

# Red Snapper Commercial Quota Retention for 2016



**Framework Action to the Fishery Management Plan for  
the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico including  
Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Impact Review, and  
Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis**

**September 2015**



*This is a publication of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council Pursuant to National Oceanic and  
Atmospheric Administration Award No.NA15NMF4410011*

This page intentionally blank

# COVER SHEET

## Retain a Portion of the Commercial Red Snapper Quota for 2016

Framework Action to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico including Environmental Assessment (EA), Regulatory Impact Review (RIR), and Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (RFAA).

---

### Type of Action

(x) Administrative      ( ) Legislative  
( ) Draft                (X) Final

### Responsible Agencies and Contact Persons

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council)	813-348-1630
2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100	813-348-1711 (fax)
Tampa, Florida 33607	<a href="mailto:gulfcouncil@gulfcouncil.org">gulfcouncil@gulfcouncil.org</a>
Assane Diagne ( <a href="mailto:assane.diagne@gulfcouncil.org">assane.diagne@gulfcouncil.org</a> )	<a href="http://www.gulfcouncil.org">http://www.gulfcouncil.org</a>
National Marine Fisheries Service (Lead Agency)	727-824-5305
Southeast Regional Office	727-824-5308 (fax)
263 13 <sup>th</sup> Avenue South	<a href="http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov">http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov</a>
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701	
Rich Malinowski ( <a href="mailto:rich.malinowski@noaa.gov">rich.malinowski@noaa.gov</a> )	

## ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

ABC	allowable biological catch
ACL	annual catch limit
ALS	accumulated landings system
AM	accountability measure
Council	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEZ	exclusive economic zone
EFH	essential fish habitat
E.O.	Executive Order
$F_{level}$	instantaneous fishing mortality corresponding to a given level
FMP	fishery management plan
FTE	Full-time Equivalent
GMFMC	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
Gulf	Gulf of Mexico
gw	gutted weight
IFQ	individual fishing quota
LAPP	limited access privilege program
lq	local quotient
Magnuson-Stevens Act	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
mp	million pounds
MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey
MRIP	Marine Recreational Information Program
MSY	maximum sustainable yield
NAICS	North American Industry Classification System
NMFS	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
OFL	overfishing limit
P*	acceptable probability of overfishing
RFA	Regulatory Flexibility Act
RFAA	Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis
RIR	regulatory impact review
RS-IFQ	red snapper individual fishing quota program
Secretary	Secretary of Commerce
SEDAR	Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review
SEFSC	Southeast Fisheries Science Center
SERO	Southeast Regional Office
SSC	Scientific Statistical Committee
SPR	spawning potential ratio
SRHS	Southeast Region Headboat Survey
TAC	total allowable catch
ww	whole weight

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER SHEET.....	i
ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT .....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
List of Figures .....	vi
Chapter 1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Purpose and Need .....	1
1.3 History of Management .....	1
Chapter 2. Management Alternatives .....	4
2.1 Action 1 - Retain a Portion of the Commercial Red Snapper Quota for 2016 .....	4
Chapter 3. Affected Environment .....	7
3.1 Description of the Physical Environment .....	7
3.2 Description of the Biological Environment .....	12
3.3 Description of the Economic Environment.....	17
3.3.1 Commercial Sector.....	17
3.3.2 Recreational Sector .....	21
3.4 Description of the Social Environment.....	28
3.4.1 Fishing Communities .....	29
3.4.2 Environmental Justice Considerations .....	36
3.5 Description of the Administrative Environment.....	40
3.5.1 Federal Fishery Management.....	40
3.5.2 State Fishery Management.....	41
Chapter 4. Environmental Consequences .....	42
4.1 Effects on the Physical Environment.....	42
4.2 Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment.....	42
4.3 Effects on the Economic Environment .....	43
4.4 Effects on the Social Environment .....	44
4.5 Effects on the Administrative Environment .....	45
4.6 Cumulative Effects Analysis.....	45
Chapter 5. Regulatory Impact Review.....	47
5.1 Introduction .....	47
5.2 Problems and Objectives .....	47
5.3 Description of Fisheries.....	47

5.4 Impacts of Management Measures .....	47
5.4.1 Action: Retain a Portion of the 2016 Commercial Red Snapper Quota .....	47
5.5 Public and Private Costs of Regulations .....	48
5.6 Determination of Significant Regulatory Action .....	48
Chapter 6. Regulatory Flexibility ACT Analysis .....	50
6.1 Introduction.....	50
6.2 Statement of the need for, objective of, and legal basis for the proposed action.....	50
6.3 Description and estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed action would apply .....	51
6.4 Description of the projected reporting, record-keeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed action .....	51
6.5 Identification of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed action.....	52
6.6 Significance of economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities.....	52
6.7 Description of the significant alternatives to the proposed action.....	53
Chapter 7. List of Preparers and Agencies Consulted .....	54
Chapter 8. References .....	55
Appendix A. Other Applicable Law .....	67

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 2.1.</b> 2016 commercial and recreational red snapper quotas .....	4
<b>Table 2.2</b> 2016 Commercial red snapper quotas and differences .....	6
<b>Table 3.2.2.</b> Species of the FMP grouped by family.....	15
<b>Table 3.3.1.1.2.</b> Summary of vessel counts and revenue .....	19
<b>Table 3.3.1.2.1.</b> Average annual business activity .....	20
<b>Table 3.3.2.1.1.</b> Number of red snapper recreational target trips, by mode, 2010-2014*. .....	23
<b>Table 3.3.2.1.2.</b> Number of red snapper recreational catch trips, by mode, 2010-2014*. .....	24
<b>Table 3.3.2.1.3.</b> Headboat angler days, 2010-2014.....	25
<b>Table 3.3.2.4.1.</b> Summary of red snapper target trips (2010-2014 average).....	28
<b>Table 3.4.1.1.</b> Percentage of total recreational red snapper landings by state for 2013.....	32
<b>Table 3.4.1.2.</b> Average community rank by total number of reef fish charter permits and divided by community population .....	34

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 3.1.1.</b> Physical environment of the Gulf.....	8
<b>Figure 3.1.2.</b> Map of most fishery management closed areas in the Gulf. ....	10
<b>Figure 3.4.1.</b> Length of fishing season in federal waters for commercial and recreational sectors .....	29
<b>Figure 3.4.1.1.</b> Top 15 commercial red snapper fishing communities by RQ value for four years. .....	31
<b>Figure 3.4.1.2.</b> Top 18 red snapper fishing communities' commercial engagement and reliance. .....	32
<b>Figure 3.4.1.3.</b> Top 15 recreational fishing communities' engagement and reliance. ....	36
<b>Figure 3.4.2.1.</b> Social vulnerability indices for red snapper commercial fishing communities..	38
<b>Figure 3.4.2.2.</b> Social vulnerability indices for recreational fishing communities. ....	39



# CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

In August 2015, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) approved modifications to the commercial and recreational sector allocations for red snapper in Amendment 28 to the Fishery Management Plan for Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico (FMP) (GMFMC 2015). The timeline for Amendment 28 does not allow NMFS to implement the proposed redistribution of red snapper commercial quota until after the annual distribution of allocation to the Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ) shareholders on January 1, 2016. This framework action will provide the Regional Administrator the authority to withhold 4.9 percent of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota (352,000 pounds whole weight) in anticipation of the implementation of Amendment 28. If Amendment 28 is disapproved by the Secretary of Commerce, the 4.9 percent of the commercial quota that was withheld would be distributed to the IFQ shareholders.

Amendment 28 and its Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzed the impacts of a reasonable range of alternatives that would change the current commercial and recreational red snapper allocation of 51:49 percent, respectively. The purpose of Amendment 28 is to reallocate the red snapper harvest consistent with the 2014 red snapper assessment update to ensure the allowable catch and recovery benefits are fairly and equitably allocated between the commercial and recreational sectors to better achieve optimum yield. Preferred Alternative 8 would result in a 48.5 percent commercial and 51.5 percent recreational allocation.

## 1.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose of this action is to withhold a percentage of the 2016 commercial ACL of red snapper equivalent to the portion of the total ACL proposed for redistribution from the commercial sector to the recreational sector in Amendment 28.

The need for this action is to allow NMFS to implement a decrease in the red snapper commercial quota for the 2016 fishing year, by only distributing to shareholders the exact portion of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota that the Council selected in Amendment 28. NMFS annually distributes the red snapper commercial quota around January 1 for that fishing year. This action would further the Council's mandate to prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from federally managed fish stocks, to take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing communities, and to provide for sustained participation of such communities, and to rebuild stocks that have been determined to be overfished.

## 1.3 History of Management

The final rule for the FMP (with its associated environmental impact statement [EIS]) (GMFMC 1981) was effective November 8, 1984, and defined the Reef Fish fishery management unit to include red snapper and other important reef fish. A complete history of management for the

FMP is available on the Council's website:

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/fishery\\_management\\_plans/reef\\_fish\\_management.php](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/fishery_management_plans/reef_fish_management.php) and a history of red snapper management through 2006 is presented in Hood et al. (2007). A detailed history of the commercial red snapper IFQ program and a discussion of its performance during the early years of the program are provided in Agar et al. (2014).

Currently, the commercial sector fishing for red snapper is regulated by a 13-inch total length (TL) minimum size limit and managed under an individual fishing quota program. Recreational fishing for red snapper is managed with a 16-inch TL minimum size limit, 2-fish bag limit, and a season beginning on June 1 and ending when the recreational ACL is projected to be caught. Other reef fish fishery management measures that affect red snapper fishing include permit requirements for the commercial and for-hire sectors as well as season-area closures.

*Red snapper allocation and quotas/ ACLs<sup>1</sup>*: The final rule for Amendment 1 (GMFMC 1989) to the FMP (with its associated environmental assessment (EA)) and regulatory impact review (RIR) was effective in February 1990. The amendment specified a framework procedure for setting the total allowable catch (TAC) to allow for annual management changes. A part of that specification was to establish a species' allocation. These were based on the percentage of total landings during the base period of 1979-1987. For red snapper, the commercial sector landed 51% and the recreational sector landed 49% of the overall harvest over the base period, hence the current 51% commercial:49%: recreational allocation. Amendment 1 also established a commercial quota allowing the Regional Administrator to close commercial red snapper fishing when the quota was caught. The recreational quota was established through a 1997 regulatory amendment (with its associated EA and RIR) (GMFMC 1995) with a final rule effective in October 1997. Prior to 1997, the recreational sector had exceeded its allocation of the red snapper TAC, though the overages were declining through more restrictive recreational management measures. With the establishment of a recreational quota, the Regional Administrator was authorized to close the recreational season when the quota is reached as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Since 2010, actions to change the red snapper catch levels have been implemented through framework actions which have set the TAC or quotas that acted as functional equivalents to ACLs. Section 407(d) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires recreational and commercial quotas for red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico. The situation of not having an actual ACL, but rather functional equivalents, has resulted in awkward wording when discussing and implementing red snapper catch levels. More importantly, accountability measures are triggered by ACLs being exceeded. As noted in Section 1.1, Amendment 40 (with an EIS, RIR, and Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (RFAA)), which established two components to the recreational sector, also established that the quota for the commercial and recreational sectors are the ACLs for the respective sectors, and that the sum of the quotas is the stock ACL (GMFMC 2015).

*Red snapper IFQ program (RS-IFQ)*: Amendment 26 (with a supplemental EIS, RIR, and RFAA), effective on January 1, 2007, established an IFQ program for the commercial red snapper fishery (GMFMC 2006). The RS-IFQ program is a single-species, single-share category program where participants use an online account for all transactions (share and

---

<sup>1</sup> The commercial and recreational ACLs are equal to the commercial and recreational quotas. In this document the terms "ACL" and "quota" are used interchangeably.

allocation transfers, landings, and cost recovery fees). For the first five years of the program (2007-2011), anyone who possessed a valid Gulf reef fish dealer permit or Gulf commercial reef fish permit was eligible to participate in the program. Beginning January 1, 2012, all U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens were eligible to obtain a RS-IFQ account to purchase red snapper shares and allocation. Only accounts with allocation and a valid Gulf commercial reef fish vessel permit can legally harvest red snapper. Allocation is distributed from shares on January first of each year and the allocation expires at the end of the year.

## CHAPTER 2. MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 Action 1 - Retain a Portion of the Commercial Red Snapper Quota for 2016

**Alternative 1:** No Action - Distribute 100% of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota to red snapper Individual Fishing Quota (RS-IFQ) account shareholders on January 1, 2016.

**Preferred Alternative 2:** Provide the Regional Administrator the authority to **withhold 4.9 % (0.352 mp ww) of the red snapper commercial quota**, before the distribution of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota to RS-IFQ account shareholders, The 4.9 % to be retained for later distribution was determined in Amendment 28.

#### **Discussion:**

At its August 2015 meeting, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) approved Amendment 28 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (Amendment 28). Amendment 28 would reallocate 0.352 mp of red snapper from the commercial sector to the recreational sector. For 2016, recreational and commercial quotas that would result from the reallocation alternatives in Amendment 28 are provided in Table 2.1.

**Table 2.1.** 2016 commercial and recreational red snapper quotas for the reallocation alternatives analyzed in Amendment 28. Quotas are expressed in million pounds whole weight (mp ww); Percentages are in percent of the total red snapper quota.

Alternatives in Amendment 28	2016 Red Snapper Quota				
	Total	Commercial		Recreational	
		Pounds	Percent	Pounds	Percent
Alternative 1 No Action	13.96	7.12	51.0%	6.84	49.0%
Alternative 2	13.96	6.701	48.0%	7.259	52.0%
Alternative 3	13.96	6.422	46.0%	7.538	54.0%
Alternative 4	13.96	5.724	41.0%	8.236	59.0%
Alternative 5	13.96	5.861	42.0%	8.099	58.0%
Alternative 6	13.96	4.651	33.3%	9.309	66.7%
Alternative 7	13.96	6.090	43.6%	7.87	56.4%
<b>Preferred Alternative 8</b>	13.96	6.768	48.5%	7.192	51.5%
Alternative 9	13.96	5.933	42.5%	8.027	57.5%

Source: Reef Fish Amendment 28

Based on expected timelines for review and implementation, Amendment 28, if approved by the Secretary, is expected to be implemented after January 1, 2016. However, the commercial shareholders in the RS-IFQ (IFQ) receive annual allocation on January 1 of each year. Therefore, quota reallocations that would decrease the commercial red snapper quota (and increase the recreational quota by the same amount) would either have to be implemented before the first of the year or be delayed by a year. By withholding a portion of the commercial quota during the distribution of annual allocations to RS-IFQ shareholders, this framework action would allow adjustments (reductions) to the 2016 commercial quota after the first of the year, in accordance with the expected timeline for the implementation of Amendment 28. Based on the purpose and need for this action, the Council faces a clearly defined dichotomous choice set; it could either retain a portion of the 2016 commercial red snapper quota necessary to facilitate the implementation of Amendment 28 in 2016 or distribute the totality of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota to RS-IFQ account shareholders. Therefore, this framework action only includes two management alternatives.

**Alternative 1** would take no action. No portion of the 2016 commercial red snapper quota would be retained. Therefore, **Alternative 1** would not allow decreases in the red snapper commercial quota after the January 1, 2016 distribution of annual allocations to RS-IFQ shareholders. Under **Alternative 1**, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) would not be able to decrease the commercial red snapper allocation in 2016, which would delay reallocation until 2017.

**Preferred Alternative 2** would allow the NMFS to implement a decrease in the commercial red snapper allocation after January 1, 2016, by only distributing the exact portion of the 2016 commercial red snapper quota selected as preferred in Amendment 28, to shareholders. Commercial red snapper quotas for 2016 expected to result from reallocation alternatives considered in Amendment 28 and differences between the quotas and the status quo commercial quota, i.e., without reallocation, are provided in Table 2.2.

The Council selected Preferred Alternative 8 in Amendment 28 that will result in 0.352 mp of the commercial quota being withheld and added to the 2016 recreational red snapper quota once the Secretary approves Amendment 28 for implementation. The 0.352 mp of red snapper withheld will be redistributed to RS-IFQ shareholders should the Secretary not approve Amendment 28.

**Table 2.2** 2016 Commercial red snapper quotas and differences between the status quo and the commercial quotas for reallocation alternatives under consideration in Amendment 28. Quotas are expressed in million pounds whole weight (mp ww); Differences are expressed in mp ww and in percent of the status quo (no action) quota.

Alternative in Amendment 28	Commercial Quota in 2016	Difference	
		Pounds	Percent
<b>Alternative 1 No Action</b>	<b>7.120</b>	----	----
Alternative 2	6.701	0.419	5.9%
Alternative 3	6.422	0.698	9.8%
Alternative 4	5.724	1.396	19.6%
Alternative 5	5.861	1.259	17.7%
Alternative 6	4.651	2.469	34.7%
Alternative 7	6.090	1.030	14.5%
Preferred Alternative 8	6.768	<b>0.352</b>	<b>4.9%</b>
Alternative 9	5.933	1.187	16.7%

Source: Data from Amendment 28

## CHAPTER 3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The affected environment as it pertains to the red snapper component of the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) reef fish fishery has been described in detail in the following documents: Generic Essential Fish Habitat (Generic EFH) Amendment (GMFMC 2004b), February 2010 Regulatory Amendment (GMFMC 2010), January 2011 Regulatory Amendment (GMFMC 2011a), Generic Annual Catch Limit/Accountability Measures (Generic ACL/AM) Amendment (GMFMC 2011b), and March 2013 Framework Action (GMFMC 2013a). This information is incorporated by reference and is summarized below. For information on impacts of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill on the affected environment, refer to [http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/deepwater\\_horizon\\_oil\\_spill.htm](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/deepwater_horizon_oil_spill.htm).

### 3.1 Description of the Physical Environment

The Gulf has a total area of approximately 600,000 square miles (1.5 million km<sup>2</sup>), 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 (Figure 3.1.1). Oceanographic conditions are affected by the Loop Current, discharge of freshwater into the northern Gulf, and a semi-permanent, anti-cyclonic gyre in the western Gulf. The Gulf includes both temperate and tropical waters (McEachran and Feckhelm 2005). Gulf water temperatures range from 54° F to 84° F (12° C to 29° C) depending on time of year and depth of water. Mean annual sea surface temperatures ranged from 73 ° F through 83° F (23-28° C) including bays and bayous (Figure 3.2.1) between 1982 and 2009, according to satellite-derived measurements.<sup>2</sup> In general, mean sea surface temperature increases from north to south with large seasonal variations in shallow waters.

The physical environment for reef fish, including red snapper, is also detailed in the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Generic EFH Amendment and the Generic ACL/AM Amendment (refer to GMFMC 2004a; GMFMC 2011a). In general, reef fish are widely distributed in the Gulf, occupying both pelagic and benthic habitats during their life cycle. A planktonic larval stage lives in the water column and feeds on zooplankton and phytoplankton (GMFMC 2004a). Juvenile and adult reef fish are typically demersal and usually associated with bottom topographies on the continental shelf (<100m) 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. For example, juvenile red snapper are common on mud bottoms in the northern Gulf, particularly off Texas through Alabama. Also, some juvenile snapper (e.g. mutton, gray, red, dog, lane, and yellowtail snappers) and grouper (e.g. Goliath grouper, red, gag, and yellowfin groupers) have been documented in inshore seagrass beds, mangrove estuaries, lagoons, and larger bay systems (Appendix B).


In the Gulf, fish habitat for adult red snapper consists of submarine gullies and depressions, coral reefs, rock outcroppings, gravel bottoms, oilrigs, and other artificial structures (GMFMC 2004a); eggs and larvae are pelagic; and juveniles are found associated with bottom inter-shelf habitat (Szedlmayer and Conti 1998) and prefer shell habitat over sand (Szedlmayer and Howe 1997).

---

<sup>2</sup> NODC 2012: <http://accession.nodc.noaa.gov/0072888>



Adult red snapper are closely associated with artificial structures in the northern Gulf (Szedlmayer and Shipp 1994; Shipp and Bortone 2009) and larger individuals have been found to use artificial habitats, but move further from the structure as they increase in size and based on the time of day (Topping and Szedlmayer 2011).



**Figure 3.1.1.** Physical environment of the Gulf including major feature names and mean annual sea surface temperature as derived from the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer Pathfinder Version 5 sea surface temperature data set (<http://accession.nodc.noaa.gov/0072888>)

### **Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC)**

Generic Amendment 3 (GMFMC 2005) addressed EFH, HAPC, and adverse effects of fishing in the following fishery management plans of the Gulf Reef Fish Resources, Red Drum, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics is hereby incorporated by reference.

### **Environmental Sites of Special Interest Relevant to Reef Fish, Red Drum, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, Spiny Lobster, Red Drum, and Coral and Coral Reefs (Figure 3.1.2)**

Detailed information pertaining to the closures and preserves is provided in the February 2010 Regulatory Amendment (GMFMC 2010) and is incorporated here by reference.

Longline/Buoy Gear Area Closure – Permanent closure to use of these gears for reef fish harvest inshore of 20 fathoms (36.6 meters) off the Florida shelf and inshore of 50 fathoms (91.4 meters) for the remainder of the Gulf, and encompasses 72,300 square nautical miles (nm<sup>2</sup>) or 133,344 km<sup>2</sup> (GMFMC 1989). Bottom longline gear is prohibited inshore of 35 fathoms (54.3 meters)



during the months of June through August in the eastern Gulf (GMFMC 2009), but is not depicted in Figure 3.2.1.

Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps Marine Reserves - No-take marine reserves (total area is 219 nm<sup>2</sup> or 405 km<sup>2</sup>) sited based on gag spawning aggregation areas where all fishing is prohibited except surface trolling from May through October (GMFMC 1999; 2003). Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps marine reserves which are closed to bottom fishing, the Edges Marine Reserve where all fishing is prohibited from January through April,

The Edges Marine Reserve – All fishing is prohibited in this area (390 nm<sup>2</sup> or 1,338 km<sup>2</sup>) from January through April and possession of any fish species is prohibited, except for such possession aboard a vessel in transit with fishing gear stowed as specified. The provisions of this do not apply to highly migratory species (GMFMC 2008).

Tortugas North and South Marine Reserves – No-take marine reserves (185 nm<sup>2</sup>) cooperatively implemented by the state of Florida, National Ocean Service, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council), and the National Park Service in Generic Amendment 2 Establishing the Tortugas Marine Reserves (GMFMC 2001).

Reef and bank areas designated as HAPCs in the northwestern Gulf include – 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 the use of some fishing gear that interacts with the bottom and prohibited use of anchors (totaling 263.2 nm<sup>2</sup> or 487.4 km<sup>2</sup>). Subsequently, three of these areas were established as marine sanctuaries (i.e., East and West Flower Garden Banks and Stetson Bank). 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 significant coral resources on Stetson Bank (GMFMC 2005).


Florida Middle Grounds HAPC - Pristine soft coral area (348 nm<sup>2</sup> or 644.5 km<sup>2</sup>) that is protected by prohibiting the following gear types: bottom longlines, trawls, dredges, pots and traps (GMFMC and SAFMC 1982).

Pulley Ridge HAPC - A portion of the HAPC (2,300 nm<sup>2</sup> or 4,259 km<sup>2</sup>) where deepwater hermatypic coral reefs are found is closed to anchoring and the use of trawling gear, bottom longlines, buoy gear, and all traps/pots (GMFMC 2005).

Alabama Special Management Zone – For vessels operating as a charter vessel or headboat, 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, fishing is limited to hook-and-line gear with no more than three hooks. Nonconforming gear is restricted to recreational bag limits, or for reef fish without a bag limit, to 5% by weight of all fish aboard.

In addition to the above, there is one site in the Gulf listed in the National Register of Historic Places. This is the wreck of the *U.S.S. Hatteras*, located in federal waters off Texas. Historical research indicates that over 2,000 ships have sunk on the Federal Outer Continental Shelf between 1625 and 1951; thousands more have sunk closer to shore in state waters during the same period. Only a handful of these have been scientifically excavated by archaeologists for the benefit of generations to come. Further information can be found at:

<http://www.boem.gov/Environmental-Stewardship/Archaeology/Shipwrecks.aspx>



**Figure 3.1.2.** Map of most fishery management closed areas in the Gulf.

### Deepwater Horizon MC252 Oil Spill

The Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill in 2010 affected at least one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the Florida Panhandle 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. 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.

Changes have occurred in the amount and distribution of fishing effort in the Gulf in response to the oil spill. This has made the analysis of the number of days needed for the recreational sector to fill its quota more complex and uncertain, and will make the requirement to allow the recreational sector to harvest its quota of red snapper while not exceeding the quota particularly challenging. Nevertheless, substantial portions of the red snapper population are found in the northwestern and western Gulf (western Louisiana and Texas) and an increasing population of red snapper is developing off the west Florida continental shelf. Thus, spawning by this segment of the stock may not be impacted, which would mitigate the overall impact of a failed spawn by that portion of the stock located in oil-affected areas. An increase in lesions was found in red

snapper in the area affected by the oil, but Murowski et al. (2014) found that the incidence of lesions had declined between 2011 and 2012. The 2013 stock assessment for red snapper (SEDAR 31, 2013) showed a steep decline in the 2010 recruitment; however, the recruitment increased in 2011 and 2012.

As a result of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 spill, a consultation pursuant to ESA Section 7(a)(2) was reinitiated. As discussed in Chapter 4.2, on September 30, 2011, the Protected Resources Division released a biological opinion, which after analyzing best available data, the current status of the species, environmental baseline (including the impacts of the recent Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil release event in the northern Gulf), effects of the proposed action, and cumulative effects, concluded that the continued operation of the Gulf reef fish fishery is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, or loggerhead sea turtles, nor the continued existence of smalltooth sawfish (NMFS 2011a). For additional information on the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill and associated closures, see: [http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/deepwater\\_horizon\\_oil\\_spill.htm](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/deepwater_horizon_oil_spill.htm).

## 3.2 Description of the Biological Environment

The biological environment of the Gulf, including the species addressed in this amendment, is described in detail in the final EISs for Generic EFH Amendment, the Generic ACL/AM Amendment, and Reef Fish Amendment 40 (refer to GMFMC 2004a; GMFMC 2011a; GMFMC 2014a) and is incorporated here by reference and further summarized below.

### Red Snapper Life History and Biology

Red snapper demonstrate the typical reef fish life history pattern as described in Appendix B of Amendment 28 (GMFMC 2015). Eggs and larvae are pelagic while juveniles are found associated with bottom features or over barren bottom (See Section 3.1). Spawning occurs over firm sand bottom with little relief away from reefs during the summer and fall. Most females are mature by age two and almost all are mature by age five (Woods et al. 2003). Red snapper have been aged up to 57 years (Wilson and Nieland 2001). In the late 1990s, most caught by the directed fishery were 2- to 4-years old (Wilson and Nieland 2001), but a recently completed stock assessment suggests that the age and size of red snapper in the directed fishery has increased in recent years (SEDAR 31 2013). A more complete description of red snapper life history can be found in the EIS for the Generic EFH Amendment (GMFMC 2004a) and SEDAR 31 (2013).

### Status of the Red Snapper Stock

A red snapper update assessment was conducted by the Southeast Fishery Science Center (SEFSC) in 2014 and presented to the SSC in January 2015 SSC<sup>3</sup>. This update assessment was based on the SEDAR 31 benchmark in 2012 and 2013 (SEDAR 31 2013). The results of the 2014 update assessment indicate that overfishing is not occurring and the stock is continuing to rebuild, but it remains overfished. Based on the assessment, the SSC recommended overfishing limits and acceptable biological catch for the years 2015-2017. Chapter 3.3 of Amendment 28 (GMFMC 2015) provides a detailed description of the red snapper stock status, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

### Status of Reef Fish Stocks

The Fishery Management Plan for Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (FMP) currently encompasses 31 species (Table 3.2.2). Eleven other species were removed from the FMP in 2012 by the Council in their Generic ACL/AM Amendment. Stock assessments and stock assessment reviews may be found on the Council ([www.gulfcouncil.org](http://www.gulfcouncil.org)) and SEDAR (<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar>) websites and have been conducted for 13 species:

- red snapper (SEDAR 7 2005; SEDAR 7 Update 2009; SEDAR 31 2013; Update 2014)
- vermilion snapper (Porch and Cass-Calay 2001; SEDAR 9 2006a; SEDAR 9 Update 2011b; SEDAR Update 2014)
- yellowtail snapper (Muller et al. 2003; SEDAR 3 2003; SEDAR 27A 2012)
- mutton snapper (SEDAR 15A 2008; SEDAR 15A Update 2014)
- gray triggerfish (Valle et al. 2001; SEDAR 9 2006b; SEDAR 9 Update 2011c and 2014)
- greater amberjack (Turner et al. 2000; SEDAR 9 2006c; SEDAR 9 Update 2010, SEDAR 33 2014)
- hogfish (Ault et al. 2003; SEDAR 6 2004a, SEDAR 37 2014)

- red grouper (NMFS 2002; SEDAR 12 2007; SEDAR 12 Update 2009)
- gag grouper (Turner et al. 2001; SEDAR 10 2006; SEDAR 10 Update 2009, SEDAR 33 2014)
- black grouper (SEDAR 19 2010)
- yellowedge grouper (Cass-Calay and Bahnick 2002; SEDAR 22 2011a)
- tilefish (golden) (SEDAR 22 2011b)
- goliath grouper (Porch et al. 2003; SEDAR 6 2004b; SEDAR 23 2011)

Utilizing the most current stock assessment information, the Gulf of Mexico fourth quarter report of the 2014 Status of U.S. Fisheries

(<http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/statusoffisheries/2011/fourth/Q4%202011%20FSSI%20and%20nonFSSI%20StockStatus.pdf>) classifies the 13 species as follows:

#### Overfished and Experiencing Overfishing:

- greater amberjack
- gray triggerfish

#### Overfished and Not Experiencing Overfishing

- red snapper

#### Not Overfished or Experiencing Overfishing:

- yellowtail snapper
- hogfish \*
- yellowedge grouper
- vermilion snapper
- black grouper
- red grouper
- gag grouper
- mutton snapper

#### Unknown:

- goliath grouper – benchmarks do not reflect appropriate stock dynamics
- snowy grouper
- speckled hind
- warsaw grouper
- yellowfin grouper
- scamp
- yellowmouth grouper
- cubera snapper
- gray snapper
- lane snapper
- queen snapper
- blackfin snapper
- silk snapper
- wenchman
- jacks complex (lesser amberjack, banded rudderfish)

- tilefish (golden) – insufficient data

\* Hogfish genetic clusters are identified as (1) Western Florida (not including hogfish west of the Florida panhandle), (2) Florida Keys/Eastern Florida, and (3) Georgia through North Carolina. The Western Florida and Florida Keys/Eastern Florida genetic populations converge south of Naples, Florida. Therefore, a portion of the Florida Keys/Eastern Florida population occurs within the Gulf of Mexico Council's area of jurisdiction, but the majority of the population occurs within the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction. These genetic populations have not been previously specified as distinct management stocks under South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Council FMPs. Recent findings indicate the Florida Keys/Eastern Florida is overfished and undergoing overfishing.

**Table 3.2.2.** Species of the FMP grouped by family.

**\*\*Note:** Goliath grouper is a protected grouper.

<u>Common Name</u>	<u>Scientific Name</u>	<u>Stock Status</u>
<b>Family Balistidae – Triggerfishes</b>		
<b>gray triggerfish</b>	<i>Balistes capriscus</i>	Overfished, overfishing
<b>Family Carangidae – Jacks</b>		
<b>greater amberjack</b>	<i>Seriola dumerili</i>	Overfished, overfishing
<b>lesser amberjack</b>	<i>Seriola fasciata</i>	Unknown
<b>almaco jack</b>	<i>Seriola rivoliana</i>	Unknown
<b>banded rudderfish</b>	<i>Seriola zonata</i>	Unknown
<b>Family Labridae – Wrasses</b>		
<b>Hogfish</b>	<i>Lachnolaimus maximus</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>Family Malacanthidae – Tilefishes</b>		
<b>Tilefish (golden)</b>	<i>Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps</i>	Unknown
<b>blueline tilefish</b>	<i>Caulolatilus microps</i>	Unknown
<b>goldface tilefish</b>	<i>Caulolatilus chrysops</i>	Unknown
<b>Family Serranidae – Groupers</b>		
<b>Gag</b>	<i>Mycteroperca microlepis</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>red grouper</b>	<i>Epinephelus morio</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>Scamp</b>	<i>Mycteroperca phenax</i>	Unknown
<b>black grouper</b>	<i>Mycteroperca bonaci</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>yellowedge grouper</b>	<i>Epinephelus flavolimbatus</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>snowy grouper</b>	<i>Epinephelus niveatus</i>	Unknown
<b>speckled hind</b>	<i>Epinephelus drummondhayi</i>	Unknown
<b>yellowmouth grouper</b>	<i>Mycteroperca interstitialis</i>	Unknown
<b>yellowfin grouper</b>	<i>Mycteroperca venenosa</i>	Unknown
<b>warsaw grouper</b>	<i>Epinephelus nigritus</i>	Unknown
<b>**goliath grouper</b>	<i>Epinephelus itajara</i>	Unknown, not overfishing
<b>Family Lutjanidae – Snappers</b>		
<b>queen snapper</b>	<i>Etelis oculatus</i>	Unknown
<b>mutton snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus analis</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>blackfin snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus buccanella</i>	Unknown
<b>red snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus campechanus</i>	Overfished, no overfishing
<b>cupera snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus cyanopterus</i>	Unknown
<b>gray snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus griseus</i>	Unknown
<b>lane snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus synagris</i>	Unknown
<b>silk snapper</b>	<i>Lutjanus vivanus</i>	Unknown
<b>yellowtail snapper</b>	<i>Ocyurus chrysurus</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>vermillion snapper</b>	<i>Rhomboplites aurorubens</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>Wenchman</b>	<i>Pristipomoides aquilonaris</i>	Unknown

Notes: \* In 2013 the genus for yellowedge grouper, snowy grouper, and warsaw grouper was changed by the American Fisheries Society from *Epinephelus* to *Hyporthodus* (American Fisheries Society 2013).



**\*\*Atlantic goliath grouper is a protected grouper and benchmarks do not reflect appropriate stock dynamics. In 2013 the common name was changed from goliath grouper to Atlantic goliath grouper by the American Fisheries Society to differentiate from the Pacific goliath grouper, a newly named species (American Fisheries Society 2013).**

## **Protected Species**

There are 28 different species of marine mammals that can or are known to occur in the Gulf of Mexico. All 28 species are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) 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 of Mexico include five sea turtle species (Kemp's Ridley, loggerhead, green, leatherback, and hawksbill); two fish species (Gulf of Mexico sturgeon and smalltooth sawfish), and two coral species (elkhorn coral and staghorn coral). Information on the distribution, biology, and abundance of these protected species in the Gulf of Mexico is included in Generic EFH Amendment (GMFMC 2004a) and the February 2005, October 2009, and September 2011 ESA biological opinions on the reef fish fishery (NMFS 2005; NMFS 2009; NMFS 2011). Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports and additional information are also available on the NMFS Office of Protected Species website: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/>.

The MMPA 2015 List of Fisheries (79 FR 14418) considers vertical line gear and longline gear as Category III gears. These gears are the dominant gear used in the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery - vertical line (90%) and longline (5.4%) 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 1% 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. Dolphins are the only species documented as interacting with these fisheries. Bottlenose dolphins prey upon on the bait, catch, and/or released discards of fish from the reef fish fishery. They are also a common predator around reef fish vessels, feeding on the discards.

All five species of sea turtles are adversely affected by the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery. Incidental captures are relatively infrequent, but occur in all commercial and recreational hook-and-line components of the reef fishery. Loggerhead sea turtles are by far the most frequently incidentally caught sea turtles. Captured sea turtles can be released alive or can be found dead upon retrieval of the gear as a result of forced submergence. Sea turtles 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 handling protocols are required in the commercial and for-hire reef fish fisheries to minimize post-release mortality.

Smalltooth sawfish also interact with the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery, but to a much lesser extent. Smalltooth sawfish primarily occur in the Gulf of Mexico off peninsular Florida. Incidental captures in the commercial and recreational hook-and-line components of the reef fish fishery are rare events, with only eight smalltooth sawfish estimated to be incidentally caught



every three years, and none are expected to result in mortality (NMFS 2011). Fishermen in this fishery are required to follow smalltooth sawfish safe handling guidelines. The long, toothed rostrum of the smalltooth sawfish causes this species to be particularly vulnerable to entanglement in fishing gear.

NMFS has conducted specific analyses (Section 7 consultations) to evaluate potential effects from the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery on species and critical habitats protected under the ESA. On September 30, 2011, the Protected Resources Division released a biological opinion (Opinion), which concluded that the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles (loggerhead, Kemp's ridley, green, hawksbill, and leatherback) or smalltooth sawfish (NMFS 2011a). The Opinion also concluded that other ESA-listed species are not likely to be adversely affected by the Reef Fish FMP. An incidental take statement was issued specifying the amount and extent 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. The Council addressed further measures to reduce take in the reef fish fishery's longline component in Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009).

Subsequent to the completion of the biological opinion, NMFS published final rules listing 20 new coral species (September 10, 2014), and designating critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population segment of loggerhead sea turtles (July 10, 2014). NMFS addressed these changes in a series of consultation memoranda. In a consultation memorandum dated October 7, 2014, NMFS assessed the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery's potential impact on the newly-listed coral species occurring in the Gulf of Mexico (3 species of *Orbicella* and *Mycetophyllia ferox*) and concluded the fishery is not likely to adversely affect any of the protected coral species. Similarly, in a consultation memorandum dated September 16, 2014, NMFS assessed the continued authorization of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico fisheries' potential impacts on loggerhead critical habitat and concluded the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is not likely to adversely affect the newly designated critical habitat.

### **Deepwater Horizon MC252 Oil Spill**

A discussion of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 event is located in Chapter 3.1 of this document and in Amendment 28.

## **3.3 Description of the Economic Environment**

### **3.3.1 Commercial Sector**

#### **3.3.1.1 Vessel Activity**

A description of the red snapper individual fishing quota (RS-IFQ) program is contained in the "Additional Information" section on the Catch Shares homepage available at: <https://portal.southeast.fisheries.noaa.gov/cs>. This description is incorporated herein by reference and is summarized below. Tables 3.3.1.1.1 and 3.3.1.1.2 contain summary vessel and

trip counts, landings, and revenue information from vessels landing at least one pound of red snapper from 2010 through 2014. Data for 2014 is preliminary and data from years prior to the implementation of the RS-IFQ program are not representative of current conditions.

The tables contain vessel counts from the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) logbook (logbook) data (vessel count, trips, and landings) and the NMFS Southeast Regional Office (SERO) Limited Access Privilege Program (LAPP) data (vessel count). Dockside values were generated using landings information from logbook data and price information from the NMFS SEFSC Accumulated Landings System (ALS) data. The logbook and LAPP data programs serve different purposes and use different data collection methods. Consequently, comparative analysis of data from these programs may produce different results, as evidenced by the vessel counts provided in Table 3.3.1.1.1. However, this assessment utilizes logbook data because the logbook program collects data on all species harvested on trips on which red snapper are harvested, as well as harvests by these vessels on trips without red snapper.

On average, 375 vessels per year landed red snapper (Table 3.3.1.1.1). These vessels, combined, averaged 2,962 trips per year on which red snapper was landed and 1,592 trips without red snapper (Table 3.3.1.1.1). The average annual total dockside revenue (2014 dollars) was approximately \$13.40 million from red snapper, approximately \$14.22 million from other species co-harvested with red snapper (on the same trip), and approximately \$10.26 million from other species harvested on trips on which no red snapper were harvested (Table 3.3.1.1.2). Total average annual revenues were approximately \$37.87 million, or approximately \$102,000 per vessel (Table 3.3.1.1.2).

**Table 3.3.1.1.1.** Summary of vessel counts, trips, and logbook landings (pounds gutted weight (lbs gw)) or vessels landing at least one pound of red snapper, 2010-2014.

Year	Number of Vessels, Logbook Data	Number of Vessels, LAPPs Data	Number of Trips that Caught Red Snapper, Logbook Data	Red Snapper Landings (lbs gw)	“Other Species” Landings Jointly Caught with Red Snapper (lbs gw)	Number of Trips that Only Landed “Other Species”	“Other Species” Landings on Trips without Red Snapper (lbs gw)
2010	375	384	2,970	2,939,254	4,040,460	1,717	3,106,308
2011	368	362	3,389	3,073,697	5,539,520	1,959	4,422,791
2012	365	371	3,432	3,469,118	5,525,735	2,026	4,818,703
2013	359	368	3,389	4,424,324	5,257,821	1,699	3,632,756
2014	410	401	1,628	2,735,798	2,217,577	560	1,008,224
<b>Average</b>	375	377	2,962	3,328,438	4,516,223	1,592	3,397,756

2014 data is preliminary; initial estimate using LAPPs data indicates 2014 red snapper landings of 5,016,056 lbs gw.  
Source: NMFS SEFSC Logbook and NMFS SERO LAPPs data. 2/15/2015

**Table 3.3.1.1.2.** Summary of vessel counts and revenue (thousand 2014 dollars) for vessels landing at least one pound of red snapper, 2010-2014.

Year	Number of Vessels, Logbook Data	Dockside Revenue from Red Snapper	Dockside Revenue from “Other Species” Jointly Caught with Red Snapper	Dockside Revenue from “Other Species” Caught on Trips without Red Snapper	Total Dockside Revenue	Average Total Dockside Revenue per Vessel
2010	375	\$11,054,115	\$12,045,338	\$8,599,488	\$31,698,941	\$84,530
2011	368	\$11,529,750	\$16,697,540	\$12,707,463	\$40,934,753	\$111,236
2012	365	\$13,784,908	\$17,140,315	\$14,442,750	\$45,367,973	\$124,296
2013	359	\$19,261,015	\$17,538,051	\$12,295,498	\$49,094,564	\$136,754
2014	410	\$11,356,047	\$7,680,926	\$3,239,250	\$22,276,223	\$54,332
<b>Average</b>	375	\$13,397,167	\$14,220,434	\$10,256,890	\$37,874,491	\$102,230

2014 data is preliminary. Source: NMFS SEFSC Logbook and ALS data. 2/15/2015

### Share, Allocation, and Ex-vessel Prices

Price information is an important component for evaluating the performance of a catch share program. Economic theory states that as fishermen no longer have to out-compete other fishermen for a share of the catch, the profits will increase as fishermen adjust the scale and scope of their operations to take advantage of market conditions. This results in increased market stability and value for shares and allocations, as more efficient fishermen are willing to pay higher prices to purchase additional shares and/or allocation from less efficient operators. Theoretically, allocation prices should reflect the expected annual net profit from harvesting one unit of quota, whereas share prices should reflect the present value of the flow of expected net returns from harvesting one unit of quota. Dockside or ex-vessel prices are the price the vessel receives at the first sale of harvest. In 2013, the median share price per pound of red snapper was \$40.00 (average price \$36.24), the median allocation price per pound was \$3.00 (average price \$2.98), and the median ex-vessel price per pound was \$4.75 (average price \$4.46). Similar final data for 2014 are not currently available and data from previous years can be found in NMFS (2014).

### 3.3.1.2 Commercial Sector Business Activity

Estimates of the business activity (economic impacts) in the U.S. associated with the Gulf red snapper commercial harvests were derived using the model developed for and applied in NMFS (2011b) and are provided in Table 3.3.1.2.1. Business activity for the commercial sector is characterized in the form of full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs, income impacts (wages, salaries, and self-employed income), and output (sales) impacts (gross business sales). Income impacts should not be added to output (sales) impacts because this would result in double counting. The estimates of economic activity include the direct effects (effects in the sector where an expenditure is actually made), indirect effects (effects in sectors providing goods and services to directly affected sectors), and induced effects (effects induced by the personal consumption expenditures of employees in the direct and indirectly affected sectors).

**Table 3.3.1.2.1.** Average annual business activity associated with the harvests of vessels that harvest red snapper, 2010-2014.

<b>Species</b>	<b>Average Annual Dockside Revenue (thousands)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total Jobs</b>	<b>Harvester Jobs</b>	<b>Output (Sales) Impacts (thousands)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Income Impacts (thousands)<sup>1</sup></b>
Red snapper	\$13,397	2,367	309	\$176,393	\$75,177
All species <sup>2</sup>	\$37,874	6,694	873	\$498,668	\$212,528

<sup>1</sup>2014 dollars.

<sup>2</sup>Includes dockside revenues and economic activity associated with the average annual harvests of all species, including red snapper, harvested by vessels that harvested red snapper.

In addition to red snapper harvests, as discussed above, vessels that harvested red snapper also harvested other species on trips where red snapper were harvested. These vessels also took trips during the year where only species other than red snapper were caught. All revenues from all species on all these trips contributed towards making these vessels economically viable and contribute to the economic activity associated with these vessels. The average annual total ex-vessel revenues from all species (including red snapper) harvested during this period (2010-2014) by vessels that harvested red snapper was approximately \$37.87 million (2014 dollars). In terms of business activity, these revenues are estimated to support 6,694 FTE jobs (873 in the harvesting sector) and are associated with approximately \$498.67 million in output (sales) impacts and approximately \$212.52 million in income impacts.

### 3.3.1.3 Dealers

Commercial vessels landing red snapper can only sell their catch to federally permitted fish dealers. On July 21, 2015, 202 dealers eligible to receive red snapper were listed on the Catch Shares homepage (<https://portal.southeast.fisheries.noaa.gov/cs>). Because there are no income or sales requirements to acquire a federal dealer permit or IFQ endorsement, the total number of dealers can vary over the course of the year and from year to year. In addition to red snapper, grouper and tilefish are Gulf LAPP species and not all dealers authorized to receive Gulf LAPP species purchase red snapper. In 2013, only 81 dealers were recorded in the LAPP data program

receiving red snapper, and this number has ranged from 66-82 over the period 2007-2013. However, although all dealers that purchase IFQ species should have their transactions recorded in the LAPPs data system, not all apparently do so, as evidenced by higher dealer counts being recorded with red snapper purchases in the ALS, which assembles data from state trip ticket data programs. For example, in 2012, 92 dealers reported red snapper purchases in the Gulf.

Because the ALS includes data on the purchase of all species by dealers, it is the best source of information on the purchase activity by these entities. In 2012, among the 92 dealers that reported red snapper purchases, 73 of these dealers were in Florida, six in Texas, six in Louisiana, four in Alabama, and three in Mississippi. Total red snapper purchased by these dealers in 2012 had an ex-vessel value of approximately \$13.89 million (2014 dollars), or approximately 12.84% of the total revenues, approximately \$108.20 million (2014 dollars), from all marine resource purchases by these dealers. Dependency on red snapper sales varies by dealer, with the percentage of red snapper purchases (value, not pounds) to total purchases varying from less than 1% to 100%. Red snapper purchases in 2012 comprised 10% or more of total purchases for 40 of these dealers, 50% or more for 11 dealers, and 5% or less for 38 dealers. Average red snapper dependency (measured as the percentage of red snapper ex-vessel value relative to the total value of all seafood purchases) was highest for Mississippi and Texas dealers, approximately 34% and 28%, respectively, followed by Alabama (approximately 21%), Florida (approximately 10%), and Louisiana (approximately 8%).

#### **3.3.1.4 Imports**

Information on the imports of all snapper and grouper species, either fresh or frozen, are available at: [http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/trade/cumulative\\_data/TradeDataProduct.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/trade/cumulative_data/TradeDataProduct.html). Information on the imports of individual snapper or grouper species is not available. In 2012, imports of all snapper and grouper species (fresh and frozen) were approximately 44.51 million pounds valued at approximately \$132.19 million (2014 dollars). These amounts are contrasted with the domestic harvest of all snapper and grouper in the U.S. in 2012 of approximately 19.60 mp valued at approximately \$62.41 million (2014 dollars; data available at: <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/commercial-fisheries/publications/index>). Although the levels of domestic production and imports are not totally comparable for several reasons, including considerations of different product form such as fresh versus frozen, and possible product mislabeling, the difference in the magnitude of imports relative to amount of domestic harvest is indicative of the dominance of imports in the domestic market. Final comparable data for more recent years is not currently available.

### **3.3.2 Recreational Sector**

#### **3.3.2.1 Angler Effort**

Recreational effort derived from the MRFSS/MRIP database can be characterized in terms of the number of trips as follows:

1. Target effort - The number of individual angler trips, regardless of duration, where the intercepted angler indicated that the species or a species in the species group was targeted as either the first or second primary target for the trip. The species did not have to be caught.
2. Catch effort - The number of individual angler trips, regardless of duration and target intent, where the individual species or a species in the species group was caught. The fish did not have to be kept.
3. Total recreational trips - The total estimated number of recreational trips in the Gulf, regardless of target intent or catch success.

Other measures of effort are possible, such as the number of harvest trips (the number of individual angler trips that harvest a particular species regardless of target intent), and directed trips (the number of individual angler trips that either targeted or caught a particular species), among other measures, but the three measures of effort listed above are used in this assessment. Estimates of the average annual red snapper effort (in terms of individual angler trips) for the charter and private/rental boat modes in the Gulf for 2010-2014 are provided in Table 3.3.2.1.1 for target trips and Table 3.3.2.1.2 for catch trips. Estimates of red snapper target effort for additional years, and other measures of directed effort, are available at <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/recreational-fisheries/access-data/run-a-data-query/queries/index>.

Because of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill, 2010 was not a typical year for recreational fishing due to the extensive closures and associated decline in fishing in much of the Gulf. For information on the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill and associated closures, see: [http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/deepwater\\_horizon\\_oil\\_spill.htm](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/deepwater_horizon_oil_spill.htm). Recreational effort for Alabama and Louisiana was affected by the 2010 oil spill incident more than that for Florida. This holds true for both the charter (target and catch effort) and private modes (target and catch effort).

**Table 3.3.2.1.1.** Number of red snapper recreational target trips, by mode, 2010-2014\*.

	Alabama	West Florida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
<b>Charter Mode</b>					
2010	2,789	16,466	0	208	19,463
2011	19,010	29,642	1,424	0	50,076
2012	16,609	24,653	7,204	74	48,540
2013	23,638	32,689	7,191	38	63,556
2014	8,827	7,364	0	0	16,191
Average	14,175	22,163	3,164	64	39,565
<b>Private/Rental Mode</b>					
2010	20,759	129,748	3,338	5,451	159,296
2011	116,886	113,021	19,900	16,790	266,597
2012	72,030	136,594	43,547	13,515	265,686
2013	222,245	461,349	24,691	21,586	729,871
2014	56,274	162,956	0	7,519	226,749
Average	97,639	200,734	18,295	12,972	329,640
<b>All Modes</b>					
2010	23,548	146,214	3,338	5,659	178,759
2011	135,896	142,663	21,324	16,790	316,673
2012	88,640	161,247	50,751	13,589	314,227
2013	245,883	494,038	31,882	21,624	793,427
2014	65,101	170,321	0	7,519	242,941
Average	111,814	222,897	21,459	13,036	369,205

\* Texas information unavailable. 2014 estimates are preliminary. Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

Note: These effort estimates have not been re-calibrated. Re-calibrated effort data are currently unavailable.

Note: There were no target trips recorded from the shore mode.

**Table 3.3.2.1.2.** Number of red snapper recreational catch trips, by mode, 2010-2014\*.

	Alabama	West Florida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Total
<b>Charter Mode</b>					
2010	12,495	57,662	205	261	70,623
2011	43,550	101,500	3,066	221	148,337
2012	25,252	105,385	10,501	74	141,212
2013	52,331	107,466	12,321	38	172,156
2014	32,173	60,270	0	0	92,443
Average	33,160	86,457	5,219	119	124,954
<b>Private/Rental Mode</b>					
2010	46,017	252,300	5,764	6,964	311,045
2011	130,500	203,567	31,957	6,169	372,193
2012	83,783	282,332	51,377	13,515	431,007
2013	227,889	537,469	55,679	29,250	850,287
2014	104,862	190,994	0	10,163	306,019
Average	118,610	293,332	28,955	13,212	454,110
<b>All Modes</b>					
2010	58,512	309,962	5,969	7,225	381,668
2011	174,050	305,067	35,023	6,390	520,530
2012	109,035	387,717	61,878	13,589	572,219
2013	280,221	644,935	68,000	29,288	1,022,444
2014	137,035	251,263	0	10,163	398,461
Average	151,771	379,789	34,174	13,331	579,064

\* Texas information unavailable. 2014 estimates are preliminary. Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

Note: These effort estimates have not been re-calibrated. Re-calibrated effort data are currently unavailable.

Note: There were no catch trips recorded from the shore mode.

Headboat data do not support the estimation of target or catch effort because target intent is not collected and the harvest data (the data reflect only harvest information and not total catch) are collected on a vessel basis and not by individual angler. Table 3.3.2.1.3 contains estimates of the number of headboat angler days for all Gulf States for 2010-2014.



**Table 3.3.2.1.3.** Headboat angler days, 2010-2014.

Year	W Florida/Alabama	Louisiana	Mississippi	Texas	Total
2010	111,018	217	*	47,154	158,389
2011	157,025	1,886	1,771	47,284	207,966
2012	161,973	1,839	1,840	51,771	217,423
2013	174,800	1,579	1,827	55,749	233,955
2014	191,365	1,634	1,623	51,231	245,853
Average	159,236	1,431	1,765	50,638	212,717

\*Confidential. Source: NMFS Southeast Region Headboat Survey (HBS).

### 3.3.2.2 Permits

The for-hire sector is comprised of charter boats and headboats (party boats). Although charter boats tend to be smaller, on average, than headboats, the key distinction between the two types of operations is how the fee is determined. On a charter boat trip, the fee charged is for the entire vessel, regardless of how many passengers are carried, whereas the fee charged for a headboat trip is paid per individual angler.

A federal for-hire vessel permit has been required for reef fish since 1996 and the sector currently operates under a limited access system. On April 25, 2015, there were 1,159 valid (non-expired) or renewable Gulf of Mexico Charter/Headboat Reef Fish Permits. A renewable permit is an expired permit that may not be actively fished, but is renewable for up to one year after expiration. Although the for-hire permit application collects information on the primary method of operation, the resultant permit itself does not identify the permitted vessel as either a headboat or a charter boat, operation as either a headboat or charter boat is not restricted by the permitting regulations, and vessels may operate in both capacities. However, only federally permitted headboats are required to submit harvest and effort information to the NMFS Southeast Region Headboat Survey (HBS). Participation in the HBS is based on determination by the SEFSC that the vessel primarily operates as a headboat. Sixty-nine vessels were registered in the SHRS as of April 24, 2015 (K. Fitzpatrick, NMFS SEFSC, pers. comm.). The majority of these headboats were located in Florida (37), followed by Texas (16), Alabama (9), and Mississippi/Louisiana (7).

Information on Gulf charter boat and headboat operating characteristics, including average fees and net operating revenues, is included in Savolainen et al. (2012) and is incorporated herein by reference.

There are no specific federal permitting requirements for recreational anglers to fish for or harvest reef fish. Instead, anglers are required to possess either a state recreational fishing permit that authorizes saltwater fishing in general, or be registered in the federal National Saltwater Angler Registry system, subject to appropriate exemptions. As a result, it is not possible to identify with available data how many individual anglers would be expected to be affected by this proposed amendment. (Note: although it is not a federal permit, Louisiana has developed an offshore angler permit. Tabulation of these permits would be expected to provide an estimate of

only a small portion of the total number of individual anglers expected to be affected by this proposed amendment.)

### **3.3.2.3 Economic Value**

Economic value can be measured in the form of consumer surplus (CS) per additional red snapper kept on a trip for anglers (the amount of money that an angler would be willing to pay for a fish in excess of the cost to harvest the fish). The estimated value of the CS per fish for a second red snapper kept on a trip is approximately \$81 (Carter and Liese 2012; values updated to 2014 dollars<sup>4</sup>). These values apply to both private and for-hire anglers.

With regards to for-hire businesses, economic value can be measured by producer surplus (PS) per passenger trip (the amount of money that a vessel owner earns in excess of the cost of providing the trip). Estimates of the PS per for-hire passenger trip are not available. Instead, net operating revenue (NOR), which is the return used to pay all labor wages, returns to capital, and owner profits, is used as a proxy for PS. The estimated NOR value is \$153.45 (2014 dollars) per charter angler trip (Liese and Carter 2012). The estimated NOR value per headboat angler trip is \$52.97 (2014 dollars) (C. Liese, NMFS SEFSC, pers. comm.). Estimates of NOR per red snapper target trip are not available.

### **3.3.2.4 Recreational Sector Business Activity**

Estimates of the business activity (economic impacts) associated with recreational angling for red snapper were derived using average impact coefficients for recreational angling for all species, as derived from an add-on survey to the MRFSS to collect economic expenditure information, as described and utilized in NMFS (2011a). Estimates of these coefficients for target or catch behavior for individual species are not available. Estimates of the average expenditures by recreational anglers are also provided in NMFS (2011a) and are incorporated herein by reference.

Business activity for the recreational sector is characterized in the form of fulltime equivalent (FTE) jobs, output (sales) impacts (gross business sales), and value-added impacts (difference between the value of goods and the cost of materials or supplies). Job and output (sales) impacts are equivalent metrics across both the commercial and recreational sectors. Income impacts (commercial sector) and value-added impacts (recreational sector) are not equivalent, though similarity in the magnitude of multipliers generated and used for the two metrics may result in roughly equivalent values. Similar to income impacts, value-added impacts should not be added to output (sales) impacts because this would result in double counting.

Estimates of the average red snapper effort (2010-2014) and associated business activity (2014 dollars) are provided in Table 3.3.2.4.1. Red snapper target effort (trips) was selected as the measure of red snapper effort. More individual angler trips catch red snapper than target red

---

<sup>4</sup> Converted to 2014 dollars using the 2014 annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all US urban consumers provided by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics (BLS).

snapper, however, as shown in Tables 3.3.2.1.1 and 3.3.2.1.2. Estimates of the business activity associated with red snapper catch trips can be calculated using the ratio of catch trips to target trips because the available estimates of the average impacts per trip are not differentiated by trip intent or catch success. For example, if the estimated number of catch trips is three times the number of target trips for a particular state and mode, the estimate of the business activity associated with these catch trips would equal three times the estimated impacts of target trips.

The estimates of the business activity associated with red snapper recreational trips are only available at the state level. Addition of the state-level estimates to produce a regional or national total will underestimate the actual amount of total business activity because summing the state estimates will not capture business activity that leaks outside the individual states. A state estimate only reflects activities that occur within that state and not related activity that occurs in another state. For example, if a good is produced in Alabama but sold in Florida, the measure of business activity in Florida associated with the its sale in Florida does not include the production process in Alabama. Assessment of business activity at the national (or regional) level would capture activity in both states and include all activity except that which leaks into other nations.

It is noted that these estimates do not, and should not be expected to, represent the total business activity associated with a specific recreational harvest sector in a given state or in total. For example, these results do not state, or should be interpreted to imply, that there are only 154 jobs associated with the charter sector in Alabama. Instead, as previously stated, these results relate only to the business activity associated with target trips for red snapper. Because of the seasonal nature of red snapper fishing, few, if any businesses or jobs, would be expected to be devoted solely to red snapper fishing. The existence of these businesses and jobs, in total, is supported by the fishing for, and expenditures on, the variety of marine species available to anglers throughout the year.

**Table 3.3.2.4.1.** Summary of red snapper target trips (2010-2014 average) and associated business activity (2014 dollars). Output and value added impacts are not additive.

	Alabama	West Florida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Texas
<b>Private/Rental Mode</b>					
Target Trips	97,639	200,734	18,295	12,972	*
Output Impact	\$5,362,296	\$11,031,053	\$1,405,198	\$463,965	*
Value Added Impact	\$2,901,900	\$6,246,386	\$675,252	\$235,988	*
Jobs	57	94	11	4	*
<b>Charter Mode</b>					
Target Trips	14,175	22,163	3,164	64	*
Output Impact	\$9,205,443	\$16,516,389	\$1,555,096	\$26,341	*
Value Added Impact	\$6,299,715	\$11,042,093	\$1,069,317	\$18,555	*
Jobs	88	143	12	0	*
<b>All Modes</b>					
Target Trips	111,814	222,897	21,459	13,036	*
Output Impact	\$14,567,739	\$27,547,442	\$2,960,294	\$490,305	*
Value Added Impact	\$9,201,615	\$17,288,479	\$1,744,569	\$254,543	*
Jobs	145	237	22	5	*

\*Because target information is unavailable, associated business activity cannot be calculated.

Note: There were no target trips recorded from the shore mode.


Source: effort data from the MRIP, economic impact results calculated by NMFS SERO using the model developed for NMFS (2011b).

Estimates of the business activity (impacts) associated with headboat red snapper effort are not available. The headboat sector in the Southeast is not covered in the MRFSS/MRIP, so estimation of the appropriate impact coefficients for the headboat sector has not been conducted. While appropriate impact coefficients are available for the charter sector, potential differences in certain factors, such as the for-hire fee, rates of tourist versus local participation, and expenditure patterns, may result in significant differences in the business impacts of the headboat sector relative to the charter sector.

### 3.4 Description of the Social Environment

Amendment 28 (GMFMC 2015) provides a description of the social environment including the conceptual and historical background for the reallocation of red snapper between the commercial and recreational sectors and is incorporated here by reference. A brief summary of the references material is provided here.

In the Gulf, the commercial and recreational sectors are managed differently and separately. The existing allocation for red snapper was implemented in 1990 alongside the establishment of a total allowable catch, and corresponding management measures intended to reduce landings by 20% for each sector (GMFMC 1989). Thus, at the time the allocation was established, there was already great demand for red snapper by both sectors. Since that time, the number of both recreational anglers and seafood consumers has increased, along with the volume of tourists and participation of other stakeholder groups in fishery management. The issue of reallocating red snapper is driven by competing visions of who should have access privileges to the resource: recreational, commercial, and/or others. Figure 3.4.1 provides a history of red snapper management for the commercial and recreational sectors, including season length, bag limits, and trip limits.



**Figure 3.4.1.** Length of fishing season in federal waters for commercial and recreational sectors (1990-2014), with changes in bag limits, trip limits, and implementation dates of limited access regulations. The timeline does not include minimum size limits or additional requirements such as use of a vessel monitoring system.


### 3.4.1 Fishing Communities

This section provides a description of where recreational and commercial fishing for red snapper occurs. The description is based on the geographical distribution of landings and the relative importance of red snapper for commercial and recreational communities. This spatial approach enables discussion of fishing communities and the importance of fishery resources to those communities, as required by National Standard 8.

### Commercial Fishing Communities

To identify commercial reliance, a regional quotient (RQ) measure was used. The RQ measures the relative importance of a given species across all communities in the region and represents the proportional distribution of commercial landings of a particular species. This proportional measure does not provide the number of pounds or the value of the catch; data that might be confidential at the community level for many places. The RQ is calculated by dividing the total pounds (or value) of a species landed in a given community, by the total pounds (or value) for that species for all communities in the region. The measure is a way to quantify the importance of red snapper to communities around the Gulf coast and suggest where impacts from management actions are more likely to be experienced. The data used for the RQ measure were assembled from the accumulated landings system (ALS), which includes commercial landings of all species from both state and federal waters and is based on dealers' reports. These data were converted to provide landings by (dealer's) address. Because of this, the address of a dealer may not be the coastal community where the dealer's facility is located. Furthermore, the most recent year of ALS data converted to provide commercial landings by community is 2012.


Commercial red snapper fishing is prosecuted throughout the Gulf region with the majority of landings occurring in the northern Gulf. Based on the RQ measure, the top 15 commercial red snapper fishing communities are identified in Figure 3.4.1.1. A community's proportion of total landings is not static and changes over time. Thus, the figure provides rankings by RQ value for four years: 2000, 2005, 2008, and 2011. The top three communities in terms of commercial landings are Galveston, Texas; Destin, Florida; and Golden Meadow, Louisiana (Figure 3.4.1.1). While in 2000, Panama City, Florida ranked first for commercial red snapper landings Gulf-wide, the community has since been replaced by Destin, Florida in terms of commercial landings of red snapper. Data are not available concerning location of red snapper consumers, such as the proportion of Gulf red snapper that is consumed within the region or elsewhere in the U.S.



**Figure 3.4.1.1.** Top 15 commercial red snapper fishing communities by RQ value for four years. Source: Southeast Fisheries Science Center, accumulated landings system (2012).

To better understand how Gulf fishing communities are engaged and reliant on fishing, indices were created using secondary data from permit and landings information for the commercial and recreational sectors (Jepson and Colburn 2013; Jacob et al. 2012). Fishing engagement is primarily the absolute numbers of permits, landings, and value. Fishing reliance has many of the same variables as engagement divided by population to give an indication of the per capita impact of this activity.

Using a principal component and single solution factor analysis each community receives a factor score for each index to compare to other communities. With the selected communities from both sectors, factor scores of both engagement and reliance were plotted onto bar graphs. Factor scores are denoted by colored bars and are standardized, therefore the mean is zero. Two thresholds of one and  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation above the mean are plotted onto the graphs to help determine a threshold for significance. Because the factor scores are standardized a score above 1 is also above one standard deviation. Using the thresholds of fishing dependence of  $\frac{1}{2}$  and one standard deviation, Figure 3.4.1.2 suggests that several communities are substantially engaged or reliant or both on commercial fishing.



**Figure 3.4.1.2.** Top 18 red snapper fishing communities' commercial engagement and reliance. Source: Southeast Regional Office, social indicators database (2012).

#### Recreational Fishing Communities

Red snapper is harvested recreationally in all states in the Gulf. However, as the red snapper stock has continued to rebuild, the proportion of landings made up by the eastern Gulf States (Alabama and western Florida) has increased compared to the western Gulf States (Texas and Louisiana). Most of the recreational catch is now landed in the eastern Gulf (Table 3.4.1.1). Fishermen in other Gulf States are also involved in recreational red snapper fishing, but these states represent a smaller percentage of the total recreational landings.

**Table 3.4.1.1.** Percentage of total recreational red snapper landings by state for 2013.

State	Landings
AL	43.9%
FL (Gulf Coast)	40.8%
LA	6.0%
MS	4.5%
TX	4.9%

Source: SERO Calibrated MRIP landings (Dec 2014).

Red snapper landings for the recreational sector are not available at the community level, making it difficult to identify communities as dependent on recreational fishing for red snapper. Data



reflecting commercial landings of red snapper may or may not reflect areas of importance for recreational fishing of red snapper. It cannot be assumed that the proportion of commercial red snapper landings among other species in a community would be similar to its proportion among recreational landings within the same community because of sector differences in fishing practices and preferences.

While there are no landings data at the community level for the recreational sector, Table 3.4.1.2 offers a ranking of communities based upon the number of reef fish charter permits and reef fish charter permits divided by population. This is a crude measure of the reliance upon recreational reef fish fishing and is general in nature and not specific to red snapper. Ideally, additional variables quantifying the importance of recreational fishing to a community would be included (such as the amount of recreational landings in a community, availability of recreational fishing related businesses and infrastructure, etc.); however, these data are not available at this time. Because the analysis used discrete geo-political boundaries, Panama City and Panama City Beach had separate values for the associated variables. Calculated independently, each still ranked high enough to appear in the list suggesting a greater importance for recreational fishing in that region. At this time it is impossible to examine the intensity of recreational fishing activity at the community level for a specific species. However, it is likely that those communities that have a higher rank in terms of charter activity and have a dynamic commercial fishery for red snapper will likely have a vigorous recreational red snapper fishery. The communities that meet those criteria are: Destin, Panama City, and Pensacola, Florida; Port Bolivar and Freeport, Texas; and Venice and Grand Isle, Louisiana.

**Table 3.4.1.2.** Average community rank by total number of reef fish charter permits and divided by community population (SERO 2012).

State	Community	Reef Fish charter permits	Permit Rank	Pop	Permit/Pop	Permit/Pop rank	Combined rank
AL	Orange Beach	105	2	5185	0.0203	3	5
LA	Venice	36	7	202	0.1782	1	8
FL	Destin	114	1	12307	0.0093	10	11
AL	Dauphin Island	19	12	1375	0.0138	5	17
TX	Port Aransas	33	9	3444	0.0096	9	18
LA	Grand Isle	14	17	597	0.0235	2	19
TX	Freeport	40	5	12183	0.0033	15	20
TX	Port O'Connor	15	15	1253	0.0120	7	22
FL	Panama City	60	3	36795	0.0016	20	23
FL	Steinhatchee	13	19	1047	0.0124	6	25
FL	Pensacola	43	4	52903	0.0008	22	26
FL	Panama City Beach	32	10	11364	0.0028	16	26
FL	Apalachicola	17	14	2357	0.0072	12	26
FL	Naples	35	8	20405	0.0017	19	27
LA	Chauvin	15	15	3220	0.0047	13	28
TX	Galveston	38	6	49990	0.0008	23	29
FL	Cedar Key	8	27	463	0.0173	4	31
TX	Matagorda	8	27	710	0.0113	8	35
MS	Biloxi	26	11	43921	0.0006	25	36
FL	Mexico Beach	9	25	1181	0.0076	11	36
FL	Carrabelle	10	23	2612	0.0038	14	37
FL	Sarasota	18	13	52877	0.0003	26	39
FL	Madeira Beach	11	21	4335	0.0025	18	39
FL	Port St Joe	10	23	3560	0.0028	17	40
FL	Tarpon Springs	14	17	23071	0.0006	24	41
FL	St Petersburg	12	20	245715	0.0000	27	47
FL	Treasure Island	8	27	6847	0.0012	21	48
TX	Houston	11	21	2068026	0.0000	29	50
TX	Corpus Christi	9	26	299324	0.0000	28	54

Destin and Panama City are likely more reliant with regard to recreational fishing as they have numerous charter operations. When visiting charter service websites from these two communities photos of red snapper are very prominent and advertised as a key target species (<http://www.fishdestin.com/fishinggallery.html>; and <http://www.jubileefishing.com/>). Panama City is less reliant upon red snapper and located in a more rural area than the other communities. In terms of occupation it has the lowest percentage working in farming, forestry, and fishing, yet it does have the largest percentage class of worker in that category. All of these communities are considered to be primarily involved in fishing based upon their community profiles (Impact Assessment, Inc. 2005).

The Orange Beach Red Snapper World Championship Tournament, billed as “Alabama’s state celebration of recreational saltwater fishing,”<sup>5</sup> was an annual event in March. Dauphin Island, Alabama also has a number of charter services that specialize in bottom fishing, especially for red snapper<sup>6</sup>. All three Alabama communities are considered primarily involved in fishing as noted in their fishing communities’ profiles (Impact Assessment, Inc. 2006). Red snapper fishing is featured at Pascagoula charter websites<sup>7</sup> and the community is regarded as primarily involved in fishing according to its community profile (Impact Assessment, Inc. 2006).

Venice and Grand Isle, Louisiana, are also ranked among the top recreational fishing communities. A sampling of charter service websites from these communities indicates they do feature red snapper as a target species but not as prominently as charter services from other states.

Red snapper are also an important species for charter fishing in Galveston and Freeport, Texas. Many of the charter services include photos of red snapper catches on their website and note that this species is one of their prime target species.<sup>8</sup> Although, many inshore species like trout and redfish are more prominently displayed. Matagorda and Freeport are noted as being primarily involved in fishing while Galveston is secondarily involved.

The following figure was produced from the indicator database as described above for the commercial sector. Figure 3.4.1.3 identifies recreational communities engaged and reliant upon fishing in general. Using thresholds of fishing dependence of ½ standard deviation and one standard deviation, Figure 3.4.1.3 suggests that several communities are substantially engaged in recreational fishing.


---

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.cityoforangebeach.com/pages\\_2007/pdfs/events/2009/2009\\_Snapper\\_Tournament.pdf](http://www.cityoforangebeach.com/pages_2007/pdfs/events/2009/2009_Snapper_Tournament.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> <http://gulfinfo.com/fishing.htm>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.jkocharters.com/1938863.html>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.texassaltwaterfishingguide.com/> or <http://www.matagordabay.com/>



**Figure 3.4.1.3.** Top 15 recreational fishing communities' engagement and reliance.  
Source: Southeast Regional Office, social indicators database (2012).


### 3.4.2 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).

Commercial red snapper fishermen and associated businesses and communities along the coast are likely to be impacted by this proposed action. However, information on race, ethnicity, and income status for groups at the different participation levels and roles is not available. To identify potential areas of EJ concern, this analysis uses a suite of indices created to examine the social vulnerability of coastal communities (Jepson and Colburn 2013). The three indices are poverty, population composition, and personal disruptions. The variables included in each of these indices have been identified through the literature as being important components that contribute to a community's vulnerability. Indicators such as increased poverty rates for


different groups, more single female-headed households and households with children under the age of five, disruptions such as higher separation rates, higher crime rates, and unemployment all are signs of populations experiencing vulnerabilities. Communities that exceed the threshold for one or more of the indices would be expected to exhibit vulnerabilities to sudden changes or social disruption that might accrue from regulatory change. As noted in Section 4.4, additional social effects are not expected from this action beyond the effects discussed in Amendment 28, as this action enables the implementation of the action taken in Amendment 28 to occur in 2016.

The commercial communities most engaged and reliant on red snapper fishing are identified in Figure 3.4.1.2, and Figure 3.4.2.1 provides each community's score for the three social vulnerability indices. The communities of Apalachicola and Panama City, Florida; Golden Meadow, Grand Isle, and Houma, Louisiana; Bayou La Batre, Alabama; Pascagoula, Mississippi; and Freeport, Galveston, and Houston, Texas exceed the threshold of  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation above the mean for at least one of the social vulnerability indices (Figure 3.4.2.1). It would be expected that these communities may exhibit vulnerabilities to social or economic disruption because of regulatory change, and would be the communities most likely subject to EJ concerns, as described in Amendment 28. Those communities that exhibit several index scores exceeding the threshold would be the most vulnerable. These include Apalachicola, Florida; Golden Meadow, Louisiana; Bayou La Batre, Alabama; Pascagoula, Mississippi; and Freeport, Galveston, and Houston, Texas. Five communities exceed the threshold of  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation for all three indices (Bayou La Batre, Alabama; Pascagoula, Mississippi; and Freeport, Galveston, and Houston, Texas). Social effects resulting from action taken in Amendment 28 are likely to be greatest in these communities.



**Figure 3.4.2.1.** Social vulnerability indices for red snapper commercial fishing communities  
Source: Southeast Regional Office, social indicators database (2012).

Recreational red snapper fishermen and associated businesses and communities along the coast are expected to benefit from this proposed action. Thus, no EJ concerns are expected for participants in the recreational sector. Figure 3.4.2.2 provides the scores of the social vulnerability indices for the top recreational fishing communities identified in Figure 3.4.1.3. Communities that exceed the threshold for one or more indices would be expected to exhibit vulnerabilities to sudden changes or social disruption that might accrue from regulatory change, and greater vulnerability is suggested by exceeding the thresholds for multiple indices.



**Figure 3.4.2.2.** Social vulnerability indices for recreational fishing communities.  
Source: Southeast Regional Office, social indicators database (2012).

## 3.5 Description of the Administrative Environment

### 3.5.1 Federal Fishery Management

Federal fishery management is conducted under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (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 (EEZ), 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 EEZ.

Responsibility for federal fishery management is shared by 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 Appendix A. 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 NMFS. 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, national security, or litigation briefings, 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 FMPs are enforced through actions of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Office of 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. These activities are being coordinated by the Council’s Law Enforcement Advisory Panel and the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission’s Law Enforcement Committee, which have developed a 5-year “Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Strategic Plan – 2008-2012.” The red snapper stock in the Gulf of Mexico is classified as overfished, but no longer



undergoing overfishing. A rebuilding plan for red snapper was first implemented under Amendment 1 to the FMP (GMFMC 1989), and has undergone several revisions. The current rebuilding plan was established in Amendment 27 to the FMP (GMFMC 2007), and calls for rebuilding the stock to a level capable of supporting MSY on a continuing basis by 2032. Periodic adjustments to the annual catch limit and other management measures needed to affect rebuilding are implemented through amendments and framework actions.

### **3.5.2 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 respective state's 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 to the FMP (GMFMC 2004a).

## CHAPTER 4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

### Action – Retain a Portion of the Commercial Red Snapper Quota for 2016

**Alternative 1:** No Action - Distribute a 100% of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota to red snapper Individual Fishing Quota (RS-IFQ) account shareholders on January 1, 2016.

**Preferred Alternative 2:** Provide the Regional Administrator the authority to **withhold 4.9 % (0.352 mp ww) of the red snapper commercial quota** before the distribution of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota to RS-IFQ account shareholders. The 4.9 % to be retained for later distribution was determined in Amendment 28.

### 4.1 Effects on the Physical Environment

Withholding part of the commercial quota (**Preferred Alternative 2**) is administrative and should not have any impacts on the physical environment beyond those already addressed in Amendment 28 (GMFMC 2015), which is hereby incorporated by reference. **Preferred Alternative 2** would allow implementation of Amendment 28 in 2016, a year before the actual physical effects described in Amendment 28 are anticipated to occur.

Amendment 28 could indirectly affect the physical environment if changes in allocation result in an increase or decrease in the amount of fishing gear used to harvest the respective commercial and recreational quotas. However, the overall red snapper combined quota would not be affected in this action or Amendment 28, thus any beneficial effects from reducing the commercial quota (reduced fishing effort) would likely be offset by adverse effects from increasing the recreational quota (increased fishing effort). The impacts to the physical environment resulting from shifting sector allocations is discussed in Amendment 28.

### 4.2 Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Withholding part of the commercial quota (**Preferred Alternative 2**) is administrative and should not have any impacts on the biological environment beyond those already addressed in Amendment 28, which is hereby incorporated by reference. **Preferred Alternative 2** would allow implementation of Amendment 28 in 2016, a year before the actual biological effects described in Amendment 28 are anticipated to occur.

Both alternatives are expected to allow the stock to recover by 2032, resulting in positive effects and maintaining consistency with the rebuilding plan. Reducing the commercial quota and increasing the recreational quota is not expected to change the biological environment. The increase in recreational quota as a result of Amendment 28 would inherently increase the fishing effort, and, in turn, alter the effects on the biological environment including targeted and non-targeted species. However, these effects would be minimal given the overall effort in the reef

fish fishery. The impacts to the biological environment resulting from shifting sector allocations is discussed in Amendment 28, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

### 4.3 Effects on the Economic Environment

The final decision made by the Secretary of Commerce relative to Amendment 28 (red snapper allocation) and the timing of that decision will determine the economic effects expected to result from this framework action. Amendment 28 would reallocate portions of the red snapper ACL to the recreational sector, i.e., increase the recreational red snapper allocation by 0.352 mp ww and decrease the commercial allocation by the same amount. After the submission of Amendment 28 for Secretarial review, three plausible outcomes with respect to implementation could occur, each of which would affect the expected effects of this proposed amendment. First, the Secretary could approve Amendment 28 in early 2016, making implementation in 2016 possible. Second, Amendment 28 could receive final approval late in 2016, making implementation in 2016 impossible. Finally, the Secretary could disapprove and not implement Amendment 28. The following discussion of the expected economic effects of the alternatives in this proposed amendment will be discussed within the context of these three outcomes with respect to final action on Amendment 28.

Under **Alternative 1** (no action), if Amendment 28 is not approved by the Secretary of Commerce or if it is approved later in 2016 and scheduled for implementation in 2017, recreational anglers would continue to receive 49 percent of the red snapper quota and commercial RS-IFQ shareholders would receive the totality of their 2016 red snapper allocation. Therefore, **Alternative 1** would not be expected to result in any economic effects because it would not affect the harvests and customary uses of red snapper by the commercial or recreational sectors.

If Amendment 28 is approved sufficiently early in 2016 for implementation in 2016, **Alternative 1** would not allow the expected effects of the reallocation of red snapper between the sectors to occur in 2016. Because commercial RS-IFQ shareholders would have already received the totality of their allocation, any increase in the recreational red snapper allocation and associated potential economic benefits would be postponed to the following year (2017). Under this scenario, **Alternative 1** would be expected to result in indirect economic effects because it would delay the potential economic benefits to the recreational sector and costs to the commercial sector expected to result from reallocation. By delaying the Council's preferred reallocation of red snapper resource, **Alternative 1** would be expected to result in indirect adverse economic effects to the recreational sector because it would not allow the potential benefits of an increase in the recreational red snapper quota through reallocation to be realized. Conversely, **Alternative 1** would be expected to result in indirect economic benefits to the commercial sector because it would shield the sector from a decrease in the commercial red snapper quota for 2016. The economic effects expected to result from the reallocation of red snapper between the sectors are discussed in Amendment 28.

If Amendment 28 is approved and scheduled for implementation in 2016, **Preferred Alternative 2** would allow the Council's preferred reallocation to be established in 2016. Although it would allow potential benefits and costs expected to result from Amendment 28 to materialize in 2016, **Preferred Alternative 2** is not expected to result in additional economic effects under this scenario. The potential benefits to the recreational sector and costs to the commercial sector of a reallocation of the red snapper quota between the sectors are discussed in Amendment 28.

If Amendment 28 is not approved by the Secretary of Commerce or if it is approved later in 2016 and scheduled for implementation in 2017, the commercial quota withheld from distribution would be returned to RS-IFQ shareholders in 2016. Under this scenario, **Preferred Alternative 2** would be expected to result in direct economic effects stemming from potential modifications to customary fishing and business practices and from the uncertainty that may arise from the timeline for returning withheld portions of the commercial quota. The retention and subsequent return to RS-IFQ participants of a portion of their annual RS-IFQ allocation may preclude some RS-IFQ participants, particularly those with limited RS-IFQ shares, from harvesting red snapper during periods of high demand, e.g., lent, thereby resulting in revenue losses. RS-IFQ participants planning to sell their annual allocation at a specific date could be precluded from completing the transaction, potentially resulting in economic losses. Although these economic effects cannot be quantified, it is expected that the longer RS-IFQ annual allocations are retained by NMFS, the greater these effects are expected to be.

## 4.4 Effects on the Social Environment

Amendment 28 would reallocate a portion of the red snapper ACL from the commercial sector to the recreational sector. The social effects expected to result from this framework action relate to the final decision to implement Amendment 28 and the timing of that decision under three scenarios, as discussed in Section 4.3.

If Amendment 28 is not approved by the Secretary of Commerce or if it is approved later in 2016 to be implemented in 2017, recreational anglers would continue to receive 49% of the red snapper ACL and commercial RS-IFQ shareholders would receive the totality of their 2016 red snapper allocation, for 2016. Thus, no additional effects would be expected to result from **Alternative 1**, as it would not affect the harvest and customary uses of red snapper by the commercial and recreational sectors.

If Amendment 28 is approved in early 2016 and scheduled for implementation in 2016, **Alternative 1** would not allow the reallocation of red snapper between the sectors to occur in 2016 because commercial RS-IFQ shareholders would have already received the totality of the year's allocation at the beginning of 2016. Thus, any increase in the recreational red snapper ACL, and attending benefits to the recreational sector would be postponed, as would the decrease to the commercial red snapper ACL, and attending negative impacts to the commercial sector expected to result from a reallocation. Under this scenario, **Alternative 1** would be expected to result in indirect negative effects by delaying the potential benefits to the recreational sector. Conversely, **Alternative 1** would be expected to result in indirect positive benefits to the

commercial sector because it would prevent the decrease in the commercial ACL from occurring in 2016. The social benefits and negative impacts expected to result from the reallocation of red snapper between the sectors are discussed in Amendment 28.

If Amendment 28 is approved and scheduled for implementation in 2016, **Preferred Alternative 2** would allow the Council's decision on reallocation to be established in 2016. Although it would allow the potential benefits and negative impacts expected to result from Amendment 28 to occur in 2016, **Preferred Alternative 2** is not expected to result in additional social effects under this scenario, beyond the potential benefits to the recreational sector and negative impacts to the commercial sector as discussed in Amendment 28.

If Amendment 28 is not approved by the Secretary of Commerce or if it is approved later in 2016 and scheduled for implementation in 2017, the commercial quota withheld from distribution would be returned to RS-IFQ shareholders in 2016. Under this scenario, **Preferred Alternative 2** would be expected to result in direct negative social effects stemming from changes to customary fishing and business practices and from the uncertainty that may arise from the timeline for returning withheld portions of the commercial ACL. The retention and subsequent return to RS-IFQ shareholders a portion of the annual RS-IFQ allocation may affect RS-IFQ participants, particularly those with limited RS-IFQ shares, by changing when, and potentially from whom, they are able to obtain red snapper allocation. RS-IFQ participants planning to sell their annual allocation at a specific date could be precluded from completing the transaction, affecting the intended recipient's access to that allocation, as well. Although these effects cannot be quantified, it is expected that the longer RS-IFQ annual allocation is retained, the greater these effects would be.

## 4.5 Effects on the Administrative Environment

The withholding of commercial red snapper allocation would have direct effects on the administrative environment through additional rulemaking. Because **Alternative 1**, the no-action alternative, would not require rulemaking, it would have no effect on the administrative environment. The act of withholding a portion of the 2016 red snapper commercial quota, **Preferred Alternative 2**, is a one-time event, and thus these alternatives would have an equivalent burden to this environment through the minor direct administrative impacts associated with the rulemaking.

Although **Preferred Alternative 2** would increase the administrative burden, the effects are likely minimal. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) currently has a program and system in place to issue, transfer, and monitor Individual Fishing Quotas. Therefore, any additional administrative burden would be in adding these new requirements to the existing NMFS program and not requiring the development of a new program.

## 4.6 Cumulative Effects Analysis

As directed by the National Environmental Protection Act (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. Cumulative effects on the physical and biological environment, socio-economic environment, and administrative environments have been analyzed in Amendment 28 (GMFMC 2015) and are hereby incorporated by reference. The cumulative effects Amendment 28 and allocation for red snapper on the biological or physical environment is likely neutral because it should not have much effect on overall fishing effort. For the socioeconomic environment, depending on the sector, some effects would be likely be positive and some negative. 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. The actions considered in Amendment 28 should not have an adverse effect on public health or safety because these measures should not alter actual fishing practices, just 1) which sector can harvest what percentage of the overall allowable harvest and 2) reduce the probability of the recreational sector exceeding its allocation.

The cumulative effects resulting from this amendment and withholding part of the commercial quota (**Preferred Alternative 2**) should not have any additional cumulative effects to the physical and biological environments beyond those already addressed in Amendment 28. The cumulative effects from this action would be expected to result in direct economic and social effects stemming from potential modifications to customary fishing and business practices and from the uncertainty that may arise from the timeline for returning withheld portions of the commercial quota. Cumulative effects to the social environment from this action are not expected to result in additional social effects beyond the potential benefits to the recreational sector and negative impacts to the commercial sector as discussed in Amendment 28. Either the retention or subsequent return of shares to RS-IFQ participants may preclude some RS-IFQ participants, particularly those with limited RS-IFQ shares, from harvesting red snapper during periods of high demand, thereby resulting in revenue losses. RS-IFQ participants planning to sell their annual allocation at a specific date could be precluded from completing the transaction, potentially resulting in economic losses. Although these economic effects cannot be quantified, it expected that the longer RS-IFQ annual allocations are retained by NMFS, the greater these effects are expected to be.

## CHAPTER 5. REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW

### 5.1 Introduction

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) requires a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for all regulatory actions that are of public interest. The RIR does three things: 1) it provides a comprehensive review of the level and incidence of impacts associated with a proposed or final regulatory action; 2) it provides a review of the problems and policy objectives prompting the regulatory proposals and an evaluation of the major alternatives that could be used to solve the problem; and, 3) it ensures that the regulatory agency systematically and comprehensively considers all available alternatives so that the public welfare can be enhanced in the most efficient and cost-effective way. The RIR also serves as the basis for determining whether the regulations are a “significant regulatory action” under the criteria provided in Executive Order (E.O.) 12866. This RIR analyzes the impacts this action would be expected to have on the red snapper component of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery.

### 5.2 Problems and Objectives

The problems and objectives addressed by this action are discussed in Section 1.2.

### 5.3 Description of Fisheries

A description of the red snapper component of the Gulf reef fish fishery is provided in Section 3.3.

### 5.4 Impacts of Management Measures

#### 5.4.1 Action: Retain a Portion of the 2016 Commercial Red Snapper Quota

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 4.1.3. The following discussion summarizes the key points of this analysis.

The final decision made by the Secretary of Commerce relative to Amendment 28 (red snapper allocation) and the timing of that decision will determine the economic effects expected to result from this framework action. If Amendment 28 is approved by the Secretary and scheduled for implementation in 2016, **Preferred Alternative 2** would allow the Council to reallocate 0.352 mp ww of red snapper from the commercial sector to the recreational sector in 2016. Although it would allow potential benefits and costs expected to result from Amendment 28 to materialize in 2016, **Preferred Alternative 2** is not expected to result in additional economic effects under this scenario. The potential benefits to the recreational sector and costs to the commercial sector of a reallocation of the red snapper quota between the sectors are discussed in Amendment 28.



If Amendment 28 is not approved by the Secretary of Commerce or if it is approved later in 2016 and scheduled for implementation in 2017, the commercial quota withheld from distribution would be returned to RS-IFQ shareholders in 2016. Under this scenario, **Preferred Alternative 2** would be expected to result in direct economic effects stemming from potential modifications to customary fishing and business practices and from the uncertainty that may arise from the timeline for returning withheld portions of the commercial quota. The retention and subsequent return to RS-IFQ participants of a portion of their annual RS-IFQ allocation may preclude some RS-IFQ participants, particularly those with limited RS-IFQ shares, from harvesting red snapper during periods of high demand, e.g., lent, thereby resulting in revenue losses. RS-IFQ participants planning to sell their annual allocation at a specific date could be precluded from completing the transaction, potentially resulting in economic losses. Although these economic effects cannot be quantified, it is expected that the longer RS-IFQ annual allocations are retained by NMFS, the greater these effects are expected to be.

## 5.5 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 which can be expressed as costs associated with the regulations. Costs associated with this action include:

Council costs of document preparation, meetings, public hearings, and information dissemination.....	\$25,000
NMFS administrative costs of document preparation, meetings and review .....	\$15,000
TOTAL .....	\$40,000

The estimate provided above does not include any law enforcement costs. Any enforcement duties associated with this action would be expected to be covered under routine enforcement costs rather than an expenditure of new funds. It is noted that it will be more difficult and, therefore, more costly, to monitor closure periods that vary by fishing mode.

## 5.6 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 the purposes of E.O. 12866.

# CHAPTER 6. REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT ANALYSIS

## 6.1 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 fishery management plan 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.

The RFA requires agencies to conduct a Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (RFAA) for each proposed rule. The RFAA 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 RFAA is conducted to primarily determine whether the proposed action would have a “significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.” The RFAA 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; 5) an identification, to the extent practicable, of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rule; 6) a description and estimate of the expected economic impacts on small entities; and 7) an explanation of the criteria used to evaluate whether the rule would impose “significant economic impacts”.

## 6.2 Statement of the need for, objective of, and legal basis for the proposed action

The need for and objective of this proposed action are provided in Chapter 1. In summary, proposed Amendment 28 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) (Amendment 28) would reallocate the red snapper harvest consistent with the 2015 red snapper assessment update to ensure the allowable catch and recovery benefits are fairly and equitably allocated between the commercial and recreational sectors to achieve optimum yield. The purpose of this proposed action is to withhold 4.9 percent of the Gulf commercial red snapper quota (352,000 lbs whole weight (ww); 317,117 lbs gutted weight (gw))

to ensure that the allocations established through Amendment 28 and implemented in 2016 are effective in the 2016 fishing year. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act provides the statutory basis for this proposed action.

### **6.3 Description and estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed action would apply**

This action, if implemented, would be expected to directly affect commercial vessels that harvest red snapper in the Gulf. Over the period 2009-2013, an average of 353 vessels per year recorded commercial red snapper harvests, based on mandatory logbook data. The maximum number of vessels with recorded commercial red snapper harvests during this period was 375 in 2010. However, in 2010, 384 vessels were identified in the red snapper IFQ on-line account program, which tracks activity in red snapper Limited Access Privilege Program. This system, however, is not the official record for trip harvests of all species by vessels with commercial harvests of red snapper, nor does it capture all landings, or associated revenues, from all species harvested on all trips by vessels that harvest red snapper. Therefore, data from both sources are used for this assessment to estimate the number of potentially affected entities. As a result, this rule would be expected to apply to 353-384 commercial fishing entities. The average annual gross revenue from all species harvested on all trips by the vessels identified with recorded red snapper harvests in logbook data over the period 2009-2013 (353 vessels) was approximately \$110,000 (2013 dollars).

NMFS has not identified any other small entities that would be expected to be directly affected by this proposed rule.

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 \$20.5 million (NAICS code 114111, finfish fishing) for all its affiliated operations worldwide. All commercial fishing vessels expected to be directly affected by this proposed rule are determined to be small business entities.

### **6.4 Description of the projected reporting, record-keeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed action, 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 action would not establish any new reporting, record-keeping, or other compliance requirements.

## **6.5 Identification of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed action**

No duplicative, overlapping, or conflicting federal rules have been identified.

## **6.6 Significance of economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities**

### **Substantial number criterion**

This proposed action would be expected to directly affect an estimated 353-384 commercial fishing entities. All of the businesses these vessels are believed to be small business entities. As a result, this proposed action, if implemented, would be expected to 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 action are believed 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?

This proposed action would withhold 352,000 lbs ww (317,117 lbs gw) of the 2016 red snapper Gulf commercial quota, valued at approximately \$1.46 million (\$4.75 median ex-vessel price per lb gw, minus the 3-percent cost recovery fee, all vessels; 2013 dollars). This is equivalent to the amount of quota proposed to be reallocated from the commercial sector to the recreational sector in proposed Amendment 28. Across all vessels (353-384 vessels), this amount of quota would be equivalent to an average of approximately 826-898 lbs gw of red snapper per vessel, valued at approximately \$3,800-\$4,100. Thus, the proposed quota withholding would result in a reduction in ex-vessel revenue in 2016 to the entities in this fishery; however, this reduction is consistent with the analysis and expected economic effects of Amendment 28, which projects a reduction in red snapper commercial quota, and associated economic benefits to commercial fishermen, beginning in 2016. The reallocation would, however, be expected to result in an increase in economic benefits to the recreational sector. Final rulemaking to implement the allocation change proposed by Amendment 28 cannot occur until after January 1, 2016, whereas distribution of the commercial quota to shareholders occurs prior to the start of each fishing year

to allow vessels to begin red snapper harvest on January 1. Once the red snapper quota is distributed to shareholders, it cannot be effectively recalled. If distributed and subsequently recalled, some fishermen may have already used or sold (transferred) the portion of their quota prior that needed to be returned. Recalling quota from just those fishermen with sufficient quota remaining would not be equitable. As a result, the only practical way to ensure the effects of Amendment 28 are realized in 2016 is to withhold the commensurate amount of quota when quota is distributed for the 2016 fishing season. If the rulemaking to implement the proposed reallocation goes final, then the effects of the reduced commercial quota, including this holdback, will be attributable to that rulemaking. If the proposed reallocation does not go final, then the withheld portion of the quota will be distributed as soon as possible to the appropriate quota shareholders. Because this quota would be available later in the fishing year, a reduction in normal total revenue (disruption of the timing of harvest may reduce the price and total revenue received), alteration of the flow of receipts, and disruption of normal business operation may occur. However, these effects would be expected to be minor because only a small portion of the available quota (less than 5 percent) would be affected for only a portion of the year.

Based on the discussion above, NMFS determines that this proposed action, if implemented, would not have a significant adverse economic effect on a substantial number of small entities.

## **6.7 Description of the significant alternatives to the proposed action and discussion of how the alternatives attempt to minimize economic impacts on small entities**

This proposed action, if implemented, would not be expected to have a significant adverse economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. As a result, the issue of significant alternatives is not relevant.

## CHAPTER 7. LIST OF PREPARERS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

### LIST OF PREPARERS

Name	Expertise	Responsibility	Agency
Assane Diagne	Economist	Co-Team Lead – Amendment development, economic analyses, Regulatory Impact Review	GMFMC
Rich Malinowski	Biologist	Co-Team Lead – Amendment development, effects analysis, and cumulative effects analysis	SERO
Juan Agar	Economist	Reviewer	SEFSC
Adam Bailey	Technical Writer Editor	Regulatory writer	SERO
David Dale	Biologist	EFH review	SERO
Daniel Goethel	Biologist	Reviewer	SEFSC
Stephen Holiman	Economist	Reviewer, Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis	SERO
Peter Hood	Biologist	Reviewer	
Ava Lasseter	Anthropologist	Social analyses	GMFMC
Jennifer Lee	Protected Resources	Protected species review	SERO
Mara Levy	Attorney	Legal compliance and review	NOAA GC
Noah Silverman	Natural Resource Management Specialist	NEPA compliance	SERO
Jessica Stephen	Biologist	Data analysis	SERO

SERO = National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office, GMFMC = Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, GC = General Counsel.

### LIST OF AGENCIES CONSULTED

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
- Southeast Fisheries Science Center  
- Southeast Regional Office  
NOAA General Counsel  
U.S. Coast Guard  
Environmental Protection Agency

## CHAPTER 8. REFERENCES

Agar, J. Stephen, A. Strelcheck, and A. Diagne. 2014. The Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper IFQ Program: The First Five Years. *Marine Resource Economics*. 29(2): 177-198.

American Fisheries Society. 2013. Common and Scientific Names of Fishes from the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Seventh Edition. Special Publication 34. Bethesda, MD.

Anderes Alvarez, B. L., and I. Uchida. 1994. Study of hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) stomach content in Cuban waters. Pages 27-40 *in* Study of the Hawksbill Turtle in Cuba (I). Ministry of Fishing Industry, CUBA. Ministry of Fishing Industry, Cuba.

Barnette, M. C. 2001. A review of the fishing gear utilized within the Southeast Region and their potential impacts on essential fish habitat. NOAA Technical. Memorandum. NMFS-SEFSC-449. National Marine Fisheries Service. St. Petersburg, Florida.

Bigelow, H.B., and W.C. Schroeder. 1953. Sawfishes, guitarfishes, skates and rays, pp. 1-514. *In*: Tee-Van, J., C.M Breder, A.E. Parr, W.C. Schroeder and L.P. Schultz (eds). Fishes of the Western North Atlantic, Part Two. Mem. Sears Found. Mar. Res. I.

Bjorndal, K. A. 1980. Nutrition and grazing behavior of the green turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. *Marine Biology* 56:147-154.

Bjorndal, K. A. 1997. Foraging ecology and nutrition of sea turtles. P. L. Lutz, and J. A. Musick, editors. *The Biology of Sea Turtles*. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Boen, C. and W. Keithly. 2012. Gulf of Mexico Red Snapper IFQ Program: Survey Results and Analysis.

Bolten, A. B., and G. H. Balazs. 1995. Biology of the early pelagic stage - the 'lost year'. Pages 579-581 *in* K. A. Bjorndal, editor. *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Bromley, Daniel W. 1977 "Distributional implications of the extended economic zone," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 59:887-8921.

Brongersma, L. D. 1972. *European Atlantic turtles*. Zoologische Verhandelingen no. 121. E.J. Brill. Leiden. 318 pages.

Byles, R. 1988. Satellite Telemetry of Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle, *Lepidochelys kempi*, in the Gulf of Mexico. Report to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation:40 pp.

Carr, A. F. 1986. RIPS, FADS, and little loggerheads. *BioScience* 36(2):92-100.

Carr, A. 1987. New perspectives on the pelagic stage of sea turtle development. *Conservation Biology* 1(2):103-121.

Copes, P. 1997. Social impacts of fisheries management regimes based on individual quotas. In *Social Implications of Quota Systems in Fisheries*. Gisli Palsson and Gudrun Petursdottir, editors. Nordic Council of Ministers, Copenhagen.

Dietz, Simon and Giles Atkinson. 2010. The Equity-Efficiency Trade-off in Environmental Policy: Evidence from Stated Preferences. *Land Economics* 86(3):423-443.

Eckert, S. A., K. L. Eckert, P. Ponganis, and G. L. Kooyman. 1989. Diving and foraging behavior of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 67(11):2834-2840.

Eckert, S. A., D. W. Nellis, K. L. Eckert, and G. L. Kooyman. 1986. Diving patterns of two leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during internesting intervals at Sandy Point, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands. *Herpetologica* 42(3):381-388.

Feeny, David, Fikret Berkes, Bonnie J. McCay, and James M. Acheson. 1990. The Tragedy of the Commons: Twenty-Two Years Later, *Human Ecology* 18:1-19.

Frick, J. 1976. Orientation and behavior of hatchling green turtles *Chelonia mydas* in the sea. *Animal Behavior* 24(4):849-857.

Gislason, Gordon. 2006. Commercial vs Recreational Fisheries Allocation in Canada: Pacific Herring, Salmon and Halibut. Sharing the Fish Conference, Fremantle, Western Australia. February 26-March 2, 2006.

GMFMC. 1981. Environmental impact statement and fishery management plan for the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico and environmental impact statement. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/RF%20FMP%20and%20EIS%201981-08.pdf>

GMFMC. 1989. Amendment 1 to the reef fish fishery management plan including environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/RF%20Amend-01%20Final%201989-08-rescan.pdf>

GMFMC. 1995. Regulatory amendment to the reef fish fishery management plan to set 1996 red snapper total allowable catch. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 49 p.



<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/RF%20RegAmend%20-%201995-12.pdf>

GMFMC. 1999. Generic Sustainable Fisheries Act Amendment to the Following FMPS: Gulf Coral and Coral Reef Resources, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, Red Drum, Reef Fish, Shrimp, Spiny Lobster, and Stone Crab. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

GMFMC. 2001. Generic amendment addressing the establishment of the Tortugas Marine Reserves in the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico: Coastal Migratory Pelagics; Coral and Coral Reefs; Red Drum; Reef Fish; Shrimp; Spiny Lobster; Stone Crab. Includes an IRFA, RIR, and a FSEIS.

GMFMC. 2003. Amendment 21 to the reef fish fishery management plan, environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, and initial regulatory flexibility analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Amend21-draft%203.pdf>

GMFMC. 2004a. Final environmental impact statement for the generic essential fish habitat amendment to the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico: 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. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20EFH%20EIS.pdf>

GMFMC. 2004b. Secretarial amendment 1 to the reef fish management plan to set a 10-year rebuilding plan for red grouper, with associated impacts on gag and other groupers includes environmental assessment, regulatory impact review and final regulatory flexibility analyses. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Secretarial-Amendment-1-RF.pdf>

GMFMC. 2005. Generic amendment number 3 for addressing essential fish habitat requirements, habitat areas of particular concern, and adverse effects of fishing in the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico: shrimp fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, United States waters, red drum fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, reef fish fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, coastal migratory pelagic resources (mackerels) in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, stone crab fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, spiny lobster fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, coral and coral reefs of the Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/FINAL3\\_EFH\\_Amendment.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/FINAL3_EFH_Amendment.pdf)

GMFMC. 2006. Final amendment 26 to the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery management plan to establish a red snapper individual fishing quota program, including supplemental environmental impact statement, initial regulatory flexibility analysis, and regulatory impact review. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Amend26031606FINAL.pdf>

GMFMC. 2007. Final amendment 27 to the reef fish fishery management plan and amendment 14 to the shrimp fishery management plan including supplemental environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida. 490 pp with appendices.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20RF%20Amend%2027-%20Shrimp%20Amend%2014.pdf>

GMFMC. 2008a. Final reef fish amendment 30A: greater amberjack – revised rebuilding plan, accountability measures; gray triggerfish – establish rebuilding plan, end overfishing, accountability measures, regional management, management thresholds and benchmarks including supplemental environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Amend-30A-Final%20208.pdf>

GMFMC. 2008b. Final Amendment 30B: gag – end overfishing and set management thresholds and targets. Red grouper – set optimum yield, TAC, and management measures, time/area closures, and federal regulatory compliance including environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20Amendment%2030B%2010\\_10\\_08.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20Amendment%2030B%2010_10_08.pdf)

GMFMC. 2009. Final amendment 31 to the fishery management plan for reef fish resources in the Gulf of Mexico addresses bycatch of sea turtles in the bottom longline component of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery, includes draft environmental impact statement and regulatory impact review. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida. 261 pp with appendices.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20Draft%20RF%20Amend%2031%206-11-09.pdf>

GMFMC. 2010. Final regulatory amendment the reef fish fishery management plan to set total allowable catch for red snapper including revised environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Red%20Snapper%20Regulatory%20Amendment%203\\_26\\_10.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Red%20Snapper%20Regulatory%20Amendment%203_26_10.pdf)

GMFMC. 2011a. Final generic annual catch limits/accountability measures amendment for the Gulf of Mexico fishery management council's red drum, reef fish, shrimp, coral and coral reefs fishery management plans, including environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, regulatory flexibility analysis, and fishery impact statement. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Generic%20ACL\\_AM\\_Amendment-September%209%202011%20v.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Generic%20ACL_AM_Amendment-September%209%202011%20v.pdf)

GMFMC. 2011b. Final reef fish amendment 32 – gag grouper – rebuilding plan, annual catch limits, management measures, red grouper – annual catch limits, management measures, and grouper accountability measures. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20RF32\\_EIS\\_October\\_21\\_2011\[2\].pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20RF32_EIS_October_21_2011[2].pdf)

GMFMC. 2011c. Regulatory amendment to the reef fish fishery management plan to set 2011 total allowable catch for red snapper. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Red%20Snapper%202011%20Regulatory%20Amendment%20-%201-11.pdf>

GMFMC. 2012. Final regulatory amendment to the fishery management plan for the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico, revise fall recreational fixed closed season and set 2012 and 2013 quotas for red snapper. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20Red%20Snapper%20Fall%20Season%20and%20Quota%20RegAmend%20-%2003-20-2012.pdf>

GMFMC. 2013a. Red snapper 2013 quota increase and supplemental recreational season, including environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis. Framework action to the fishery management plan for the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Red%20Snapper%20Framework%20Action%20Set%202013%20Quotas%2008-01-13.pdf>

GMFMC. 2013b. Red snapper individual fishing quota program 5-year review. Jointly prepared by Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and NMFS Southeast Regional Office. Tampa and St. Petersburg, FL. <http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Red%20Snapper%205-year%20Review%20FINAL.pdf>

GMFMC. 2014a. Amendment 40 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico - Recreational Red Snapper Sector Separation. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/fishery\\_management\\_plans/reef\\_fish\\_management.php](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/fishery_management_plans/reef_fish_management.php)

- GMFMC. 2014b. Recreational Accountability Measures for Red snapper, including environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis. Framework action to the fishery management plan for the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Recreational%20AMs%20for%20Red%20Snapper%2010-6-2014.pdf>
- GMFMC. 2014c. Amendment 39 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico – Regional Management. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.  
[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/council\\_meetings/Briefing%20Materials/BB-03-2015/B-10\(b\)%20PPH%20Draft%20RF39%20Reg%20Man.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/council_meetings/Briefing%20Materials/BB-03-2015/B-10(b)%20PPH%20Draft%20RF39%20Reg%20Man.pdf)
- GMFMC 2015. Amendment 28 to the Reef Fish Management Plan for the Reef Fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.
- GMFMC and SAFMC. 1982. Fishery management plan final environmental impact statement for coral and coral reefs. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida; and South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Charleston, South Carolina.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Coral%20FMP.pdf>
- Gore, R. H. 1992. The Gulf of Mexico: A treasury of resources in the American Mediterranean. Pineapple Press. Sarasota, Florida.
- Hausman, Jerry. 2012. Contingent valuation: from dubious to hopeless. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 26(4)43-56.
- Hood, P. B., A. J. Strelcheck, and P. Steele. 2007. A history of red snapper management in the Gulf of Mexico. Pages 267-284. in W. F. Patterson, III, J. H. Cowan, G. R. Fitzhugh, and D. L. Nieland, editors. Red snapper ecology and fisheries in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. AFS, Symp 60, Bethesda, MD.
- Hughes, G. R. 1974. Is a sea turtle no more than an armored stomach? *Bulletin of the South African Association for Marine Biological Research* 11:12-14.
- Impact Assessment, Inc. 2005. Identifying Communities Associated with the Fishing Industry Along the Florida Gulf Coast. Impact Assessment, Inc. La Jolla, CA. Volumes 1-3 646 pp.
- Impact Assessment, Inc. 2006. Identifying Communities Associated with the Fishing Industry in Alabama and Mississippi -Final Report. Prepared under Contract WC133F-03-SE-0603.  
[http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/socialsci/pdfs/AlaMiss\\_PublicReleaseVersion\\_pdf\\_Feb06.pdf](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/socialsci/pdfs/AlaMiss_PublicReleaseVersion_pdf_Feb06.pdf)
- Jacob, S., P. Weeks, B. Blount, and M. Jepson. 2012. Development and Evaluation of Social Indicators of Vulnerability and Resiliency for Fishing Communities in the Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Policy* 26(10): 16-22.

Jepson, M. and L.L. Colburn. 2013. Development of Social Indicators of Fishing Community Vulnerability and Resilience in the U.S. Southeast and Northeast Regions. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-129, 64 p.

Keinath, J. A., and J. A. Musick. 1993. Movements and diving behavior of leatherback turtle. *Copeia* 1993(4):1010-1017.

Lanyon, J.M., C.J. Limpus, and H., Marsh. 1989. Dugongs and turtles: grazers in the seagrass system. *In*: Larkum, A.W.D, A.J., McComb and S.A., Shepard (eds.) *Biology of Seagrasses*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 610.

Limpus, C.J., and N., Nichols. 1988. The southern oscillation regulates the annual numbers of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) breeding around northern Australia. *Australian Journal of Wildlife Research* 15:157.

Limpus, C.J., and N., Nichols. 1994. Progress report on the study of the interaction of El Niño Southern Oscillation on annual *Chelonia mydas* numbers at the southern Great Barrier Reef rookeries. *In*: *Proceedings of the Australian Marine Turtle Conservation Workshop*, Queensland Australia.

Lutz, P. L., and J. A. Musick, editors. 1997. *The biology of sea turtles*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Lutz, P. L., J. A. Musick, and J. Wyneken. 2003. *The Biology of Sea Turtles*. Volume II. CRC Press, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Márquez M, R. 1994. Synopsis of biological data on the Kemp's ridley turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii* (Garman 1880). U. S. Dept. of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, Florida.

McCay, Bonnie J., and James M. Acheson. 1987. Human Ecology of the Commons In *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources*. B.J. McCay and J.M. Acheson, eds. Pp. 1-34. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

McEachran, J.D. and J.D. Fechhelm. 2005. *Fishes of the Gulf of Mexico*, Vol. 2. University of Texas Press. Austin, Texas.

Meylan, A. 1984. Feeding ecology of the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) spongivory as a feeding niche in the coral reef community. University of Florida.

Meylan, A. 1988. Spongivory in hawksbill turtles: a diet of glass. *Science* 239:393-395.

- Meylan, A. B., and M. Donnelly. 1999. Status justification for listing the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) as critically endangered on the 1996 IUCN Red List of Threatened Animals. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* 3(2):200-204.
- Mortimer, J. A. 1981. The feeding ecology of the west Caribbean green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) in Nicaragua. *Biotropica* 13(1):49-58.
- Mortimer, J. A. 1982. Feeding ecology of sea turtles. Pages 103-109 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- NMFS. 2005. Endangered Species Act – Section 7 consultation on the continued authorization of reef fish fishing under the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery management plan and proposed amendment 23. February 15, 2005. National Marine Fisheries Service. St. Petersburg, Florida.
- NMFS. 2011a. Biological opinion on the continued authorization of Reef Fish fishing under the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan. September 30, 2011. Available at: <http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/esa/Fishery%20Biops/03584%20GOM%20Reef%20Fish%20BiOp%202011%20final.pdf>
- NMFS. 2011b. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2009. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. National Marine Fisheries Service-F/SPO-118. Available at: [http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/fisheries\\_economics\\_2009.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/fisheries_economics_2009.html)
- NMFS. 2014. Gulf of Mexico 2013 Red Snapper Individual Fishing Quota Annual Report [http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable\\_fisheries/lapp\\_dm/index.html](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable_fisheries/lapp_dm/index.html)
- Norman, J. R., and F. C. Fraser. 1938. *Giant Fishes, Whales and Dolphins*. W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., New York, NY. 361 pp.
- Ogren, L. H. 1989. Distribution of juvenile and subadult Kemp's ridley sea turtles: preliminary results from 1984-1987 surveys. Pages 116-123 in C. W. Caillouet Jr., and J. A.M. Landry, editors. *Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Biology, Conservation, and Management*. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College, Galveston, Texas.
- Paredes, R.P. 1969. Introducción al Estudio Biológico de *Chelonia mydas agassizi* en el Perfil de Pisco, Master's thesis, Universidad Nacional Federico Villareal, Lima, Peru.
- PFMC. 1986. Seventh Amendment to the Fishery Management Plan for Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California Commencing in 1978. Pacific Fishery Management Council. Portland, Oregon.
- PFMC. 1988. Ninth Amendment to the Fishery Management Plan for Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California Commencing in 1978. Pacific Fishery Management Council. Portland, Oregon.

Plummer, M.L., W. Morrison, and E. Steiner. 2012. Allocation of fishery harvests under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act: Principles and practice. U.S. Dept. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-115, 84 p.

SEDAR 3. 2003. Complete stock assessment report of yellowtail snapper in the southeastern United States – SEDAR 3, Assessment report 1. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 6. 2004a. SEDAR report 1 the goliath grouper in southern Florida: Assessment review and advisory report. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 6. 2004b. SEDAR report 2 the hogfish in Florida: Assessment review and advisory report. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 7. 2005. Stock assessment report of SEDAR 7 Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 7 Update. 2009. Update stock assessment report of SEDAR 7 Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9. 2006a. Stock assessment report 1 of SEDAR 9: Gulf of Mexico gray triggerfish. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9. 2006b. Stock assessment report 2 of SEDAR 9: Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9. 2006c. Stock assessment report 3 of SEDAR 9: Gulf of Mexico vermilion snapper assessment report 3. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9 Update. 2010. SEDAR 9 stock assessment update report, Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.



SEDAR 9 Update. 2011a. SEDAR update stock assessment of vermilion snapper in the Gulf of Mexico. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9 Update. 2011b. SEDAR update stock assessment of gray triggerfish in the Gulf of Mexico. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9 Update. 2011c. SEDAR update stock assessment of gray triggerfish in the Gulf of Mexico. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 10. 2006. Gulf of Mexico Gag Grouper Stock Assessment Report 2. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 10 Update. 2009. Stock assessment of gag in the Gulf of Mexico. – SEDAR update assessment. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 12. 2007. SEDAR12-Complete Stock Assessment Report 1: Gulf of Mexico Red Grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 12 Update. 2009. Stock assessment of red grouper in the Gulf of Mexico – SEDAR update assessment. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 15A. 2008. Stock assessment report 3 (SAR 3) South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico mutton snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 15A. 2014. FWC Report IHR2014-05, February 23, 2015. Stock assessment of Mutton Snapper (*Lutjanus analis*) of the U.S. South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico through 2013.

[http://sedarweb.org/docs/suar/SEDAR%20Update%20Stock%20Assessment%20of%20Mutton%20Snapper%202015\\_FINAL.pdf](http://sedarweb.org/docs/suar/SEDAR%20Update%20Stock%20Assessment%20of%20Mutton%20Snapper%202015_FINAL.pdf)

SEDAR 19. 2010. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic black grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina.

<http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 22. 2011a. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico tilefish. Southeast Data,

Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.



SEDAR 22. 2011b. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico yellowedge grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 23. 2011. Stock assessment report South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico goliath grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 31. 2013. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 33. 2014a. Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack stock assessment report. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 33. 2014b. Gulf of Mexico gag stock assessment report. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

Shaver, D. J. 1991. Feeding Ecology of Wild and Head-Started Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtles in South Texas Waters. *Journal of Herpetology* 25(3):327-334.

Simpfendorfer, CA. 2001. Essential habitat of the smalltooth sawfish, *Pristis pectinata*. Report to the National Fisheries Service's Protected Resources Division. Mote Marine Laboratory, Technical Report (786) 21pp.

Simpfendorfer, C.A., and T.R., Wiley. 2004. Determination of the distribution of Florida's remnant sawfish population, and identification of areas critical to their conservation. Mote Marine Laboratory, Technical Report July 2, 2004, 37 pp.

Soma, M. 1985. Radio biotelemetry system applied to migratory study of turtle. *Journal of the Faculty of Marine Science and Technology, Tokai University, Japan*, 21:47.

Standora, E. A., J. R. Spotila, J. A. Keinath, and C. R. Shoop. 1984. Body temperatures, diving cycles, and movement of a subadult leatherback turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*. *Herpetologica* 40:169-176.

Szedlmayer, S. T. and R. L. Shipp. 1994. Movement and growth of red snapper, *Lutjanus campechanus*, from an artificial reef area in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 55: 887-896.

Szedlmayer, S. T. and J. C. Howe. 1997. Substrate preference in age-0 red snapper, *Lutjanus campechanus*. *Environmental biology of fishes* 50: 203-207.

Szedlmayer, S. T. and J. Conti. 1998. Nursery habitat, growth rates, and seasonality of age-0 red snapper, *Lutjanus campechanus*, in the northeast Gulf of Mexico. *Fishery Bulletin*. 97:626-635.

Thayer, G.W., K.A., Bjorndal, J.C., Ogden, S.L., Williams, and J.C., Zieman. 1984. Role of large herbivores in seagrass communities. *Estuaries* 7:351.

Topping, D.T. and S.T. Szedlmayer. 2011. Home range and movement patterns of red snapper (*Lutjanus campechanus*) on artificial reefs. *Fisheries Research*. 112: 77-84.

van Dam, R. P., and C. E. Diez. 1998. Home range of immature hawksbill turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata* (Linnaeus) at two Caribbean islands. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 220(1):15-24.

Walker, T. 1994. Post-hatchling dispersal of sea turtles. *Proceedings of the Australian Marine Turtle Conservation Workshop* 1994:79-94.

Wilson, C.A. and D.L. Nieland. 2001. Age and growth of red snapper, *Lutjanus campechanus*, from the northern Gulf of Mexico off Louisiana. *Fishery Bulletin* 99:653-664.

<http://fishbull.noaa.gov/994/wil.pdf>

Woods, M. K. 2003. Demographic differences in reproductive biology of female red snapper (*Lutjanus campechanus*) in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Master's thesis. University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL

## **APPENDIX A. OTHER APPLICABLE LAW**

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) provides the authority for management of stocks included in fishery management plans in federal waters of the exclusive economic zone. However, 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 (5 U.S.C. Subchapter II), which establishes a “notice and comment” procedure to enable public participation in the rulemaking process. Under the Act, the National Marine Fisheries Service (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 Act also establishes a 30-day waiting period from the time a final rule is published until it takes effect. NMFS can waive this waiting period under certain circumstances.

### **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 (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 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. 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 an action for managed stocks 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. NMFS, as part of the Secretarial review process, will make a determination regarding the potential impacts of the proposed actions.

### **Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act**

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934 (16 U.S.C. 661-667e) provides the basic authority for the Fish and Wildlife Service's involvement in evaluating impacts to fish and wildlife from proposed water resource development projects. It also requires Federal agencies that construct, license or permit water resource development projects to first consult with the Service (and the National Marine Fisheries Service in some instances) and State fish and wildlife agency regarding the impacts on fish and wildlife resources and measures to mitigate these impacts.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect wildlife resources pertaining to water resource development as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **National Historic Preservation Act**

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, (Public Law 89-665; 16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*) is intended to preserve historical and archaeological sites in the United States of America. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to evaluate the impact of all federally funded or permitted projects for sites on listed on, or eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places and aims to minimize damage to such places.

Typically, fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect historic places with exception of the *U.S.S. Hatteras*, located in federal waters off Texas, which is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed actions are not likely to increase fishing activity above previous years. Thus, no additional impacts to the *U.S.S. Hatteras* would be expected.

### **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 fishing activities, and studies of pinniped-fishing activity interactions.

Under section 118 of the MMPA, NMFS must publish, at least annually, a List of Fisheries that places all U.S. commercial fishing activities into one of three categories based on the level of incidental serious injury and mortality of marine mammals that occurs in each fishing activity. The categorization of a fishing activity in the List of Fisheries determines whether participants in that fishing activity may be required to comply with certain provisions of the MMPA, such as registration, observer coverage, and take reduction plan requirements.

### **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703) protects migratory birds. The responsibilities of Federal agencies to protect migratory birds are set forth in Executive Order 13186. US Fish and Wildlife Service is the lead agency for migratory birds. The birds protected under this statute are many of our most common species, as well as birds listed as threatened or endangered. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NMFS and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), as required by Executive Order 13186 (66 FR 3853, January 17, 2001), is to promote the conservation of migratory bird populations. This MOU focuses on avoiding, or where impacts cannot be avoided, minimizing to the extent practicable, adverse impacts on migratory birds and strengthening migratory bird conservation through enhanced collaboration between NMFS and FWS by identifying general responsibilities of both agencies and specific areas of cooperation. Given NMFS' focus on marine resources and ecosystems, this MOU places an emphasis on seabirds, but does not exclude other taxonomic groups of migratory birds.

Typically, fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect migratory birds. The proposed actions are not likely to change the way in which the fishery is prosecuted. Thus, no additional impacts are reasonably expected.

### **Paperwork Reduction Act**

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (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 Act requires NMFS to obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget before requesting most types of fishing activity information from the public. None of the alternatives in this amendment are expected to create additional paperwork burdens.

### **Prime Farmlands Protection and Policy Act**

The Farmland Protection and Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201) was enacted to minimize the loss of prime farmland and unique farmlands as a result of Federal actions by converting these lands to nonagricultural uses. It assures that federal programs are compatible with state and local governments, and private programs and policies to protect farmland.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect farmlands as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **National Wild and Scenic Rivers System**

The National Wild and Scenic Rivers System of 1968 (Public Law 90-542; 16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) preserves certain rivers with outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of present and future generations. The Act safeguards the special character of these rivers, while also recognizing the potential for their appropriate use and

development. It encourages river management that crosses political boundaries and promotes public participation in developing goals for river protection.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect wetland habitats as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **North American Wetlands Conservation Act**

The North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-233) established a wetlands habitat program, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to protect and manage wetland habitats for migratory birds and other wetland wildlife in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect wetland habitats as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **Executive Orders (E.O.)**

#### **E.O. 12630: Takings**

The E.O. 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**

E.O. 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 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: 1) 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; 2) creates a serious inconsistency or otherwise interferes with an action taken or planned by another agency; 3) materially alters the budgetary



impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or 4) 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 E.O. 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.

#### **E.O. 12962: Recreational Fisheries**

This E.O. 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 (NRFCC) 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 NRFCC 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 E.O. 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 Essential Fish Habitat (GMFMC 2005), which established additional habitat



areas of particular concern (HAPCs) and gear restrictions to protect corals throughout the Gulf of Mexico. There are no implications to coral reefs by the actions proposed in this amendment.

### **E.O. 13132: Federalism**

The E.O. 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).

In Amendment 30B, no Federalism issues were identified relative to the action to establish the 30B permit provision. Therefore, consultation with state officials under Executive Order 12612 was not necessary. In Council discussions regarding this framework action, the question of whether the 30B permit provision conflicts with state regulations has been discussed (see Section 1.1), but no determination was made that this constitutes a Federalism issue. Consequently, consultation with state officials under Executive Order 12612 remains unnecessary.

### **E.O. 13158: Marine Protected Areas**

This E.O. 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 marine protected areas, HAPCs, and gear-restricted areas in the eastern and northwestern Gulf. The existing areas 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 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act included a new habitat conservation provision that requires each existing and any new FMPs to describe and identify essential fish habitat (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 environmental impact statement (GMFMC 2004b) to address the new EFH requirements contained within the Act. Section 305(b)(2) requires federal agencies to obtain a consultation for any action that may adversely affect EFH.

These actions are not expected to change the way in which the fisheries are conducted in regard to the impact of the fisheries on the environment. The actions, considered in the context of the fisheries as a whole, will not have an adverse impact on EFH; therefore, an EFH consultation is not required.