



Tab B, No. 11g

Draft Amendments:

State Management Program



Overview

- Current preferred alternatives
- How state management would work

Issues

- Not all states participating
- Inclusion of for-hire vessels
- Options requiring on the water enforcement

Potential Alternatives


- Lines marking areas adjacent to each state in the EEZ
- Endorsement to for-hire permits



Current Preferred Alternatives

Program Amendment

Action 1: Components	Alt 4 (Aug 2017)	Each state decides to manage private only or both components.	
Action 2: Allocation	Alt 6 (June 2018)	EFP allocations	



Inconsistent with each other

Individual States

	LA	MS	AL	FL	TX
Action 1: Delegation or CEPs	Alt 2, Options 2a-2d (Apr 2018)	Alt 2, Options 2a-2d (Apr 2018)	Alt 2, Options 2a-2d (Apr 2018)	None	Alt 2, Options 2a-2e + 2g (June 2018)
Action 2: Quota Adjustment	Alt 2, Option 2a (Aug 2017)	Alt 2, Option 2a (Jan 2018)	None	None	None

Current Preferred Alternatives

Action 1 – Components of the Recreational Sector to include in State Management Programs

Preferred Alternative 4: For a state with an approved state management program, the state will choose whether to manage its private angling component only, or to manage both its private angling and federal for-hire components.

Action 2 – Apportioning the Recreational ACL (Quota)

Preferred Alternative 6: Establish an allocation of the recreational sector ACL that may be used for state management programs by apportioning the private angling ACL among the states based on the allocations set in the exempted fishing permits approved for the states to manage the recreational harvest of red snapper in 2018 and 2019.



Scenario 1


- All 5 states have state management amendments approved and programs in place.
- States establish fishing seasons when red snapper may be landed from state and federal waters.
- Enforcement carried out dockside.
- EEZ essentially stays open.



Other scenarios

- Not all states participating.
- Inclusion of for-hire vessels.
- Delegation of options requiring on-the-water enforcement.

May require partitioning the EEZ.




Federal for-hire vessels

- Establishing allocation by state
- Permits are transferable
- Gulf-wide permit, but all states may not participate

Alternatives:

- Partition the EEZ
- Endorsement to for-hire permits to determine state for landings



Endorsement to For-hire Permits

Alternative: Establish a red snapper endorsement for vessels with a charter/headboat permit for Gulf reef fish. To land red snapper in a state managing the federal for-hire component in the Gulf, a federally permitted vessel must have an endorsement for that state, and must follow the regulations specific to the state program for which the endorsement is issued. A Gulf-wide endorsement will be required for vessels with a charter/headboat permit for Gulf reef fish to land red snapper in a state not managing the for-hire component under an approved state management program.



Endorsement to For-hire Permits

If the permit is transferred and the new permit holder will be fishing in a different jurisdiction:

Option a: an endorsement for a different state management program or the Gulf-wide season will not be issued to the transferred permit until the following fishing year.

Option b: a new endorsement may be issued upon request for a different state management program.



Options for Delegation

State management, as it has been previously considered by the Council, included measures that would rely primarily on dockside enforcement, such as bag limits (**Options 2a** and **2b**) and size limits (**Options 2c** and **2d**). When in federal waters, enforcement would be of the most generous state regulation (e.g., highest bag limit) of a state with an open season.

Option 2a: bag limit

Option 2b: for-hire vessel captain/crew may not retain a bag limit

Option 2c: minimum size limit within range of 14 to 18 inches TL

Option 2d: maximum size limit

Option 2e: requirements for live release devices (e.g., descending devices)

Option 2f: requirements for harvest gear

Option 2g: use of area or depth-specific regulations.



Options for Delegation

State regulations could be written for dockside enforcement (“must carry aboard”), and not require delegation

Option 2e: requirements for live release devices (e.g., descending devices)

Option 2f: requirements for harvest gear

*Without further information about the scope and purpose of the area or depth-specific regulations, **Option 2g** cannot be included in a state’s delegation.*

Option 2g: use of area or depth-specific regulations.

