equal to MSY.

Why is recapture of fish not included and calculated in adjusting for mortality? If don't look at this in Amendment 32 there are going to be outraged anglers.

An FWRI study observed release mortality rate of just over 1%, on headboats in less than 100 feet of water. Why is this not included? The biggest problem with releases is dolphin predation.

Why is a 24 inch minimum size limit, which used to be a preferred alternative, no longer being considered?

There needs to be a full benchmark assessment on gag now.

The assessment model does not acknowledge that fish move around.

The gag are not gone. The red snapper are so thick that you can't get the bait down to the gag.

Action 2.1 (Gag recreational scenarios) - Go back to a 4 fish gag bag limit. Only have a two month spawning season closure, and apply it to both commercial and recreational sectors if it is to protect spawning aggregations.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper bag limit) - Thanks for the 4 fish red grouper bag limit, but where is our 5?

Action 3 (Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment) - NMFS promised with IFQs that the guy buying into it would still get his share, but that share was held hostage if Florida didn't comply. They lied to the commercial sector. Try bringing that to the recreational sector, that's Armageddon, I'll go back to being a psycho killer.

Action 5 (Gag Commercial Size Limit) – Don't lower the size limit. There aren't many that size in the depths they are fishing. If they are getting 22" gag, they are fishing too shallow and need to go deeper.

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – Do not create any additional closures. It's highly questionable if they have any effect.

Action 7.1 (Commercial Accountability Measures) - IFQ proponents have ignored the discards they have because they can't get gag IFQ shares. So it's not the accountability measure that the council claims.

Socioeconomic Analyses - This rating of individual communities is ludicrous. It splits the communities

up too much. Studies show that 50% of all recreational snapper trips all leave from Hillsborough, Pinellas, and Manatee. Valrico as 16th in the state based on boat owner's address, but that boat's owner actually has five boats docked in Madeira Beach.

Mike Jackson, Clearwater, FL, recreational fisherman – He stated that his classification of shallow-water grouper were that they did not occur in deeper than 265 feet, and deep-water grouper never occurred shallower than 260 feet. However, gag and yellowmouth are found in both areas. He produced a nautical chart delineating the area off Florida's Gulf coast between 40 and 100 fathoms, which he claimed was gag habitat that was not being considered. He estimated the area to be 14,275 square miles.

Allen Rodriguez, Sarasota, FL, representing Reel Fun Charters and Economy Tackle – He felt that if the commercial fishery has an average 67% release mortality rate, the commercial fishery is out of control and should not be allowed. He noted that the timber industry can harvest trees, but they have to replant what they harvest. Congress in 1900 passed the Lacey Act because of migratory birds that were being killed for their feathers. He claimed that the Lacey Act says that a public natural resource is for the public, if it gets to the point that it has to be managed by government, it's there for everyone to take, not to go buy in the grocery store. He felt that the Magnuson Act is in conflict with the Lacey Act. He felt that we have no data and are just guessing at how many fish there are. He did not think that we need a closure, but if the stock is in dire need of closure, close commercial as well as recreational sectors. However, he manages a tackle store, and feels that a closure is a bad economic move. The tackle shops are seeing their number of sales, going down. They are down 40% in the last 3 years, and it's impacting the number of fish caught. He also felt that goliath grouper are eating a lot of gag grouper.

Action 2.1 (Gag Recreational Scenarios) - He was opposed to using a slot limit because it would increase the release mortality rate on older fish. He supports just a 2 month closure and a 24" size limit. However, he sees a downside to a larger gag minimum size limit. It would result in larger fish being caught on average. In the red snapper fishery, the season has been shortened because the fish are bigger.

William E. Keene II, Tampa, FL, recreational fisherman – Felt that the numbers used for the science are wrong, and that people are losing business as a result. He suggested creating a fresh catch share ticket, similar to a snook stamp, that would allow a fisherman to hire a boat to go out and catch a fish 12 months a year. This would help the for-hire boats make more money.

Kurt Theodore, Palm Harbor, FL, recreational fisherman – Expressed disappointment with the availability of documents and lack of ample notice. He felt the low turnout for the hearing was due to apathy and economic conditions, as well as not having proper materials in advance. He felt that the 25% reduction of MSY is arbitrary. He does not believe that the release mortality is accurate, and feels that a benchmark stock assessment is completely necessary but is not on the agenda.

Action 2.1 (Gag Recreational Scenarios) – He opposes the slot limit but supports a 24 inch size limit, which he feels would reduce landings by 30%, combined with a 4 fish bag limit and the 2-month closed season.

Captain Chad Haggert, Clearwater, FL, charterboat operator, Double Eagle Deep Sea Fishing – He has been fishing since 1967 and feels that there are not as many gag out there.

Action 2.1 (Gag Recreational Scenarios) - Stated that he wants the longest gag season possible so he can sell trips to tourists. He would support a larger size limit and a smaller bag limit in exchange for a longer season.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) – He doesn't see a benefit and thinks there will be effort from gag. He suggested keeping the bag limit at 2 red grouper, or maybe raise it to 3 fish, but not more.

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Marathon, Florida
May 4, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Ed Sapp

Dr. Carrie Simmons

Phyllis Miranda

4 Members of the Public in Attendance

Jack Fernandez, Summerland Key, FL – Next Chapter Fishing – He stated that he has worked under the individual fishing quota program for red snapper since its implementation as well as the grouper individual fishing quota program. He stated that the circle hook requirement for reef fish fishing was implemented with good intentions and it works for bottom fishing for grouper and snapper, but it does not work for the yellowtail snapper fishery, which is the most sustainable fishery in Key West. He felt that it needed to be considered as a southeast region flexibility issue. He noted that there is increased pressure on the silk snapper. He noted that it was a strong fishery, but that the individual fishing quota program and implementation of Amendment 31 has caused northern Gulf fishermen to shift effort to south Florida to catch other species once they have used up their grouper individual fishing quota. He suggested implementing a control date for silk snapper, a south Florida species. He added that he had been fishing for many years and he should be rewarded; he should not have to give up his fishing due to fishermen from other areas coming in and overfishing the stock. He felt that red snapper is not overfished, and that it is a fish that is very abundant.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Members of the Public who did not speak:

Bill Kelly, Marathon, FL – Florida Keys Commercial Fisherman's Association

Mike Henry, Big Pine Key, FL

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Mobile, AL
May 9, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Bob Shipp
Assane Diagne
Karen Hoak

No members of the public in attendance.
No testimony was given.

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish 32 Amendment
Biloxi, Mississippi
May 10, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Kay Williams
Assane Diagne
Karen Hoak

Public in Attendance:

Tom Becker
F. J. Eicke

The opening statement was read by Kay Williams. **F. J. Eicke**, Ocean Springs, MS – Coastal Conservation Association – submitted written comments for the record. Mr. Eicke's comments are attached.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Galveston, Texas
May 10, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Joe Hendrix

John Froeschke

Emily Muehlstein

3 Members of the Public in Attendance

Todd Hanslik

Jonny Williams

Fred Angor

No one commented on Reef fish 32. See the summary of ACL/AM public hearings for additional comments.

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Panama City Beach, Florida
May 10, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Bill Teehan

Steven Atran

Charlotte Schiaffo

Martha Bademan (FWC staff)

9 Members of the Public in Attendance (plus 4 reporters)

Holly Binns, PEW Environmental Group – Stated that gag are overfished and in need of significant protection.

Action 2.1 (Gag Scenarios) – Supported the longest recreational season possible as long as it has a high probability of rebuilding the stock. However, she was concerned that assumptions that there would be a 50% increase in effort during the open season might be too low. She cited red snapper, where effort increased substantially when the recreational season was shortened, and recommended that the Council look at the historical data.

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – She supported the use of time and area closures to protect and improve reproductive potential, and supported additional protections for habitat and gag spawning aggregations.

PEW Environmental Group will submit additional comments later, but these are two of the major concerns.

Bob Zales II, Panama City Boatman's Association – Felt that tagging studies currently being done by Florida FWC will lead to lower release mortality estimates for the next gag stock assessment.

Action 1 (Rebuilding Plan) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2, 10-year rebuilding plan.

Action 2.1 (Gag Scenarios) – Supports the Reef Fish AP's recommendation for a split winter season (January plus December 24-31) and summer season (June 1 through July 7) with a 1-gag bag limit (Alternative 5). This will help the downstate fishermen who need a winter fishery, and the upstate fishermen who want a gag season that will coincide with red snapper season. Having concurrent gag and red snapper seasons will address concerns that there would otherwise be red snapper discards from fishermen fishing for gag. He supported the Reef Fish AP's unanimous opposition to slot limits and recommended that they be moved to Considered but Rejected. He felt that slot limits do not work in deep water.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) – Supports Preferred Alternative 3 for a 4 red grouper bag limit with reductions to 3 and then 2 fish if the annual catch limit is exceeded.

Action 3 (Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2, 14% reduction.

Action 4 (Multi-Use IFQ shares) – Supports Preferred Alternative 4, suspend red grouper multi-use shares while gag rebuilding is in effect.

Action 5 (Commercial Gag Size Limit) - He expressed concern that if the commercial size limit is reduced to 22 inches, it could result in commercial fishermen targeting smaller gag that are currently available only to the recreational sector, once the recreational fishery closes.

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – Supports Alternative 1, no action. He feels that the current time and area closures are enough.

Action 7.1 (Commercial Accountability Measures) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2 (IFQ is the accountability measure).

Action 7.2 (Recreational Accountability Measures) – Supports Preferred Alternative 4 (add an overage adjustment to overfished stocks and authority for AA to close recreational season when annual catch limit is projected to be reached).

There is a rerun of the red grouper yield projections currently being done by the Science Center. If the SSC finds that the 2011 red grouper ABC can be increased as a result of the rerun, he asked that the Council in June request an emergency action to make that additional amount available to the fishermen.

Bart Niquet –

Action 2.1 (Gag Scenarios) – He feels that the season is too short. A longer season is needed even if it is just on weekends.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) – Recommended a 4 grouper bag limit within which 3 could be red grouper (Alternative 2).

Action 3 (Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2, 14% reduction.

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – Opposed to any more closures. This would hurt the fishery rather than help it by concentrating fishing effort on the limited amount of remaining open area.

He feels that there are plenty of gag, and the fishery doesn't need to be reduced as much as proposed. He also feels there are plenty of red grouper and supports the increase.

Mike Eller, Destin Charterboat Association –

Action 1 (Rebuilding Plan) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2, 10-year rebuilding plan.

Action 2.1 (Gag Scenarios) – He would prefer to maintain the September 16 through November 15 season (Alternative 2) due to the Destin Fishing Rodeo, but he understands the need for a split season. He does not support a slot limit.

Action 2.2 (Red Grouper Bag Limit) – The Destin Charterboat Association supports a 3 fish bag limit (Alternative 2), but he personally would prefer to see it remain at 2 fish (Alternative 1). The concern is with increased discard of gag while targeting red grouper.

Action 3 (Commercial Gag Quota Adjustment) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2, 14% reduction.

Action 5 (Commercial Gag Size Limit) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2 (22 inches)

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – Opposed to Alternative 2 (expand Madison-Swanson area to the north and west).

Action 7.1 (Commercial Accountability Measures) – Supports Preferred Alternative 2 (IFQ is the accountability measure).

Action 7.2 (Recreational Accountability Measures) – Supports Alternative 3 (add authority for AA to close recreational season when annual catch limit is projected to be reached). He feels it is important to have a mechanism in place to prevent overages, but is disappointed that the mechanism is dependent upon MRIP data.

Russell Underwood, Panama City, FL, commercial fisherman and party boat operator – Asked when the additional gag IFQ quota would be released under the interim rule. (The Council representative and staff said it would be soon, but did not have a specific date).

Action 2.1 (Gag Scenarios) – Supports having gag and red snapper open at the same time in order to protect the resource. He also feels that the recreational sector needs longer seasons.

Action 5 (Commercial Gag Size Limit) – Supports the Preferred Alternative 2 (22 inches).

Action 6 (Time and Area Closures) – He does not support any additional time and area closures. This would concentrate the fishing off of Panama City, put more stress on the fishery, and create conflicts between the commercial vessels and the party and charterboats already operating in that area.

He supports having the 1 million pound recreational red snapper underage in 2010 added to next year's recreational allocation.

Chris Niquet, Panama City, did not wish to speak, but in response to Russel Underwood's statement that the recreational sector needs longer seasons, he stated from the audience that party boats need to have 55 to 60 days to fish.

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Corpus Christi, Texas
May 11, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Joe Hendrix

John Froeschke

Emily Muehlstein

1 Member of the Public in Attendance

Art Morris (Texas Parks and Wildlife)

No testimony was given.

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Kenner, Louisiana
May 11, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Damon McKnight
Assane Diagne
Karen Hoak

Public in Attendance:

Jason Adriance, LA Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
David Dauzat, Metairie, LA
Terry Miguad, Metairie, LA
Louis Rossignol, Kenner, LA
Walter Stone, Metairie, LA
Steve Zelenka, Destrehan, LA

Terry Miguad, Metairie, LA – Louisiana Council of Underwater Dive Clubs – inquired why offshore oil platforms are not considered and protected as essential marine habitat. Mr. Miguad’s written testimony is attached.

Walter Stone, Metairie, LA – expressed concerns relative to the timeliness of the documents and inquired about meeting location changes. Mr. Stone also questioned the quality of the data included in the amendment. Mr. Stone’s written comments are attached to this summary.

During subsequent discussions, attendees expressed opposition to the slot limit considered in Amendment 32.

At the conclusion of testimony, McKnight allowed for an informal discussion. Issues discussed included the reliability of data used by the Council, sector separation, and, allocation between the sectors.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Supplemental Public Hearings:

Summary of the Public Hearing on Reef Fish Amendment 32 Fort Myers, FL August 1, 2011

Council and Staff:

Bob Gill

Emily Muehlstein

3 members of the public in attendance

Sharon McBreen, representing PEW- written testimony

Paul Giordaro, representing CCA submitted written testimony

A member of the public who chose not to identify himself spoke on- Action 2.2.1- He supports alternative 3- the split season that would allow for a winter season, although it would limit his number of fishing days he believes that a January season option would increase his days of productive fishing in South Florida.

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

**Public Hearing Summary on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
St. Petersburg, FL
August 2, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Ed Sapp
Steven Atran
Kathy Periera

6 members of the public in attendance

Dennis O'Hern, Executive Director, Fishing Rights Alliance –

General - Felt that the Council's public notifications were sloppy and submitted notices that contained errors. The Federal Register notice for the public hearings incorrectly referred to Steven Atran as Dr. Steven Atran, and Orange Beach, Alabama as Orange Beach, Florida. The Council website also refers to Orange Beach, Florida.

Reef Fish Amendment 32

- Complained about an ACL/ACT Control Rule working group that was formed in 2010 that included members from environmental groups but nobody from the fishing community.
- Stated that documents for this public hearing were still not made available in a timely manner. Two weeks before the hearing, the mini-guides were available but not the amendments.
- Questioned why there were no recreational management scenarios that used a 24" minimum size limit. He stated that the Council had produced documentation that a 24" size limit would reduce harvest by 30%, making it unnecessary to implement any other changes. Furthermore, is biologically the optimum size limit. In response to a statement from Steven Atran that an analysis that a 24" size limit using the gag management scenario spreadsheets provided by NMFS showed that it would increase total removals by 4-5% but would also increase dead discards, he questioned the reliability and transparency of the spreadsheets, noting that NMFS had locked the spreadsheets so that users could not view how the calculations were done.
- Opposed a 22" commercial size limit for gag. Although few gag at that size were currently being caught by the commercial sector, he felt that if the size limit were reduced commercial fishermen would begin catching more of them to serve the restaurant demand for plate sized fish.
- Opposed to catch shares. He felt that those who supported catch shares and sector separation had an incentive to misreport catches, and pointed to the discrepancy between charterboat and private recreational catches of red snapper as an example.
- Reiterated that there is nothing in the Magnuson-Stevens Act that says that catches need to be reduced by 10% or some other percentage to achieve optimum yield.
- Felt that recreational dead discard estimates were overstated and that there was evidence of multiple recaptures of gag in the same day. FWRI data shows that there is low release mortality and high recapture rates.
- Felt that amendments are being written by NMFS staff and then handed to Council staff for tweaking.
- Felt that there was overwhelming anecdotal evidence that there was strong abundance and recruitment of gag.

Sharon McBreen, Pew Environment Group – Submitted written comments on both Mackerel Amendment 18 and Reef Fish Amendment 32, and stated that additional comments would be provided before the Council meeting. Spoke on Amendment 18.

Samantha Port-Minner, Ocean Conservancy - Stated that additional comments would be provided before the Council meeting. Spoke on Amendment 32.

Amendment 32 – Supports finalizing the amendment at the August Council meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Members of the public who attended but did not speak:

John Laurent

James Fesperman

**Summary of the Public Hearing on
Reef Fish Amendment 32
Panama City, FL
August 3, 2011**

Council and Staff:

Larry Abele
Rick Leard
Charlotte Schiaffo

9 Members of the Public in Attendance

Chair Larry Abele called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. he read the chair statement for Amendment 18 and asked if anyone had comments or wanted to see the presentation by Dr. Leard. The audience decided to forgo watching the Amendment 18 presentation and instead had Dr. Leard explain a few major points of the amendment.

Amendment 32

Larry Abele reviewed the main points of Amendment 32, and then Dr. Leard gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Bob Zales asked what percentage of OFL and ACL equaled ABC.

Jim Clements expressed concern that even though commercial fishers would not exceed their ACL this year, ACT would be applied to both sectors which would reduce the commercial share. Mr. Abele explained that allocation was not reduced, that it was still based on ACL. Dr. Leard also noted that the Council had not yet voted on the proposed measures and since ACT was not required by law the Council might decide it was not needed.

Mr. Clements supported closed areas in Action 6 since gag and red grouper spawned in those areas and needed to be protected. He had concerns under Action 3 on dead discards. He stated that NOAA landings data showed that even though the year was 60% gone, only 30% of the gag quota had been caught, so dead discards were not a problem in that fishery, and thus did not need an 80% or for the gag quota to be cut for the commercial sector.

He advocated Alternative 1, no action under Action 3.

Bob Zales noted that it was difficult to catch legal size fish, and would like to see the bag limit set as high as possible. He had serious concerns about NMFS being able to regulate under new restrictive measures and not having the ability to set ACL without sufficient data. He stated that arbitrarily setting ACL, ABC, and AMs did not work. He added that a big factor in lower landings was the economy since fewer people were fishing.

Chris Niquet opposed any closures, stating that in the Madison-Swann closed area there were no more fish than there had ever been, even though the area had been closed for 10+ years.

Mr. Abele interjected that there were larger fish than there had been before in that area.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30.

Members of the public who attended but did not speak:

Trip Aikeman-CCA

Pam Anderson-PCBA

Henry Hunt-Charterboat

Stephanie Free-FWCC

Bart Niquet-Niquet Fisheries

Michelle Sempsrott-FWCC

Reef Fish Amendment 32 to the Gulf Grouper

Fishery Management Plan- will establish annual catch limits and annual catch targets for 2012 to 2015 for gag and for 2012 for red grouper. The amendment contains actions to establish a rebuilding plan for gag; set recreational bag limits, size limits and closed seasons for gag/red grouper in 2012

CCA has reviewed the documents and provided comments and recommendations to present at the hearings. Some of the comments in the attachment include:

"The angling public has been put into a difficult position as the Gulf Council just posted the final hearing documents on this amendment and the even more complex Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures on April 27. This process, which involves hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents on these issues, is not conducive to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions on the options presented here, options that could have serious implications on the public's ability to access these public resources in the future.

This process threatens to damage any faith that the recreational angling community may have that the Council is sincere in its efforts to gather and utilize meaningful input from us."

"The most central issue regarding Gulf grouper management to CCA is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, the Gulf Council initiated action on an amendment to set grouper allocation more than three years ago and has only now begun to schedule committee meetings on this issue. This is inexcusable. Currently gag grouper have been allocated in an arbitrary and capricious fashion in the Commercial Grouper IFQ amendment that was not supported by the legally mandated analyses. CCA's case against this action is currently before a federal judge and we are waiting for a decision."

MAIL &
EMAIL
MAY 31

Coastal Conservation Association
Comments for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
Public Hearings on Amendment 32
May 2011

Good evening, my name is Paul Giordano *JICF PRESIDENT
CCA FLORIDA.* and I would like to thank the Council for giving us the opportunity to address the fishery management proposals before us tonight.

Having said that, it must also be pointed out that we believe this comment process is seriously flawed. The angling public has been put into a difficult position as the Gulf Council just posted the final hearing documents on this amendment and the even more complex Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures on April 27. This process, which involves hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents on these issues, is not conducive to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions on the options presented here, options that could have serious implications on the public's ability to access these public resources in the future. As presented here today, this process threatens to damage any faith that the recreational angling community may have that the Council is sincere in its efforts to gather and utilize meaningful input from us.

CCA is still reviewing the extensive documents and reserves the right to make final comments at the Council meetings. However, the following testimony has been prepared by Coastal Conservation Association to address the following issues:

The Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment
Reef Fish Amendment 32

AMENDMENT 32

The most central issue regarding Gulf grouper management to CCA is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, the Gulf Council initiated action on an amendment to set grouper allocation more than three years ago and has only now begun to schedule committee meetings on this issue. This is inexcusable. Currently gag grouper have been allocated in an arbitrary and capricious fashion in the Commercial Grouper IFQ amendment that was not supported by the legally mandated analyses. CCA's case against this action is currently before a federal judge and we are waiting for a decision.

We insist that the Gulf Council use the required economic, social and conservation criteria – as mandated in the NOAA Catch Share Policy – to allocate grouper and all other natural resources under its authority to maximize the economic benefits available to the entire people of this nation from the wise use of these resources.

Although not a subject of Amendment 32 another such arbitrary allocation for black grouper is being considered in the ACL/AM amendment – again without any of the analyses of impacts and benefits that are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Catch Share Policy. We will resist efforts to continue to arbitrarily allocate these resources.

Regarding the specific management measures of Amendment 32:

- CCA would support a 10-year recovery period and basing the allowed harvest on reaching the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) as opposed to the overly restrictive Annual Catch Target (ACT). The Council is using the conservative optimal yield target for overall management of grouper and we do not think an ACT is necessary. We support achieving the longest open season possible.
- For red grouper we can support the preferred alternative of setting the bag limit at 4 per day and scaling it back, if necessary, in subsequent years if this is needed to avoid a future closed season.
- We do not support closing any season for other groupers than gag.

GENERIC ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS/ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES AMENDMENT

Coastal Conservation Association has several significant concerns with the concepts contained in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment:

- With regard to Annual Catch Limits, CCA believes that all recreational ACLs should be measured in numbers of fish rather than pounds. This will remove some of the uncertainty and error that plagues recreational catch data.
- We support moving species with landings of less than 20,000 pounds out of the management complex, rather than designating them Ecosystem Species. Doing so will prevent managers from being required to enact measures that may impact dozens of species in a single complex in order to recover the weakest species.
- For unassessed species, unless there is clear evidence that the stock is declining, the control rule should not limit current harvest. It is absurd to employ an ABC control rule that could require significant reductions of harvest for a species when no problems have been documented with the stock. The logical option would be to simply cap the harvest at current levels until data is available to support an assessment.
- We are greatly dismayed to see that this document still looks exclusively at past landings history as the sole method to set allocations between the recreational and commercial sectors. We believe the allocation process should be forward-looking and that managers should make every effort to manage these fisheries to reflect present and future realities, rather than locking in these resources to repeat history. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council should use the criteria set out in the NOAA Catch Share Policy in setting any allocation and use economic value as a key criteria in order to set allocations that achieve the greatest benefit to the country.

2 of 2

IT'S TIME TO END LONGLINE FISHING

tampabay.com
Know it now.

STACK THE ODDS IN YOUR FAVOR

Waypo
LIVING
Exactly what you

Home | News/Local | Politics | Sports | Entertainment | Money | Blogs | Life | Weather & Traffic | Shopping/Classifieds | Jobs | Real Estate | Cars

Ads by Google

Fishing Guide Tampa Bay

Tarpon Season is on in Anna Maria!

Tampa Bay Sarasota St Pete

www.tarpontimecharlers.com

Fishing Trip Saskatchewan

From Fishing Guides And Packages

To Maps, Get All Travel Info Here!

www.Fishing-In-Saskatchewan.com

Local Fishing

Search For Fishing Near You

Using The Web's Local Search!

Local.com

Tampa Bay Fishing Guide

Fish Tampa Bay, including the F

Reefs & Wrecks with Capt Gask

Tampa-Bay-Florida-Fishing-Guide.com

Document

[Start a New Search](#) | [Previous Results](#)

Buy Complete Document: [FREE Abstract](#) [Full Text](#) [Page Print](#)

IT'S TIME TO END LONGLINE FISHING

St. Petersburg Times - St. Petersburg, Fla.

Author: Anonymous

Date: Feb 9, 2009

Start Page: A.10

Section: NATIONAL

Text Word Count: 2834

Abstract (Document Summary)

Recreational and commercial bandit fishing has paid the price for longliners for years with bag limit reductions, size limit increases and seasonal closures. We have had to adapt to now the longliners' turn. If longliners truly believe themselves to be fishermen, they must realize that by eliminating the practice of longline fishing, they will improve the en for both commercial and recreational fishermen.

*adapt to
en for
fishery*

Public Testimony - Roy Coghill
Amendment 32 - St. Petersburg
May 3, 2011

<http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/sptimes/access/1641268241.html?FMT=ABS&FMTS=ABS:FT&date=Feb+9%2C+2009&author=A...> 5/3/2011

Coastal Conservation Association
Comments for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
Public Hearings on Amendment 32
May 2011

Good evening, my name is Jeff Miller and I would like to thank the Council for giving us the opportunity to address the fishery management proposals before us tonight.

Having said that, it must also be pointed out that we believe this comment process is seriously flawed. The angling public has been put into a difficult position as the Gulf Council just posted the final hearing documents on this amendment and the even more complex Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures on April 27. This process, which involves hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents on these issues, is not conducive to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions on the options presented here, options that could have serious implications on the public's ability to access these public resources in the future. As presented here today, this process threatens to damage any faith that the recreational angling community may have that the Council is sincere in its efforts to gather and utilize meaningful input from us.

CCA is still reviewing the extensive documents and reserves the right to make final comments at the Council meetings. However, the following testimony has been prepared by Coastal Conservation Association to address the following issues:

The Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment
Reef Fish Amendment 32

AMENDMENT 32

The most central issue regarding Gulf grouper management to CCA is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, the Gulf Council initiated action on an amendment to set grouper allocation more than three years ago and has only now begun to schedule committee meetings on this issue. This is inexcusable. Currently gag grouper have been allocated in an arbitrary and capricious fashion in the Commercial Grouper IFQ amendment that was not supported by the legally mandated analyses. CCA's case against this action is currently before a federal judge and we are waiting for a decision.

We insist that the Gulf Council use the required economic, social and conservation criteria – as mandated in the NOAA Catch Share Policy – to allocate grouper and all other natural resources under its authority to maximize the economic benefits available to the entire people of this nation from the wise use of these resources.

Although not a subject of Amendment 32 another such arbitrary allocation for black grouper is being considered in the ACL/AM amendment – again without any of the analyses of impacts and benefits that are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Catch Share Policy. We will resist efforts to continue to arbitrarily allocate these resources.

Regarding the specific management measures of Amendment 32:

- CCA would support a 10-year recovery period and basing the allowed harvest on reaching the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) as opposed to the overly restrictive Annual Catch Target (ACT). The Council is using the conservative optimal yield target for overall management of grouper and we do not think an ACT is necessary. We support achieving the longest open season possible.
- For red grouper we can support the preferred alternative of setting the bag limit at 4 per day and scaling it back, if necessary, in subsequent years if this is needed to avoid a future closed season.
- We do not support closing any season for other groupers than gag.

GENERIC ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS/ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES AMENDMENT

Coastal Conservation Association has several significant concerns with the concepts contained in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment:

- With regard to Annual Catch Limits, CCA believes that all recreational ACLs should be measured in numbers of fish rather than pounds. This will remove some of the uncertainty and error that plagues recreational catch data.
- We support moving species with landings of less than 20,000 pounds out of the management complex, rather than designating them Ecosystem Species. Doing so will prevent managers from being required to enact measures that may impact dozens of species in a single complex in order to recover the weakest species.
- For unassessed species, unless there is clear evidence that the stock is declining, the control rule should not limit current harvest. It is absurd to employ an ABC control rule that could require significant reductions of harvest for a species when no problems have been documented with the stock. The logical option would be to simply cap the harvest at current levels until data is available to support an assessment.
- We are greatly dismayed to see that this document still looks exclusively at past landings history as the sole method to set allocations between the recreational and commercial sectors. We believe the allocation process should be forward-looking and that managers should make every effort to manage these fisheries to reflect present and future realities, rather than locking in these resources to repeat history. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council should use the criteria set out in the NOAA Catch Share Policy in setting any allocation and use economic value as a key criteria in order to set allocations that achieve the greatest benefit to the country.

Amendment 32 talking points – suggested highlights in bold.

ABOUT THE DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Why were the documents not available until Wednesday afternoon?

There was NO announcement when the documents WERE posted to the website. Why not? Who made the decision to NOT tell the public that the overdue documents were finally available, albeit only electronically? The main document is a 27 MEG download. That is a HUGE file. The public is rightfully offended by the Council's lack of respect and obvious disdain for meaningful public input.

Does the Council have any idea or even care about the people who have no or very limited computer access? This process has certainly denied the general public adequate time with the final proposals. The excuse of 'we're busy' does not hold water. Amendment 32 had initial public hearings over a year ago. OVER A YEAR AGO, that's what I said. Not too busy to push catch shares, though, as we can see by all of the recent Council activity.

Now, the documents presented to us only days away from the FINAL HEARINGS are still labeled DRAFT.

While the Council spends hundreds of thousands of tax dollars on 'outreach' designed to 'engage the angler in the management process, they systematically deny us the opportunity to provide thoughtful comments on proposed regulations. This appears to violate the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

How stupid do you think the public is that we will allow you to treat us this way? We request another round of hearings with at least fifteen days in which to review the documents prior to a hearing.

The recreational sector has spoken loud and clear: NO CATCH SHARES. What more does the Council need? Or is the catch share agenda another Council damn-the-public-opinion steamrolling of the public's rights?

The recreational sector, including the majority of its for hire captains, have CLEARLY SPOKEN AGAINST SECTOR SEPARATION. So why is the Council staff preparing a sector separation amendment? How can the Council possibly deny their ignoring of public input?

ABOUT THE DOCUMENT ITSELF

Why is it still a draft?

How nice of them to condense 153 pages to 16 for your ease of understanding.

The document shows that Maximum Sustainable Yield is reduced by 25% and is renamed Optimum Yield. This is an arbitrary 25% reduction. It will now be even easier for the anti-fishing agenda to claim that anglers are overfishing. What a crock of bad soup this is. Optimum Yield should be set at the old Maximum Sustainable yield. That is, in fact,

optimum. We reject the automatic reductions. They are NOT required to be set so low by Magnuson. In fact, Magnuson does not prohibit $MSY=OFL=OY$.

Why is the concept of re-capturing not considered? We know full well and have scientific proof spanning fifteen years that daily re-capture of undersized fish is a regular occurrence, yet we treat every discard as a unique fish and apply a high release mortality rate. This drives regulations to eliminate fishing effort.

Why is new best available science showing minimal release mortality in under 100 feet of water NOT being used to estimate landings reductions?

Why have we not done a full benchmark stock assessment when your Scientific and Statistical Committee asked for it? Because of the once in 30 year red tide event, the assessment is showing that the stock was reduced by 1/3. This has been shown to be wrong, yet a new assessment is not on the five year schedule of assessments.

Given that release mortality estimates HAVE been lowered slightly, why is a 24" minimum size limit for recreational anglers not being considered? It would result in a nearly 30% reduction in landings. The reduction should be even higher now, given the knowledge that 2/3 of the released gag are in state waters with an average depth of less than 30 feet. We would expect a benefit of more like 40%. All that without destroying a person's opportunity to fish. This would maximize the biological effect and minimize the social and economic impacts. DEMAND THAT THIS OPTION BE INCLUDED AND PREFERRED.

A slot limit on a grouper is insane. Even your own Reef Fish AP rejected it unanimously.

We are concerned that the Council is once again using a couple of agenda-driven comments to paint the picture of the gag fishery in the northern gulf. The individuals are proponents of sector separation and recreational catch shares. This is another example of selective hearing on the Council's part.

Why are the Interdisciplinary Planning Teams, formed and directed by the National Marine Fisheries Service, writing the regulations behind closed doors and without any accountability for formulation and methodology behind landings reduction estimates?

Just like with Red Grouper, overwhelming anecdotal evidence has been presented attesting to strong abundance, strong recruitment and a wide range of sizes available in the gag fishery. These all contradict the flawed, outdated gag assessment.

This is a 3 billion dollar mistake that the state of Florida will bear the brunt of. We have had enough of the mismanagement under which we have suffered for years. We demand accountability for mismanagement.

We demand another round of public hearings, based on final documents available AT LEAST fifteen days prior to the hearing.

2.2 Action 2. Recreational Bag Limits, Size Limits, and Closed Seasons

2.2.1 Gag Scenarios

PUBLIC PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE:

New full benchmark stock assessment. Interim management to be 24 " gag minimum size, 4 fish bag limit, 2 month spawning closure protection (Feb and March) for recreational AND commercial harvest.

If we have a spawning protection closure, it should be closed for all harvest.

2.2.2 Red Grouper Bag Limit

Preferred Alternative 3. Increase the red grouper bag limit to 4 fish per person. If, at the end of any season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper ACL, the bag limit will be reduced to 3 fish. If, at the end of any subsequent season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper ACL again, the red grouper bag limit will revert back to 2 fish.

Action 3 commercial dead discard adjustment – If dead discards are used in recreational calculations, then they should be used in commercial as well.

2.5 Action 5. Commercial Gag Size Limit

Alternative 1: No action. The commercial gag minimum size limit remains at 24 inches total length.

Female gag reach 50% maturity at about 23 inches (Figure 2.5.1). At smaller size limits, the majority of the fish will not yet have spawned. This will reduce spawning potential and could negatively impact the rebuilding plan.

These words say it all. What is the motivation to kill fish before they reach sexual maturity?

2.6 Action 6. Time and Area Closures

*Note: more than one alternative and option can be selected as preferred


Alternative 1: No Action, Do not create additional time and area closures that prohibit fishing for gag and other reef fishes.

There is not enough data to accurately assess stocks. How come we can be so precise.

NMFS promised sector accountability, then played rec against commercial by using cross sector accountability measures.

When will NMFS become accountable for their mismanagement?

Violated federal law by moving the two meetings after publishing in the federal register. Who is responsible for this?



Coastal Conservation Association
Comments for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
Public Hearings, Biloxi, Mississippi, May 10, 2011

My name is F. J. Eicke, Ocean Springs, Mississippi and I appear before this hearing on behalf of the Coastal Conservation Association Mississippi. My role in CCA Mississippi is that of Chairman of the Government Relations Committee.

We believe this comment process is seriously flawed. The angling public has been put into a difficult position as the Gulf Council posted the final hearing documents on Amendment 32 and the even more complex Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures in insufficient time for study, particularly by the lay public of which I am a member. This process, which involves hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents on these issues, is not conducive to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions on the options presented here, options that could have serious implications on the public's ability to access these public resources in the future. As presented here today, this process threatens to damage any faith that the recreational angling community may have that the Council is sincere in its efforts to gather and utilize meaningful input from us. We receive numerous reports from the recreational angling community – CCA members and non-members – who simply are frustrated and overwhelmed by the restrictions they do not understand. The question is whether the Gulf Council can defend its actions.

With these caveats, we have prepared comments to address the following issues:

The Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment
Reef Fish Amendment 32

AMENDMENT 32

The most central issue regarding Gulf grouper management to CCA is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, the Gulf Council initiated action on an amendment to set grouper allocation more than three years ago and has only now begun to schedule committee meetings on this issue. This is inexcusable. Currently gag grouper have been allocated in an arbitrary and capricious fashion in the Commercial Grouper IFQ amendment that was not supported by the legally mandated analyses. CCA's case against this action is currently before a federal judge and we are waiting for a decision.

We insist that the Gulf Council use the required economic, social and conservation criteria – as mandated in the NOAA Catch Share Policy – to allocate grouper and all other natural resources under its authority to maximize the economic benefits available to the entire people of this nation from the wise use of these resources. We are addressing a natural, public resource.

Although not a subject of Amendment 32, the Gulf Council risks making arbitrary allocations of black grouper and has possibly already done so for greater amberjack without any of the analyses of impacts and benefits that are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Catch Share Policy. The impact of the red snapper allocation that is based on historic data that is clearly out-of-date is yet another example of how crucial allocation decisions are to the

recreational community that is yet to believe that the Gulf Council is willing or prepared to consider the required economic, social and conservation criteria. CCA will resist efforts to continue to arbitrarily allocate our marine resources.

Regarding the specific management measures of Amendment 32:

- CCA would support a 10-year recovery period and basing the allowed harvest on reaching the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) as opposed to the overly restrictive Annual Catch Target (ACT). The Council is using the conservative optimal yield target for overall management of grouper and we do not think an ACT is necessary. We support achieving the longest open season possible.
- We do not support closing any season for other groupers than gag.

GENERIC ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS/ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES AMENDMENT

Coastal Conservation Association has several significant concerns with the concepts contained in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment:

- With regard to Annual Catch Limits, CCA believes that all recreational ACLs should be measured in numbers of fish rather than pounds. This will remove some of the uncertainty and error that plagues recreational catch data.
- We support moving species with landings of less than 20,000 pounds out of the management complex, rather than designating them Ecosystem Species. Doing so will prevent managers from being required to enact measures that may impact dozens of species in a single complex in order to recover the weakest species.
- For unassessed species, unless there is clear evidence that the stock is declining, the control rule should not limit current harvest. It is absurd to employ an ABC control rule that could require significant reductions of harvest for a species when no problems have been documented with the stock. The logical option would be to simply cap the harvest at current levels until data is available to support an assessment.
- We are greatly dismayed to see that this document still looks exclusively at past landings history as the sole method to set allocations between the recreational and commercial sectors. We believe the allocation process should be forward-looking and that managers should make every effort to manage these fisheries to reflect present and future realities, rather than locking in these resources to repeat history. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council should use the criteria set out in the NOAA Catch Share Policy in setting any allocation and use economic value as a key criteria in order to set allocations that achieve the greatest benefit to the country.

Terry

LOUISIANA COUNCIL OF UNDERWATER DIVE CLUBS

3513 43rd Street, Metairie, LA 70001
504 833-1884
tgmigaud@cox.net
www.lcudc.com

May 9, 2011

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2203 N Lois Avenue
Suite 1100
Tampa, FL 33607

To whom it may concern,

This letter contains comments for the proposed Amendment 32 for the Gulf of Mexico gag grouper fishery. On behalf of the Louisiana Council of Underwater Dive Club's (LCUDC) membership, the following comments are submitted.

The LCUDC is composed of nine (9) independent dive clubs with eight (8) clubs in Louisiana and one (1) club in Texas with approximately 200 members and with an e-mail list of over 500 divers from the USA and abroad.

The LCUDC is in complete agreement with the FRA letter from the Executive Director Dennis O'Hern to Peter Hood, SERO, National Marine Fisheries Service dated MAY 6, 2011 on this matter.

The LCUDC would like to add to the debate in that as offer stated in mail-outs, web sites, and the Gulf Coast Council (GCC) meetings that the GCC is mandated under Magnuson-Stevens Act to prevent overfishing in the Gulf of Mexico. It is our understanding that part of that act mandates the protection of essential marine habitats. It is also our understanding that the Gulf of Mexico is declared an essential marine habitat with the exception of offshore platforms.

That is the question that is posed to the Gulf Coast Council: Why are offshore platforms not part of the essential marine habitats? When questions are asked at the GCC meeting concerning the platforms and why they not protected from removal, the answer more offers than not: "We do not know what's on the platforms, we need to do studies." The perception is the GCC does not want to know what is on the platforms as then they would be required to act to prevent their removal. After over 70 years, it may be time for the GCC to find out what is on the platforms if they are going to live up to their mandate.

A recently study on Red Snappers on platforms

Study: Coastal Marine Institute: title: Proof of Concept for Platform Recruited Fish, Phase 1:
Do Platforms Provide Habitat for Subadult Red Snapper? Dated February 2010

Authors:

Lauren K. Nowling
James H. Cowan, Jr.

Richard F. Shaw

In the end of the **Conclusions** part on page 56 and 57, the last 2 parts stated:
"It may be possible to determine if there are a disproportionate number of adult red snapper in the eastern Gulf and elsewhere that acquired this oil and gas platform signature in the otoliths, during some time in their early life history."

7) If the above is true, oil and gas platforms may constitute red snapper essential fish habitats and, as such, should be considered as a viable tools in management of red snapper 77

If this is true for red snapper, it could be assumed it is true for many of other fishes such as groupers, amberjacks, and cobia.

I would like to note that James Cowan has stated in an article in National Geographic Magazine dated Feb, 2011 title: "Why Fish Flock to Sunken Ships".

On page 90 he made a statement concerning platforms: "When it comes to Red Snapper, artificial reefs are bait." That platforms increase "overfishing species that are already under stress". These statements and the above study is a contradiction of positions. This study points out the correct hypnosis based on facts not just a stated opinion with no facts.

Early this year, MP 305 was removed. From many divers' observations in late January until early March Groupers of various species including the Gag would school up on this platform.

What was their purpose? Were they seeking protection? Were they feeding? Were they spawning? From divers observations probably all three took place. Did the Gulf Coast Council protect this possible and probably valuable marine habitat? No. This platform was a biomass full of life, corals, tropical fishes of all kinds, and valuable commercial and recreational marine fishes such as the Gag. The Gulf Coast Council stated on record that Gag grouper was closed during February and March due to the fact that it is there spawning season. The time and the activities of the gag on this platform would indicate they were indeed in and around the platform to spawn.

A question that the above study indicates is that the platform has change the behavior of many important – threatening species of fishes. Red snapper and many other species of fishes have found the platforms an important step in their life cycle. It has given the various species new areas to seek protection, to feed, and yes to spawn.

Within the next five (5) years 1500 of the 4000 platforms will be destroyed. Some will be toppled in place (10% to 15%) for the "Rigs to Reef" to program, but the upper part (the most productive part) will be lost. This would be an expected loss of approximately 3,750 acres of coral habitat. Fewer than 4% of the 4000 platforms have been studied. (Statements from ecorigs.com)

An LSU Coastal Management Initiative study R.S Carney, June 2005 states "it may be ecologically accurate to consider it a whole new habitat, a steel archipelago... Older structures will be removed, and even if large numbers are cut or toppled to create fish habitat, the most productive upper zone will be lost. From now on, the unique platform ecosystem is likely to be in decline."

Wilson et. al 2003 reported that the upper partial of the productive platforms contains ten times the biomass of a natural reef including the NOAA Flower Garden National Sanctuary.

On a page titled "Artificial Reefs: Oases for Marine Life in the Gulf" from the web site of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE) states: "a typical 4-pile platform jacket (the underwater support structure of an offshore platform) provides 2-3 acres of living and feeding habitat for thousands of underwater species" "Marine researchers have reported fish densities to be 20 to 50 times higher on platforms than in nearby water, and each platform seasonally serves as **critical habitats** for thousands of fishes, many of which are of recreational and commercial importance."

Please notice the wording by NOAA "**serves as critical habitats**".

The "Rigs to Reef" program is a hoax. The Governor of Louisiana has taken \$18 million out the fund and probably seeking to raid the balance.

If the FRA finds that they must seek a legal remedy, the LCUDC respectfully request that the loss of essential marine habitats be made part of their case as the perception is that the Gulf Coast Council is not living up to their mandate to protect essential marine habitats.

The LCUDC thanks you in advance for your consideration on this matter and respectfully requests that this letter be made part of the record on this matter.

Respectfully



Terry Migaud
Secretary/Treasure

Attachments:

BOEMRE page title Artificial Reefs: Oases for Marine Life in the Gulf

CMI study in part: Proof of Concept for Platform Recruited Fish, Phase 1: Do Platforms Provide Habitat for Subadult Red Snapper?

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement

[Home](#)
[Search](#)
[Site Map](#)



GOMR

[About BOEMRE](#)
[Newsroom](#)
[FAQ](#)
[Renewable Energy](#)
[Offshore Energy](#)
[Enviro. Stewardship](#)
[Research](#)
[Jobs](#)
[Library](#)
[Kids' Page](#)
[Pipeline Open Access](#)
[GOMESA Rev. Sharing](#)
[Public Engagement](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Alaska](#)
[Atlantic](#)
[Gulf of Mexico](#)
[Pacific](#)

Artificial Reefs: Oases for Marine Life in the Gulf

Whether it's an operating oil and gas (petroleum) production platform or a retired platform intentionally placed for conservation and fisheries enhancement, a typical 4-pile platform jacket (the underwater support structure of an offshore platform) provides 2-3 acres of living and feeding habitat for thousands of underwater species.

That's a good thing, because the natural bottom of the Gulf of Mexico (GOM) is a flat plain, comprised of mud, clay and sand with very little natural rock bottom and reef habitat. Without the platform and other artificial reefs, fish and other marine life typically would become widely dispersed, far from ideal conditions for commercial fishing and recreational fishing and diving.




As observed and documented by the Minerals Management Service's (MMS) diving scientists, invertebrates and plants attach to petroleum platforms within weeks of their placement in the marine environment. Within a year, the platform can be completely covered with plants and sessile invertebrates, attracting mobile invertebrates and fish species, and forming a highly complex food chain.

As observed and documented by the Minerals Management Service's (MMS) diving scientists, invertebrates and plants attach to petroleum platforms within weeks of their placement in the marine environment. Within a year, the platform can be

completely covered with plants and sessile invertebrates, attracting mobile invertebrates and fish species, and forming a highly complex food chain.

Petroleum platforms function as entirely new places to live; niches for countless animals. In addition to harboring numerous species of juvenile fish and adult life stages, these platforms serve as hunting grounds for swift open-ocean pelagic fishes, such as mackerel, tuna, and jacks. These fish species use the steel platform reefs as places to grab a quick meal, but also for orientation in an otherwise featureless environment, and as areas to rest where the platform structure weakens or deflects currents, and as places to hide from species that may prey on them. Marine researchers have reported fish densities to be 20 to 50 times higher at oil and gas platforms than in nearby open water, and each platform seasonally serves as critical habitat for 10 to 20 thousand fishes, many of which are of recreational and commercial importance.



Retired petroleum platforms are required by the MMS lease agreement to be removed from the marine environment and taken to shore for disposal within one year from termination of the oil and gas lease. An alternative to onshore disposal is the conversion of retired platforms to permitted and permanently submerged platform artificial reefs, i.e. Rigs-to-Reefs (RTR).



In 1980, the MMS initiated an effort to develop a database that would

Hot Topics:



[New Reforms](#)
[Ocean Energy
Safety Advisory
Committee](#)
[Notice to Lessees](#)
[Well Permits and
Plans](#)
[Investigations and
Review Unit](#)
[Deepwater Horizon
Library & Reading
Room](#)

Contact:

[Public Affairs](#)

Coastal Marine Institute

Proof of Concept for Platform Recruited Fish, Phase I: Do Platforms Provide Habitat for Subadult Red Snapper?



MMS U.S. Department of the Interior
Minerals Management Service
Gulf of Mexico OCS Region



Cooperative Agreement
Coastal Marine Institute
Louisiana State University

Coastal Marine Institute

Proof of Concept for Platform Recruited Fish, Phase I: Do Platforms Provide Habitat for Subadult Red Snapper?

Authors

Lauren K. Nowling
James H. Cowan, Jr.
Richard F. Shaw

February 2010

Prepared under MMS Cooperative Agreement
1435-99-CA-30951-18181

by

Louisiana State University
Coastal Fisheries Institute
School of the Coast and Environment
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Published by

U.S. Department of the Interior
Minerals Management Service
Gulf of Mexico OCS Region

Cooperative Agreement
Coastal Marine Institute
Louisiana State University

they are simply attracting fish to the area, they may merely promote overfishing. Bohnsack (1989) offered a conceptual model which inferred that increased production is most likely at locations isolated from natural reefs, and for habitat-limited, demersal, philopatric, territorial, and obligatory reef species. Species that are recruitment-limited, pelagic, highly mobile, and either partially reef-dependant or opportunistic reef fish may be present on platforms simply due to attraction. This is particularly true in locations with abundant natural reef habitat and/or where exploitation rates are high. Therefore, the question of habitat limitation lies at the heart of the artificial reef controversy (Grossman *et al.*, 1997). Bohnsack (1989) also stated that artificial reefs are unlikely to benefit heavily exploited or overfished populations without other management actions. Currently, the Gulf Management Council does not include oil and gas platforms, or any other artificial reef habitat, in their treatment of EFH.

OTOLITHS

The teleost otolith is composed of calcium carbonate, mainly in the form of aragonite, and an organic matrix including proteins, carbohydrates and lipids, as well as trace elements that are deposited during otolith deposition (Takagi *et al.*, 2000). Otoliths are located in the head of fishes in three pairs (sagittae, lapilli, and asteriscii) and function in the acoustico-lateralis system. They grow, or accrete, relative to somatic growth, forming concentric opaque and translucent rings; increments in otoliths can be deposited sub-daily, daily, and annually.

Otoliths are bathed in endolymph within the inner ear sacs and the otolith grows without touching any cells (Takagi, 2002). It is generally believed that the organic matrix is first constructed, followed by aragonite crystallization. The cells of the membranous wall of the otolith organ synthesize components of the otolith matrix. The components are secreted into the endolymph, a framework is constructed and the aragonite crystallization occurs on that framework (Takagi *et al.*, 2000). Therefore, the calcification process of otoliths is heavily dependent upon the composition of the endolymphatic fluid (Campana, 1999). The key regulating factors appear to be pH of the endolymph, which is determined by the concentration of bicarbonate ions in the endolymph (Romanek and Gauldie, 1996; Payan *et al.*, 1997, 1998), and temperature. Calcium carbonate can crystallize as any one of three crystal morphs (calcite, aragonite or vaterite) and the rate and type of calcium carbonate crystals formed in otoliths is regulated by proteins (Campana, 1999). Aragonite is the norm for sagittae and lapilli otoliths, while most asteriscii are made of vaterite. Strontium carbonate is virtually isostructural with aragonite making substitution of Sr ions for Ca in aragonite very likely. Ions similar to Ca and Sr, such as other alkaline earth metals (Mg and Ba), can also be substituted for Ca in the aragonite matrix.

OTOLITH MICROCHEMISTRY

In the field of fisheries biology and management, the analysis of otolith microstructure is a quickly expanding field of prime importance (Payan *et al.*, 1997). Fish otoliths have traditionally been used as a hard part to age fish, but recent research indicates that they may also serve as ideal natural markers of individual fish or fish populations (Campana *et al.*, 1994). Some goals of otolith research focus on transport, movement, and mixing hypotheses, as well as understanding the mechanisms by which minor and trace elements are incorporated into otoliths, and developing tools with which to measure the elements present. Secor *et al.* (1995b) stated that concerted efforts at the suborganismal and organismal level are required to determine the effect of the environment on otolith composition.

estuaries. Otoliths were removed and analyzed by solution-based ICP-MS; preliminary analyses suggested that seven elements (Mg, Mn, Cu, Zn, Sr, Ba, and Pb) were detectable in the otoliths (Gillanders and Kingsford, 2000). However, their results showed that significant differences were found in the otolith chemistry of juvenile trumpeter from different estuaries, but that success rates of classification to recruited estuaries ranged from 50 to 100% (Gillanders and Kingsford, 2000). While their results were promising, Gillanders and Kingsford (2000) suggested that the addition of further elements to the discriminant function and the use of stable isotopes might improve their classification accuracies.

There are several such examples in the literature similar to the studies described above (Secor *et al.*, 1995a; Jessop *et al.*, 2002; Sanchez-Jerez *et al.*, 2002; Swan *et al.*, 2003; Arai *et al.*, 2004; Brazner *et al.*, 2004; Chittaro *et al.*, 2004; and Arslan and Secor, 2005, to name but a few). Although the study by Patterson *et al.* (1998) was the only other from the Gulf of Mexico using red snapper, it is plausible to compare this study to those discussed above, as they represent direct comparisons to this research and others in the current literature, with one notable exception. This study is unique because it deals with an elemental signature of oil and gas platforms, i.e., a fingerprint derived from a man-made habitat.

A study by Spencer *et al.* (2000) that utilized distinct anthropogenic sources of lead in fish otoliths as a potential nursery ground stock marker in Hawaii is the “bridge” that closes the gap between this study and those in the previous literature. Spencer *et al.* (2000) collected three species of juvenile tropical reef fish (parrotfish, sergeant major, and domino damselfish) at 5 locations in Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, and used ICP-MS for otolith analysis. Variations measured in the lead stable isotope ratios in the otoliths reflected mixing of anthropogenic lead from the Kaneohe Bay watershed and “background” lead characteristic of the adjacent ocean (Spencer *et al.*, 2000). They found that the lead isotopic composition of the watershed has a low $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{204}\text{Pb}$ signature primarily reflecting past combustion of tetra-ethyl Pb additives in fuels, while the ocean water has a high $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{204}\text{Pb}$ isotopic composition (Spencer *et al.*, 2000). The key issue was that the characteristic anthropogenic Pb isotope ratios are a qualitative rather than quantitative marker, so that the reliable detection of the presence of distinct Pb isotopes is all that is required for nursery ground discrimination (Spencer *et al.*, 2000). The use of an anthropogenic otolith signature instead of naturally occurring markers inspired the expansion of the “nursery area hypothesis” to manmade rather than natural nursery habitats.

The overall objectives of all of the studies mentioned involve determination of the origin of adult recruits in coastal and offshore environments. This is very similar to the main goal of the next phase of this research; namely to determine if adult red snapper now recruiting to habitats in the eastern Gulf and elsewhere have spent any portion of their lives on oil and gas platforms. The real distinction between this research and the studies performed earlier in the literature is that it is the first to deal with determining the otolith “elemental fingerprint” of reef fishes attributable to their association with man-made habitats rather than natural habitats. If findings hold true, it may provide a new direction in which this type of research may expand.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the fact that the main goal of this study was to prove the concept that otolith microchemistry could be used to determine association of red snapper with oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico, a number of other important conclusions can be drawn. They are as follows:

- This method was successful; otolith microchemistry can be used to determine the trace element signature of oil and gas platforms in otoliths of red snapper.
- Vanadium 51, Lead 206, Lead 207, and Lead 208 may be dissolution products incorporated into red snapper otoliths from oil and gas platform operations and their prior drilling operations.
- It is plausible to move forward with microdrill sub-sampling of either the otolith cores or progressively out from the core of adult fish, to determine if the new recruits that are now expanding into the eastern Gulf were associated with oil and gas platforms during some portion of their early life, and to determine age-specific habitat affinity.
- It may be possible to determine if there are a disproportionate number of adult red snapper in the eastern Gulf and elsewhere that have acquired this "oil and gas platform signature" in their otoliths, during sometime in their early life history.
- If the above statement is true, oil and gas platforms may constitute red snapper essential fish habitat and, as such, should be considered as viable tools in management of red snapper.

Walter Storch

I'm giving you fair warning –

I'm going to beat you up a bit. But I've got a point to make

How can you have the AUDACITY to change meeting times and places / release reports with just days notice of public hearings (this report was issued on April 27th – the first public hearing was scheduled just days later – and expect us to educate ourselves as to what you are taking from us See MS page 69

YOU WANT US TO PLAY BY THE RULES BUT YOU DON'T HAVE TO? God forbid I get caught in federal waters without the proper venting tool - I'll face heavy fines and all kinds of possible penalties.

What's your penalty for not following the rules? A guaranteed 3% increase to your 377 MILLION DOLLAR budget for 2011 !!!!!

and that's just

Well – I didn't have time to review the SEVERAL HUNDRED pages of information but I did notice your statistical committee was very busy. The report I'm supposed to "Educate myself" all about in a few days covers EVERY amendment ever made , in detail. It also includes census data for several counties in Florida. Because we need to know how many Asian people lived in Bay county in 1990, 2000, and 2007 and what grade of high school they passed. And yes it even includes totally obscure information that we paid God only knows how much for - such

as HOW MANY CHURCHES THERE ARE IN BAY COUNTY WITH A MARITIME THEME. I'd really like to know how this factors into the statistical data for the red grouper fishery. We have the same Bullshit data for Oskaloosa County, Wakulla County, and Franklin County.

DID YALL READ THIS? - WHO READ AMENDMENT 32? I guess you reviewed it prior to releasing it? You did read it ? correct?

I need to know who read this report.

Because in the very short time I've had to review it I noticed some pretty lame assed mistakes, Look at page 112 table 3.3.3.8 , *COLUMN 2* I'm not familiar with the state of Apalachicola , or Steinhatchee, or even the great state of Panama City.

This goes on for several pages – I hope you didn't read it because that's the ONLY reason I can see for YOU our ALL KNOWING – ALL TRUSTWORTHY – GULF COUNCIL to allow something so blatant to get by you –

I know this is just a typo, but you either read the report and don't care about the mistakes in it – which means you have no business commenting on it. Or you didn't read the report – which means you have no business commenting on it. Which is it?

So if you didn't educate yourself to it HOW CAN YOU USE IT TO
CHANGE THE FISHERY LIMITS!!!!!!!

When I started I told you I was going to beat you up but it was to make
a point.

Damon McKNIGHT – You've been a very successful charter Boat Captain
for over 15 YEARS

Harlon Pearce – You are the Chaiman of the La. Seafood Promotion
Board and "AMBASSADOR for LA. Seafood around the WORLD"

Myron Fischer – You are a Captain and MULTI WORLD RECORD HOLDER

You each had to have an incredible passion for fishing to achieve what
you have done. I know you each remember having landed the biggest
fish on the boat, or bringing home a box overflowing with fish – or
showing a kid how to land a big fish. You ALL have to admit there's no
other feeling like that in the world.

Well what I want to know is where that passion is now?

Because every time you accept A BULLSHIT REPORT LIKE THIS AND
NEEDLESLY CLOSE A SEASON YOU TAKE AWAY SOMEBODYS CHANCE
AT HAVING THAT FEELING.

YOU CANNOT SIT THERE AND TELL ME YOU ACCEPT THIS AS "THE BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE" AND USE IT TO TAKE AWAY YOUR RIGHT TO YOUR PASSION – FISHING!

WHAT IS ALSO

I WOULD BE EMBARRASSED TO HAVE MY NAME ASSOCIATED WITH A REPORT LIKE THIS – I KNOW YOU ARE TOO PROUD TO ALSO.

But if you do accept it – you have failed miserably at your job and should be fired.

THIS REPORT IS ABSOLUT CRAP!
Do what is right – stand up – find that passion AGAIN – and DEMAND REAL INFORMATION – NOT THIS BULLSHIT!!!!

Subject: AMENDMENT 32 Date: Tuesday, May 10, 2011 7:38 AM From: Alan Rubin
<spex@earthlink.net> To: John Milner
<GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org> Conversation: AMENDMENT 32

Coastal Conservation Association

Comments for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council

Public Hearings on Amendment 32, May 2011

My name is ALAN RUBIN and I would like to thank the Council for giving us
the opportunity to address the

fishery management proposals before us tonight.

Having said that, it must also be pointed out that we believe this comment
process is seriously flawed. The angling public has been put into a

difficult position as the Gulf Council just posted the final hearing
documents on this amendment and the even more complex Annual Catch Limit/

Accountability Measures on April 27. This process, which involves hundreds and
hundreds of pages of documents on these issues, is not conducive

to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions on the options
presented here, options that could have serious implications on the

public's ability to access these public resources in the future. As presented
here today, this process threatens to damage any faith that the recreational

angling community may have that the Council is sincere in its efforts to
gather and utilize meaningful input from us.

CCA is still reviewing the extensive documents and reserves the right to
make final comments at the Council meetings. However, the following

testimony has been prepared by Coastal Conservation Association to address
the following issues:

The Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment

Reef Fish Amendment 32

AMENDMENT 32

The most central issue regarding Gulf grouper management to CCA is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially

reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, the Gulf Council initiated action on an

amendment to set grouper allocation more than three years ago and has only now begun to schedule committee meetings on this issue. This is

inexcusable. Currently gag grouper have been allocated in an arbitrary and capricious fashion in the Commercial Grouper IFQ amendment that

was not supported by the legally mandated analyses. CCA's case against this action is currently before a federal judge and we are waiting for a

decision.

We insist that the Gulf Council use the required economic, social and conservation criteria as mandated in the NOAA Catch Share Policy to

allocate grouper and all other natural resources under its authority to maximize the economic benefits available to the entire people of this nation

from the wise use of these resources.

Although not a subject of Amendment 32 another such arbitrary allocation for black grouper is being considered in the ACL/AM amendment to

again without any of the analyses of impacts and benefits that are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Catch Share Policy. We will

resist efforts to continue to arbitrarily allocate these resources.

Regarding the specific management measures of Amendment 32:

CCA would support a 10-year recovery period and basing the allowed harvest on reaching the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) as opposed to the overly

restrictive Annual Catch Target (ACT). The Council is using the conservative optimal yield target for overall management of

grouper and we do not

think an ACT is necessary. We support achieving the longest open season possible.

For red grouper we can support the preferred alternative offsetting the bag limit at 4 per day and scaling it back, if necessary, in subsequent years

if this is needed to avoid a future closed season.

We do not support closing any season for other groupers than gag.

GENERIC ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS/ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES AMENDMENT

Coastal Conservation Association has several significant concerns with the concepts contained in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment:

With regard to Annual Catch Limits, CCA believes that all recreational ACLs should be measured in numbers of fish rather than pounds. This will

remove some of the uncertainty and error that plagues recreational catch data.

We support moving species with landings of less than 20,000 pounds out of the management complex, rather than designating them Ecosystem

Species. Doing so will prevent managers from being required to enact measures that may impact dozens of species in a single complex in order to recover the weakest species.

For unassessed species, unless there is clear evidence that the stock is declining, the control rule should not limit current harvest. It is absurd to

employ an ABC control rule that could require significant reductions of harvest for a species when no problems have been documented with the

stock. The logical option would be to simply cap the harvest at current levels until data is available to support an assessment.

We are greatly dismayed to see that this document still looks exclusively at past landings history as the sole method to set allocations between

the recreational and commercial sectors. We believe the allocation process should be forward-looking and that managers

should make every effort to manage these fisheries to reflect present and future

realities, rather than locking in these resources to repeat history. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council should use the criteria set out in the NOAA Catch Share Policy in setting any allocation and use economic value as a key criteria in order to set allocations that achieve the greatest benefit to the country.

ALAN RUBIN 3457 PEACE RIVER DR.

PUNTA GORDA, FL 33950

The Gulf Fishermen's Association, whose members hold a substantial amount of grouper/tilefish IFQ shares, supports making Madison Swanson and Steam Boat Lumps a time area closure from January through April. This will make the predominant spawning area more consistent. NOAA Law Enforcement has stated numerous times that a consistent regulation on the 40 break will be much more enforceable.

Right now, the 40 Break is a speed trap for honest commercial fishermen, who accidentally enter the closed areas because the boundary lines are so confusing, and it is hard for them to figure out which area is closed, which area is open, and which area is open only during a certain time.

There is no scientific evidence that large spawning gags have increased in these two closed areas over the last 10 years. In Amendment 32, Dr. Robert Shipp stated, "an area protected from *all* or some human activity was *not* effective for a majority of marine species due to their mobility in and out of the closed areas." Chris Koenig stated in Amendment 32 that the main objective of time area closures is to protect spawning aggregations of gag and to protect a portion of the male gag population particularly vulnerable to fishing during spawning.

The 40 break is not an area where *yellowedge* and *tilefish* are caught. The predominant fishing grounds for these fish are offshore of the 40 break. For the most part, yellowedge and tilefish are targeted during June through August, when waters inshore of the 35 fathom line are closed to longliners. A Time Area Closure January through April will not preclude longliners from filling their yellowedge and tilefish quotas.

In Action 6, please select Alternatives 5, option c., as the Council's preferred alternative.

Jim Clements Board of Directors Gulf Fishermen's Association

OFFICERS
Venable Proctor
Chairman

Mitch Brownlee, Jr.
Vice Chairman

Bill Schwarzlose
Vice Chairman

Patrick Murray
President

Michael Kennedy
Vice President

Russell Kent
Vice President

Gary Loomis
Vice President

Gus Schram, III
Vice President

Rob Donlin
Secretary

Judy Shaw
Assistant Secretary


Robbie Chisolm
Treasurer

EXECUTIVE BOARD

N. DeGraaf Adams
Jeff Allen
Bruce Arendale
Bill Bird
William Blanchet
Douglass Boyd
Stan Brogdon
Billy Byrd
Gaylord "Rocky" Chase, Jr.
John Duren
Ed Francis
Terry Gray
Donald Hall, II
Christopher Harbuck
Charles Harter, III
Richard Hoban
Tom Hollingshead
Angela Hult
Claude C. Jennings, Jr.
Gary Kuecker
Edwin Lamberth
Ed Liccione
Mac McKeever
David Nobles
Matt Olson
David Owens
L. Don Perkins
Mark Ray
Don Roberts
John Roberts
Nelson "Snoop" Roth, Jr.
Chris Smisek
Timothy Strickland
Don Swanson
Ben Vaughan, III
Rusty Vincent
John Walther
Charles Witek, III

Robert Taylor
Director of State Development

Ted Venker
Conservation Director



Coastal Conservation Association

TEXAS • LOUISIANA • MISSISSIPPI • ALABAMA • FLORIDA • GEORGIA
SOUTH CAROLINA • NORTH CAROLINA • VIRGINIA • MARYLAND • NEW YORK
CONNECTICUT • MASSACHUSETTS • NEW HAMPSHIRE • MAINE • OREGON • WASHINGTON

May 26, 2011

Dr. Bob Shipp
Chairman
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2203 N Lois Avenue
Suite 1100
Tampa, Florida 33607 USA

Dear Dr. Shipp,

CCA believes that the comment process for Amendment 32 and the ACL/AM Amendment was seriously flawed. We understand the legal requirements that are at work and are forcing the Council to operate this way to meet looming deadlines. However, the angling public has been put into a difficult position as the final hearing documents on this amendment and the even more complex Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures were not posted until just a few days before the public hearings were scheduled to begin.

This process, which as you know involves hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents on these issues, is not conducive to allowing stakeholders to develop informed decisions on the options presented here, options that could have serious implications on the public's ability to access these public resources in the future. This process threatens to damage any faith that the recreational angling community may have that the Council is sincere in its efforts to gather and utilize meaningful input from us.

The inadequate time frame did not allow a thorough review of the public hearing documents, nor did it even allow adequate time to prepare CCA representatives to participate in the public hearings as fully as we would have preferred. After further review of the extensive documents, Coastal Conservation Association has prepared these final comments to address the following issues:

The Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment
Reef Fish Amendment 32

AMENDMENT 32

Amendment 32 must prohibit commercial take during the gag grouper spawning season, just as recreational take is prohibited during spawning. We recognize that the commercial fishers are limited by a quota, however, allowing a directed fishery on any of the spawning aggregations is disruptive and very likely will produce negative impacts on spawning success. Allowing directed commercial take during the spawning season while prohibiting

More Than 30 Years of Conservation

Dedicated to the Conservation and Protection of Marine Life

6919 Portwest Drive, Suite 100 • Houston, Texas 77024 • Fax (713) 626-5852 • (713) 626-4234
www.JoinCCA.org

recreational take is not only damaging to the resource it undermines the angling public's trust in the management system.

To CCA, one of the most important issues regarding Gulf grouper management is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, CCA requested 5 years ago that the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council develop formal allocations for Gulf grouper based on maximizing the value and benefits of this common property resource to the nation. Several discussions have occurred since then but ultimately no definitive action has been taken. Given the apparent necessity for future restrictions on gag harvest, we believe that it is absolutely necessary for the Council to address allocation of this resource. That allocation effort must be guided by current economic, demographic, conservation and social criteria. Allocating based primarily on prior catch records is unacceptable. Although not a subject of Amendment 32, another such arbitrary allocation for black grouper is being considered in the ACL/AM amendment – again without any of the analyses of impacts and benefits that are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Catch Share Policy. We will resist efforts to continue to arbitrarily allocate these resources.

We insist that the Gulf Council use the required economic, social and conservation criteria – as mandated in the NOAA Catch Share Policy – to allocate grouper and all other natural resources under its authority to maximize the economic benefits available to the nation from the wise use of these resources. The current Gulf Council Grouper IFQ program allocates and grants exclusive right of access to more than 65 percent of all the Gulf red and gag grouper to a limited number of commercial interests. CCA has contended that in fisheries where there is a large and growing recreational sector, exclusive fishing rights proposals maximize benefits to the commercial fishing industry while ignoring the participation and beneficial impacts of recreational fishing. We are opposed to this management program which subsidizes marginal commercial fisheries while strangling more valuable recreational fisheries. CCA currently has a case against this action before a federal judge and are waiting for a decision.

Regarding the specific management measures of Amendment 32:

- CCA would support a 10-year recovery period and basing the allowed harvest on reaching the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) as opposed to the overly restrictive Annual Catch Target (ACT). The Council is using the conservative optimal yield target for overall management of grouper and we do not think an ACT is necessary. We support achieving the longest open season possible.
- If the major problems noted previously are resolved, CCA would support a recreational and commercial spawning season closure for gag in February, March and April. We do not support closing any season for other groupers than gag.
- CCA does not support a slot size for gag, and prefers the current 22-inch minimum size. It should be restated that the primary cause in the recent decline in gag

grouper populations is not overfishing. Gag populations were severely damaged by a massive red tide off of Florida which lasted for more than a year. Prior to the red tide event, gag grouper biomass levels were rising under the existing regulations.

- For red grouper we can support the preferred alternative of setting the bag limit at 4 per day and scaling it back, if necessary, in subsequent years if this is needed to avoid a future closed season. An increase in recreational take is long overdue.
- CCA also supports maintaining the 20-inch minimum size for red grouper and the February-March spawning season closure.

Gag and red grouper fisheries are extremely valuable to the State of Florida in particular, where 96 percent of all the gag grouper taken in the Gulf is caught and landed. Recent economic comparisons of Gulf red and gag grouper show that the value of the recreational fisheries dwarfs the commercial fisheries. CCA will continue to insist that the Gulf Council and NMFS fairly allocate the resource to all users based on current economic, social and conservation criteria.

GENERIC ANNUAL CATCH LIMITS/ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES AMENDMENT

Coastal Conservation Association has several significant concerns with the concepts contained in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment:

- Given the Gulf Council's solid history of setting overfishing limits, we urge the members to consider all options in the context of which measure will give them the most flexibility in making case-by-case decisions in the future.
- With regard to Annual Catch Limits, CCA believes that all recreational ACLs should be measured in numbers of fish rather than pounds. This will remove some of the uncertainty and error that plagues recreational catch data.
- We support moving species with landings of less than 20,000 pounds out of the management complex, rather than designating them Ecosystem Species. Doing so will prevent managers from being required to enact measures that may impact dozens of species in a single complex in order to recover the weakest species.
- For unassessed species, unless there is clear evidence that the stock is declining, the control rule should not limit current harvest. It is absurd to employ an ABC control rule that could require significant reductions of harvest for a species when no problems have been documented with the stock. The logical option would be to simply cap the harvest at current levels until data is available to support an assessment.
- We are greatly dismayed to see that this document still looks exclusively at past landings history as the sole method to set allocations between the recreational and commercial sectors. We believe the allocation process should be forward-looking and that managers should make every effort to manage these fisheries to

Dr. Bob Shipp
May 26, 2011
Page 4

reflect present and future realities, rather than locking in these resources to repeat history.

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council should use the criteria set out in the NOAA Catch Share Policy in setting any allocation and use economic value as a key criteria in order to set allocations that achieve the greatest benefit to the country.

We do appreciate the opportunity to comment on these issues, and hope that in the future we and other concerned members of the public will have the chance to participate more fully in the process.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'CB', is positioned above the typed name of the signatory.

Chester Brewer, Chairman
CCA National Government Relations Committee

Subject: GagDate: Monday, May 9, 2011 2:54 PMFrom: Ira Pearson
<naclh20skier@verizon.net>To: John Milner
<GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org>Conversation: Gag

Dear gulf council:

I recently attended your meeting last Monday night, May 2nd, at the Hilton. My opinions regarding gag closures:

I am, like most fishermen, concerned with protecting the species and overfishing. That is why it is amazing to me that longlining is permitted at all. Is it because of a strong lobby or good-old-boy connections??? I am not trying to be facetious. You mentioned at the meeting that you had decreased the number of long liners. If you are really concerned with protecting the species, why have they not banned long lining completely and made them switch to bandit fishing (electric reels)? What would be the result??? higher grouper prices???? why would that be bad???

At the meeting you mentioned if a commercial fisherman was at his quota and then caught more, he could get on the radio and try to "buy" somebody else's share. That doesn't make a lot of sense it doesn't even sound plausible. You spoke of a huge amount of bycatch for commercial fishermen as if it was insignificant and yet you plan on curtailing recreational fisherman who MIGHT take a couple extra fish a year.

I am surprised that, in this down economy, that all of your plans hurt the recreational fishing industry tremendously. It does not seem that the recreational fishermen are the ones depleting the species. You will be hurting hotels, bait shops, dive shops, boat builders, boat repairman, party-boats, and much more. Tourists pour money into our economy....and MANY will not come if they cannot fish.

I have dove for 30 years in the Gulf of Mexico from 28 feet to 90 feet anywhere from off Anna Maria to off Clearwater. There are more gags now than 30 years ago. Do they move around from ledge to ledge...Yes. In the same summer a ledge can be loaded, become almost barren and then loaded again.

I thought about the one older gentleman that got up and spoke. He said he was retired and liked to go out with a couple of buddies and fish....and now he can't. If the recreational fisherman is not depleting the stocks, why is the opportunity being taken from so many "little" fishermen like him??? What about fishing every other month and increase the size of gag to 24 inches????

Like I said, I am concerned with protecting the species and overfishing. I think you are allowing the commercial fisherman to tax the species at the expense of the recreational fisherman and our overall economy. If you just banned long-lining wouldn't that help the overfishing tremendously??? You would protect the species and protect our overall economy (tourist & resident) by allowing recreational fishing.

Sincerely, Cheryl Pearson
clh20skier@verizon.net
1124 38 Avenue NE St.
Petersburg, FL 33704
727-823-1322

From: <C21JWHITE@aol.com> **Date:** Fri, 27 May 2011 20:16:58 -0400 **To:** John Milner
<GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org> **Subject:** Gag Grouper closure

The State of Florida depends on its tourists visiting our state each year for business and commerce. Thousands of tourists go fishing on their visit to Florida. It has been this way for decades. You are destroying many industries and business that depend on an open season for grouper. It is hard to believe that you are doing all of this in the middle of a very bad economic cycle. I have lived here since I was 6 years old. My father moved here from Connecticut because of his love for fishing and the water. I am sure thousands of others did the same. I have owned a Beach Business since 1983! You reduced the Gag grouper take 60% never has there ever been this drastic type of cut. Now you want to close the season for most of the whole year! I have been diving these waters since 1976 I believe my knowledge from first hand dives over 100's of dives is better knowledge than you are relying on for your decisions. There are plenty of grouper in the Gulf of Mexico. There are just as many grouper in State waters as there was in the 80s.

The current bag limits are working. You people do not care about the consequences of these awful decisions you are making for Florida and surrounding gulf states. ALL OF YOU HAVE NO COMMON SENSE! I have fished my whole life here in Florida. With Gas prices so high, the red tides of this past decade the pressure from recreational fishing has dropped off the shelf! All you care about is your commercial friends and interests. Why not consider the following which would greatly reduce the pressure and maintain a healthy population of grouper while letting the recreational angler and businesses that depend on this fishery year round. Close all recreational gag grouper fishing Monday thru Friday. Allow fishing on the Weekends only. That would be a 70% closure on days to fish during the year. Raise the size to 24 inch min reduce bag limit to 1 fish per person. . This is a fair plan that works for everyone. Businesses do most of their business on Weekends and that is when most working Floridians have time to fish. Tourists visiting Florida could still catch and keep 1 grouper on the weekends. As everyone knows the wind seems to blow always on the weekends. The Weekend fishing would not be available all 52 weeks year round because of our fall and winter weather cold fronts which would restrict fishing for grouper, reducing the fishing days even further! This is a win-win solution for everyone and will greatly reduce the recreational take but allow year round fishing. Could really help business stay afloat and which will reduce unemployment and job loss. This is a common sense solution!

James White Seminole Fl Recreational Fisherman

Dear Gulf Council,

My name is Louis Rossignol,

I am a,

30 Vet of the Hell Divers Spearfishing Club,

Director of the Louisiana Council of Underwater Dive Clubs,

Board member of the Fishing Rights Alliance,

For public record, I would like to state that this meeting appears to be in violation of the Federal Register Act, United States Code, Title 44, Chapter 15, section 1508, which states that 15 days public notice is required. The notice of change was posted in the federal register on April 29th, less than 15 days before the meeting. This was a change of location that was not adequately publicized. How can you expect the public to believe that you really care what they think by having meetings and not adequately posting them? The last public input meeting, we were given the wrong day to show up, and we missed it completely, this is more than a typo, this is a purposeful, misleading of the public to squelch public input.

The first public input meeting I ever attended almost 20 years ago, I was told by a Gulf Council member before the meeting started, "Why are you even here, we are just going to do what we want to do". No wonder attendance is so low tonight!

The Council claims to listen to the public, yet the examples of ignoring the public are in these proposals.

Where is the 24 inch gag minimum size limit? 22 inches is below the desired 50% sexual maturity size.

Where is the accountability measure that carries uncaught 'allowable catch' to the next year? We just had the BP spill that stopped us from fishing for over 6 months last year. There is no possible way the ACL's of last year were met.

Why is there absolutely no consideration of re-capture and release of undersized gags in the process?

Why is new best available science showing minimal release mortality in under 100 feet of water NOT being used to estimate landing reductions?

Why have we not done a full benchmark stock assessment when your own Scientific and Statistical Committee asked for it? Because of the once in 30 year red tide event, the assessment is showing that the stock was reduced by 1/3. This has been shown to be wrong, yet a new assessment is not on the five year schedule of assessments.

We request a new full benchmark stock assessment. Interim management to be 24 " gag minimum size, 4 fish bag limit, 2 month spawning closure protection (Feb and March) for recreational AND commercial harvest.

DATA AND THE PUBLIC:

Why are Annual Catch Limits being irresponsibly set when the National Marine Fisheries Service has not even complied with the Magnuson mandate to fix their fatally flawed data? Congress mandated that MRFSS fix its data collection in January of 2009, yet the data collection by MRFSS is still fatally flawed.

The amberjack closure is just another example of the Gulf Council trying to thwart the public's right to fish. Closing the season in June and July does nothing to help the fish stocks; all it does is thwart the public in a supposed effort reduction, when in fact the stock has never been healthier. If the Gulf Council was really concerned about Amberjack stocks, it would close the season during spawning time, recreationally and commercially, not during peak fishing months. But how would the Council know, they still haven't fixed their data collection, yet they still impose unfair regulations on fishermen.

The red snapper regulations are a joke as anyone of the fishing public will attest. You claim this year to give us a higher ACL while reducing the season on an over populated fish, claiming that the fish we catch are larger. Instead of an ACL in

pounds, you should be giving us and ACL in numbers of fish, if you had any data other than the fatally flawed dockside surveys you use to mismanage our fisheries. This fishery and others have given the fishing public a complete distain and lack of trust for the Gulf Council which we will be relaying to Congress.

ABOUT THE DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Why were the documents not available until Wednesday afternoon? The 27th.

Why was there was NO announcement when the documents WERE posted to the website. Why didn't our Louisiana representatives notify us? Aren't they supposed to represent us? Who made the decision to NOT tell the public that the overdue documents were finally available, albeit only electronically? The main document is a 27 MEG download. That is a HUGE file. The public is rightfully offended by the Council's lack of respect and obvious disdain for meaningful public input. Now we are supposed to give public input on 2 - 200+ page documents, which are still labeled DRAFT?

Does the Council have any idea or even care about the people who have no or very limited computer access? This process has certainly denied the general public adequate time with the final proposals. Amendment 32 had initial public hearings over a year ago. It appears that you're not too busy to push catch shares though, as we can see by all of the recent Council activity.

Now, the documents presented to us only days away from the FINAL HEARINGS are still labeled DRAFT.

While the Council spends hundreds of thousands of tax dollars on 'outreach' designed to 'engage the angler in its mismanagement process, they systematically deny us the opportunity to provide thoughtful comments on proposed regulations. This appears to violate the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

We request another round of hearings with at least fifteen days in which to review the final documents, not drafts, prior to a hearing. The fishing public is totally disenchanted with the Council's catch share driven agenda, total distain

for public input, and over-regulation and mismanagement of our fisheries while using still fatally flawed data.

As in the Jones Act, the recreational sector has spoken loud and clear: NO CATCH SHARES. What more does the Council need? Or is the catch share agenda another Council damn-the-public-opinion steamrolling of the public's rights?

The recreational sector, including the majority of it's for hire captains, have CLEARLY SPOKEN AGAINST SECTOR SEPARATION. So why is the Council staff preparing a sector separation amendment?

LOBSTER

I read on the Gulf Council website that they are having public input on Spiny lobster in South Florida; Duck Key, Key West and St. Pete Beach, why is it, if you're from Louisiana or any other of the neighboring states we don't have any say so on Spiny Lobster? Why do you discriminate against Louisiana? We like lobster too.

Let me tell you, Congress is listening, and our Senators and Representative are getting tired of hearing from us about the mismanagement of our fisheries from the Gulf Council and NMFS. When we go to Washington, again, our message will be clear, we want complete removal of those involved in the mismanagement process. The fishing Public has had enough.

Just as you are putting a check mark in your box, listening to me in this public input, I am putting a check mark in my box also. With this video, I will show Congress, I tried to work within the system. But the system doesn't work, and the system is stealing the rights of the American Angler. We want it changed, we are tired of having our right to fish steamrolled by an agenda driven Gulf Council, with absolutely no data, to back up their findings.

On our next visit to Congress we will DEMAND that any Council members and NMFS employees who continue to defy Congress be REMOVED from their position.



Dr. Robert Shipp, Chairman
Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
2205 North Lois Avenue
Suite 1100
Tampa, Florida 33607

May 27, 2011

RE: Public Hearing Draft on Reef Fish Amendment 32 (Rev.04/27/11)

Chairman Shipp:

The Pew Environment Group strongly urges the Council to approve Reef Fish Amendment 32 at the June 2011 meeting to ensure new measures are in place by January 2012. Gag is one of the most important fisheries in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, particularly with the recreational community, but gag is heavily overfished. The population declined dramatically after the 2005 red tide event, adding additional mortality on top of overfishing. Significant reductions in harvest are needed now in order to end overfishing and rebuild the population. We appreciate and commend the Council's and staff's effort on the development of the Amendment. However, we also have recommendations to address some concerns regarding several action items in the Public Hearing Draft for Reef Fish Amendment 32 (Rev. 04/27/11).

We would be supportive of either option to allow the longest recreational season possible, or splitting the recreational season into two to give south Florida anglers more of an opportunity to participate in the fishery. Whichever scenario the Council chooses, the most important considerations should be crafting a rebuilding plan that has a high probability of success and ensuring that the management scenarios and harvest reductions are conservative enough to prevent the annual catch limit (ACL) from being exceeded -- which would trigger accountability measures (AMs) and further reduce fishing opportunities. The primary objective of the rebuilding plan should be to end and prevent overfishing so that the gag population can more quickly recover. Additionally, in order to rebuild a healthier and more productive gag population that can support a robust fishery in the years to come, actions that will protect the already depleted large males and spawning aggregations should also be adopted.

Specifically, we recommend:

- Expanding time and area closures to protect male gag year-round and spawning aggregations. This should include year-round protections at "The Edges" and in addition, should also include expanding protections for the spawning aggregations along

the shelf break where gag are known to spawn. At a minimum, the Council should expand the spawning area protections.

- Selecting recreational management measures that achieve rebuilding at the Annual Catch Target (ACT) levels and mortality reductions on the order of 60%.
- Ensuring the assumptions on effort intensification and shifting for all the actions, including increases in the recreational red grouper bag limit, are sufficiently taken into account and supported by data analysis.
- Accounting for all mortality in any changes in gag size limits for the recreational and commercial fisheries.

Protection of Males and Spawning Aggregations

An important objective of the rebuilding process should include increasing the population's reproductive potential through further protections of males in the population and of spawning aggregations. Scientific analysis has shown the quickest population recoveries for species that change sex, such as gag, can be achieved through a combination of significant decreases in mortality on all age classes coupled with added protection of the male proportion of the population.¹ Additionally, it makes sense biologically to offer further protection during spawning season for a species as heavily overfished as gag, particularly on the aggregations.


The proportion of males in the Gulf of Mexico gag population has dropped precipitously: from about 17-21 percent the late 1970s to 2-5 percent in the mid 1990s, where it continues to hover today.² Because of this dangerously low proportion of males, a regulatory amendment was implemented in 2000 that established two marine reserves (Madison Swanson and Steamboat Lumps) primarily to protect and increase the number of males. Initial research documented modest gains in the male sex ratio though the proportion of males declined following those initial gains, likely due to illegal fishing within the reserve.³ However, recent research during 2007-2010 has documented that there has been a substantial increase in the proportion of males in the Madison Swanson reserve -- which is significantly different from the sex ratio outside the reserve (see figure below).⁴ These results provide strong evidence that the protected areas are benefiting male gag and fulfilling the primary goal of the marine reserves. More importantly, the ability to increase the male sex ratio through protected areas can only help rebuild the gag population more quickly if properly scaled and enforced.

¹ Heppell, S.S., et al. 2006. Models to Compare Management Options for a Protogynous Fish. *Ecological Applications*, 16(1), pp. 238-249.

² Koenig and Coleman, draft of MARFIN Project Final Report, Project No. NA07NMF4330120. Protection of Grouper and Red Snapper Spawning in Marine Reserves: Demographics, Movements, Survival, and Spillover Effects in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.



(sources: Koenig et al 1996, Koenig & Coleman draft MARFIN Project Final Report for 2000s)

We strongly urge the Council to consider additional measures to protect male gag by adopting a year-round closure at “The Edges” [Alternative 4d, Action 6]. Important considerations for such action include:

- Gag males tend to stay year-round at the offshore spawning sites with relatively little movement and are especially susceptible to fishing pressure.⁵
- Gag are protogynous hermaphrodites, which means they all start life as females and some portion of the females become males, typically after the spawning season (April – July) when those fish that are approximately 7 years old and about 31 inches.⁶
- Year-round protection of known male habitat and spawning sites also affords protection for the transitioning gag -- which will be males for the next spawning season.
- Full protection would allow the population to get older and larger, and the sex ratio to return closer to historical levels, which would increase productivity.
- Over the past few decades, research shows gag have gotten substantially smaller in unprotected areas, due to fishing pressure which tends to remove the larger fish.⁷
- Continued loss of the large dominant males could be “detrimental to the gag rebuilding plan”.⁸
- Protecting the males year-round could be beneficial for rebuilding the population but also could help reduce overall mortality by reducing bycatch.⁹

⁵ Koenig, C. C., F. C. Coleman, L. A. Collins, Y. Sadovy, and P. L. Colin. 1996. Reproduction in gag (*Mycteroperca microlepis*) (Pisces: Serranidae) in the eastern Gulf of Mexico and the consequences of fishing spawning aggregations. In F. Arraguin-Sánchez, J. L. Munro, M. C. Balgos, and D. Pauly, editors. Biology, fisheries and culture of tropical groupers and snappers. ICLARM Conf. Proc. 48:307-323. NOAA.

⁶ Ibid.


⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Public Hearing Draft, Reef Fish Amendment 32. Revised 4/27/2011. Pg. 128.

⁹ Ibid., Pg. 53

- Closing the Edges year-round would also reduce gag discards and adjustments to the commercial quota under Action 3 might not be necessary.

In addition, the **Council should expand protections for the spawning aggregations in the area along the shelf-edge that currently is not afforded that protection [Alternative 3c, Action 6].** Gag spawn at known sites offshore during winter and early spring in large aggregations where they are vulnerable to fishing pressure. During this time, females move to the offshore, deepwater shelf-edge habitat where the males reside. Historically, intensive fishing pressure on these spawning aggregations has greatly contributed to the decrease in the proportion of males. A seasonal closure offers partial protection for these fish, and gives them the ability to spawn uninhibited which should in turn increase reproductive output over time. Additionally, a seasonal closure may also help to reduce gag discards and adjustments to the commercial quota under Action 3 may not be warranted.



(Figure 2.6.1. Public Hearing Draft, Reef Fish Amendment 32 (rev. 4/27/11).)

Recreational Management Measures Should Have High Probability of Success

The Pew Environment Group supports the longest recreational season possible or a split season within the confines of appropriate assumptions that provide a strong assurance that overfishing will not occur. As stated in the Public Hearing Draft of Amendment 32 for the recreational management action, a 47 to 61 percent reduction in mortality is needed to achieve the annual catch target level in order to end and prevent overfishing. **However, we urge the Council to aim for achieving mortality reductions closer to 61% to provide a high probability of successfully rebuilding gag within the scheduled timeframe.**

That higher percentage of necessary mortality reductions is based on 2006-08 data from the updated stock assessment and better captures the true nature of the fishery and population. In contrast, that lower percentage is based on just one year of recent landings (2009). Relying on only one year of data when just landings statistics are available may be overly optimistic and lead to overfishing, which could in turn trigger accountability measures.

Baseline data	Reductions needed	Reductions selected
2006-08	61%	56%
2009	47%	54%

Under the yield projections recommended by the Scientific and Statistically Committee in the Amendment (Table 1.4.1), the ACT is reduced from the ACL by only 16%. Because there is high management uncertainty associated with the gag recreational fishery, and expected reductions in catch under the preferred alternative in Action 2 are below the upper end of the range, we feel there is a high likelihood of exceeding the ACL and triggering AMs. We therefore urge the Council to **aim for higher reductions in mortality, i.e. closer to 61%**, to provide a high probability of success in maintaining the rebuilding plan for gag within the scheduled timeframe.

Effort Intensification and Shifting

The Council's preferred option for recreational management measures only achieves a 54-56 percent reduction in mortality, and this assumes state consistency in Florida and across the Gulf and factors in a 50 percent increase in catch during the much shorter open season. While we commend the Council for factoring in effort intensification, the 1.5 effort intensification factor selected may not capture the potential effort shift for gag during the truncated open season. Examining red snapper as an example, when the recreational season dropped from 194 days in 2007 to 65 days in 2008, the number of private recreational trips for red snapper increased by about 130 percent.¹⁰ While catch and effort statistics are not directly comparable, there is reason to believe that the effort intensification factor, which assumes a 50% increase in gag landings during the open season, may be overly optimistic, particularly since the gag

¹⁰ Figure 5 of Tab B No.4(d), February 2011 Gulf Council briefing book. Data provided by N. Farmer (NOAA SERO) to C. Hanson on May 11, 2011.

recreational fishery is dominated by private recreational anglers. **The Council should ensure measures realistically capture effort intensification.** Since the selected level of mortality reduction may not be sufficient to end overfishing (as discussed above), assumptions should be conservative enough to provide for a higher probability of success.

As proposed in the Amendment, harvest for red grouper, and other shallow-water grouper, will be allowed throughout the year. Since there is a close association among the gag with red grouper, other shallow-water grouper and other reef fish, anglers may shift effort to red grouper, which potentially could cause discards of gag to increase. In addition, the proposed increase in the red grouper recreational bag limit may further increase directed effort to red grouper. **The selected management action should be supported by data analysis to ensure mortality of gag is not exacerbated.** Additionally, **any changes in the red grouper bag limit should factor in impacts to gag and be supported by data analysis to ensure there is not an increase in total mortality.**

Size Limit Changes and Mortality

The primary objective in adjustments to size limits should be to reduce overall mortality, including from discards. **Any changes in gag recreational and commercial size limits should be supported by data and analysis to ensure the changes won't increase total mortality.** Proposed size limit changes in both the commercial and recreational fisheries would have multiple simultaneous effects in mortality. The net balance of these impacts should be considered in selection of preferred alternatives for size limits so that all mortality is accounted for and addressed properly.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we urge the Council to adopt measures to fully protect a large portion of the male gag population through a year-round closure at The Edges, as well as protect the shelf-break area between Madison Swanson and The Edges where gag predominantly spawn. At a minimum, the Council should provide protection for the seasonal spawning aggregations throughout the shelf-edge. Additionally, we urge the Council to strive for a high probability of success in the recreational management measures by aiming for close to 60% mortality reductions. Management decisions should be supported by data and analysis to ensure mortality is not actually increased through effort intensification, shifting and changes to size limits.

While this Amendment calls for a ten-year rebuilding plan, recovery of the gag population can occur much more quickly and robustly if the recommendations above are taken into consideration. Not only should the Council be working towards reducing overall mortality, but also providing measures to rebuild a more sustainable gag population by protecting males and spawning. A more sustainable gag population will mean a stable and viable fishery in the not-so-distant future.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Council and staff on ending and preventing overfishing of gag so the population can rebuild as quickly as possible and we can all enjoy a vibrant and sustainable fishery over the long-term.

Sincerely,



Chad Hanson
Senior Policy Analyst
Gulf of Mexico Fish Conservation Campaign
Pew Environment Group



Holly Binns
Manager
Southeast Fish Conservation Campaigns
Pew Environment Group

Date: 6/6/11

To Gulf Council and Commission Members,

I would like to supply comments in writing regarding the proposed alternative for grouper regulations in the Gulf of Mexico. The numbers represent proposed actions by the Council or Commission. My responses are in bullets below.

- 1) The current preferred management alternative for the recreational gag grouper season would be a July 1 through October 31 harvest season. These season dates would yield the greatest number of fishing days (123) without exceeding the annual catch target. However, the Reef Fish Advisory Panel is recommending a split season that would allow fishing in the winter (January 1-31 and December 24-31) and summer (June 1 through July 7).
 - First I should set the stage for the type of Angler I am because I am typical for a majority of small boat owners in the Tampa Bay area/W Central FL. I own a vessel <25' in length with a single outboard engine. Most of my "offshore" trips occur in <20 miles offshore because I do not want to either A) spend the \$ on fuel and oil or B) do not want run the risk of getting stranded well offshore with only a single engine. I summarize this because this type of angler probably represents >80 % of the recreational vessels going offshore in the Tampa Bay Area to catch grouper and we are directly impacted by these proposed regulations. In terms of experience I have been fishing W Central FL waters for about 20 years.
 - In relation to proposed dates for the open season they could NOT BE WORSE in timing. As you should know, Gag grouper migrate year round moving from offshore to inshore and back offshore to feed, spawn and avoid excessively hot water during the summer months. The best nearshore (State Waters) fishing in W Central FL for Gag grouper occurs in spring and fall. Gag can be readily caught in state waters during this time. The open season for 2011 (Sept 16 - November 15) could not be more APPROPRIATE. In addition, when gag grouper was open this past spring (April 1 - May 30) in State waters, the fishing was excellent. Fish begin to move to deeper depths starting in late June and July and do not return until October. Thus, any of the proposed times in which Gag grouper would be open in June or July only creates harder fishing conditions for recreational anglers. Even with it open who wants to run 20 or 40 miles when you can catch them in Tampa Bay or 3 or 4 miles offshore during spring and fall?
 - o The recommendation the Council should consider are maintaining the 2011 open seasons (April 1 - May 30 and Sept 16 - Nov 15). This minimizes costs to the recreational angler
 - o If anything, the June/July dates should be taken off the table for consideration and reallocated to accommodate fall or spring fishing. Potentially a 4 month season from October 1 – January 31 would be ideal.

2) The Council is also considering reducing the commercial size limit from 24 to 22 inches to reduce release mortality in the commercial fishery. The current recreational minimum size limit for gag is also 22 inches. Staff requests Commission direction on these issues at this time.

- The council needs to adopt better consistency between the recreational and commercial sectors. This is a problem which I'll explain under the proposed red grouper alternatives. If consistency is adopted for the size limit of Gag grouper it **MUST ALSO BE CONSISTENT ACROSS SECTORS** for Red Grouper. Whether the size limit is 22 or 24 inches for Gag I don't have a preference although the conservationist in me recommends making it 24 across the board (especially if it is undergoing "overfishing". One thing the Council and Commission need to remember is that unlike the Red grouper fishery, much of the Gag grouper occurs in waters <100' and discard mortality is much, much lower.

3) The Council is also considering management alternatives red grouper (Reef Fish Amendment 32). Red grouper is not overfished, nor is it undergoing overfishing. In recent years, the recreational sector has not caught its allocation of red grouper, so the Council is considering relaxing recreational red grouper regulations.

- First, let me thank the Council and Commission for considering this option. This is welcome news. Now for the reality, especially in regards to the statement that the recreational sector has not caught its allocation of Red Grouper. There are two primary reasons for this and are in direct relation to the points discussed above.
- The Red grouper fishery is truly more of "offshore" fishery which requires a distance of >25 miles or more in W Central FL. With the recession and soaring fuel prices that >80% of anglers that I described under #1) doesn't deem it worthy to travel that kind of distance to catch 2 Red grouper. I catch the occasional Red grouper 10 to 15 miles offshore but I don't target them.
- Most importantly, Red grouper up to 18" are abundant. The reasons the recreational sector doesn't catch its quota is because it's nearly **IMPOSSIBLE** to land a 20" Red. The commercial sector cleans them out. I mention this because before the 18" rule was implemented for the commercial sector, it was easier to catch the 2 Red grouper bag limit in water <25 miles offshore. Again the Council and Commission **MUST** adopt consistency across sectors. The 18" rule for commercial and 20" rule for recreational should be changed. If you are proposing it for Gag then recreational fishers should be allowed to take 18" Reds. This is a no-brainer. Regulations in recent years have been tilting in the commercial sectors favor and the balance should be restored. For example, even though the grouper fishery now operates under a

quota system it is still ludicrous that commercial sector can take grouper during spawning season. If the Council truly wants to manage these stocks responsibly then ALL GROUPER FISHING should be closed in the late winter months (February & March).

4) Other Targeted Spp.

- This is not a current issue but I would like to see the size limit for hogfish raised from 12" to 16". My anecdotal observations (because I'm also a diver) make me believe that hogfish in the Gulf are less abundant than 10 to 15 years ago. More restaurants sell hogfish and the recreational spearfishing community has grown exponentially over the last 3 decades resulting in more pressure on this species. The problem with hogfish is it is managed under snappers and while taking 12" snappers is OK because they are numerous, this size limit is not appropriate for hogfish.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you would like more input. Given my schedule it is very difficult for me to attend these meetings.

Sincerely,



Rob Ruzicka
2433 Tropical Shores Dr SE
Saint Petersburg, FL 33705
Phone: 786-385-6613
rob.ruzicka@gmail.com

----- Forwarded Message

From: Charles Saussy <c_saussy@yahoo.com>

Date: Tue, 7 Jun 2011 21:13:26 -0400

To: Bob Gill <bgillbgill@embarqmail.com>, Chris Blankenship <chris.blankenship@dcnr.alabama.gov>, Corky Perret <Corky.Perret@dmr.ms.gov>, <dennis@thefra.org>, <douglassboyd@yahoo.com>, Ed Sapp <ewsapp@hotmail.com>, John Milner <GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org>, Kay Williams <hkaywilliams@hotmail.com>, <info@superstrikecharters.com>, John Greene <intimidatorcharters@yahoo.com>, <Jane.lubchenco@noaa.gov>, Joe Hendrix <jhendrix1706@aol.com>, Kevin Anson <Kevin.Anson@dcnr.alabama.gov>, <labele@fsu.edu>, Myron Fischer <mfischer@wlf.la.gov>, <Nick.Wiley@myFWC.com>, Harlon Pearce <nolrah@aol.com>, Robin Riechers <robin.riechers@tpwd.state.tx.us>, Roy Crabtree <roy.crabtree@noaa.gov>, Bob Shipp <rshipp@jaguar1.usouthal.edu>, Tom McIlwain <tom.mcilwain@usm.edu>, "Teehan, William" <william.teehan@MyFWC.com>

Subject: Amendment 32 Comments

Dear Council members, please accept my apologies for the first blank email. I am a recreational fisherman and diver of 25 years from Pinellas County Florida and I am very concerned about the regulation trends I have seen over the last 3-4 years. I am in total agreement with the following and hope at some point your Council will take us "little guys" seriously. I have over the years invested thousands of dollars in boats, dive gear, and fishing equipment for the recreation I and my family truly love. Your organization seems to have no problem taking all of that away without my vote or my input. Please consider this my comment and request;

Dear Gulf Council:

Amendment 32 comments.

Please enter these comments into the public record for the Key West Council meeting.

The public hearing meetings appear to be in violation of the Federal Register Act, United States Code, Title 44, Chapter 15, section 1508, which states that 15 days public notice is required. The notice of change was posted in the federal register on April 29th, less than 15 days before the meeting. Further, the change of location for the LA and MS public hearings were changed and not properly noticed in the federal register. How can you expect the public to believe that you care what they think?

I would like to get an official answer as to who exactly is responsible for these apparent violations of law.

The Council claims to listen to the public, yet the examples of ignoring the public are in these proposals. Where is the 24 inch gag minimum size? 22 inches is below the desired 50% sexual maturity size. The public called for a 24 inch minimum size as opposed to season reductions and/or bag limit reductions.

Where is the accountability measure that carries uncaught 'allowable catch' to the next year? Another LOUD and CLEAR request from the public appears to be completely ignored.

Why is there absolutely no consideration of re-capture and release of undersized gags in this process?

Why are Annual Catch Limits being set when the National Marine Fisheries Service has not even complied with the Magnuson mandate to fix recreational data? NMFS and the Gulf Council appear to be operating in defiance and contempt of Congress.

ABOUT THE DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Why were the documents not available until Wednesday afternoon before the hearings started? This is absolutely inexcusable and quite possibly a violation of Magnuson. I am sure that a NMFS lawyer will tell you otherwise. I will remind you that this is an OPINION that has caused members of Congress to take great umbrage with the interpretation of the law. After all, Congress wrote the law. It has become clear that NMFS legal opinions continue to defy Congressional intent.

There was NO announcement when the documents WERE posted to the website. Why not? Who made the decision to NOT tell the public that the overdue documents were finally available, albeit only electronically? The main document is a 27 MEG download. That is a HUGE file. The public is rightfully offended by the Council's lack

of respect and obvious disdain for meaningful public input.

Does the Council have any idea or even care about the people who have no or very limited computer access? This process has certainly denied the general public adequate time with the final proposals. The excuse of 'we're busy' does not hold water. Amendment 32 had initial public hearings over a year ago, so this is not a last minute amendment. The council is not too busy to push catch shares and sector separation, as we can see by all of the recent Council activity.

While the Council spends hundreds of thousands of tax dollars on 'outreach' designed to 'engage the angler in the management process', they systematically deny us the opportunity to provide thoughtful comments on proposed regulations, as evidenced by the timeliness of document availability. This appears to violate the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

How docile do you think the public is that we will allow you to treat us this way? We request another round of hearings with at least fifteen days in which to review the documents prior to a hearing.

The recreational sector has spoken loud and clear: NO CATCH SHARES. What more does the Council need? Or is the catch share agenda another of the Council's damn-the-public-opinion steamrolling of the public's rights? It certainly appears that the Council has wholesale ignored public input.

The recreational sector, including the majority of its for hire captains, have CLEARLY SPOKEN AGAINST SECTOR SEPARATION. So why is the Council staff preparing a sector separation amendment? How can the Council possibly deny its ignoring of public input?

ABOUT THE DOCUMENT ITSELF

The document shows that Maximum Sustainable Yield is reduced by 25% and is renamed Optimum Yield. This is an arbitrary 25% reduction. It will now be even easier for the anti-fishing crowd to claim that anglers are overfishing. What a crock of bad soup this is. Optimum Yield should be set at the old Maximum Sustainable yield.

That is, in fact, optimum. We reject the automatic reductions. They are NOT required to be set so low by Magnuson. In fact, Magnuson does not prohibit $MSY=OFL=OY$.

Why is the concept of re-capturing not considered? We know full well and have scientific proof spanning fifteen years that daily re-capture of undersized fish is a regular occurrence, yet we treat every discard as a unique fish and apply a high release mortality rate. This discard rate is a major driver of regulations to eliminate fishing effort.

Why is new best available science showing minimal release mortality in under 100 feet of water NOT being used to estimate landings reductions? The state of Florida has tagging evidence indicating low release mortality and strong survival rates,

Why have we not done a full benchmark stock assessment when the Council's own Scientific and Statistical Committee asked for it? Because of the once in 30 year red tide event, the assessment is showing that the stock was reduced by 1/3. This has been shown to be wrong, yet a new assessment is not on the five year schedule of assessments.

Given that release mortality estimates HAVE been lowered slightly, why is a 24" minimum size limit for recreational anglers not being considered? It would result in a nearly 30% reduction in landings. The reduction should be even higher now, given the knowledge that 2/3 of the released gag are in state waters with an average depth of less than 30 feet. We would expect a benefit of more like 40%. All that without destroying a person's opportunity to fish. This would maximize the biological effect and minimize the social and economic impacts.

THIS OPTION NEEDS TO BE INCLUDED AND LISTED AS PREFERRED.

A slot limit on a grouper is insane. Even your own Reef Fish AP rejected it unanimously.

We are concerned that the Council is once again using a couple of agenda-driven comments to paint the picture of the gag fishery in the northern gulf. The individuals are proponents of sector separation and recreational catch shares. This is another example of selective hearing on the Council's part.

Why are the Interdisciplinary Planning Teams, formed and directed by the National Marine Fisheries Service, writing the regulations behind closed doors and without any accountability for formulation and methodology behind landings reduction estimates?

Just like with Red Grouper, overwhelming anecdotal evidence has been presented attesting to strong abundance, strong recruitment and a wide range of sizes available in the gag fishery. These all contradict the flawed, outdated gag assessment.

This is a 3 billion dollar (Fisheries Economic of the US- DOC) mistake that the state of Florida will bear the brunt of. We have had enough of the mismanagement under which we have suffered for years. We demand accountability for mismanagement.

I request and fully expect another round of public hearings, based on final documents which will be made available AT LEAST fifteen days prior to the hearings.

Here are some comments on the Amendment, by section:

2.2 Action 2. Recreational Bag Limits, Size Limits, and Closed Seasons

2.2.1 Gag Scenarios

PUBLIC PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE:

New full benchmark stock assessment. Interim management to be 24 “ gag minimum size, 4 fish bag limit, 2 month spawning closure protection (Feb and March) for recreational AND commercial harvest.

If we have a spawning protection closure, it should be closed for all harvest.

2.2.2 Red Grouper Bag Limit

Preferred Alternative 3. Increase the red grouper bag limit to 4 fish per person. If, at the end of any season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper ACL, the bag limit will be reduced to 3 fish. If, at the end of any subsequent season, it is determined that the recreational sector has exceeded its red grouper ACL again, the red grouper bag limit will revert back to 2 fish.

Again, the rec sector does NOT receive the 5 red grouper bag limit (what we used to have).

Action 3 commercial dead discard adjustment – If dead discards are used in recreational calculations, then they should be used in commercial as well.

2.5 Action 5. Commercial Gag Size Limit

Alternative 1: No action. The commercial gag minimum size limit remains at 24 inches total length.

Female gag reach 50% maturity at about 23 inches (Figure 2.5.1). At smaller size limits, the majority of the fish will not yet have spawned. This will reduce spawning potential and could negatively impact the rebuilding plan. These words say it all. What is the motivation to kill fish before they reach sexual maturity?

2.6 Action 6. Time and Area Closures

*Note: more than one alternative and option can be selected as preferred

Alternative 1: No Action, Do not create additional time and area closures that prohibit fishing for gag and other reef fishes.

There is not enough data to accurately assess stocks. How come we can be so precise about fishing areas?

NMFS promised sector accountability when NMFS sold the catch shares idea to the commercial sector and then played recreational against commercial by using cross sector accountability measures. This was used to threaten the state of Florida into complying with NMFS outrageous and arrogant demand that the state match the federal rules. The state of Florida FWC Commissioners all cited the fear of ‘punishment’ by NMFS if the state failed to bend to NMFS demands. A threat from a rogue agency should NOT be the reason for a state to ignore its own citizens. In fact, I will encourage the state of Florida to reject this ‘blackmail’ and to further hold responsible those who perpetrated the federal actions.

When will NMFS become accountable for their mismanagement?

The Council and NMFS violated federal law by moving two of the public input meetings after publishing in the federal register. Who is responsible for this?

I hope the Council will remember the Red Grouper debacle in which NMFS claimed Red Grouper were overfished/undergoing overfishing, in direct contradiction to the vast majority of observations and anecdotal evidence presented by the public to the Council and NMFS. A year and a half later, a new stock assessment VERIFIED THAT THE RED GROUPER WERE, IN FACT, HEALTHY at the time of the NMFS action, supporting the overwhelming anecdotal evidence presented by the public at the time.

Fast forward to Gag Grouper: The SAME THING is happening. Overwhelming anecdotal evidence is being ignored

while unconscionable economic and social distress is being forced upon the public by this out of control agency (NMFS). When will accountability be provided for the mismanagement of our fisheries?

Thank you for your time. I look forward to a response.

Respectfully,

Charles R Saussy Jr.

PO Box98

Crystal Beach, Fla., 34681

From: Richard Appell <rappell@sabalpalmbank.com>

Date: Thu, 9 Jun 2011 10:57:57 -0400

To: John Milner <GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org>

Subject: Grouper restrictions

As a Florida Native I would like to recommend that you reconsider the ban on grouper fishing that is currently under proposal by Amendment 32. For some reason the Council keeps putting more and more restrictions on the recreational and local charter captains and giving more to the Commercial Long Liners that results in the taking of undersize fish of all variety, including endangered sea turtles. If you did a comparison of economic impact in this state I feel you would discover that the recreational money is far greater than the Commercial impact at this time. Why cannot someone use common sense when they look at restrictions of the taking of public stock. Examples of this would be the removing of species from commercial sale in this state and country like Redfish, Snook and other wildlife that improves once they are removed from the commercial market. Then put on restrictions of the taking of species during their breeding seasons and limit the take to one or two fish per trip. The use of your non scientific counting of fish take is also questionable and based on the current take of Red Snapper in the Gulf would show that the species is or has improved beyond the estimates of your faulty calculations.

Perhaps I have been around too long and see the mistakes our government has made in the oversight of our wildlife and are influenced more by the money lobbying groups that profit more than the individual recreational angler. Please reconsider your rules and look at the actual individuals of the states rather than a few commercial groups that want to profit at the expense of our country's natural reserves. I would one day hope my grandchildren would be able to enjoy the fishing experiences I have over my lifetime and not see our seas exploited to the point that citizens ignore the rules to be able to enjoy the dinner of a fish once caught in the seas.

Richard S. Appell

Venice Market President

735 E. Venice Ave

Venice, FL 34285

Office: 941-484-9191

Fax 941-306-0917

rappell@sabalpalmbank.com

[Federal Register Volume 76, Number 136 (Friday, July 15, 2011)]
[Notices]
[Pages 41766-41767]
From the Federal Register Online via the Government Printing Office [<http://www.gpo.gov/>]
[FR Doc No: 2011-17789]

Submitted By
Dennis O'Hern

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648-XA569

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
(NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

ACTION: Council to convene public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council will convene public hearings on: Amendment 18 to the Fishery Management Plan for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico and Amendment 32 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan in the Gulf of Mexico.

DATES: The public meetings will be held on August 1, 2011 through August 3, 2011 at seven locations throughout the Gulf of Mexico. The public hearings will begin at 6 p.m. and will conclude no later than 9 p.m. For specific dates see SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

ADDRESSES: The public meetings will be held at locations listed in the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

Council address: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 2203 N. Lois Avenue, Suite 1100, Tampa, FL 33607.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Richard Leard, Deputy Executive Director/Senior Fishery Biologist (Amendment 18), Dr. Steven Atran, Population Dynamics Statistician (Amendment 32) at Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; telephone: (813) 348-1630.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council will hold public hearings on Amendment 18 to the Fishery Management Plan for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Including Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Impact Review, and Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis. Amendment 18 contains alternatives for actions to set annual catch limits and accountability measures if such limits are exceeded for Gulf group king mackerel, Gulf group Spanish mackerel, and Gulf group cobia. It also contains measures to remove cero, little tunny, dolphin, and bluefish (Gulf) from the fishery management plan; revise the framework procedure; and separate cobia into Atlantic and Gulf migratory groups. Similar measures are being proposed for the Atlantic migratory stocks.

Reef Fish

Amendment 32 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan establishes annual catch limits and annual catch targets for 2012 and 2015 for gag and for 2012 for red grouper. The Amendment also contains actions to: Establish a rebuilding plan for gag; set recreational bag limits, size limits and closed seasons for gag/red grouper in 2012; consider a commercial gag and shallow-water grouper quota adjustment to account for dead discards; make adjustment to multi-use IFQ shares in the grouper individual fishing quota program; reduce the commercial gag size limit; modify the offshore time and areas closures; and revise gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper accountability measures.

The Public Hearings will begin at 6 p.m. and conclude at the end of public testimony or no later than 9 p.m. at the following locations:

Monday, August 1, 2011, Amendment 18--Plantation Suites--1909 Hwy 361, Port Aransas, TX 78373, (361) 749-3866; Amendment 18--Courtyard Marriott Gulfport Beachfront Hotel, 1600 East Beach Blvd., Gulfport, MS 39501, (228) 864-4310; Amendment 32--Hyatt Place Ft. Myers at the Forum--2600 Champion Ring Road, Fort Myers, FL 33905, (239) 418-1844.

Tuesday, August 2, 2011, Amendment 18 and Amendment 32--Hilton St. Petersburg Carillon Park--950 Lake Carillon Drive--St. Petersburg, FL 33716--(727) 540-0050; Amendment 18--Fairfield Inn & Suites, 3111 Loop Road, Orange Beach, FL 36561, (251) 543-4444; Amendment 18--Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Research Lab, 195 Ludwig Annex, Grand Isle, LA 70358, (985) 787-2163.

Wednesday, August 3, 2011, Amendment 18 and Amendment 32--Boardwalk Beach Resort, 9400 S. Thomas Drive, Panama City Beach, FL 32408, (850) 230-4681.

Copies of the documents can be obtained by calling (813) 348-1630.

Special Accommodations

These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Kathy Pereira at the Council (see ADDRESSES) at least 5 working days prior to the meeting.

[[Page 41767]]

Dated: July 11, 2011.

Tracey L. Thompson,
Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine
Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2011-17789 Filed 7-14-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

Submitted By:
Dennis O'Hern

Public Hearings & Scoping Meetings: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council - Windows Internet Explorer

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Go! Search Page Status News Search More

Public Hearings & Scoping Meetings: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council

Panel & Committees News & Resources Education & FAQs

2203 N. Lois Avenue Suite 1100 Tampa, Florida 33607 USA
Phone: 813-348-1630
Toll Free: 888-833-1844
Fax: 813-348-1711
Email: info@gulfcouncil.org

Quick Links

- Briefing Books
- Press Releases
- Gulf Fishery News
- Acronyms
- FTP Server
- Calendar
- National Standards

Public Hearings & Scoping Meetings: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council

August 1 - 3, 2011 - all meetings begin at 6:00 p.m. and will end no later than 9:00 p.m.

Monday, August 1, 2011

Plantation Suites
1909 Highway 361
Port Aransas, TX 78373

Monday, August 1, 2011

Conrad Marriott
Gulfport Bakhron Hotel
1609 East Beach Blvd.
Gulfport, MS 39501

Tuesday August 2, 2011

Hilton St. Petersburg
950 Lake Carlton Drive
St. Petersburg, FL 33715

Tuesday August 2, 2011

Rainfield Inn & Suites
3111 Cooper Road
Orange Beach, FL 36561

Tuesday August 2, 2011

Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries Research Lab
185 Ludwig Annex
Gretna Lake, LA 70358

Wednesday, August 3, 2011

Boardwalk Beach Resort
9400 S. Thomas Drive
Panama City Beach, FL 32409

* Meeting is for both Reef Fish Amendment 32 and Mackerel 18.

Panel & Committee Meetings:

Outreach & Education Advisory Panel

August 2 - 4, 2011
Begins at 1:00 p.m. 8/2
Concluding by noon 8/4
View Full Agenda

Meetings

- Panel & Committees
- Public Hearings
- Stock Assessments
- Briefing Books
- Council Motions
- Council TV

Watch Council TV!

The Council meetings on Gulf Council TV. All meetings will be webcast when possible.

Watch Now

Internet Protected Mode Off

11:20 AM 8/2/2011



Testimony at the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council workshop
Sharon McBreen, Gulf Outreach Coordinator, Pew Environment Group

August 2, 2011

RE: Public Hearing Draft for Amendment 18 to the Coastal Migratory Pelagic FMP (Mackerel 18 Amendment) and the Public Hearing Draft for Amendment 32 to the Reef Fish FMP

Good evening, members and staff of the Gulf Council. Thank you for the opportunity to address you today on these important issues. My name is Sharon McBreen, with the Pew Environment Group's Fish Conservation Campaign in the Gulf of Mexico.

Mackerel Amendment 18

As you know, we have been supportive of the Gulf Council's efforts to develop the Generic Annual Catch Limits Amendment, and although we understand there are notable differences in each of the fishery management plans, the design and implementation of both Mackerel Amendment 18 and the Generic ACL Amendment should be similar: catch levels should be properly and consistently established to prevent overfishing, and catch limits along with accountability measures (AM) should be in place to maintain catches within the prescribed limits.

In setting catch levels for the species covered in Amendment 18, the Council has opted to use the Acceptable Biological Catch control rule developed by the Scientific and Statistical Committee for the Generic ACL Amendment. The Council has also decided to set the ACL equal to the ABC, but is not using an annual catch target, or ACT, as is done in the Generic ACL Amendment. The ACT is intended to capture management uncertainty in the fisheries and to provide a buffer so that the ACL is not exceeded. To not consider and account for management uncertainty assumes the Council and NMFS are able to perfectly track and record catch and landings from all sectors, which we know is not the case.

Therefore, we strongly recommend the use of the ACT control rule from the Generic ACL Amendment for all species in Amendment 18, just as the ABC control rule is incorporated. To do so, an alternative should be added to the document to this effect.

Additionally, there are no post-season AMs selected for use in the Amendment. Relying solely on the in-season AMs to maintain catch within the prescribed limits may not be

enough to prevent going over the ACLs. Having post-season AMs selected and ready to be implemented gives the Council more tools in the toolbox to make sure the annual catch limits are not routinely exceeded.

In addition, the species currently slated for removal from the Coastal Migratory Pelagic FMP should remain in the FMP as managed species and should not be removed. Adequate scientific justification for removing these species has not been provided, nor have any scientifically based criteria been established to judge whether or not species should be removed. Additionally, the SSC has not been asked to provide advice on which species could be removed safely from the FMP. Removing these four species, all of which have landings above the established threshold for removal, and well above in some cases, or which are commonly misidentified with similar species -- is short-sighted. The better alternative would be to maintain these species in the FMP and establish ACLs and AMs using the recommendations above or to develop scientifically based justification for removal of species supported by appropriate data and analysis before taking this ill-advised action.

We view the use of the ABC and ACT control rules and sufficient AMs for all targeted species as key to an overall proactive plan that will help the Council to prevent overfishing by setting limits and sticking to them, while allowing adjustments over time as conditions change. This system will enable better monitoring and allow adaptive management. Together, this approach should help to avert tougher, more painful restrictions or population declines in the future by managing wisely now. More importantly, it moves fisheries management into a more sustainable future which will benefit not just fish but the communities that rely on healthy and vibrant fisheries.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on Amendment 18. We will provide more detailed comments regarding our concerns and recommendations prior to the August Council meeting.

Amendment 32

We support final approval of Amendment 32 to the Reef Fish FMP as adopted by the Council at the June 2011 meeting. In particular, we are supportive of additional protections for gag spawning aggregations and appreciate efforts to account for discard mortality and effort shifting in the recreational fishery. However, we do have concerns that the recreational management measures for gag and red grouper may not be conservative enough to prevent excessive gag mortality or ACLs from being exceeded. Additionally, the recreational in-season AMs should be targeted toward the ACT rather than the ACL so there is higher probability of keeping the catch under the annual catch limit. We will provide more detailed recommendations on changes we urge the Council to make to address these concerns prior to adopting Amendment 32 at your August meeting.

Thank you for hosting this public hearing and we look forward to continuing to work with the Council and staff on these and other issues.

The Generic Annual Catch Limits/Accountability Measures Amendment
Reef Fish Amendment 32

AMENDMENT 32

Amendment 32 must prohibit commercial take during the gag grouper spawning season, just as recreational take is prohibited during spawning. We recognize that the commercial fishers are limited by a quota, however, allowing a directed fishery on any of the spawning aggregations is disruptive and very likely will produce negative impacts on spawning success. Allowing directed commercial take during the spawning season while prohibiting recreational take is not only damaging to the resource it undermines the angling public's trust in the management system.

To CCA, one of the most important issues regarding Gulf grouper management is allocation. We recognize that the gag stock in the Gulf has been substantially reduced through a mixture of fishing and red tide mortality and support a rebuilding plan. However, CCA requested 5 years ago that the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council develop formal allocations for Gulf grouper based on maximizing the value and benefits of this common property resource to the nation. Several discussions have occurred since then but ultimately no definitive action has been taken. Given the apparent necessity for future restrictions on gag harvest, we believe that it is absolutely necessary for the Council to address allocation of this resource. That allocation effort must be guided by current economic, demographic, conservation and social criteria. Allocating based primarily on prior catch records is unacceptable. Although not a subject of Amendment 32, another such arbitrary allocation for black grouper is being considered in the ACL/AM amendment – again without any of the analyses of impacts and benefits that are required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Catch Share Policy. We will resist efforts to continue to arbitrarily allocate these resources.

We insist that the Gulf Council use the required economic, social and conservation criteria – as mandated in the NOAA Catch Share Policy – to allocate grouper and all other natural resources under its authority to maximize the economic benefits available to the nation from the wise use of these resources. The current Gulf Council Grouper IFQ program allocates and grants exclusive right of access to more than 65 percent of all the Gulf red and gag grouper to a limited number of commercial interests. CCA has contended that in fisheries where there is a large and growing recreational sector, exclusive fishing rights proposals maximize benefits to the commercial fishing industry while ignoring the participation and beneficial impacts of recreational fishing. We are opposed to this management program which subsidizes marginal commercial fisheries while strangling more valuable recreational fisheries. CCA currently has a case against this action before a federal judge and are waiting for a decision.

Regarding the specific management measures of Amendment 32:

- CCA would support a 10-year recovery period and basing the allowed harvest on reaching the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) as opposed to the overly restrictive Annual Catch Target (ACT). The Council is using the conservative optimal yield target for overall management of grouper and we do not think an ACT is necessary. We support achieving the longest open season possible.
- If the major problems noted previously are resolved, CCA would support a recreational and commercial spawning season closure for gag in February, March and April. We do not support closing any season for other groupers than gag.

- CCA does not support a slot size for gag, and prefers the current 22-inch minimum size. It should be restated that the primary cause in the recent decline in gag grouper populations is not overfishing. Gag populations were severely damaged by a massive red tide off of Florida which lasted for more than a year. Prior to the red tide event, gag grouper biomass levels were rising under the existing regulations.
- For red grouper we can support the preferred alternative of setting the bag limit at 4 per day and scaling it back, if necessary, in subsequent years if this is needed to avoid a future closed season. An increase in recreational take is long overdue.
- CCA also supports maintaining the 20-inch minimum size for red grouper and the February-March spawning season closure.

Gag and red grouper fisheries are extremely valuable to the State of Florida in particular, where 96 percent of all the gag grouper taken in the Gulf is caught and landed. Recent economic comparisons of Gulf red and gag grouper show that the value of the recreational fisheries dwarfs the commercial fisheries. CCA will continue to insist that the Gulf Council and NMFS fairly allocate the resource to all users based on current economic, social and conservation criteria.

AMENDMENT 18 TO THE COASTAL MIGRATORY PELAGIC RESOURCES

Coastal Conservation Association has several significant concerns with the setting of ACL/AMs:

- *Given the Gulf Council's solid history of setting overfishing limits, we urge the members to consider all options in the context of which measure will give them the most flexibility in making case-by-case decisions in the future.*
- *With regard to Annual Catch Limits, CCA believes that all recreational ACLs should be measured in numbers of fish rather than pounds. This will remove some of the uncertainty and error that plagues recreational catch data.*
- *We support moving species with landings of less than 20,000 pounds out of the management complex, rather than designating them Ecosystem Species. Doing so will prevent managers from being required to enact measures that may impact dozens of species in a single complex in order to recover the weakest species.*
- *For unassessed species, unless there is clear evidence that the stock is declining, the control rule should not limit current harvest. It is absurd to employ an ABC control rule that could require significant reductions of harvest for a species when no problems have been documented with the stock. The logical option would be to simply cap the harvest at current levels until data is available to support an assessment.*
- *We are greatly dismayed to see that this document still looks exclusively at past landings history as the sole method to set allocations between the recreational and commercial sectors. We believe the allocation process should be forward-looking and that managers should make every effort to manage these fisheries to reflect present and future realities, rather than locking in these resources to repeat history.*

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council should use the criteria set out in the NOAA Catch Share Policy in setting any allocation and use economic value as a key criteria in order to set allocations that achieve the greatest benefit to the country.

August 3, 2011

Re: Reef fish amendment 32

To: Gulf Council Members

I am a recreational fisherman and member of CCA. I fish in the Gulf of Mexico about 15 days a year targeting gag grouper out of Homosassa. I have witnessed the damage done to the marinas, restaurants, motels, bait shops and charter captains caused by the recession, high gas prices, and your closure of gag grouper in the Homosassa area. I have been offshore twice since the closure and seen almost no(3-5) other recreational fishing boats each time. This is in areas I would normally see 20-30. I am hearing many fishermen talk about selling their offshore boats. Your actions have to have seriously impacted the boat dealers also.

My request is that you take a common sense approach to your decisions. Take the input from the numbers people, take the input from the fishermen, groups like CCA which have a long range concern for the fishery, and use your knowledge of recent history of the fishery and how quickly it can rebound to come to a conclusion that will help these industries to recover during these difficult times. A two fish limit on gag grouper will easily allow for a quick recovery. They did fine for years with a five fish limit even under the pressure put on them during the booming economy with lower gas prices. Even with the season open, there will not be nearly as many fishermen in this weak economy.

Please give us a practical, common sense solution.

Charles T. Holt 4495 Roosevelt Blvd.
unit 701 Jacksonville, FL 32210
charlesandgeorge@bellsouth.net

From: John Milner <GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org>
Date: Tue, 9 Aug 2011 16:50:26 -0400
To: Emily Muehlstein <emily.muehlstein@gulfcouncil.org>
Subject: FW: Proposed Gulf Gag Season

----- Forwarded Message

From: Philipp Muennig <pmuennig@yahoo.com>
Date: Sun, 7 Aug 2011 19:06:05 -0400
To: John Milner <GulfCouncil@gulfcouncil.org>
Subject: Proposed Gulf Gag Season

I would like to address the proposed July through October season for Gags: though it is an improvement over the current season, it favors the head boat and charter boat recreation population not the individual fisherman who would benefit more if the season were set during the colder months of the year. Since the individual fishermen are greater in total number, we represent the largest population of fishermen and should be given the most consideration according to democratic principles. I recommend reductions or a complete closure to the commercial fishing for gags so the recreation season could span 6 months total. Commercial fishing should technically always be closed for any species identified as being overfished, since everyone would be allowed equal access to fish according to democratic principles. As a compromise a split 6 month recreation season should be set when the largest population of gags are in shallow water such as April-June and October-December. With the increased prices in fuel this will allow fuel conservation minded individual with smaller boats a greater opportunity to harvest gags safely. Thank you for accepting my input.

The form letter below was received via email by the following individuals, August 5 – 8, 2011:

Charles T. Holt – Jacksonville, FL
Terry Sobo - Cape Coral, FL
Charles M. Weddel - Tampa FL
Jeannine Brady - Gainesville, FL
Scott Mitchell Hagee – Kilder, IL
Capt. Chip Blackburn - Mexico Beach, FL
Leon Paul Kass - Seminole FL
Capt. Henry Clayton James - Land O' Lakes. FL
Christopher Dailey - St. Petersburg FL
Bruce Waits - St. Petersburg FL
Brad Grant - Merritt Island FL
Capt. Bill Cordonnier - Palmetto, FL
Ed Makatura
Steve Moore - Key West, FL
Allen Patrick - St. Petersburg, FL
Eric Gill - Parrish, FL
Matthew Avery - Parrish, FL
Michael Messaros
Brad Belzel - Largo FL
Adam Wilson - North Port, FL
William and Patti Causey - Perry, FL

Dear Gulf Council members-

I fish in the Gulf and have a great interest in the management of my fisheries. (ADD PERSONAL INFORMATION HERE, IF YOU WISH, such as business owner, boat owner, life long angler, etc.) I am submitting comments on THREE SEPARATE AMENDMENTS in this email; Amendment 32, Amendment 18 and the ACL/AM amendment, in that order.

My information, for the record:

Name
address
city/state/zip

Amendment 32

This quick list is followed by more in-depth comments on Amendment 32.

- Do NOT reduce the commercial minimum size for gag.
- INCREASE the minimum size for recreational gag to 24". This would maximize the biological effect and minimize the social and economic impacts.
- Make available the NMFS formulas used to determine season length, future effort and angler behavior.
- Provide for the carryover of uncaught allowable recreational landings to the following year's recreational allowable landings.
- What part of NO CATCH SHARES and NO SECTOR SEPARATION did you not hear?

- Concern of inflated gag landings driven by the speculation of sector separation. Incentive to misreport drives landings estimates through the roof.
- Why is gag's Maximum Sustainable Yield reduced by 25%? This is NOT a mandated reduction: This is policy not agreeable to the stakeholders.
- Why is the concept of re-capture of undersized discards being flatly IGNORED despite OVERWHELMING EVIDENCE that it happens regularly?
- Why is the evidence of an extremely low release mortality rate for gag being IGNORED? The Florida FWRI has the evidence, which is also supported by strong anecdotal evidence presented by participants in the FWRI tagging program.
- The slot limit for gag should never have even been considered.
- Why are the Interdisciplinary Planning Teams, formed and directed by the National Marine Fisheries Service, writing the regulations behind closed doors and without any accountability for formulation and methodology behind landings reduction estimates?
- Red Grouper was healthy when NMFS tried unsuccessfully to stop all grouper fishing to protect the red grouper. Overwhelming anecdotal evidence of a healthy stock provided by anglers was proven to be correct two years later. We are experiencing the same with gag grouper today. How many jobs will you destroy with these unnecessary regulations?
- Why has the SSC's recommendation of reruns using the latest figures been ignored? Why are signs of crashing effort ignored?
- A spawning closure is a spawning closure. Why would IFQs exempt commercial fishermen from a fishing closure to protect the spawn?
- No additional time or area closures should be considered at this time.

These hearings are being billed as additional hearings due to the lack of availability of the documents for the last set of hearings, yet the documents for this hearing have only been available for a week. They were not on the website (the guide to the hearing is not the full document). Why did it take so long to make the documents available again? Does the Council realize the damage this does to credibility with the stakeholders? Many anglers are convinced that their input has no effect on the process.

This latest document contains absolutely no consideration of the 24" gag minimum size. There is also ZERO discussion of a provision for carrying forward unused allowable landings, such as those caused by overly restrictive regulations. Again, there is the appearance that public input means nothing.

A 24 " gag minimum would allow for a far longer fishing season than any other management measure, yet it is ignored. The rationale for ignoring the size increase is an increase in dead discards, yet that rationale is flawed in that it relies upon known to be inflated discard mortality rates.

Several years ago, a 24" gag minimum length was the Council's PREFERRED alternative. Recent Council/NMFS documents showed a 24 inch limit would produce SIGNIFICANT landings reductions while having only a MINIMAL EFFECT on the anglers' actual opportunity to fish, as closed seasons would be avoided.

The minimum size limit for commercial gag should NOT be reduced. It is below the 50% sexual maturity level of gag, which is at 23 ½ inches. This is far from sound management. Why would we encourage commercial fishermen to target smaller fish?

The 100% effort increase multiplier being used in the estimates of effort shift due to season closure is pure speculation and has no real merit as a plausible concept. Given the development of these ideas outside of the view and participation of the public (under the guise of IPTs), one can reasonably surmise that transparency means nothing.

The recreational sector has spoken loud and clear: NO CATCH SHARES. What more does the Council need? Or is the catch share agenda another of the Council's damn-the-public-opinion steamrolling of the public's rights? It certainly appears that the Council has wholesale ignored public input.

I am greatly concerned by the implications of inflated gag landings due to the incentive to misreport/over report landings by those who feel that doing so would possibly secure them a larger 'share' of a recreational pie, all at the expense of the recreational angler.

The document shows that Maximum Sustainable Yield is reduced by 25% and is renamed Optimum Yield. This is an arbitrary 25% reduction. It will now be even easier for the anti-fishing crowd to claim that anglers are overfishing. Optimum Yield should be set at the old Maximum Sustainable yield. That is, in fact, optimum. I am appalled by the automatic reductions. They are NOT required to be set so low by Magnuson. In fact, Magnuson does not prohibit $MSY=OFL=OY$.

Why is the concept of re-capturing not considered in the assessment of the stock? It is well known that scientific proof spanning fifteen years exists showing the daily re-capture of undersized fish is a regular occurrence, yet we treat every discard as a unique fish and apply a high release mortality rate. This discard rate is a major driver of regulations to eliminate fishing effort.

Why is new best available science showing minimal release mortality in under 100 feet of water NOT being used to estimate landings reductions? The state of Florida has tagging evidence indicating low release mortality and strong survival rates.

Why have we not done a full benchmark stock assessment when the Council's own Scientific and Statistical Committee asked for it? Because of the once in 30 year red tide event, the assessment is showing that the stock was reduced by 1/3. This has been shown to be wrong, yet a new assessment is not on the five year schedule of assessments. The 2006 gag assessment was declared UNRELIABLE UPON ITS VERY COMPLETION IN JANUARY 2006.

Given that release mortality estimates HAVE been lowered (slightly), why is a 24" minimum size limit for recreational anglers not being considered? It would result in a nearly 30% reduction in landings. The reduction should be even higher now, given the knowledge that 2/3 of the released gag are in state waters with an average depth of less than 30 feet. We would expect a benefit of more like 40%. All that without destroying a person's opportunity to fish. This would maximize the biological effect and minimize the social and economic impacts. THIS OPTION NEEDS TO BE INCLUDED AND LISTED AS PREFERRED.

A slot limit on a grouper is insane. Even your own Reef Fish AP rejected it unanimously.

We are concerned that the Council is once again using a couple of agenda-driven comments to paint the picture of the gag fishery in the northern gulf. The individuals are proponents of sector separation and recreational catch shares. This is another example of selective hearing on the Council's part.

Why are the Interdisciplinary Planning Teams, formed and directed by the National Marine Fisheries Service, writing the regulations behind closed doors and without any accountability for formulation and methodology behind landings reduction estimates?

Just like with Red Grouper, overwhelming anecdotal evidence has been presented attesting to strong abundance, strong recruitment and a wide range of sizes available in the gag fishery. These all contradict the flawed, outdated gag assessment.

A spawning closure is a spawning closure. Why would IFQs exempt commercial fishermen from prosecuting fish during the spawn?

No additional time or area closures should be considered, other than a spawning closure in the winter, if necessary. There is not

enough data to accurately assess stocks. How come we can be so precise about fishing areas?

Why has the SSC's recommendation of reruns using the latest figures been ignored? Why are signs of crashing effort ignored? When all fishing stops, what will you manage?

Amendment 18

Who made the LATEST mistakes in the Federal Register notice of these meetings? Did Steve Atran get his Ph.D.? When did Orange Beach move to Florida?

Copies of the website and the Federal Register Notice (FRN) with the mistakes highlighted were submitted at the St. Pete hearing on August 2, 2011. Who will be held responsible? The last set of FRN's regarding the May public hearings also contained critical errors. A request for determination of responsibility for that set of errors has been ignored by Steve Bortone. Transparency takes another hit.

Once again, no mention is made of how unrealized allowable quota is to be carried over into the next year. While this is a public theme of every single FMP and action, Council and NMFS continue to ignore the public, much like they ignore Congress.

NO reductions in current landings levels are acceptable, nor are any accountability measures that rely on in-season quota monitoring using the MRIP/MRFSS data. Refer to the NRC reports of 2000 and 2006 for rationale supporting exclusion of said data.

There is currently no need or indication of a need for further reductions in landings of recreational mackerel, cobia or dolphin. Why then would we make a decision which would FURTHER reduce economic activity generated by fishing? Fishing activity is projected to continue to decline, according to the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Why was a control rule group established with NO fishing representation while having significant environmental group representation? Further, why was that group established in violation of the Council's charter, yet its decisions were requested to be voted in as compliant?

Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures amendment

Why was the control rule written by a group that included an Ocean Conservancy member, a PEW trust member and NO OTHER stakeholders whatsoever? Why were funds spent on an unauthorized group? Why was the unauthorized control rule group's output accepted for use by the Council? Does this speak to transparency?

Why did the Council SSC use a P-star table paid for by Ocean conservancy, which differed from NMFS own p-star values? Who will be held accountable? Why was this allowed?

This invalidates all ACL/AM limits set using the Ocean Conservancy version of p-star thus far. Is there any wonder why the public has no faith in the management system? Council members are ultimately responsible for allowing this behavior.

Worthy of note is the LACK OF A PROCESS FOR UNUSED ALLOWABLE CATCH. Any overages are not carried forward. Why not? The public clearly requested this over the last three years, yet the public remains ignored.

Taking 25% off of the top, then another 25% for a 'buffer' in which Accountability Measures (fishing slowdown regulations) will kick in is tantamount to a fifty percent reduction, with NO BIOLOGICAL NEED for such a reduction.

The 'old method' gave us Maximum Sustainable Yield and allowed us to exceed that once in every four years, allowing for the cyclical nature of fish stocks.

Optimum Yield should be set at the old Maximum Sustainable yield. That is, in fact, optimum. Any automatic reductions are unnecessary, economically damaging and possibly even in violation of Magnuson. Optimum yield is NOT required to be set so low by Magnuson. In fact, Magnuson does not prohibit $MSY=OFL=OY$.

We should NOT suffer any further erosion of our fishing rights. We request that all Florida and Louisiana representatives assert that Floridians Louisianans have the RIGHT to fish. It is not a privilege.

This whole idea of setting Annual Catch Limits on data poor species is preposterous and designed to end fishing as we know it. The flawed data collection process has not been improved upon. Magnuson is being ignored or selectively observed. This is wrong and people should be held accountable for this.

How can ACL and AM be set when the data remains flawed and unreliable? Magnuson calls for two years of functioning Angler Registration before setting ACLs. Again, there is no mention in Magnuson of automatic 25-50% landings reductions.

I am concerned by reports of over-reporting of trips and landings by some members of the charter community. This practice seems to be in response to the push for recreational catch shares. The perceived benefit of this is to get the largest possible piece of any recreational pie that might be carved up and handed out in the future. The effect this will have on the effort and landings estimates for the recreational sector is astounding. Anglers already are suffering a shortened red snapper season due to increased landings and landed size of the fish. The effort estimates are still incredibly high. Could this be why?

Fish have tails. They don't know that they are supposed to stay in one place, or not cross an arbitrary line. How then can we in good conscience close areas to fishing when the benefit is negligible.

There should be no accountability measures set until such time as we have reliable data upon which to make decisions.

Worthy of note is the LACK OF A PROCESS FOR UNUSED ALLOWABLE CATCH. Any underages are not carried forward. Why not? The public clearly requested this over the last three years, yet the public remains ignored.

NMFS and the Council ignored Congress about catch shares and sector separation. Given the recent memorandum from NOAA legal counsel regarding catch share programs, it is very easy to believe that there exists an agenda that will be advanced regardless of the law or Congressional intent. We now understand how NMFS consistently abuses its authority.

Do not move forward with the ACL amendment until such time as the control rule group issue and congressional intent are resolved. According to NMFS attorney's interpretations of the Magnuson, the very act of discussing seething provides evidence of action. You have discussed a plan. Now you should hold off until the issues brought up in discussion are resolved.

APPENDIX C-1 COMMENTS ON THE DEIS FROM EPA



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 4
ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER
61 FORSYTH STREET
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8960

2011 JUL 25 PM 12:26

July 21, 2011

Dr. Roy E. Crabtree
Regional Administrator
Southeast Regional Office
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701

RA	DRA	OMI
NEPA	SRA	SDRA
Copy/	F/SER1	M&B
Orig/	F/SER2	IT
Route	F/SER3	GRANTS
	F/SER4	CS/PERMITS
Action	FYI	Date
Return to		
FILE		RECYCLE

Subject: EPA NEPA Review Comments on NOAA's DEIS for "Reef Fish Amendment 32, Gag - Rebuilding Plan, Annual Catch Limits, Management Measures, Red Grouper - Annual Catch Limits, Management Measures, Grouper Accountability Measures, Gulf of Mexico"; CEQ #20110177

Dear Dr. Crabtree:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the subject National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in accordance with our responsibilities under Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. EPA understands that the purpose and need for Amendment 32 is to address the overfishing of gag and develop a stock rebuilding plan in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) and to modify the red grouper catch limits in response to the improved status of the stock.

It is our understanding that NOAA proposes 7 actions within the DEIS which include: 1) rebuilding plan for the gag stock; 2) establishing or modifying recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons for gag and red grouper; 3) applying commercial gag quota adjustments to account for dead discards; 4) adjusting multi-use individual fishing quota shares (allocation); 5) changing the commercial gag size limit; 6) establishing time and area closures; 7) and modifying current gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper accountability measures.

EPA has a responsibility to review and comment on major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, including Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) and FMP Amendments (Amendments) as developed, approved, and implemented under the MSA where those Plans and Amendments are subject to the EIS requirement of NEPA, but it should be clear that we defer to NOAA and the Councils as to the development of fishery statistics and the relative importance of the commercial and recreational fisheries for each species.

EPA appreciates that several alternatives for proposed actions were presented and that preferred alternatives were identified in the DEIS. Based on our review, we offer the

Internet Address (URL) • <http://www.epa.gov>

Recycled/Recyclable • Printed with Vegetable Oil Based Inks on Recycled Paper (Minimum 30% Postconsumer)

following comments for the preferred alternatives for the 7 actions covered within the DEIS.

Actions and Alternatives:

Action – 1: Rebuilding Plan for Gag

Under the preferred alternative for Action 1 the Council proposes to establish a rebuilding plan for the gag that will rebuild the stock to a level consistent with producing maximum sustainable yield in 10 years or less. EPA notes that as required by the MSA, the Council must implement a fishery management plan that aims to rebuild overfished stocks to healthy, sustainable levels within 10 years. As we have suggested in previous NEPA comment letters, EPA supports an increased rate recovery for the overfished fishery resource. However, if these actions substantively impact societal issues (particularly if minority or low-income fishers (i.e., environmental justice populations) are disproportionately affected), this should be considered in the decision-making process. EPA is pleased that the Council will be implementing management strategies that could rebuild the stock within 7 years, which would allow for additional time the achieve the management target date of 10 years.¹

Action 2: Recreational Bag Limits, Size Limits, and Closed Seasons for Gag/Red Grouper

Under the preferred alternative for Action 2.1 the Council proposes a longer open season (June 1 - October 31) and sets a 22-30 inch slot size limit, 2 fish gag bag limit, and 4 fish aggregate bag limit. Under the preferred alternative for Action 2.2 the Council proposes an increase in the red grouper bag limit to 4 fish per person and proposes adaptive management tools that will allow for reductions in the bag limit if the annual catch limit is exceeded. We defer to NOAA and the Council when setting recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons for the Gag/Red Grouper.

Action 3: Commercial Gag and Shallow-water Grouper Quota Adjustments to Account for Dead Discards

Under the preferred alternative for Action 3 the Council proposes to reduce the gag commercial quota to 86% of the ACT to compensate for dead discards not being reduced to projected levels needed to achieve 100% of the ACT. EPA appreciates NOAA and the Council's efforts to adjust quotas to address the issue of dead discards. While EPA supports this effort, we do recommend that the Council provide additional information and justification in section 2.3 of the FEIS for using 86% of the ACT to account for dead discards.

Action 4: Adjustments to Multi-use IFQ Shares

Under the preferred alternative for Action 4 the Council proposes to set the percentage of red grouper IFQ allocation converted into multi-use allocation equal to zero. Once NOAA Fisheries declares the gag rebuilt, set the percentage of red grouper IFQ allocation converted into multi-use allocation as follows:

¹ p. 23

Red Grouper Multi-use (in percent) = $100 * [\text{Gag ACL} - \text{Gag Allocation}] / \text{Red Grouper Allocation}$

The red grouper multi-use percentage will be recalculated following adjustments in commercial gag ACL, gag allocation, or red grouper allocation. Although we defer to NOAA and the Council when setting adjustments to the multi-use IFQ shares, we do request that the FEIS better define the “buffer” as described in the following statement in the DEIS.

After the gag stock is fully rebuilt, the percentage of red grouper allocation converted into red grouper multi-use allocation valid to harvest red or gag grouper would be determined based on the buffer existing between the gag annual catch limit and individual fishing quota allocation and on the magnitude of the red grouper annual catch limit.²

In addition, as we have stated in past comment letters, we find it somewhat unclear how multiuse IFQ shares would benefit the fishery since allocations can be used for more than one species. We recommend that additional information and clarification be provided in the FEIS regarding how multiuse IFQ shares benefit the gag and red grouper fisheries.

Action 5: Commercial Gag Size Limit

Under the preferred alternative for Action 5 the Council proposes to reduce the commercial gag minimum size limit to 22 inches total length. EPA notes that Table 2.5.1 indicates a dramatic increase in gag dead discards from 1990 – 2008. It is suggested in the DEIS that an increase in the commercial minimum size limit from 20 inches to 24 inches lead to significant increases in dead discards. It would seem plausible that increasing fishing effort and efficiency has occurred over this same period. We would recommend that the FEIS include additional discussion of the causes of the significant increases in dead discards seen in Table 2.5.1 over the past 18 years. EPA also notes that the commercial minimum size limit proposed by the Council would match the current recreational minimum size limit, and we concur that this would provide for a more uniform enforceable size limit across both sectors.

Action 6: Time and Area Closures

More than one alternative and option can be selected as preferred alternative for Action 6. Based on information provided in the DEIS discard mortality increases with increase depths³ (i.e. the deeper the fish is caught the less likely it will survive release). EPA agrees with the Council that focusing closure areas on deeper waters should reduce bycatch mortality of gag. Although we defer to NOAA and the Council when setting the time and area closures for the gag, we do suggest that the same level of information regarding the benefits of the area closures be provided for the proposed seasonal closures in the FEIS.

² p. 35-36

³ p. 47

Action 7: Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures

Under the preferred alternative for Action 7.1, the Council proposes accountability measures for the gag, red grouper and shallow-water grouper commercial sector that will be the current individual fishing quota program. Under the preferred alternative for Action 7.2, the Council proposes to add an overage adjustment to be applied when gag or red grouper are considered overfished and in-season accountability measures to close a season early if needed to the existing gag and red grouper accountability measures. We defer to NOAA and the Council when setting gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper accountability measures.

General Comments:

Environmental Justice

Although proposed FMPs/Amendments are implemented for the sake of recovering the fishery, they can have societal effect on fishers. These affects can be equally or unequally distributed among fishers. Section 3.3.3 states that:

although some communities expected to be affected by this proposed rule may reside in counties that have minority or economic profiles that exceed the EJ thresholds and, therefore, constitute areas of concern, no EJ issues have been identified or are expected to arise⁴

It appears that no EJ issues have been identified by the Council based on the following information:

- Estimated State Demographics:
 - Minority (non-whites including Hispanics) – 38.7%
 - Below Poverty Line – 12.6%
- EJ Threshold of 1.2 the State Average Demographics:
 - Minority Threshold – 46.4%
 - Poverty Line Threshold – 15.1%

The EJ analysis estimates that Pinellas County does not meet the minority or poverty line thresholds. While this may be true, EPA is concerned that Pinellas County may not be the best representation of the actual impacted community, primarily the fishers in this case. In addition, we are concerned that no other Counties along the west coast of Florida are included in this analysis. It is further stated in the DEIS that “Additional communities beyond those profiled above would be expected to be affected by the actions in this proposed rule”⁵ yet no additional analysis is included for these other communities. EPA recommends that the FEIS include a more detailed EJ analysis which includes all the potential impacted communities.

⁴ p. 69

⁵ p. 71

Public Participation – It is important to incorporate and discuss public participation activities related to EJ and the proposed action. There is no discussion of the public participation process related to EJ communities in the DEIS. In addition, it is not clear that representatives of EJ communities were involved or that any issues they have were identified. EPA recommends more EJ specific outreach efforts for these public participation opportunities in the future.

Color Figures and Tables in DEIS

EPA found figures and tables in the DEIS copies delivered to the Region very difficult to review. Several figures and tables required color copies to interpret. EPA was able to download a pdf version off the Council's website for review. For future documents, please provide color copies of maps and figures that require color to interpret.

EPA DEIS Rating:

Although some clarification comments were offered for this DEIS, EPA generally supports NOAA and the Councils on Amendment 32 and gives deference to their fishery expertise. Therefore, EPA rates this DEIS as "LO" (Lack of Objections). Nevertheless, we request that NOAA and the Councils directly respond to our comments in a dedicated section of the FEIS.

EPA appreciates the opportunity to review the DEIS. Should NOAA have questions regarding our comments on the Amendment actions, please feel free to contact Dan Holliman at 404/562-9531 or holliman.daniel@epa.gov and for EJ comments please contact Ntale Kajumba at 404/562-9620 or kajumba.ntale@epa.gov of my staff.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Daniel Holliman" with a stylized "for" written below it.

Heinz J. Mueller
Chief, NEPA Program Office
Office of Policy and Management

APPENDIC C-2 NMFS RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Overall, the EPA was supportive of the Council's proposed actions intended to rebuild the gag stock and manage the harvest of shallow-water grouper. They deferred to the Council's and NMFS's expertise in managing fishery resources and rated this DEIS as an "LO" (Lack of Objections). This means the DEIS adequately sets forth the environmental impacts of the alternatives and no further analysis or data collection is necessary. However, an EPA reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information in the final environmental impact statement (FEIS). Two general comments from the EPA were the Environmental Justice analysis be conducted on communities potentially impacted by the actions in this amendment and that additional discussion of the public participation process be included, particularly in the participation by Environmental Justice communities.

Response: The Environmental Justice Considerations section has been updated to include a more detailed environmental justice analysis which includes all the potential impacted communities, as requested. The analysis includes all counties along the west coast of Florida which (a) have a strong relationship to the gag or red grouper fishery, and (b) present a potential concern for environmental justice issues by exceeding the thresholds for poverty and minority rates. The analysis uses county-level census data as we do not have data refined to the individual or vessel level within communities to be able to analyze such impacts at this time.

In response to the comment concerning public participation, the same problem arises: without available data on the race and income status for groups at the different participation levels (vessel owners, crew, dealers, processors, employees, employees of associated support industries, etc.), it is not possible at this time to identify those who should be targeted for environmental justice outreach. Unlike commercial fisheries including spiny lobster and shrimp in which environmental justice minority populations are known to participate substantially, the presence of minority or poverty populations within the grouper fishery is unknown. We recognize that minorities and those below the poverty line do suffer more negative impacts from social disruption, however at this time we can only attempt to identify where vulnerable populations may be and hope that through public comment any specific issues that may be related to that vulnerability will be identified. As socio-cultural data improvement continues, it will hopefully become possible to better identify environmental justice populations in the grouper fishery and to direct efforts toward these groups for public participation opportunities in the future.

EPA comments specific to Amendment 32 actions are described below and will be addressed in the FEIS.

Action 1: Although the EPA supports rebuilding gag, the agency would like the societal impacts (particularly environmental justice populations) to be considered in the decision-making process.

Response: As mentioned above, without available data on the race and income status for groups at the different participation levels, it is not possible at this time to identify those who should be targeted for environmental justice outreach.

Action 2: The EPA deferred to the Council and NMFS when setting recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons for gag and red grouper.

Action 3: The EPA deferred to the Council and NMFS on this action setting the gag quota, but requested there should be more detail provided in how the downward 14 percent adjustment was arrived at.

Response: Additional information in how the 14 percent downward adjustment of the gag commercial quota is provided in Section 2.3. In summary, this adjustment represents an intermediate adjustment between the best and worst case scenarios. The chosen percentage represents approximately the 75th percentile for the adjustment range.

Action 4: The EPA deferred to the Council and NMFS on this action, but requested that the FEIS better define “buffer” and better explain how multi-use shares benefits the commercial sector.

Response: In Section 2.4, the term ‘buffer’ was deleted from the discussion. The discussion now indicates that the amount of multi-use allocation is based on the difference between the annual catch limit and the annual catch target (which is equivalent to the individual fishing quota allocation). Granting multi-use allocation when the annual catch limit and the individual fishing quota allocation (annual catch target) are equal would lead to harvest exceeding the annual catch limit. With respect to how multi-use shares benefit the commercial sector, the discussion notes that multi-species individual fishing quota program participants benefit from the creation of catch quota balancing measures such as the multi-use allocations which help participants respond to temporal fluctuations (e.g., recruitment pulses) and geographical variations (e.g., different areas of the Gulf) in gag and red grouper abundance.

Action 5: The EPA requested more discussion of the trends in Table 2.5.1 in the FEIS. In addition, the EPA concurred that having equal commercial and recreational minimum size limits would assist the enforceability of the regulations.

Response: The primary purpose of this table is to show the effects of regulations on increasing the number of discards. As shown, there is a large increase in discards in 2000 due to the size limit increase and a smaller increase in 2005 when a trip limit was implemented. The initial commercial minimum size limit went into effect in 1990, the first year of Table 2.5.1. The reason for this is the stock assessment that generated these values concluded that commercial discards are exclusively due to minimum size regulations. Because of this, changes in effort and efficiency are less relevant to this discussion and so were not included.

Action 6: Although the EPA defers to the Council and NMFS on setting time-area closures, they requested the same level of information on the benefits of closed areas be provided for the proposed season closures in the FEIS.

Response: Additional text has been added to Section 5.6 that explains further elaborates on the effects of the closed seasons.

Action 7: The EPA deferred to the Council and NMFS when setting gag, red grouper and shallow-water grouper accountability measures.

APPENDIX C-3 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) received a total of 12 comments from individuals and organizations in addition to the EPA during the 45-day comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Ten comments were from individuals and two comment letters were received from non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Comments from the NGOs were generally supportive of the DEIS, but had comments specific to some of the actions. Most comments from individuals were negative toward the DEIS in general or to specific actions in the DEIS.

Many of the public comments were non-specific to actions in the amendment. Some respondents pointed out that gag in the area they fished appeared to be very abundant. They suggested regional gag management might be more appropriate where conservative measures are applied to areas of low gag abundance and more liberal measures be applied to areas of higher gag abundance. One respondent indicated that the abundance of gag in the area he fished was low and felt this low abundance was not due to overfishing, but due to other factors such as reduced levels of prey species and red snapper taking over the gag niche. Another questioned whether management measures were needed at all. Two respondents suggested management measures on other fisheries or sectors needed to be further regulated to reduce gag mortality. These included the shrimp (both inshore and offshore) fishery and the reef fish longline sector.

In the list below, some of the comments have been summarized due to length of the original submitted comments. All of the original comments on the draft environmental impact statement can be viewed via the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. To view posted comments, enter "NOAA-NMFS-2011-0135" in the keyword search and click on "search."

Response to general comments: With respect to regional management, the Council has considered regional management for other species including red snapper and gray triggerfish; however, the scale of regional management was on a gross scale and evaluated different management measures between the eastern and western Gulf of Mexico (Gulf). Because gag are found primarily in the eastern Gulf, regional management would be on a much finer scale, likely regions within Florida. Because many data used in assessments looks at broader areas (e.g., the state level), it would be difficult to implement sub-state regulations. In addition, this type of management would be difficult to enforce because of the range of locations people land fish when fishing in federal waters. For example, the Middle Grounds Habitat Area of Particular Concern can be accessed by fishermen from the Tampa Bay area to the Florida Panhandle.

In response to the comment that low gag abundances were due to environmental factors such as prey abundance or competition from other reef fish species, it is beyond the scope of this DEIS to examine these factors. The stock assessment the alternatives are based on was for gag and did not factor in other species. The assessment did take into account a reduction in the stock biomass that was the result of some natural episodic mortality event in 2005. Because of a large-scale red tide event also occurred during this year, biologists speculated the two events may be related. The Council is looking at ecosystem management for Gulf stocks and modeling exercises are ongoing to look at a variety of multispecies interactions. However, these efforts are ongoing and it will take time until these models can be applied to manage reef fish stocks.

For fisheries outside of those covered in the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico, action would need to be taken under a different fishery management plan and so is outside of the scope of Amendment 32. The Council may wish to evaluate the shrimp fishery relative to

gag; however, this action would need to be taken in the shrimp fishery management plan. With respect to fishing for reef fish with longlines, regulations from Amendment 31 were implemented in May 2010. These regulations required a longline endorsement that reduced the number of longline vessels in the Gulf. In addition, it limited the number of hooks that could be used on these vessels and placed restrictions on where they could fish. At this time, it is unknown what the effects of these measures are on the gag stock because the last year of landings used in the stock assessment was 2008. Future stock assessments may be able to determine if these measures have been beneficial for gag.

The following are comments specific to actions in Amendment 32

Action 1. Rebuilding plan for gag

Several comments from the public questioned the need for a rebuilding plan. They questioned the science behind the stock assessment and that their personal observations water where gag are more abundant than in past years. Both NGOs supported a rebuilding plan as long as it has a good probability of success. One NGO supported a 7-year rebuilding plan (Alternative 3) over the preferred 10-year rebuilding plan (Alternative 2) because of the greater certainty the stock will rebuild and that this timeframe is consistent with the proposed management measures designed to harvest the annual catch target.

Response: As mentioned in the purpose and need in Amendment 32, the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires NMFS and regional fishery management councils to prevent overfishing, and achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from federally managed fish stocks. In addition, the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires fishery managers to specify through rebuilding plans their strategy for rebuilding overfished stocks to a sustainable level within a certain time frame. The most recent stock assessment of gag indicated the stock was overfished and undergoing overfishing. Therefore, a rebuilding plan for gag is required. With regards to the length of the rebuilding plan, 10 years is the longest time period allowed under the Magnuson-Stevens Act unless circumstances allow a longer time frame. In this case, these circumstances do not apply. As mentioned in Section 2.1, the harvest levels set by the Council in Actions 2 and 3 should rebuild the stock within 7 years. However, due to uncertainties regarding the plan, the Council chose a 10-year plan to provide a buffer should rebuilding not occur as anticipated.

Action 2. Recreational bag limits, size limits, and closed seasons

Action 2.1. Gag bag limit, size limit, and closed season scenarios

Several comments were received on this action. One respondent was very concerned about the effect on the economic health of their community if no winter fishing was allowed and recommended Alternative 3 (January and April season) be selected. Another respondent thought the minimum size limit for gag should be increased to 26 inches as a way to increase the spawning potential of the stock. Both NGOs questioned the assumptions used by the Council in the decision model to determine recreational alternatives. They were concerned the 1.5 effort shift may be too low and that the Council should evaluate using a higher level. Additionally, one felt the levels of harvest reduction were too low to ensure the stock rebuilds and suggested management measures be based on a level closer to a 61 percent reduction in removals.

Response: As described in Section 2.2.1, the season selected by the Council is nearly twice as long as the other alternatives being considered. Based on public testimony, this is what most participants in the recreational sector preferred. The economic losses as described in Section 5.2.3 indicate that this

alternative performs similarly to the January and April season alternative which had slightly lower economic losses. After hearing public testimony to increase the minimum size limit of for gag, the Council determined this alternative was not practical because of concerns about increased discards, and subsequently increased discard mortality. As far as what level of effort shift to select, as described in Section 2.2.1, the Council determined some effort shifting is likely to occur, but doubling of the effort shift seemed too high of an assumption. If the Council is not correct with this assumption, in-season accountability measures and overage adjustments (Action 7.2) would provide additional protections for the stock.

As discussed in Section 2.1, needed reductions in the number of removals was estimated to fall between two baseline periods—2006-08 when landings are higher (greater reduction needed) and 2009 when landings were lower (lower reduction needed). The closer the reductions are to those under the 2006-08 timeframe which requires a 61% reduction to meet the annual catch target, the more conservative a measure is for the stock, but the more adverse to the recreational sector. In evaluating the alternatives, the Council selected a strategy within the range provided by the baselines that balanced the ability for the stock to recover while minimizing adverse effects on the recreational sector.

Action 2.2. Red grouper bag limit

One NGO indicated that they were supportive of the adaptive management process in this action. However, they were concerned that change from two fish to four fish may be too much of an increase and lead to the recreational annual catch limit being exceeded. They recommended Alternative 2 (increase the bag limit to three fish) be selected and revised to include an increase to four fish in the future if this bag limit could be supported.

Response: Red grouper is neither overfished nor undergoing overfishing. The recreational sector has not caught its allocation of red grouper in recent years, and with an increase in allocation in 2011 or 2012 it is unlikely to catch its limits. Therefore, a relaxation of the recreational red grouper regulations is warranted to allow the sector to catch more of its allocation. As discussed in Section 2.2.2, the bag limit analyses done in Amendment 30B suggests an increase from a 2-fish to a 4-fish bag limit could increase harvest by 13.2%. This is less than a proposed increase in the red grouper total allowable catch currently in the implementation process. Thus, it is unlikely the red grouper recreational annual catch limit will be exceeded. Furthermore, Action 7.2 proposes in-season monitoring which would close the fishery if the harvest is projected to exceed the annual catch limit.

Action 3. Commercial gag quota adjustment to account for dead discards

Two public comments indicated they were against this action. One felt there was minimal discard mortality by the vertical line sector while the other felt the commercial sector would ignore this action. One NGO was supportive of the preferred alternative, but indicated the Council should verify this level of adjustment through observer programs.

Response: As described in Section 2.3, with the cuts in the commercial quota, it is likely that many individual fishing quota shareholders will likely run out of allocation. This means gag caught while targeting other species would be discards and some additional discard mortality would occur. This is the reason for considering the quota adjustment. With respect to ignoring the action, the commercial sector is highly regulated through the individual fishing quota program and so would be held to their individual

allocation. The commercial sector is currently subject to an observer program and information on the performance of the adjustment will be available for review.

Action 4. Adjustments to multi-use individual fishing quota shares

There were no comments from the public that were not in support of this action.

Action 5. Commercial gag size limit

Both NGOs support reducing bycatch, but expressed concern about the proposed reduction in the commercial size limit. Their main concern is how the reduction may affect the spawning potential of the stock. Both pointed out the minimum size limit is less than the size at 50 percent maturity and how any change in size limit could affect projection outcomes from the most recent assessment.

Response: There is a tradeoff between loss of spawning potential and the reduction in dead discards from reducing the minimum size. As described in Section 5.5.2, because the proportional reduction in the number of discarded gag is greater than the proportional increase in the number of fish needed to meet the individual quota, this alternative will likely provide a net positive benefit to the stock.

Action 6. Time and area closures

One public comment supported the closure of “The Edges.” Both NGOs supported the use of time and area closures to protect the gag spawning stock. They supported closing additional areas and preferred year-round closures to partial year closures.

Response: The Council selected the no action alternative as preferred primarily because of the negative social and economic impacts compared to the measurable biological benefits. These effects are discussed in Section 2.6 and 5.6. As described, closing a particular area can provide biological and ecological benefits, but these are difficult to quantify because of effort shifting outside the closed area. In general closing fishing areas remains a controversial issue and requires well defined rationale and trade-offs for closing a fishing area, particularly large fishing area(s). The Council had previously selected Alternative 3, Option c at the April 2011 meeting as the preferred alternative. However, most comments the Council received were negative regarding this closed area because of issues such as effort shifting and inter-sector completion. Thus, the Council selected the no action alternative at its August 2011 when the Council took final action on Amendment 32.

Action 7. Gag, Red Grouper, and Shallow-water Grouper Accountability Measures

Action 7.1 Gag, red grouper, and shallow-water grouper commercial accountability measures

Both NGOs supported Preferred Alternative 2; however, one recommended the individual fishing programs account for not only landed fish, but discarded fish as well.

Response: Currently the individual fishing quota program is based on landings only. To account for discarded fish, an at-sea monitoring program would need to be developed. In providing estimates of harvest levels, stock assessments do account for discarded fish as estimated by observer programs (see response for Action 3).

Action 7.2 Gag and red grouper recreational accountability measures

Both NGOs supported the Preferred Alternative 4; however, one NGO recommended that in-season accountability measures close the fishery when the annual catch target is achieved rather than the annual catch limit.

Response: In setting an in-season closure date should in-season projections indicate an annual catch limit would be exceeded, fishery managers are likely err on the side of caution in selecting a date. To allow the annual catch limit to be exceeded would postpone future increases for both the gag and red grouper fisheries. For gag, the increases are a part of the rebuilding plan, and for red grouper, the increases are a part of increases in the total allowable catch currently being proposed through a framework action. In addition, the gag stock is under a rebuilding plan. If the gag annual catch limit is exceeded, then an overage adjustment could be applied, further reducing the subsequent year's total allowable catch. Thus, the closure date would likely be based on the sector harvesting some value below the annual catch limit such as the annual catch target.

Table 1 below contains additional management scenarios for Action 2.1 based on the Reef Fish Advisory Panel recommended split season scenario. In addition to indication the percent change in total removals, the table also shows the adjusted landed catch after accounting for dead discards (adj. landings column). Table 2 shows the adjusted landings for the five alternatives currently in Action 2.1.

D-1