Modifications to Charter Vessel and Headboat Reporting Requirements

Amendment 39 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region
Amendment 9 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic
Amendment 27 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region

(including Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Impact Review, and Regulatory Flexibility Analysis)

September 2016
DRAFT Version: 8/19/2016
This page intentionally left blank.
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COVER SHEET

Name of Action

Modifications to Charter Vessel and Headboat Report Requirements

Responsible Agencies and Contact Persons

South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council  843-571-4366
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201  843-769-4520 (fax)
North Charleston, South Carolina 2940
http://www.safmc.net
John Carmichael (john.carmichael@safmc.net)

National Marine Fisheries Service  727-824-5305
Southeast Regional Office  727-824-5308 (fax)
263 13th Avenue South
http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
Karla Gore (karla.gore@noaa.gov)
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUMMARY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>What actions are proposed?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who is proposing the actions?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why are the Council and NMFS considering action?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is a charter vessel?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is a headboat vessel?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is the for-hire fishery monitored now?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the history of management?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What other data reporting projects and activities are underway?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 2. MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter Vessels</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Headboats</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify Electronic Reporting Requirements to Require Vessel or Catch Location Reporting</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>Description of the Physical Environment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snapper Grouper</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolphin and Wahoo</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Migratory Pelagics</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of the Biological, Physical and Ecological Environment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snapper Grouper</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Migratory Pelagics</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolphin and Wahoo</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected Species</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bycatch</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description of the Economic Environment</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Sector</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Recreational Sector ...................................................................................................... 24
3.4 Description of the Social Environment .............................................................................. 28
3.5 Environmental Justice Considerations ................................................................................ 31
3.6 Description of the Administrative Environment ............................................................... 32
3.5.1 Federal Fishery Management ....................................................................................... 32
3.5.2 State Fishery Management ........................................................................................... 38
3.5.3 Enforcement ................................................................................................................ 39

CHAPTER 4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES ....................................................... 40

4.1. Action 1: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter Vessels .... 40
4.1.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical/Biological/Ecological Environment ...... 40
4.1.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment ......................................... 41
4.1.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment ............................................... 44
4.1.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment ................................. 45

4.2. Action 2: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Headboats ......... 47
4.2.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical/Biological/Ecological Environment ...... 47
4.2.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment ......................................... 48
4.2.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment ............................................... 48
4.2.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment ................................. 49

4.3 Action 3: Modify Electronic Reporting Requirements to Require Vessel or Catch Location Reporting ................................................................................................... 50
4.3.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical/Biological/Ecological Environment ...... 50
4.3.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment ......................................... 50
4.3.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment ............................................... 51
4.3.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment ................................. 51

CHAPTER 5. COUNCIL CONCLUSIONS ............................................................................. 52

5.1 Action 1: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter Vessels ..... 54
5.2 Action 2: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Headboats .......... 57
5.3 Action 3: Modify Electronic Reporting Requirements to Require Vessel or Catch Location Reporting ................................................................................................... 58

5.4 Recommendations of Council Advisors ............................................................................ 59
5.4 Recommended Reporting Program Details ....................................................................... 59

CHAPTER 6. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ............................................................................... 62

6.1 Cumulative Biological Impacts ........................................................................................... 62

CHAPTER 7: LIST OF PREPARERS ..................................................................................... 68

CHAPTER 8. REFERENCES ................................................................................................... 69
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.3.1. Total number of federally-permitted charter vessels in the South Atlantic...... 3
Table 1.4.1. Total number of headboats in the South Atlantic participating in the SRHS 2010-2015. .................................................................................................................................................. 4
Table 3.3.1. Number of South Atlantic charter vessel angler trips, by state, 2011-2014...... 24
Table 3.3.2. South Atlantic headboat angler days, by state, 2011–2014. ................................. 25
Table 3.3.3. 2014 business activity (thousands of 2014 dollars) associated with charter vessel trips in the South Atlantic. Output and value added impacts are not additive......... 27
Table 3.4.1. Distribution of South Atlantic charter permits, as of November 20, 2015. ...... 29
Table 3.4.2. Number of valid and renewable permits held by charter vessels in the South Atlantic, by coastal county as of November 20, 2015................................................................. 30
Table 3.5.1. Summary of the existing monitoring tools currently implemented in recreational fisheries of the Southeast Region. ............................................................... 34
Table 3.5.2. Greater Atlantic Region Fisheries Office (GARFO) vessel trip report (VTR) requirements by vessel permit type............................................................... 36
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1.1. Jurisdictional boundaries of the Gulf of Mexico (blue), South Atlantic (orange), Mid-Atlantic (green), and New England (peach) Fishery Management Councils. 2
Figure 3.1.1. Composite map of HAPC and EFH in the South Atlantic Region.................... 17
Figure 3.2.1. Components of the biological environment described in this amendment...... 20
**ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Annual Catch Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCSP</td>
<td>Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Accountability Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMFC</td>
<td>Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Cumulative Effects Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>South Atlantic Fishery Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Coastal Migratory Pelagics of the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>Exclusive Economic Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFH</td>
<td>Essential Fish Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEP</td>
<td>Fishery Ecosystem Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMP</td>
<td>Fishery Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>Greater Atlantic Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARFO</td>
<td>Greater Atlantic Fisheries Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMFMC</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GulfFIN</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico Fishery Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPC</td>
<td>Habitat Area of Particular Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMS</td>
<td>Highly Migratory Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Large Pelagic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMPA</td>
<td>Marine Mammal Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRIP</td>
<td>Marine Recreational Information Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMFS</td>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>Net Operating Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>National Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLE</td>
<td>Office of Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OY</td>
<td>Optimum Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Producer Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Regional Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA</td>
<td>Regulatory Flexibility Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFAA</td>
<td>Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIR</td>
<td>Regulatory Impact Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFMC</td>
<td>South Atlantic Fishery Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Secretary of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFSC</td>
<td>Southeast Fisheries Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERO</td>
<td>Southeast Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMZ</td>
<td>Special Management Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>Science and Research Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRHS</td>
<td>Southeast Region Headboat Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Scientific and Statistical Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG</td>
<td>United States Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTR</td>
<td>Vessel Trip Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY

What is proposed?
The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) is considering mandatory electronic reporting for charter vessels. The Council is also considering modifying the timing of headboat reporting by reducing the grace period allowed for submitting reports.

Who would this affect?
The Council proposes to implement the same reporting requirements for federally permitted charter vessels that currently exist for headboats. Federally permitted charter vessels and headboats in the snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics (mackerel and cobia) fisheries along the Atlantic Coast will be affected. A federal permit is required for all for-hire vessels (charter and headboats) operating more than 3 miles offshore (federal waters).

Why is this needed?
Mandatory reporting for charter vessels will improve the data available for management and stock assessment. Electronic reporting for the charterboat sector is expected to improve the accuracy and timeliness of data collection and allow fishery managers to better monitor landings and discards, and more accurately assess the impacts of regulations on the for-hire industry fishing in federal waters. Requiring reporting by vessels will prevent data gaps and missed information.

Reducing the grace period in headboat reporting would have a positive effect to fish stocks by providing data to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center more quickly, which can reduce the likelihood of exceeding the annual catch limits, thus reducing the likelihood of overfishing. It will also reduce the recall period for those who wait until the deadline to report, which can improve data accuracy.

How many charter vessels will be impacted and will there be a cost for doing this?
There are currently 1,984 charter vessels in the South Atlantic with Federal For-Hire Permits. There are 75 headboats in the Southeast Region Headboat Survey, including 59 with some type of federal for-hire permit.

Cost: If you have a computer or access to a computer (for example in a library), it will only cost you the time to input the trip information. The South Atlantic Council is working on a pilot project, in cooperation with charter and headboat vessel operators, to develop user-friendly software to make it easy and quick to enter the proposed trip reports, and to enable data entry from a mobile device.
Actions in the For-Hire Reporting Amendment

Action 1. Operators of charter vessels would report electronically:

- **Alternative 1.** No Action. If selected, a charter vessel operator must maintain a fishing record for each trip or portion of such trip. Reports must be on approved paper logbook forms and postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday).

- **Preferred Alternative 2.** All operators of charter vessels would file electronic reports for each trip. Reports would be due weekly, or at intervals shorter than a week if notified. Electronic reports would be due by Tuesday following each week that ends on Sunday.

- **Alternative 3.** Daily. Electronic reports would be filed daily by all charter vessel operators, and due by noon of the following day.

Action 2. Operators of headboats would report on a new deadline:

- **Alternative 1.** No Action. If selected, a headboat operator must submit an electronic fishing record for each trip of all fish harvested through the Southeast Region Headboat Survey. Electronic fishing records (reports) must be submitted weekly (or at intervals shorter than a week if notified) by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week.

- **Preferred Alternative 2.** Reports would be due weekly, or at intervals shorter than a week if notified. Electronic reports would be due by Tuesday following each week that ends on Sunday, instead of reports being due on the following Sunday. This is a change from 7 days to prepare and submit reports to 2 days.

- **Alternative 3.** Daily. Electronic reports would be due by noon of the following day.

Action 3. Operators of charter vessels would report catch locations the same way headboats currently report location:

- **Alternative 1.** No action. Charter vessels in the for-hire survey report area fished (inshore, state, or federal waters) if selected.

- **Preferred Alternative 2.** Operators of charter vessels would report location electronically by entering latitude/longitude in degrees and minutes in the required fields or by clicking on an electronic headboat chart. This is how headboats report now.
Timing for the For-Hire Reporting Amendment

- **December 7-11, 2015** (Atlantic Beach, North Carolina) – South Atlantic Council reviews document, picks preferred alternatives, and approves for public hearings.
- **January 19, 2016** – Informal Question and Answer Webinar
- **January 25-February 3, 2016** – Public hearings from North Carolina to Florida
- **February 8, 2016** – Webinar Public Hearing for Mid-Atlantic and New England fishermen
- **February 10, 2016** – Written comments due by 5 pm
- **March 7-11, 2016** (Jekyll Island, Georgia) – South Atlantic Council reviews public comments, modified preferred alternatives as required, and approves all actions. Public comment on Wednesday, March 9th beginning at 5:30 pm
- **June 13-17, 2016** (Cocoa Beach, Florida) – South Atlantic Council reviews core data elements. Public comment on Wednesday, June 15th beginning at 5:30 pm
- **September 12-16, 2016** (Myrtle Beach, SC) – South Atlantic Council reviews document. Public comment on Wednesday, September 14th beginning at 5:30 pm.
- **December 5-9, 2016** (Atlantic Beach, NC) – South Atlantic Council reviews document and considers for final approval. Public comment on Wednesday, December 7th beginning at 5:30 pm.
- **January 15, 2017** - Send for review and implementation by Secretary of Commerce/National Marine Fisheries Service.
- **TBD, Mid-2017** – target date for regulations to be effective; operators of charter vessels begin electronic reporting and new deadline effective for headboats
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 What actions are proposed?

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) is proposing actions in this amendment that would change the method, frequency, and required data elements of fishery data reporting by for-hire operators. This amendment proposes: (Action 1) mandatory electronic reporting for charter vessels operators with for-hire permits in the snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagic fisheries. Weekly and daily reporting alternatives are considered; (Action 2), reducing the time allowed for headboat operators to complete their electronic reports by 5 days, from the Sunday to the Tuesday of each week following the weekly reporting periods which end on Sunday; and (Action 3, requiring location reporting by charter vessels with the same detail now required for headboat vessels.

1.2 Who is proposing the actions?

This amendment began as a joint effort with the Gulf of Mexico Council and is now being developed by the South Atlantic Council and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The Council develops the amendment and submits it to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) who, on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce, ultimately approves, disapproves, or partially approves, and implements the actions in the amendment through the development of regulations. The Council and NMFS are responsible for making this document available for public comment. The draft environmental assessment (EA) was made available to the public during the scoping process, public hearings, and in Council meeting briefing books. The final EA/amendment will be published for public comment during the notice of availability and proposed rule stages of the rulemaking process.

1.3 Why are the Council and NMFS considering action?

The intent of this amendment is to improve the timeliness and accuracy of catch data. Accurate fisheries information about catch, effort, and discards is important to fulfill the management obligations of the Council and NMFS. Reliable and complete fishery data is critical to stock assessment and management evaluations. While the for-hire component of the recreational sector
harvests a substantial proportion of the Annual Catch Limit (ACL) for several Council managed fish species, such as cobia, dolphin, and wahoo, current data collection programs for charter vessels do not provide catch information on a timely enough basis for the Council to respond to developments in the fishery. In addition, the survey-based method used to estimate catch by charter vessels does not always provide reasonably accurate and reliable information for many Council managed species with low catches and catch limits. These methods are particularly imprecise for those snapper grouper species which are only rarely encountered by fishery participants.

### Purpose for Actions

The *purpose* is to increase the accuracy and timeliness of landings, discards, effort and socio-economic data of federally permitted for-hire vessels participating in the South Atlantic managed fisheries.

### Need for Actions

The *need* is to improve charter vessel and headboat fishery data used for management and to improve monitoring and compliance of federally permitted for-hire vessels in the South Atlantic managed fisheries.

### 1.4 Who will be affected by these actions?

The For-Hire Reporting Amendment affects headboat and charter vessel operators with for-hire permits for species managed in the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic (Snapper Grouper FMP), FMP for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo FMP), and the FMP for the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region (CMP FMP) (*Figure 1.1.1*). There is one combined permit for both charter vessels or headboats.

South Atlantic snapper grouper are managed from North Carolina through the Florida Keys to the boundary between the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils. Atlantic dolphin and wahoo are managed by the Council along the entire east coast, from Maine to Florida. South Atlantic CMP species are managed from New York through the...
Florida Keys to the Council boundary. The actions proposed in this amendment extend the reporting requirements of the For-Hire Reporting Amendment through the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils’ areas for vessels with federal for-hire permits for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP species.

1.5 What is a charter vessel?

Charter vessels carry recreational anglers but fees are paid for chartering the vessel rather than paying individual angler fees. A charter vessel is less than 100 gross tons (90.8 metric tons) that meets the requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard to carry six or fewer passengers on a for-hire trip and that engages in charter fishing at any time during the calendar year (50 C.F.R. § 622.2). The number of charter vessels with for-hire permits for the snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo or CMP fisheries in the South Atlantic is shown in Table 1.3.1. Note that this table does not include charter vessels which may operate in the South Atlantic but do not possess any for-hire permits for fisheries managed by the Council. Such vessels will not be impacted by this amendment.

Table 1.3.1. Total number of federally-permitted charter vessels in the South Atlantic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Other States</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>2,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NMFS, Southeast Regional Office, Permits Office.

1.6 What is a headboat vessel?

Headboats carry recreational anglers where passage is charged on a per angler, or per head basis. Headboats are generally defined as vessels that hold a valid Certificate of Inspection issued by the U.S. Coast Guard to carry more than six passengers for hire. However, the SRHS includes only large capacity vessels that sell passage to recreational anglers primarily as headboats (i.e., charges by the “head”). Currently, a vessel is selected by the SRD to participate in the SRHS if it meets all, or a combination, of these criteria:

1) Vessel licensed to carry ≥ 15 passengers (Gulf); > 6 (South Atlantic).
2) Vessel fishes in the EEZ or state and adjoining waters for federally managed species.
3) Vessel charges primarily per angler (i.e., by the “head”).

The number of headboats surveyed in the South Atlantic by the SRHS by state from 2010 through 2015 is provided in Table 1.4.1 (South Atlantic).
Table 1.4.1. Total number of headboats in the South Atlantic participating in the SRHS 2010-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NMFS, Southeast Regional Headboat Survey

1.7 How is the for-hire fishery monitored now?

Charter vessel landings and discards for the South Atlantic are monitored through the for-hire survey of the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP). Fishing effort is calculated based on a monthly phone sample (10%) of federally-permitted charter vessels. Catch rate observations and catch sampling is provided through dockside monitoring. Information is reported in 2 month waves, with preliminary reports available 45 days after the end of each wave.

Catch and effort information for headboats is provided by the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey (SRHS) administered by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). In accordance with prior Council actions, headboats report each trip through an electronic application, and are required to report by the Sunday following the end of each week ending on Sunday. Although headboat operators report on a weekly basis, information on catches is made available on the same schedule as the MRIP derived charter boat estimates.

Currently, headboat catches are reported 45 days after each 2-month wave, providing consistency with the reporting by MRIP. Part of the reason for the time reporting lag is that the South Atlantic Council has specified the recreational ACL in pounds, requiring the reported numbers of fish to be converted to pounds. Generating catch estimates in pounds requires the integration of mean weights collected by angler intercepts. This is accomplished for the headboat catches during the 45 day period after a 2-month wave. The MRIP catches are reported in numbers and weight. However, the SEFSC has developed a methodology for generating weight that they concluded is more accurate for the southeast. This adds an unspecified period of time after the MRIP data are released for the SEFSC to apply their conversion factors and provide a catch estimate in weight. This amendment would allow for the collection of data from headboat and charter vessels in a much more timely manner and would provide better management of the fisheries because of the more accurate and timely data.

1.8 What is the history of management?

For a person aboard a vessel that is operating as a charter vessel or headboat to fish for or possess, in or from the exclusive economic zone (EEZ), South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin or wahoo, or South Atlantic coastal migratory pelagic fish, a valid charter
vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin or wahoo, or Atlantic CMP species must have been issued to the vessel and must be onboard. Detailed information on the history of management is provided in Appendix D. The following is a summary of regulations addressing for-hire reporting requirements in the fisheries affected by this amendment, which include South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagic.

Amendment 4 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic (Snapper Grouper FMP) (SAFMC, 1991) established charterboat and headboat permits and required charterboats and headboats to report, if selected. Amendment 4 also required that recreational fishermen must make snapper grouper species, or parts thereof, available for inspection upon request. Amendment 7 (SAFMC 1994) established dealer permits for both charter and headboats. Amendment 15B required that for-hire vessels with a for-hire permit, and private recreational vessels if fishing for snapper grouper species in the EEZ, shall use observer coverage, logbooks, electronic logbooks, video monitoring, or any other method deemed necessary to measure by catch by NMFS, if selected. Electronic logbook reporting for headboat vessels was required under Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Amendment 6 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP/Amendment 22 to the Coastal Migratory Pelagic (CMP) FMP (SAFMC 2013a). This amendment required selected vessels with a Federal for-hire Permit to report landings data electronically; and implemented a provision that authorizes NMFS to require weekly or daily reporting as required.

The Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC, 2003) required owners of commercial vessels and/or charter vessels/headboats to have vessel permits and, if selected, submit reports and required dealers to have permits and, if selected, submit reports. In 2004, the Dolphin Wahoo FMP required that operators of commercial vessels, charter vessels and headboats that are required to have a federal vessel permit for dolphin and wahoo must display operator permits. Amendment 2 (SAFMC 1987) to the CMP FMP (implemented in 1987) required that charter vessels and headboats fishing in the EEZ of the Gulf of Mexico or Atlantic for CMP species have permits.

1.9 What other data reporting projects and activities are underway?

The South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Councils convened a Technical Subcommittee devoted to for-hire reporting in 2014 to develop best practices recommendations for improved for-hire data collections programs. The full report of that group is provided in Appendix E to this amendment. Additionally, discussion of each action indicates how the preferred alternatives address this group’s recommendations.

The Council is a partner in an Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) research project that is now underway to test tablets for recording fishery data for for-hire trips. Tablets will be provided to participating vessels from North Carolina through Florida for testing and evaluating electronic reporting. A subset of participants will use an electronic measuring board to measure the length of fish that are released. The Council considers the software developed in conjunction with ACCSP as a tool NMFS should consider for fishermen to submit trip reports proposed under this amendment. The Council is also working with NMFS and ACCSP on a
related project to develop a validation methodology for logbook data using the existing South Carolina for-hire logbook program.

Although federally permitted commercial dealers currently report weekly through an electronic system, commercial fishermen with a snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, or CMP federal permit must report via a paper logbook. Commercial fishermen have expressed interest in reporting electronically, and the South Atlantic Council is exploring ways to allow them to use software to report similar to what is being done in the northeast. Through a future amendment, the South Atlantic Council will also consider requiring electronic reporting for commercial fishermen.
CHAPTER 2. MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Action 1: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter Vessels

Alternative 1 (No Action). Under current regulations, the owner or operator of a charter vessel with a charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic coastal migratory pelagic (CMP) species, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin and wahoo has been issued, or whose vessel fishes for or lands such (CMP species, snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic or Atlantic exclusive economic zone (EEZ), and who is selected to report by the Science and Research Director (SRD) must maintain a fishing record for each trip, or a portion of such trips as specified by the SRD, on forms provided by the SRD. Completed fishing records must be submitted to the SRD weekly, postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday). Information to be reported is indicated on the form and its accompanying instructions.

For South Atlantic snapper grouper, charter vessels selected to report by the SRD must participate in the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) sponsored electronic logbook and/or video monitoring program as directed by the SRD. Completed fishing records may be required weekly or daily, as directed by the SRD.

Preferred Alternative 2. Require that federally permitted charter vessels, while operating as a charter vessel, submit fishing records to the SRD weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Weekly = Tuesday following each fishing week. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel preferred.

Preferred Sub-alternative 2a. Report all fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. (current headboat requirement)

Sub-alternative 2b. Report only South Atlantic federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. (snapper grouper, dolphin/wahoo, and CMP species)

Sub-Alternative 2c. Report all federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested.

Alternative 3. Require that federally permitted charter vessels, while operating as a charter vessel, submit fishing records to the SRD daily via electronic reporting via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Daily = by noon of the following day.

Sub-alternative 3a. Report all fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. (current headboat requirement)

Sub-alternative 3b. Report only South Atlantic federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. (snapper grouper, dolphin/wahoo, & CMP species)

Sub-Alternative 3c. Report all federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested.
Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements

Note: The catastrophic conditions provisions, delinquent reporting, and the requirement to participate in a video monitoring program, if selected, are not changed by any of the alternatives in this amendment.

Comparison of Alternatives

**Preferred Alternative 2** would require federally permitted charter vessels participating in the dolphin wahoo, snapper grouper, and CMP fisheries to submit fishing records weekly, or at intervals shorter than a week, via electronic reporting (using NMFS approved hardware or software). **Preferred Alternative 2** could improve fishery dependent data in several ways. Mandatory reporting by all charter vessels will remove the need to develop survey based estimates of catch and effort. Weekly reporting could make data available to the science and management process faster, potentially reducing the likelihood of exceeding Annual Catch Limits (ACLs). **Preferred Alternative 2** could also improve data accuracy as reports would be completed shortly after each trip, potentially reducing problems associated with recall errors. Reporting by Tuesday would standardize charter vessel logbook reporting with commercial logbook reporting (and headboats if Alternative 2 is chosen for Action 2). However, **Preferred Alternative 2** would reduce the timing flexibility for report preparation by charter vessel operators and this could be burdensome during peak season when the number of trips taken, the number of passengers carried, and catch are greatest.

**Preferred Sub-alternative 2a** of Alternative 2 requires operators of charter vessels with dolphin wahoo, snapper grouper, CMP for hire permits to reporting all effort and all catch regardless of where a trip takes place or what species may be targeted. This is the most inclusive of the Sub-alternatives considered, and will therefore best prevent any gaps in catch reporting. Limiting reporting to either South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) managed species, as in Sub-alternative 2b, or to federally managed fish as in Sub-alternative 2c, would allow some species to be caught but not reported. This could reduce future management effectiveness, as events such as range expansions by, or developing fisheries for, species not managed by the Council would be overlooked in the data system. This would hinder the Council’s ability to modify managed species in response to environmental, social, or economic changes that may occur in the future. In addition, omitting some species from mandatory reporting is counter to the Council’s intent to eliminate duplicate reporting. Under Sub-alternative 2b, additional monitoring programs would be required to collect information for federal and state species, and under Sub-alternative 2c additional monitoring programs would be required to collect information for state managed species. Given the multi-species nature of the South Atlantic charter fishery, these data omissions could result in a significant loss of information.

**Alternative 3** would require charter vessels participating in the subject fisheries to submit a report for each day. As with Preferred Alternative 2, this report would be submitted electronically and received by NMFS (due noon the following day). **Alternative 3** could further reduce the likelihood of exceeding ACLs with reduced recall error compared to Alternative 1 (No Action) and Preferred Alternative 2. However, **Alternative 3** would add additional burden and reduced flexibility compared to Alternatives 1 (No Action) and Preferred Alternative 2. The Sub-alternatives of **Alternative 3** are the same as those for **Alternative 2** and carry the same relative risks and benefits.
For both **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3**, it is the intent of the Council to maintain existing provisions for catastrophic conditions, delinquent reporting, and video monitoring. During catastrophic conditions, the use of paper forms for basic required reporting may be authorized by the Regional Administrator (RA) through publication of timely notice, and the RA also has the authority to waive or modify reporting time requirements. An electronic report not received within the time specified is delinquent. A delinquent report automatically results in a prohibition on harvesting or possessing the applicable species by the permit holder, regardless of any additional notification to the delinquent permit owner and operator by NMFS. This prohibition is applicable until all required and delinquent reports have been submitted and received by NMFS according to the reporting requirements. For South Atlantic snapper grouper, charter vessels selected to report by the SRD must participate in the NMFS-sponsored electronic logbook and/or video monitoring program as directed by the SRD. Completed fishing records may be required weekly or daily, as directed by the SRD.

Currently, charter vessels in fisheries for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP are only required to report if selected. None have been selected to date. The Council’s intent in considering this action is for the owner or operator of a charter vessel with a for-hire charter vessel permit for South Atlantic CMP species, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin and wahoo, and whose vessel fishes for or lands CMP species, snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic or Atlantic EEZ, to report all catch and fishing effort through an electronic system, regardless of where they operate. All fishing trips shall be reported and all operators shall report their fishing activities, rather than just a subset of selected vessels as currently required.

The Council’s intent is to eliminate duplicate reporting and allow fishermen to file a single report that will be available to all agencies and programs requiring fishing effort and catch information. Charter operators who are currently required to report, such as through the SC Department of Natural Resources (DNR) charter logbook, the Greater Atlantic Region (GAR) Vessel Trip Report (VTR) system, or programs implemented in the Southeast for the Gulf of Mexico, should not have to file an additional report for fishing activities requiring reporting under this amendment in order to comply with the provisions of this amendment. For this reason, the Council supports the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) model, which has a proven ability to assimilate electronic catch reports from both state and federal agencies across a wide variety of platforms providing mobile, at-sea, and shore based options.

Mandatory, electronic, weekly reporting by a census of the entire fishery addresses the mandatory participation, electronic data collection, reporting frequency and census reporting recommendations of the National Research Council (NRC) and the Gulf and South Atlantic Technical Subcommittee on for-hire reporting. Requiring that reports be filed even if no fishing activity took place addresses the recommendation pertaining to validation and accountability.

The Council is considering taking actions for limited entry in the for-hire sector. Compliance with the reporting requirements of this amendment may be considered by the Council when determining eligibility criteria. In its review of this amendment in April 2015, the Mackerel
Advisory Panel (AP) recommended the Council consider limited entry if electronic reporting were implemented in the for-hire sector.

The Council’s intent is that charter vessels with federal permits for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP meet the similar data elements currently collected for federal headboats and for charter vessels and headboats in South Carolina. The specified core data elements identified by the Council through this amendment are intended to meet these requirements. While there needs to be sufficient flexibility in the structure and design of the data collection program to ensure that the system can be built in a timely and efficient manner, the Council expects to be included, and given an opportunity to participate in the process for determining changes, if the agency decides changes in the core data elements are required. Furthermore, the Council’s expectation for involvement includes the opportunity for participation, review and comment by the Council’s designated advisory groups including its Scientific and Statistical Committee and appropriate FMP APs.

The Council identified core data elements to collect for each charter fishing trip. Core data elements listed below are intended to provide basic information on catch and effort required for each trip to manage the fishery and monitor the population. Core elements also include limited economic variables to improve the Councils ability to determine the economic impacts of regulations. More detailed information that may be required to improve social and economic evaluations or more precisely describe where species are encountered by the fishery may be obtained through dedicated sampling of a sub-set of charter trips, potentially on a voluntary basis, similar to what is now done to obtain commercial discard and economic information. The core data elements include many of the specific data recommendations identified by the technical subcommittee as necessary for validation and estimation.

**CORE DATA ELEMENTS. Variables to collect for each trip.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Hours fished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Time</td>
<td>Primary depth fished: may be reported as a range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Target species: may be reported in categories or groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Time</td>
<td>Location: 1 minute grid (consistent with headboat reporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Location</td>
<td>Number of each species kept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Location</td>
<td>Number of each species released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel ID (name, License #)</td>
<td>Charter fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain ID (name, License #)</td>
<td>Fuel used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fishermen</td>
<td>Fuel price per gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of crew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method (general categories, e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troll, bottom, spear, drift)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional data that could be collected on a sample or voluntary basis from both charter vessels and headboats includes:

- releases/discards measured and specific location (depth) of release recorded
- retained catch at specific location (depth) recorded
- economic data (similar to what is currently being collected from commercial fishermen)
- social data
2.2 Action 2: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Headboats

**Alternative 1 (No Action).** Under current regulations, the owner or operator of a headboat with a charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic CMP species, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin and wahoo, and whose vessel fishes for or lands such CMP species, snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic or Atlantic exclusive economic zone (EEZ), and who is selected to report by the SRD, must submit an electronic fishing record for each trip of all fish harvested via the SRHS. Electronic fishing records must be submitted at weekly intervals (or intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD) by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week. If no fishing activity occurred during a reporting week, an electronic report stating so must be submitted for that reporting week by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week.

**Preferred Alternative 2.** Require that headboats, while operating as a headboat, submit fishing records to the SRD weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Weekly = Tuesday following each fishing week. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel preferred.

**Alternative 3.** Require that headboats, while operating as a headboat, submit fishing records to the SRD daily via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Daily = by noon of the following day.

Note: The catastrophic conditions provisions, delinquent reporting, and the requirement to participate in a video monitoring program, if selected, are not changed by any of the alternatives in this amendment.

**Comparison of Alternatives**

The SRHS, which is administered by the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC), includes approximately 76 large capacity headboats operating in the South Atlantic from Florida through North Carolina (*Table 1.4.1*). Federally permitted vessels included in this survey are required to report catch and effort data weekly to NMFS (*Table 2.1.2*). The SRHS requires all federally permitted headboat vessels operating in South Atlantic waters to report, weekly, through the electronic logbook system. There are vessels located in the GAR (VA to ME) which possess South Atlantic for-hire permits that are not currently selected by the SRD to report under the SRHS electronic logbook, because these vessels hold permits that require them to report all fishing activity and catch through the GAR VTR System. Due to the requirements to collect biological samples of catches through dockside sampling, and the need for validation of fishing records and efforts, it is more practical and efficient for primary data collection to take place in the region where vessels are located.

**Alternative 1 (No Action)** requires headboats participating in South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, or Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic CMP fisheries, if selected by the SRD,
Preferred Alternative 2 would continue the requirement for headboats participating in the South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, or Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic CMP fisheries to report weekly, or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD, via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). The difference between Alternative 1 (No Action) and Preferred Alternative 2 is the time between the end of the fishing week (Sunday) and report submission. Alternative 1 (No Action) allows 7 days to prepare and submit reports while Preferred Alternative 2 would allow only 2 days. Preferred Alternative 2 could improve fishery data in several ways. Fishery data could be available in the science and management process faster, potentially reducing the likelihood of exceeding ACLs. Preferred Alternative 2 could also improve accuracy as reports would be completed soon after each trip reducing problems associated with recall errors, and reporting by Tuesday would standardize headboat logbook reporting with commercial logbook reporting (and charter vessels if Alternative 2 is chosen for Action 1). However, Preferred Alternative 2 would reduce the flexibility of the headboat operators for the timing of report preparation and this could be acute during peak season when the number of trips, the number of passengers, and catch are greatest.

Alternative 3 would require headboats participating in the South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, or Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic CMP fisheries to submit a report each day. This report would be submitted electronically and would need to be received by NMFS (by noon the following day). Alternative 3 could further reduce the likelihood of exceeding ACLs and reduce recall error compared to Alternative 1 or Preferred Alternative 2. However, Alternative 3 would add additional burden and reduced flexibility in comparison to Alternative 1 or Preferred Alternative 2.

For both Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, it is the intent of the Council to maintain existing provisions for catastrophic conditions, delinquent reporting, and video monitoring. During catastrophic conditions, the use of paper forms for basic required reporting may be authorized by the Regional Administrator (RA) through publication of timely notice, and the RA also has the authority to waive or modify reporting time requirements. An electronic report not received within the time specified is delinquent. A delinquent report automatically results in a prohibition on harvesting or possessing the applicable species by the permit holder, regardless of any additional notification to the delinquent permit owner and operator by NMFS. This prohibition is applicable until all required and delinquent reports have been submitted and received by NMFS according to the reporting requirements. For South Atlantic snapper grouper, charter vessels selected to report by the SRD must participate in the NMFS-sponsored electronic logbook and/or video monitoring program as directed by the SRD. Completed fishing records may be required weekly or daily, as directed by the SRD.

Historically, headboat vessels reported logbook information to the SRHS using paper forms. Beginning January 1, 2013, selected vessel owners/operators have been required to submit electronic logbooks. Vessel operators selected to report are required to report 100% of their vessel trips, regardless of whether the trips occur in the EEZ or in state waters. The current reporting requirements place the responsibility for submitting required information directly on
the permit holder. Further, a permit renewal application for which all logbooks have not been submitted is considered incomplete and the application will be considered abandoned if the deficiency is not corrected in a timely manner. However, the federal for-hire permit is open access, and a fisherman can purchase a new permit if a permit is lost or expired. If a vessel is delinquent for any trips, an e-mail reminder is sent to the vessel owner after the reporting week ends. If the vessel continues to be non-compliant, the permit office and law enforcement is notified. A vessel that fails to report in a timely manner may be reported to law enforcement. The obligation to report is reinforced annually via certified letter to each permit holder.

The Council is considering taking actions through future amendments that could consider limited entry in the for-hire sector. Compliance with the reporting requirements of this amendment may be among the factors considered by the Council when determining eligibility criteria in any future limited entry programs.
2.3 Action 3: Modify Electronic Reporting Requirements to Require Vessel or Catch Location Reporting

Alternative 1 (No Action). Current regulations require charter vessels participating in the for-hire survey to report area fished (inshore, state, or federal waters), if selected as part of the survey. Headboats participating in the SRHS are required to report latitude and longitude of area fished (degrees and minutes only; within 1 nautical mile (nm)² area).

Preferred Alternative 2. Require federally permitted charters vessels to report location electronically by latitude/longitude in degrees and minutes or by clicking on a headboat chart. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel preferred.

Two Alternatives Considered
Section 1502.14(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act states that “agencies shall: rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives…..” Two reasonable alternatives for this action, including the no action alternative, have been identified by NMFS and the Council. The Council is considering requiring charter vessels to report catch location in the same manner as is currently required for headboats. Preferred Alternative 2 reflects the current manner in which headboats are required to report area fished. The Council and NMFS could consider a third alternative to not require charter vessels to report area fished, but that would not meet the purpose and need and is therefore unreasonable.

Comparison of Alternatives

Charter vessels that are surveyed using the MRIP for-hire survey (i.e., 10% weekly) are asked to report area fished (i.e., area fished, state, or federal waters) in addition to the other elements listed in Table 2.1.1.

Alternative 1 would maintain the current self-reporting systems in place, that is, report area fished if selected in the for-hire survey (charter vessel) or latitude/longitude of area fished within 1 nm² area (headboat).

Preferred Alternative 2 would require charter vessels to report location fished manually by latitude/longitude in degrees and minutes or by clicking on a geographic grid in the electronic reporting application, which is currently required for headboats in the South Atlantic. All vessels would be required to report this information.

Core data elements listed under action 1 are consistent with this preferred alternative. Selecting this alternative ensures that area reporting is consistent for all federal for-hire vessels in the South Atlantic. To some extent this action is tied to Action 1, since there will be no need to specify electronic reporting of area with a particular resolution if the mandatory electronic reporting alternatives of Action 1 are not approved.
CHAPTER 3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Description of the Physical Environment

3.1.1 Snapper Grouper

Habitat for Snapper Grouper Species

Information on the habitat utilized by species in the Snapper Grouper Complex is included in Volume II of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) (SAFMC 2009) and incorporated here by reference. The FEP can be found at: http://www.safmc.net/ecosystem/Home/EcosystemHome/tabid/435/Default.aspx

Essential Fish Habitat for Snapper Grouper Species

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) is defined in the Reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) as “those waters and substrates necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity” (16 U.S. C. 1802(10)). Specific categories of EFH identified in the South Atlantic Bight, which are utilized by federally-managed fish and invertebrate species, include both estuarine/inshore and marine/offshore areas. Specifically, estuarine/inshore EFH includes: Estuarine emergent and mangrove wetlands, submerged aquatic vegetation, oyster reefs and shell banks, intertidal flats, palustrine emergent and forested systems, aquatic beds, and estuarine water column. Additionally, marine/offshore EFH includes: Live/hard bottom habitats, coral and coral reefs, artificial and manmade reefs, Sargassum species, and marine water column.

EFH utilized by snapper grouper species in this region includes coral reefs, live/hard bottom, submerged aquatic vegetation, artificial reefs and medium to high profile outcroppings on and around the shelf break zone from shore to at least 183 meters [600 feet (but to at least 2,000 feet for wreckfish)] where the annual water temperature range is sufficiently warm to maintain adult populations of members of this largely tropical fish complex. EFH includes the spawning area in the water column above the adult habitat and the additional pelagic environment, including Sargassum, required for survival of larvae and growth up to and including settlement. In addition, the Gulf Stream is also EFH because it provides a mechanism to disperse snapper grouper larvae.

For specific life stages of estuarine dependent and near shore snapper grouper species, EFH includes areas inshore of the 30 meter (100 feet) contour, such as attached macroalgae; submerged rooted vascular plants (seagrasses); estuarine emergent vegetated wetlands (saltmarshes, brackish marsh); tidal creeks; estuarine scrub/shrub (mangrove fringe); oyster reefs and shell banks; unconsolidated bottom (soft sediments); artificial reefs; and coral reefs and live/hard bottom habitats.
Habitat Areas of Particular Concern for Snapper Grouper Species

Areas which meet the criteria for Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs) for species in the snapper grouper management unit include medium to high profile offshore hard bottoms where spawning normally occurs; localities of known or likely periodic spawning aggregations; near shore hard bottom areas; The Point, The Ten Fathom Ledge, and Big Rock (North Carolina); The Charleston Bump (South Carolina); mangrove habitat; seagrass habitat; oyster/shell habitat; all coastal inlets; all state-designated nursery habitats of particular importance to snapper grouper (e.g., Primary and Secondary Nursery Areas designated in North Carolina); pelagic and benthic *Sargassum*; Hoyt Hills for wreckfish; the *Oculina* Bank HAPC; all hermatypic coral habitats and reefs; manganese outcroppings on the Blake Plateau; and South Atlantic Council-designated Artificial Reef Special Management Zones (SMZ). Areas that meet the criteria for HAPCs include habitats required during each life stage (including egg, larval, postlarval, juvenile, and adult stages).

In addition to protecting habitat from fishing related degradation though fishery management plans (FMPs) regulations, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council), in cooperation with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), actively comments on non-fishing projects or policies that may impact EFH. The Council adopted a habitat policy and procedure document that established a four-state Habitat Advisory Panel (AP) and adopted a comment and policy development process. With guidance from the Habitat AP, the Council has developed and approved habitat policies on: energy exploration, development, transportation and hydropower re-licensing; beach dredging and filling and large-scale coastal engineering; protection and enhancement of submerged aquatic vegetation; and alterations to riverine, estuarine and near shore flows, offshore aquaculture, invasive estuarine species, and invasive marine species (available at [www.safmc.net](http://www.safmc.net)).

EFH and HAPCs in the South Atlantic Region are shown in Figure 3.1.1.
Figure 3.1.1. Composite map of HAPC and EFH in the South Atlantic Region. Source: John Froescke, Ph.D. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
3.1.2 Dolphin and Wahoo

Habitat for Dolphin and Wahoo

Information on the habitat utilized by dolphin and wahoo is included in Volume II of the Fishery FEP (SAFMC 2009) and incorporated here by reference. The FEP can be found at: http://www.safmc.net/ecosystem/Home/EcosystemHome/tabid/435/Default.aspx

EFH for Dolphin and Wahoo

EFH for dolphin and wahoo is the Gulf Stream, Charleston Gyre, Florida Current, and pelagic Sargassum. This EFH definition for dolphin was approved by the Secretary of Commerce on June 3, 1999, as a part of the Council’s Comprehensive Habitat Amendment (SAFMC 1998) (dolphin was included within the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP at that time, and the EFH definition has been carried forward through the establishment of the dolphin and wahoo FMP). This definition does not apply to extra-jurisdictional areas.

HAPCs for Dolphin and Wahoo

HAPCs for dolphin and wahoo in the Atlantic include The Point, The Ten-Fathom Ledge, and Big Rock (North Carolina); The Charleston Bump and The Georgetown Hole (South Carolina); The Point off Jupiter Inlet (Florida); The Hump off Islamorada, Florida; The Marathon Hump off Marathon, Florida; The “Wall” off of the Florida Keys; and Pelagic Sargassum. A map of these areas is available via the FEP link above. This HAPC definition for dolphin was approved by the Secretary of Commerce on June 3, 1999 as a part of the Council’s Comprehensive Habitat Amendment (dolphin was included within the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP).

3.1.3 Coastal Migratory Pelagics

Habitat for Coastal Migratory Pelagics

A description of the physical environment for coastal migratory pelagic (CMP) species is provided in Amendment 18 to the CMP FMP (GMFMC and SAFMC 2011), and is incorporated herein by reference.

EFH for Coastal Migratory Pelagics

A description of the EFH for CMP species is provided in Amendment 18 to the CMP FMP (GMFMC and SAFMC 2011), and is incorporated herein by reference. EFH for CMPs include coastal estuaries from the US/Mexico border to the boundary between the areas covered by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council from estuarine waters out to depths of 100 fathoms (GMFMC 2004). In the South Atlantic, EFH for coastal migratory pelagic species includes sandy shoals of capes and offshore bars, high profile rocky bottom and barrier island ocean-side waters, from the surf to the shelf.
break zone, but from the Gulf Stream shoreward, including *Sargassum*. In addition, all coastal inlets, all state-designated nursery habitats of particular importance to coastal migratory pelagics (for example, in North Carolina this would include all primary nursery areas and all secondary nursery areas).

For cobia, EFH also includes high salinity bays, estuaries, and seagrass habitat. In addition, the Gulf Stream is an essential fish habitat because it provides a mechanism to disperse coastal migratory pelagic larvae. For king and Spanish mackerel and cobia, essential fish habitat occurs in the South Atlantic and Mid-Atlantic Bights.

**HAPCs for Coastal Migratory Pelagics (CMP)**

A description of the HAPCs for CMP species is provided in Amendment 18 to the CMP FMP (GMFMC and SAFMC 2011), and is incorporated herein by reference. Areas which meet the criteria for HAPCs include sandy shoals of Capes Lookout, Cape Fear, and Cape Hatteras from shore to the ends of the respective shoals, but shoreward of the Gulf stream; The Point, The Ten-Fathom Ledge, and Big Rock (North Carolina); The Charleston Bump and Hurl Rocks (South Carolina); The Point off Jupiter Inlet (Florida); *Phragmatopoma* (worm reefs) reefs off the central east coast of Florida; nearshore hard bottom south of Cape Canaveral; The Hump off Islamorada (Florida); The Marathon Hump off Marathon (Florida); The “Wall” off of the Florida Keys; Pelagic *Sargassum*; and Atlantic coast estuaries with high numbers of Spanish mackerel and cobia based on abundance data from the Estuarine Living Marine Resources Program. Estuaries meeting this criteria for Spanish mackerel include Bogue Sound and New River (North Carolina), for cobia, Broad River (South Carolina).
3.2 Description of the Biological, Physical and Ecological Environment

The biological environment in the areas affected by actions in this amendment is defined by two components (Figure 3.2.1). Each component will be described in detail in the following sections.

Figure 3.2.1. Components of the biological environment described in this amendment.

3.2.1 Snapper Grouper

Information on the biology of species in the Snapper Grouper Complex is included in Volume II of the FEP (SAFMC 2009) and incorporated here by reference. The FEP can be found at: http://www.safmc.net/ecosystem/Home/EcosystemHome/tabid/435/Default.aspx

3.2.2 Coastal Migratory Pelagics

A description of CMP species biology is provided in Amendments 18, 20A, and 20B to the CMP FMP (GMFMC and SAFMC 2011, 2013, 2014), and is incorporated herein by reference.

3.2.3 Dolphin and Wahoo

Information on the biology of dolphin and wahoo is included in Volume II of the Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) (SAFMC 2009) and incorporated here by reference. The FEP can be found at: http://www.safmc.net/ecosystem/Home/EcosystemHome/tabid/435/Default.aspx

3.2.4 Protected Species

There are 40 listed species protected by federal law that may occur in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the South Atlantic Region and are under the purview of the NMFS. Thirty-one of these species are marine mammals protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). Six of these marine mammal species (sperm, sei, fin, blue, humpback, and North Atlantic right whales) are also listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In
addition to those six marine mammals, five species of sea turtles (green, hawksbill, Kemp’s ridley, leatherback, and loggerhead); the smalltooth sawfish; five distinct population segments (DPSs) of Atlantic sturgeon; and two Acropora coral species (elkhorn [Acropora palmata] and staghorn [A. cervicornis]) are also protected under the ESA. Portions of designated critical habitat for North Atlantic right whales and Acropora corals occur within the Council’s jurisdiction. Additionally, on September 10, 2014, NMFS listed 20 new coral species under the ESA, five of those species occur in the Caribbean (including Florida) and all of these are listed as threatened. The two previously listed Acropora coral species remain protected as threatened.

The NMFS has reviewed the potential impacts of the snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagics and the dolphin wahoo fishery on protected species in the region. The potential impacts from the continued authorization of these fisheries on currently listed protected species have been considered in previous ESA Section 7 consultations or subsequent memoranda. Those consultations indicate that of the species listed above, sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish are the most likely to interact with these fisheries and are therefore discussed further below.

**Turtles**

Green, hawksbill, Kemp’s ridley, leatherback, and loggerhead sea turtles are all highly migratory and travel widely throughout the South Atlantic. The following sections are a brief overview of the general life history characteristics of the sea turtles found in the South Atlantic region. Several volumes exist that cover the biology and ecology of these species more thoroughly (i.e., Lutz and Musick (eds.) 1997, Lutz et al. (eds.) 2003).

**Green** sea turtle hatchlings are thought to occupy pelagic areas of the open ocean and are often associated with Sargassum rafts (Carr 1987, Walker 1994). Pelagic stage green sea turtles are thought to be carnivorous. Stomach samples of these animals found ctenophores and pelagic snails (Frick 1976, Hughes 1974). At approximately 20 to 25 cm carapace length, juveniles migrate from pelagic habitats to benthic foraging areas (Bjorndal 1997). As juveniles move into benthic foraging areas a diet shift towards herbivory occurs. They consume primarily seagrasses and algae, but are also known to consume jellyfish, salps, and sponges (Bjorndal 1980, 1997; Paredes 1969; Mortimer 1981, 1982). The diving abilities of all sea turtles species vary by their life stages. The maximum diving range of green sea turtles is estimated at 110 m (360 ft) (Frick 1976), but they are most frequently making dives of less than 20 m (65 ft) (Walker 1994). The time of these dives also varies by life stage. The maximum dive length is estimated at 66 minutes with most dives lasting from 9 to 23 minutes (Walker 1994).

The **hawksbill’s** pelagic stage lasts from the time they leave the nesting beach as hatchlings until they are approximately 22-25 cm in straight carapace length (Meylan 1988, Meylan and Donnelly 1999). The pelagic stage is followed by residency in developmental habitats (foraging areas where juveniles reside and grow) in coastal waters. Little is known about the diet of pelagic stage hawksbills. Adult foraging typically occurs over coral reefs, although other hard-bottom communities and mangrove-fringed areas are occupied occasionally. Hawksbills show fidelity to their foraging areas over several years (van Dam and Diéz 1998). The hawksbill’s diet is highly specialized and consists primarily of sponges (Meylan 1988). Gravid females have been noted ingesting coralline substrate (Meylan 1984) and calcareous algae (Anderes Alvarez and Uchida 1994), which are believed to be possible sources of calcium to aid in eggshell production. The
maximum diving depths of these animals are not known, but the maximum length of dives is estimated at 73.5 minutes. More routinely, dives last about 56 minutes (Hughes 1974).

**Kemp’s ridley** hatchlings are also pelagic during the early stages of life and feed in surface waters (Carr 1987, Ogren 1989). Once the juveniles reach approximately 20 cm carapace length they move to relatively shallow (less than 50m) benthic foraging habitat over unconsolidated substrates (Márquez-M. 1994). They have also been observed transiting long distances between foraging habitats (Ogren 1989). Kemp’s ridleys feeding in these nearshore areas primarily prey on crabs, though they are also known to ingest mollusks, fish, marine vegetation, and shrimp (Shaver 1991). The fish and shrimp Kemp’s ridleys ingest are not thought to be a primary prey item but instead may be scavenged opportunistically from bycatch discards or from discarded bait (Shaver 1991). Given their predilection for shallower water, Kemp’s ridleys most routinely make dives of 50 m or less (Soma 1985, Byles 1988). Their maximum diving range is unknown. Depending on the life stage a Kemp’s ridleys may be able to stay submerged anywhere from 167 minutes to 300 minutes, though dives of 12.7 minutes to 16.7 minutes are much more common (Soma 1985, Mendonca and Pritchard 1986, Byles 1988). Kemp’s ridleys may also spend as much as 96% of their time underwater (Soma 1985, Byles 1988).

**Leatherbacks** are the most pelagic of all ESA-listed sea turtles and spend most of their time in the open ocean. Although they will enter coastal waters and are seen over the continental shelf on a seasonal basis to feed in areas where jellyfish are concentrated. Leatherbacks feed primarily on cnidarians (medusae, siphonophores) and tunicates. Unlike other sea turtles, leatherbacks’ diets does not shift during their life cycle. Because leatherbacks’ ability to capture and eat jellyfish is not constrained by size or age, they continue to feed on these species regardless of life stage (Bjorndal 1997). Leatherbacks are the deepest diving of all sea turtles. It is estimated that these species can dive in excess of 1,000 m (Eckert et al. 1989) but more frequently dive to depths of 50 m to 84 m (Eckert et al. 1986). Dive times range from a maximum of 37 minutes to more routines dives of 4 to 14.5 minutes (Standora et al. 1984, Eckert et al. 1986, Eckert et al. 1989, Keinath and Musick 1993). Leatherbacks may spend 74% to 91% of their time submerged (Standora et al. 1984).

**Loggerhead** hatchlings forage in the open ocean and are often associated with *Sargassum* rafts (Hughes 1974, Carr 1987, Walker 1994, Bolten and Balazs 1995). The pelagic stage of these sea turtles are known to eat a wide range of things including salps, jellyfish, amphipods, crabs, syngnathid fish, squid, and pelagic snails (Brongersma 1972). Stranding records indicate that when pelagic immature loggerheads reach 40-60 cm straight-line carapace length they begin to live in coastal inshore and nearshore waters of the continental shelf throughout the U.S. Atlantic (Witzell 2002). Here they forage over hard- and soft-bottom habitats (Carr 1986). Benthic foraging loggerheads eat a variety of invertebrates with crabs and mollusks being an important prey source (Burke et al. 1993). Estimates of the maximum diving depths of loggerheads range from 211 m to 233 m (692-764 ft) (Thayer et al. 1984, Limpus and Nichols 1988). The lengths of loggerhead dives are frequently between 17 and 30 minutes (Thayer et al. 1984, Limpus and Nichols 1988, Limpus and Nichols 1994, Lanyan et al. 1989) and they may spend anywhere from 80 to 94% of their time submerged (Limpus and Nichols 1994, Lanyan et al. 1989).

**Fish**
Historically the smalltooth sawfish in the U.S. ranged from New York to the Mexico border. Their current range is poorly understood but believed to have contracted from these historical areas. In the South Atlantic region, they are most commonly found in Florida, primarily off the Florida Keys (Simpfendorfer and Wiley 2004). Only two smalltooth sawfish have been recorded north of Florida since 1963 [the first was captured off North Carolina in 1963 and the other off Georgia in 2002 (National Smalltooth Sawfish Database, Florida Museum of Natural History)]. Historical accounts and recent encounter data suggest that immature individuals are most common in shallow coastal waters less than 25 m (Bigelow and Schroeder 1953, Adams and Wilson 1995), while mature animals occur in waters in excess of 100 m (Simpfendorfer pers. comm. 2006). Smalltooth sawfish feed primarily on fish. Mullet, jacks, and ladyfish are believed to be their primary food resources (Simpfendorfer 2001). Smalltooth sawfish also prey on crustaceans (mostly shrimp and crabs) by disturbing bottom sediment with their saw (Norman and Fraser 1938, Bigelow and Schroeder 1953).

### 3.2.5 Bycatch

A summary of the bycatch and discards is provided in the Bycatch Practicability Analysis in Appendix F. The actions in this amendment will help to better quantify the bycatch and discard rates in the snapper grouper, CMP, and dolphin wahoo fisheries in the Southeast Region. With more accurate and timely reporting, managers can better understand the level of bycatch and discards associated with the charter and for-hire components of these fisheries.
3.3 Description of the Economic Environment

3.3.1 Commercial Sector

The actions in this proposed amendment only pertain to the recreational for-hire sector (charter vessels and headboats). As a result a description of the economic environment for the commercial sector is not provided.

3.3.2 Recreational Sector

The actions in this proposed amendment would primarily apply to for-hire vessels operating in the South Atlantic. However, management of the CMP species and dolphin wahoo by the Council extends up the U.S. Atlantic coast. Because the proposed actions would primarily affect South Atlantic for-hire vessels, the following discussion focuses on the characteristics of this fleet. Detailed information on the operation of the for-hire fleet in the mid- and northeast Atlantic is provided in Steinback and Brinson (2013) and is incorporated herein by reference.

Angler Effort

The for-hire sector is comprised of charter vessels and headboats (party boats). Although charter vessels 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.

Estimates of the South Atlantic charter vessel angler effort (individual angler trips regardless of trip duration or species target intent or catch success) for 2011-2014 are provided in Table 3.3.1. These estimates are derived from the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>123,796</td>
<td>15,687</td>
<td>151,681</td>
<td>81,215</td>
<td>372,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>143,663</td>
<td>19,920</td>
<td>160,097</td>
<td>24,662</td>
<td>348,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>155,572</td>
<td>21,040</td>
<td>111,366</td>
<td>48,464</td>
<td>336,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>192,504</td>
<td>30,773</td>
<td>96,620</td>
<td>94,374</td>
<td>414,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>153,884</td>
<td>21,855</td>
<td>129,941</td>
<td>62,179</td>
<td>367,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

The effort estimates provided in Table 3.3.1 are from all charter vessels in the respective states and, thus, include effort for both federally permitted vessels and charter vessels that only fish in
state waters. Although the MRIP data allows estimation of effort in federal waters, for which respective vessels would require a federal permit (see the permits discussion below), federally permitted vessels also fish in state waters and are subject to federal regulations wherever they fish. As a result, it is not possible with available data to estimate the number of charter vessel angler trips by only federally permitted charter vessels. Therefore, the estimates provided in Table 3.3.1 exceed the angler effort on the vessels encompassed by the proposed actions in this amendment by an unknown number of trips.

Estimates of headboat angler effort in the South Atlantic for 2011-2014 are provided in Table 3.3.2. These estimates are derived from the NMFS Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS). Headboat angler effort is calculated as angler days, which are a standardized count of trips that result from the combination of partial-day, full-day, and multiple-day trips. The SRHS includes some vessels that do not possess a federal for-hire permit. Thus, the estimates of headboat angler days, like the estimates of effort on charter vessels, do not reflect effort for just federally permitted vessels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Florida-Georgia*</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>124,041</td>
<td>18,457</td>
<td>44,645</td>
<td>187,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>139,623</td>
<td>20,766</td>
<td>41,003</td>
<td>201,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>165,679</td>
<td>20,547</td>
<td>40,963</td>
<td>227,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>195,890</td>
<td>22,691</td>
<td>42,025</td>
<td>260,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>156,308</td>
<td>20,615</td>
<td>42,159</td>
<td>219,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SRHS.
*Florida and Georgia are combined for confidentiality purposes.

Permits

A federal for-hire vessel permit is required for fishing in federal waters for Atlantic dolphin wahoo, Atlantic CMP species, and South Atlantic snapper grouper species. On October 30, 2015, there were 2,138 vessels with at least one valid (non-expired) federal for-hire permit to fish for Atlantic dolphin wahoo, Atlantic CMP species, or South Atlantic snapper grouper species. Each of these permits is an open access permit, so the total number of permitted vessels changes year-to-year. Most for-hire vessels possess more than one for-hire permit. Among the vessels with at least one for-hire permit, 1,604 vessels had all three permits, 199 vessels had two permits (83 vessels possessed both the dolphin wahoo and CMP permits, 35 vessels possessed both the dolphin wahoo and snapper grouper permits, and 81 vessels possessed both the CMP and snapper grouper permits), and 335 vessels had only one for-hire permit (247 vessels possessed only the dolphin wahoo permit, 19 vessels possessed only the CMP permit, and 69 vessels possessed only the SG permit). The totals for valid Atlantic CMP permits and valid Atlantic permits include vessels operating in the mid- and northeast Atlantic. Finally, 402 of the vessels with at least one for-hire permit also possessed at least one federal for-hire permit required to fish in federal waters in the Gulf of Mexico to fish for CMP or reef fish species.
Although the for-hire permit application collects information on the primary method of operation, the permit itself does not identify the permitted vessel as either a headboat or a charter vessel and vessels may operate in both capacities. However, if a vessel meets the selection criteria (see Section 1.4) used by the SRHS and is selected to report by the SRD of the Southeast Fishery Science Center (SEFSC), the vessel is determined to operate primarily as a headboat and is required to submit harvest and effort information to the SRHS. As of February 2016, 74 South Atlantic headboats were registered in the SRHS (K. Fitzpatrick, NMFS SEFSC, pers. comm.). It is unknown how many headboats in the mid- or northeast Atlantic have an Atlantic CMP or Atlantic dolphin wahoo for-hire permit.

Information on South Atlantic charter vessel and headboat operating characteristics is included in Holland et al. (2012) and is incorporated herein by reference.

**Economic Value**

Economic value for for-hire vessels 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. For vessels in the South Atlantic, the estimated NOR values are $160 per charter angler trip and $43 per headboat angler trip (C. Liese, NMFS SEFSC, pers. comm.). As previously noted, management by the Council of the CMP species and dolphin wahoo extends up the U.S. Atlantic coast and not just the South Atlantic region. The average NOR values per angler trip for for-hire vessels in the mid-Atlantic and Northeast region are $24 and $26, for charter vessels and headboats, respectively (S. Steinback, NMFS NEFSC, pers. comm.). All estimates are in 2015 dollars.

**Business Activity**

The desire for recreational fishing generates economic activity as consumers spend their income on various goods and services needed for recreational fishing. This spurs economic activity in the region where recreational fishing occurs. It should be noted that, in the absence of the opportunity to fish, the income would presumably be spent on other goods and services and these expenditures would similarly generate economic activity in the region where the expenditure occurs. As such, the information provided below represents a distributional analysis only.

Recreational fishing generates business activity (economic impacts). Business activity for the recreational sector is characterized in the form of full-time equivalent jobs, output (sales) impacts (gross business sales), and value-added impacts (difference between the value of goods and the cost of materials or supplies). Estimates of the business activity (economic impacts) associated with recreational charter vessel angling in 2014 in the South Atlantic are provided in **Table 3.3.3**. These estimates and additional details are available at [https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/economics/publications/feus/fisheries_economics_2014/index](https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/economics/publications/feus/fisheries_economics_2014/index)

The estimates provided in **Table 3.3.3** include only impacts at the state level. These numbers are not additive across the region. Addition of the state-level estimates to produce a regional (or
national total) could either under- or over-estimate the actual amount of total business activity because of the complex relationship between different jurisdictions and the expenditure/impact multipliers. Neither regional nor national estimates are available at this time.

Estimates of the business activity associated with headboat effort are not available. Headboat vessels are not covered in the MRIP in the South Atlantic. As a result, estimation of the appropriate business activity coefficients for headboat effort has not been conducted. Beginning in August 2014, socio-economic data fields were added to the SRHS electronic logbook. However, these data refer to the vessel operation and not angler expenditures, which are the basis for estimating the business activity associated with the different recreational sector modes.

The estimates of business activity for the South Atlantic do not include the business activity associated with vessels that possess the appropriate Council-mandated for-hire permits (dolphin wahoo or CMP), but operate north of the South Atlantic states. This information is not available at this time.

### Table 3.3.3. 2014 business activity (thousands of 2014 dollars) associated with charter vessel trips in the South Atlantic. Output and value added impacts are not additive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Florida</th>
<th>Georgia</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Impact</td>
<td>$146,821</td>
<td>$13,493</td>
<td>$48,746</td>
<td>$56,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Added Impact</td>
<td>$89,171</td>
<td>$7,639</td>
<td>$27,801</td>
<td>$32,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Description of the Social Environment

The proposed actions in this amendment would be expected to affect charter fishing businesses associated with the South Atlantic’s snapper grouper, CMP, and dolphin wahoo fisheries, which are not already participating in the SRHS. A description of the current requirements for participants of the SRHS and a description of the information collected in the survey are provided in Section 3.5.1.1 and in the South Atlantic Headboat Amendment (SAFMC 2013c). The proposed actions in this amendment do not pertain to the commercial sector. Therefore, a description of the social environment for the commercial sector is not provided.

Detailed descriptions of the social environment for each fishery are included in recent amendments and are herein incorporated by reference. These include Dolphin Wahoo Amendments 5 and 8 (SAFMC 2013b; 2015); Coastal Migratory Pelagics Amendment 20A (GMFMC/SAFMC 2013a); and Snapper Grouper Amendments 29 and 34 (SAFMC 2014; 2015).

Federal for-hire permits are currently required for vessels to take paying passengers to fish in federal waters. In the South Atlantic, the for-hire permits for snapper grouper, CMPs, and dolphin wahoo are all open access; existing permits may not be transferred, but new permits may be issued. The annual application fee for these vessel permits is $25 for the first permit and $10 for each additional permit.

Table 3.4.1 shows the number of federal charter permits for South Atlantic dolphin wahoo, CMP, and snapper grouper by region and state. Most permits are on vessels associated with one of the South Atlantic states, but there are also vessels with for-hire permits (particularly dolphin wahoo and coastal migratory pelagics) in the Mid-Atlantic region, New England region, and even in the Gulf of Mexico region.

The number of charter vessels possessing each type of for-hire permit is provided for the South Atlantic states by county in Table 3.4.2. In Florida, the communities with the highest number of vessels with at least one for-hire permit are in the counties of Monroe (Florida Keys), Volusia, Brevard, Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade. Important tourism areas on the Florida east coast and Keys are generally the areas with higher numbers of for-hire businesses, such as St Augustine, Daytona Beach/Port Orange, Cocoa Beach, Canaveral, West Palm Beach, Merritt Island, Islamorada, Marathon and Key West.

In Georgia, most for-hire vessels are associated with the Savannah area (Chatham County) and St Simons/Brunswick (Glynn County). For South Carolina communities, most vessels with for-hire permits are near the Myrtle Beach area (including Little River and Murrells Inlet in Horry County), Charleston, and Hilton Head Island. The North Carolina communities with the most for-hire vessels include Hatteras and Manteo (Dare County), Morehead City/Atlantic Beach (Carteret County), and the Southport area (Brunswick County) (Table 4.3.2). As in Florida, all of these communities are also important areas for coastal tourism. These are also areas with high levels of engagement and reliance on recreational fishing (SAFMC 2013b; 2014; 2015).
Table 3.4.1. Distribution of South Atlantic charter permits, as of November 20, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Atlantic Charter Permits</th>
<th>South Atlantic Total</th>
<th>Gulf of Mexico Total</th>
<th>Mid-Atlantic Total</th>
<th>New England Total</th>
<th>TOTAL PERMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolphin Wahoo</td>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Snapper Grouper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic Total</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida East Coast</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Keys</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Mexico Total</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida West Coast</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic Total</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERMITS</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SERO Permits Office
Table 3.4.2. Number of valid and renewable permits held by charter vessels in the South Atlantic, by coastal county as of November 20, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total # of Vessels with at least one South Atlantic Charter Permit</th>
<th>Breakdown of # Vessels with Each South Atlantic Charter Permit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dolphin Wahoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Keys TOTAL</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida East Coast TOTAL</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida Keys TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flagler/St Johns</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Lucie</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palm Beach</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glynn</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina TOTAL</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horry</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleton</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina TOTAL</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currituck</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dare</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyde</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carteret</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onslow</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pender</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hanover</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Counties</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Atlantic TOTAL</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SERO permits office.
3.5 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.

South Atlantic federally permitted for-hire fishing businesses participating in the dolphin wahoo, CMP, and snapper grouper fisheries would be expected to be affected by this proposed action. This action is expected to impact the administrative procedures of federally permitted charter for-hire businesses and would require the submission of electronic reports. Information on race and ethnicity of federally permitted charter for-hire business owners and their employees is not available; however it is very unlikely that there would be a disproportionately high impact on businesses including members of minority populations, as direct impacts from adopting the new reporting requirements are expected to be minimal. Further, it is expected that there would be no impact to low-income populations as owners of these businesses are likely not in poverty. As discussed elsewhere in the document (such as in the Effects on the Social Environment section, Chapter 4, and Chapter 5) because the economic and social effects would be expected to be minimal to non-existent in the short-run (charter vessels are currently required to report if selected by the SRD, but to date, have not been selected) and positive in the long-run (more timely harvest reporting supporting improved management decisions), no adverse effects would be expected to accrue to charter vessel customers, or associated businesses and communities. Thus, no environmental justice concerns are expected to arise from this proposed action.
3.6 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 (MSA) (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), originally enacted in 1976. The MSA claims sovereign rights and exclusive fishery management authority over most fishery resources within the U.S. 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 U.S. EEZ.

Responsibility for federal fishery management decision-making is divided between the U.S. Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) and eight regional Fishery Management Councils that represent the expertise and interests of constituent states. Regional Fishery Management Councils are responsible for preparing, monitoring, and revising management plans for fisheries needing management within their jurisdiction. The Secretary is responsible for collecting and providing the data necessary for the Councils to prepare fishery management plans and for promulgating regulations to implement proposed plans and amendments after ensuring that management measures are consistent with the MSA and with other applicable laws summarized in Appendix C. In most cases, the Secretary has delegated this authority to NMFS.

The Council is responsible for conservation and management of fishery resources in the EEZ of the U.S. South Atlantic. These waters extend from 3 to 200 miles offshore from the seaward boundary of the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and east Florida to Key West with the exception of two fishery management plans: species in the CMP FMP are managed from New York to Florida and those in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP are managed from Maine to Florida. The Council has thirteen voting members: one from NMFS; one each from the state fishery agencies of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida; and eight public members appointed by the Secretary. There are two public members from each of the four South Atlantic States. Non-voting members include representatives of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), Department of State, and Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC).

The Council has adopted procedures whereby the non-voting members serving on the Council committees have full voting rights at the committee level but not at the full Council level. In addition, provisions allow the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2 voting seats at the committee level for snapper grouper and CMP, and both the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils have 1 voting seat at the committee level for dolphin wahoo. Council members serve three-year terms and are recommended by State Governors and appointed by the Secretary from lists of nominees submitted by state governors. Appointed members may serve a maximum of three consecutive terms.

Public interests also are involved in the fishery management process through participation on Advisory Panels and through Council meetings, which, with few exceptions, are open to the public. The Councils use Scientific and Statistical Committees to review the data and science being used in assessments and fishery management plans/amendments. In addition, the
regulatory process is in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act, in the form of “notice and comment” rulemaking.

3.5.1. South Atlantic Region Reporting Requirements

Currently, the owner or operator of a vessel for which a charter vessel permit for South Atlantic CMP fish, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin and wahoo has been issued, or whose vessel fishes for or lands such coastal migratory pelagic fish, snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic or Atlantic exclusive economic zone (EEZ), and who is selected to report by the SRD, must maintain a fishing record for each trip, or a portion of such trips as specified by the SRD, on forms provided by the SRD. Completed records for charter vessels must be submitted to the SRD weekly, postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each trip (Sunday). Currently, all headboats are required to submit fishing records to the SRD weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD via electronic reporting (via computer or Internet). Weekly = 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday).

The Southeast Region recreational reporting requirements by fishery management plan are summarized in Table 3.5.1. Detailed information on electronic reporting requirements and the future implementation plan for the Southeast region can be found in the NMFS Southeast Region Electronic Monitoring and Reporting Regional Implementation Plan (NMFS 2015) and is hereby incorporated by reference.

Table 3.5.1. Summary of the existing monitoring tools currently implemented in recreational fisheries of the Southeast Region. Green cells indicate fisheries where electronic technologies have already been implemented and regulated programs are in place. Fisheries where additional Electronic Reporting (ER) and Electronic Monitoring (EM) could potentially be suitable are noted, and yellow cells indicate those fisheries that have been identified as the highest priority for implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Fishery</th>
<th>Current Requirements</th>
<th>Additional ER Potentially Suitable?</th>
<th>EM Potentially Suitable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paper logbooks/reports</td>
<td>Electronic Logbooks</td>
<td>VMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Reef Fish</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Conch</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiny Lobster</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corals and Reef Associated Plants and Invertebrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harves and possession prohibited except with Federal permit for scientific research, exempted fishing, or exempted educational activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Mexico</td>
<td>Reef Fish</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed for commercial purposes only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Drum</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live rock harvested for commercial purposes. Harvest and possession of corals prohibited except with Federal permit for scientific research, exempted fishing, or exempted educational activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic</td>
<td>Coastal Migratory Pelagics</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spiny Lobster</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>Snapper-Grouper</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dolphin-Wahoo</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>Y - Headboat only</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Golden Crab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sargassum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live rock harvested for commercial purposes. Harvest and possession of corals prohibited except with Federal permit for scientific research, exempted fishing, or exempted educational activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.1.2 Greater Atlantic Region Reporting Requirements

The Greater Atlantic Region Fisheries Office (GARFO) requires that all federally-permitted vessels whether fishing in state or federal waters report catch as described in Table 3.5.2 and below. The following is excerpted from [source].

**Defining fishing trip activity that requires a Vessel Trip Report**

If your vessel is issued any of the fishery permits with reporting requirements shown in the table above, you are required to complete a vessel trip report (VTR) for every fishing trip, whether the vessel is fishing in state or federal waters, or in another region of the country, such as the South Atlantic. This is true for all trips, no matter what species is being fished for or caught. Having an observer or at-sea monitor on board during a trip does not relieve you from this requirement. These instructions clarify that a VTR is required for any trip on a federally permitted vessel when you catch fish, or when your operations include activities that would support fishing, such as preparing to catch or harvest fish, or attempting to catch or harvest fish. All such fishing activities must be reported, even if no landings are made. The trip is the period of time during which these activities are conducted, beginning when the vessel leaves port and ending when the vessel returns to port.

There are only two instances where a VTR isn’t required for a specific trip:

- If you are transiting without any product onboard and don’t engage in any fishing activity. For example, you’re moving your vessel to a shipyard or you’re returning to your home port.
- If you are operating under a scientific Letter of Acknowledgement

You are required to report fishing trips even if no fish are caught or onboard if the following events occur:

- If you begin a fishing trip, but must return to port before setting or retrieving gear because of issues like bad weather or mechanical problems, then you must still complete a VTR. In this case, you must complete the information in VTR Fields 1-6, along with fields 24-27, and enter “No Effort” in the lower portion of the VTR.
- If you make a fishing trip just to set out gear you must still complete a VTR. Complete the information in VTR fields 1-6, along with fields 24-27, and enter “Set Only” in the lower portion of the VTR.
- If you make an unsuccessful trip, and don’t catch any fish, you must still complete a VTR. In this case, you must complete all of the trip information in VTR Fields 1-16, and enter “No Catch” or “NC” in the species code field (#17).
Table 3.5.2. Greater Atlantic Region Fisheries Office (GARFO) vessel trip report (VTR) requirements by vessel permit type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of reporting</th>
<th>Report deadline</th>
<th>If you did not fish.....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a vessel is issued a permit for:</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Atlantic herring;</td>
<td>Then the owner/operator must submit trip reports weekly</td>
<td>If you subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Atlantic mackerel;</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Illex squid;</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Longfin squid/butterfish;</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Northeast multispecies;</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ocean quahogs:</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Surfclams . . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to weekly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each week that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a vessel is issued a permit for:</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Atlantic bluefish</td>
<td>Then the owner/operator must submit trip reports monthly</td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Atlantic deep-sea red crab</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Atlantic sea scallop</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Black sea bass</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Monkfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Northeast skate</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Scup</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Spiny dogfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Summer flounder</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tilefish</td>
<td></td>
<td>If subject to monthly reporting, you must submit a Did Not Fish report for each month that there is no fishing trip activity. If you know your vessel will be inactive, you may submit these reports electronically up to 3 months in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a vessel is issued a permit for American lobster <strong>and</strong> no other Greater Atlantic Region vessel permit . . . . . .</td>
<td>Then the owner/operator is not required to submit trips reports (check with your state, which may require reporting).</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** -- **
Submitting a VTR if you conducted no fishing trip activity
As noted in the table, you must submit a VTR even if you did not use your vessel for any fishing activity for the entire reporting period, weekly or monthly, that is applicable to your permit types. In this case, you must fill out the “Did Not Fish” field at the top of the form, complete the vessel identification information in Fields 1-3, and sign and submit the form. However, we remind you that activity such as starting a fishing trip or preparing to catch fish is considered fishing activity. For example, if you start a fishing trip on Wednesday, but land and offload your catch the following Monday (i.e., after a trip of 6 days), the VTR must be submitted by midnight Tuesday of the third week and must provide all of the information about the trip. In this case, there is no week in which you “Did Not Fish”.

Did Not Fish (DNF) reports may be submitted on the NMFS issued paper VTR or through our secure webpage, “Fish-On-Line” at https://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/NMFSlogin
DNF reports submitted electronically through Fish-On-Line do not need to be mailed into NMFS. If you need your confidential vessel Personal Identification Number (PIN) or cannot access Fish-On-Line please contact NMFS at (978) 281- 9133 or by email at nmfs.gar.data.requests@noaa.gov

You must report all species caught (both kept and discarded), including all protected species. To report sea turtles or ESA-listed fish species (e.g., Atlantic salmon or sturgeon) incidentally caught, injured, or killed, enter the species code for each turtle or fish under the species code name column (#17) on the VTR. Enter the actual number (count) of sea turtles or listed fish caught in the discard column (#19). Under the vessel name column (#21), comment on the condition of the sea turtles or listed fish (e.g., alive, injured, or dead).

When an incidental mortality or injury of a marine mammal (seals, dolphins, porpoises, and whales) occurs during commercial fishing activities, you must also fill out and return the Marine Mammal Authorization Program Mortality & Injury Reporting Form within 48 hours of returning from the trip on which the incident occurred. You may obtain additional information, including a reporting form at: www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/prot_res/mmap/certificate.html or call 978-281-9328.

3.5.1.3. Highly Migratory Species Management Division Reporting Regulations for Charter Vessels and Headboats

Owners of vessels that carry passengers for-hire and fish for, possess, or retain Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) (tunas, billfish, swordfish, and sharks) must obtain an annual Atlantic HMS Charter/Headboat permit and have a valid Merchant Marine License or Uninspected Passenger Vessel License. HMS charter vessels and headboats operate under different rules depending on whether they are on a “for-hire” or a “non-for-hire” trip, and the combination of permits held by the charter vessel/headboat.
If the vessel owner only holds an Atlantic HMS charter/headboat permit, that owner is required to report catch in the appropriate NMFS logbook program, if selected. Entries on a day’s fishing activities must be entered on the logbook form within 48 hours of completing the day’s activities, or before offloading, whichever is sooner. The owner or operator must submit the logbook forms postmarked within 7 days of offloading all Atlantic HMS. If a selected vessel did not fish during a calendar month, then that vessel must submit a no-fishing form no later than 7 days after the end of the month. Atlantic HMS charter vessels and headboats may also be selected for cost-earnings reporting.

If a vessel owner issued an HMS charter/headboat permit also has a permit issued in a non-HMS fishery that is required to report, any landings should be reported, as required, under the appropriate NMFS Regional vessel logbook program.

All HMS charter/headboat vessel owners/operators must report all recreational landings (i.e., fish kept) of Atlantic billfish (blue marlin, white marlin, roundscale spearfish, and sailfish), swordfish, and bluefin tuna (landings and dead discards) to NMFS within 24 hours of landing at the dock (with the exception of fish landed in Maryland or North Carolina) either via a web-based reporting system or by calling the appropriate Reporting Hotline. Participation in surveys such as the Large Pelagics Survey (LPS) or MRIP does not fulfill recreational reporting obligations.


### 3.5.2 State Fishery Management

The state governments of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the east coast of Florida have the authority to manage fisheries that occur in waters extending three nautical miles from their respective shorelines. North Carolina’s marine fisheries are managed by the Division of Marine Fisheries of the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality. The Marine Resources Division of the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources regulates South Carolina’s marine fisheries. Georgia’s marine fisheries are managed by the Coastal Resources Division of the Department of Natural Resources. The Marine Fisheries Division of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission is responsible for managing Florida’s marine fisheries. Each state fishery management agency has a designated seat on the South Atlantic Council. 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 South Atlantic states are also involved in the management of marine fisheries through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). This commission was created to coordinate state regulations and develop management plans for interstate fisheries. It has significant authority, through the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act and the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act, to compel adoption of consistent state
regulations to conserve coastal species. The ASFMC also is represented at the Council level, but only has voting authority at the committee level.

The NMFS’ State-federal Fisheries Division is responsible for building cooperative partnerships to strengthen marine fisheries management and conservation at the state, inter-regional, and national levels. This division implements and oversees the distribution of grants for two national (Inter-jurisdictional Fisheries Act and Anadromous Fish Conservation Act) and two regional (Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act and Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act) programs. Additionally, it works with the ASMFC to develop and implement cooperative state-federal fisheries regulations.

3.5.3 Enforcement

Both the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Office for Enforcement (NOAA/OLE) and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) have the authority and the responsibility to enforce Council regulations. NOAA/OLE agents, who specialize in living marine resource violations, provide fisheries expertise and investigative support for the overall fisheries mission. The USCG is a multi-mission agency, which provides at sea patrol services for the fisheries mission.

Neither NOAA/OLE nor the USCG can provide a continuous law enforcement presence in all areas due to the limited resources of NOAA/OLE and the priority tasking of the USCG. To supplement at sea and dockside inspections of fishing vessels, NOAA entered into Cooperative Enforcement Agreements with all but one of the states in the Southeast Region (North Carolina), which granted authority to state officers to enforce the laws for which NOAA/OLE has jurisdiction. In recent years, the level of involvement by the states has increased through Joint Enforcement Agreements, whereby states conduct patrols that focus on federal priorities and, in some circumstances, prosecute resultant violators through the state when a state violation has occurred.

Administrative monetary penalties and permit sanctions are issued pursuant to the guidance found in the Policy for the Assessment of Civil Administrative Penalties and Permit Sanctions for the NOAA Office of the General Counsel – Enforcement Section. This Policy is published at the Enforcement Section’s website: [http://www.gc.noaa.gov/enforce-office3.html](http://www.gc.noaa.gov/enforce-office3.html).
CHAPTER 4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1. Action 1: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter Vessels

4.1.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical/Biological/Ecological Environment

The charter vessel reporting requirement is an administrative process for providing a means of collecting data from the industry, and does not directly affect the physical or biological environment, but does have an indirect effect. There would be positive indirect biological effects because having all charter vessels report electronically would make it easier to track landings in a timely manner. This would help prevent exceeding annual catch limits (ACLs), leading to healthier fish stocks by reducing the likelihood of overfishing. **Alternative 1 (No Action)** already requires that vessels, if selected, must maintain a fishing record for each trip, or a portion of such trips as specified by the Science and Research Director (SRD), on forms provided by the SRD; however, no charter vessels have been selected. Completed fishing records must be submitted to the SRD weekly, postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday). **Alternative 1 (No Action)** could result in adverse impacts if landings are not reported in a timely fashion and allowable harvests are exceeded. Reporting provides a method to estimate mortality, which is then used to assess the stock conditions. Current levels of reporting results in stock assessments that are based on a high degree of uncertainty which is not as useful for management purposes. Electronic reporting by charter vessels, as proposed by **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** (and associated sub-alternatives) could reduce the likelihood of overages of the ACLs by providing a means for...
more timely reporting as well as providing a source for better data collection to support the stock assessments and future management.

Overages of the ACLs can have an adverse effect to the stock and stock conditions. For overfished species in the South Atlantic, any overages are deducted from the allowable harvest the following fishing year. In these instances, the adverse effects may be mitigated. However, especially for species under a rebuilding plan, simply lowering the following year ACL may not offset the adverse impacts of the overage. For example, the reduction in spawning potential of the stock due to exceeding the ACL is not fully compensated by an equivalent harvest reduction in the next fishing year.

In these cases overages may prevent achieving the rebuilding target and optimum yield. All of the alternatives, (even Alternative 1) require some kind of reporting, if selected. Preferred Alternative 2 and Preferred Alternative 3 would require that the reporting be done electronically and Preferred Alternative 2 would require reports to be submitted weekly or at intervals shorter than a week, based on the SRD request. Alternative 3 would require daily electronic reporting. All of the action alternatives would require that data be submitted to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) more frequently than the current requirements and electronically resulting in positive indirect biological effects.

Fishermen are required to meet the reporting requirements associated with their permit (CFR 50 Section 622.5). With electronic reporting, as proposed in Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, it would be much easier to track those who are not meeting the reporting requirements of their permit. As of February 2016, there are 74 headboats (Table 1.4.1) in the South Atlantic reporting catches electronically; however, there are approximately 2,000 charter vessels (Table 1.3.1) that would need to use the new electronic reporting system. Thus, tracking charter vessels, and taking action when they do not report, could require more effort than for headboat vessels because there are so many more charter vessels.

Alternative 1 (No Action), Preferred Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 are unlikely to result in any direct adverse impacts on protected species such as endangered or threatened whales, sea turtles, corals, or Habitat-Areas-of-Particular-Concern (HAPCs). Modifications to reporting requirements for the charter sector are not expected to change current fishing practices. Total harvest will still be restrained by the commercial and recreational ACLs, and accountability measures (AMs) will still be used to help prevent overfishing. It is unlikely any alternative would result in increased or modified fishing effort in the dolphin wahoo, coastal migratory pelagic, or snapper grouper fishery; therefore, no adverse biological impacts on protected species or physical environment, or bycatch or prey species is expected as a result of this action.

4.1.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Currently, effort and catch data for federally permitted charter vessels operating in Council managed fisheries is collected through the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) For-Hire Survey. This program is not census based, rather it is a subsample of the for-hire fleet which may require several weeks to several months to compile harvest and effort data. Additionally, for-hire operators of NMFS Greater Atlantic Region (GAR) federally permitted
vessels are required to submit a vessel trip report (VTR) for each fishing trip. VTRs provide information on when and where catch occurred. The VTR can be submitted using a paper or electronic form. These reports typically cover fishing activity occurring North of North Carolina. Presumably, vessels participating in Council managed fisheries in the GAR are covered by the VTR program. However, any vessels in the GAR who possess only South Atlantic for hire permits (CMP, dolphin wahoo, or snapper grouper) will be required to report under the provisions of this amendment.

**Alternative 1 (no action)** would maintain current reporting requirements for federally permitted charter vessels and would therefore not affect the harvest and customary uses of South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, or coastal migratory pelagics (CMP). Consequently, **Alternative 1** would not be expected to result in direct economic effects. However, **Alternative 1** would continue to allow for a time lag in the collection of landings information. If the time lags result in delaying needed management measures, e.g., a timely closure of a fishery, and adversely affect fish stocks, adverse indirect economic effects would be expected to result. Additionally, the absence of census-type coverage logbook trip reports for charter vessels in the South Atlantic limits the amount and quality of available information, such as harvest, discard, effort, and economic data, on which to base other management decisions (beyond the timing of quota closure) and restricts the management options available for implementation. These limitations may have economic implications for both this component of the recreational sector, the recreational sector as a whole, and the commercial sector. For example, better data would enable more accurate assessments of total fishing mortality, effort, and operational costs. This would support improved monitoring of quotas (as previously discussed), better ensuring overruns do not occur, as well as improved forecasts of the expected biological, economic, and social effects of current and proposed regulations. As part of the larger recreational sector, circumstances that limit understanding of the performance of charter vessels by extension affect understanding of the performance of the recreational sector as a whole and the expected economic effects of proposed management measures. For example, a stock assessment that is adversely affected by poor harvest or effort data from charter vessels would have harvest and management implications on all users within the recreational sector as well as the commercial sector.

Electronic reporting would be more efficient than other forms of reporting because the information provided could be directly integrated into an electronic system that would allow a combination of records and tabulation of harvests. With electronic reporting, data would not have to be manually input from paper forms, faxes, or scanned documents. This can reduce costs and data entry errors. The specification of ACLs and AMs has increased the need for more timely collection of harvest data. Recreational AMs vary from in-season closures for some species such as black sea bass, red grouper, and golden tilefish to a reduction in the length of the fishing season in the year following an ACL overage for many other species. The current frequency of data reporting could increase the likelihood of harvest overages for species that have in-season closures like black sea bass. For species with a recreational AM that shortens the length of the following fishing season, better and more timely data could help ensure landings do not exceed the ACL in the year following an overage. Only in extreme situations would potential overages be expected to be so severe that the status of a stock or a recovery plan would be jeopardized under the current reporting schedule. However, overages have the potential,
depending on the AMs, to result in significant disruption in fishing behavior and reduce revenue and profit for for-hire vessels and associated businesses, and reduce potential fishing opportunities for anglers. **Alternative 1 (No Action)** would be expected to continue to result in these indirect economic effects.

Electronic reporting could have benefits for charter vessel owners. Electronic submission of data could provide a warehouse for storing data for a vessel. Reports can be generated that will allow vessel owners to track performance over time. Reports could even be generated to compare a vessel’s fishing success against that of the average charter fishing vessel.

**Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** would require federally permitted charter vessels to submit fishing records via electronic reporting. **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** would require weekly and daily submissions, respectively. **Preferred Sub-alternative 2a** and Sub-alternative **3a**, **Sub-alternatives 2b and 3b**, and **Sub-alternatives 2c and 3c** would required reporting for all fish harvested/discarded, reporting only for Council-managed species, or reporting for all federally-managed species, respectively.

In terms of time necessary to complete the requests and associated costs, in general **Preferred Alternative 2** would be less burdensome than **Alternative 3** as reporting would be weekly instead of daily. From an economic perspective, there are no substantial differences between the sub-alternatives of **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3** if the for-hire participant is only involved in Council or federally managed fisheries. If the participant is commonly involved in both state-managed and federally-managed fisheries, then reporting requirements as specified in **Sub-alternatives 2b and 3b** would be least costly followed by **Sub-alternatives 2c and 3c**, with **Preferred Sub-alternative 2a** and **Sub-alternative 3a** having the highest costs. Indirect economic benefits derived from improved data would occur for all sub-alternatives present in Alternatives **2 and 3**, but would be inverse to the previous cost statement, with the more costly, time consuming options expected to yield greater benefits.

The cost of implementing electronic reporting that is expected to be borne by charter operators to report would be minimal if they own a computer or have access to a computer. Additionally, whatever computer that is used would need to have access to the Internet. However, if they do not own or have access to a computer (e.g., at a library), they would need to purchase a computer. For this analysis, it is not known how many charter vessel owners already have computers or access to the Internet. According to **Table 1.3.1**, in 2014 there were 1,984 federally-permitted charter vessels in the South Atlantic. It is not known how many of the vessels have the same owner that would report landings using the same computer. Therefore, the worst-case scenario is that all vessels would need a basic computer on which to report landings and a basic Internet connection. A basic computer system can be purchased for $260 (in 2016 dollars; www.amazon.com/Dell-Optiplex-Included-Processor-Professional/dp/B00UTV6ZWWM/ref=sr_1_98?ie=UTF8&qid=1453746419&sr=8-98&keywords=PC+Computer+with+monitor). A tablet computer with a detachable keyboard can be purchased for as little as $120 (in 2016 dollars; www.amazon.com/Viking-Pro-Computer-Touchscreen-Detachable/dp/B0174AX43I/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1453748342&sr=8-1&keywords=tablet+computer). The cost of a basic monthly Internet connection is $46.92 (in 2014 dollars; http://www.ask.com/business-finance/average-internet-bill-439f4e05fc0bb3c7).
The estimated one time cost, if all 1,984 permitted vessel owners needed to purchase a computer would be $515,840. To purchase a tablet computer would be $238,080. An annual cost for the average Internet connection would be approximately $1,117,071 for all of the vessel owners. What is not included in these estimates are costs associated with training to learn how to use a computer, if needed, nor is maintenance or replacement, as needed. However, the stated costs associated with implementing electronic reporting are likely to be highly over-estimated because many charter vessel owners are already using the Internet for various business-related activities such as to promote their business, attract customers, and upload photographs from successful trips.

All data will be entered at the trip level into software. The only difference is the frequency with which the data need to be entered. Once the user learns the data entry software, it is estimated that reporting requirements would take a for-hire vessel operator approximately ten minutes per trip for either Preferred Alternative 2 or Alternative 3. In 2015, there were 192,781 angler trips taken on charter vessels in federal waters in the South Atlantic region (Personal communication from the NMFS, Fisheries Statistics Division, August 9, 2016). Assuming that all of these trips occurred on vessels that were federally permitted to fish for Council managed species and were carrying an average of 3 anglers per trip, a total of 64,260 individual charter trips were taken. Applying an average of ten minutes spent on record keeping per trip, an overall 10,710 hours would have been expended to satisfy reporting requirements as specified in Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. Based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics May 2015 mean hourly wage for fishers and related fishing workers of $13.90 per hour, the estimated cost stemming from the reporting requirement is approximately $148,870 on an annual basis (in 2015 dollars; USDOL 2016). Charter trips occurring outside of the South Atlantic region were not included in this analysis, as it is assumed that if these captains have a federal fishing permit for South Atlantic managed fisheries, they will also have federal fishing permits for GAR fisheries and will therefore already be covered under the VTR program.

The Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) has approved development of software for at-sea data entry using a tablet computer. The amount for the software development is $195,680. NMFS SEFSC has developed computer software, currently used by headboat operators, that could be modified, as needed, for use by charter vessels. The costs of such modifications are currently unknown.

Similarly, costs expected to be borne by the Agency to administer these data collection efforts cannot be determined. If it is assumed that shortening the reporting frequency from weekly to daily reporting would result in marked improvements in the data collected and that these improvements would result in more effective management, then Alternative 3 would be expected to result in the greatest economic benefits, followed by Preferred Alternative 2. However, the net economic effects expected to result from these alternatives cannot be determined at this time because the potential benefits that would be expected to result from the proposed changes and the costs of the hardware and software that would be approved by NMFS cannot be estimated at this time.

4.1.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment
Section 3.4 (Social Environment) includes detailed information about fishermen and communities that may be affected by changes to reporting requirements for for-hire permit holders. In general, negative social effects of charter vessel reporting requirements would likely be associated with any added time and financial burden for charter vessel operators to meet the requirements. Increased frequency in reporting under Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 may have some negative effects on charter vessel owners and captains because businesses would need to allocate additional time or staff to submit reports. The daily reporting requirement under Alternative 3 would be more burdensome for charter vessels than the weekly reporting in Preferred Alternative 2. Alternative 1 (No Action) would not be expected to negatively impact charter vessels in terms of additional time and money requirements.

The requirement for electronic reporting under Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would affect charter vessel owners and operators who do not already use computer systems or some other electronic devices in their businesses. Some fishermen are not familiar with computers or Internet, and some may simply be more comfortable with paper fishing records. There may also be an increased risk of errors for electronic reporting by fishermen who typically do not use computers or some other electronic device, and Internet in their businesses.

However, requiring all charter vessels to report electronically and more frequently (Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3) is expected to result in broad social benefits. Assuming compliance from fishery participants, more frequent and timely reporting would be expected to contribute to improved quota monitoring. This could lead to increased likelihood of an in-season AM being triggered (such as an in-season closure) and there may be some short-term negative effects on the entire recreational sector due to restricted or no access to a species. However, the long-term biological benefits of timely AMs that keep recreational catch below the recommended levels will be more beneficial in the long term for consistent and stable recreational fishing opportunities.

Reporting requirements in Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are expected to provide additional information that may help to better forecast early closures and minimize frequency of post-season AMs, such as reduced seasons in the subsequent year. This could help for-hire operators in annual or multi-year business planning. Under Alternative 1 (No Action), there would be no improvements to monitoring as a result of more timely reporting, and it would be more likely that AMs would continue to impact charter businesses, communities, and customers.

4.1.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Alternative 1 (No Action) would result in no increase in administrative burden on NMFS as this is the status quo of how data are currently collected. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would increase the administrative burden on NMFS, as all federally-permitted charter vessels would be required to submit electronic records to the SRD and this would be an increase in the number of vessels reporting electronically. There is currently no SEFSC application configured to specifically accept this information, so a platform and database would also have to be developed or existing programs modified. These costs could be minimized by working through an already developed program, such as that now used to by headboats for electronic reporting, or having the data submitted through ACCSP. However, the details of the data collection program
required to implement the actions of this amendment will be developed by the SRD at a later date, once the actions are approved. In order of administrative impacts to the agency, **Alternative 3** would have the highest administrative impact with trip daily reporting, then **Preferred Alternative 2** with mandatory weekly reporting.
4.2. Action 2: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Headboats

4.2.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical/Biological/Ecological Environment

The headboat vessel reporting requirement is an administrative process for providing a means of collecting data from the industry, and does not directly affect the biological environment, but does have an indirect effect. Alternative 1 (No Action) requires the owner or operator of a headboat for which a charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic CMP species, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin and wahoo has been issued, or whose vessel fishes for or lands such CMP species, snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic or Atlantic exclusive economic zone (EEZ), and who is selected to report by the SRD (Note: The headboat amendment specified that all headboats must report) must submit an electronic fishing record for each trip of all fish harvested via the Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS). Electronic fishing records must be submitted at weekly intervals (or intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD) by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week. If no fishing activity occurred during a reporting week, an electronic report stating so must be submitted for that reporting week by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week. The action alternatives would modify the frequency of reporting and would require that any vessel operating under a headboat permit must report electronically, not just those headboat selected by the SRD. Alternative 1 (No Action) could result in adverse impacts if landings are not reported in a timely fashion and allowable harvests are exceeded. Reporting provides a method to estimate mortality, which is then used to assess the stock conditions. Stock assessment results based on data with a high degree of uncertainty are not as useful for management purposes.

Like Alternative 1 (No Action), Preferred Alternative 2 would require electronic reporting by headboats. However, instead of reporting by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week, Preferred Alternative 2 would require reporting on Tuesday following each fishing week. Thus, landings would be provided to the SRD sooner under Preferred Alternative 2 than under
Alternative 1 (No Action). Alternative 3 would increase the frequency of reporting from weekly to daily. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 could provide positive effect to fish stocks by provided data to the SRD more quickly than Alternative 1 (No Action), which can reduce the likelihood of exceeding the ACLs, thus reducing the likelihood of overfishing. Overages of the ACLs have an adverse effect to the stock and stock conditions.

Alternative 1 (No Action), Preferred Alternative 2, and Alternative 3 are unlikely to result in any direct adverse impacts on protected species such as endangered or threatened whales, sea turtles, corals, or HAPCs. All alternatives would modify reporting requirements for the headboat sector, but overall, this would not change current fishing practices. Total harvest would still be restrained by the commercial and recreational ACLs, and AMs would still be used to help prevent overfishing. It is unlikely any alternative would result in increased or modified fishing effort in the dolphin wahoo, coastal migratory pelagic, or snapper grouper fishery; therefore, no adverse biological impacts on protected species or physical environment, or bycatch or prey species, are expected under this action.

4.2.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not affect the harvest and customary uses of South Atlantic snapper grouper, Atlantic dolphin wahoo, or coastal migratory pelagic species because it would maintain current reporting requirements for headboats. Therefore, Alternative 1 (No Action) would not be expected to result in direct economic effects.

Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would require all headboats to submit fishing records via electronic reporting on different time schedules. Electronic submission of fishing records is currently required; this action only addresses the time by which reports must be filed. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would require weekly and daily submissions, respectively. Headboats with SA federal permits that are operating North of North Carolina would not be impacted, as they are already participating in the VTR program and would be exempt from the South Atlantic reporting requirements.

Marginal differences in the time required for record keeping between daily vs weekly reporting is expected to be minimal, as records will need to be kept for each trip regardless of reporting interval. In terms of a time buffer for reporting and forgoing being out of compliance along with the associated costs to headboats of doing so, Preferred Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1 (No Action), as both require weekly reporting, with Preferred Alternative 2 being slightly more restrictive by requiring reporting earlier in the week. Alternative 3 would be most costly, as reporting would be daily instead of weekly. Currently, all South Atlantic headboats are required to report electronically, therefore no additional costs are expected to be borne by headboat operators to gain access to a computer or the internet.

4.2.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Section 3.4 (Social Environment) includes detailed information about fishermen and communities that may be affected by changes to reporting requirements for for-hire permit holders with headboat businesses. The effects of reporting requirements on headboat businesses would be similar to expected effects on charter vessels, as described in Section 4.1.3 (Action 1...
Social Effects). In general, negative social effects of headboat reporting requirements would likely be associated with any added time and financial burden for headboat owners and crew to meet the requirements. Increased frequency in reporting under Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 may have some negative effects on headboat owners and captains because businesses would need to allocate additional time or staff to submit reports. The daily reporting requirement under Alternative 3 would be more burdensome for headboats than the weekly reporting in Preferred Alternative 2. Alternative 1 (No Action) would not be expected to negatively impact the for-hire sector in terms of additional time and money requirements. The requirement for increased electronic reporting under Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would affect vessel owners who do not already use computer systems in their businesses, or could result in errors. However, requiring all headboats to report electronically and more frequently (Alternative 3) is expected to result in broad social benefits by improving quota monitoring, as discussed in Section 4.1.3.

There may also be some positive benefits for individual charter fishing businesses associated with having a consistent record of catch on the charter boat’s trips under Preferred Alternative 2 or Alternative 3. This information could be used for marketing purposes to demonstrate the ability and knowledge of the captain and crew. Additionally, a database could be established that would allow charter business owners to access their own records and compare them to summarized reports at a local or regional level.

4.2.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Alternative 1 (No Action), the status quo alternative, would not be expected to result in an increase in administrative burden to NMFS. Under Alternative 1 there would be no changes in how data are currently collected for fishery quota monitoring. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, would increase the administrative burden on NMFS, as all federally permitted vessels would be required to submit records to the SRD on a weekly basis. However the difference in administrative burden between Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 is expected to be minimal.

Alternative 1 (No Action), the status quo alternative, would not be expected to result in any increase in administrative burden on vessel owners. Alternative 3 would result in more burden to the vessels owners as they would be required to report daily compared to weekly (or shorter than a week) in Preferred Alternative 2.
4.3 Action 3: Modify Electronic Reporting Requirements to Require Vessel or Catch Location Reporting

4.3.1 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical/Biological/Ecological Environment

The requirement to report the location of area fished is an administrative process for providing a means of collecting data from the industry, and does not directly affect the biological or physical environment but may have an indirect effect. It is expected that with more complete location information, managers would be able to make better decisions about future management.

Preferred Alternative 2 would require electronic reporting of latitude/longitude in degrees and minutes or by clicking on a geographic chart for charter vessels fishing in the South Atlantic. Neither Alternative 1 nor Preferred Alternative 2 will have direct impacts on the physical, biological or ecological environment but Preferred Alternative 2 may result in better management decisions that can ultimately result in biological benefits to the species. Because Preferred Alternative 2 only proposes electronic location reporting, it is tied to Action 1. If electronic reporting for the charter vessel fleet is not implemented, this action would not be relevant.

Two Alternatives Considered
Section 1502.14(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act states that “agencies shall: rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives…” Two reasonable alternatives for this action, including the no action alternative, have been identified by NMFS and the Council. The Council is considering requiring charter vessels to report catch location in the same manner as is currently required for headboats to ensure consistency in reporting throughout the region.

4.3.2 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

As Alternative 1 (No Action) is the status quo and no requirement is in place to require charter vessel or catch location reporting, it is expected not to have any additional economic effects. Assuming electronic reporting becomes a requirement for charter vessels (Action 1), Preferred Alternative 2 is expected to have minor economic effects. Reporting location fished will require additional time when filling out a trip report. However, the marginal increase in time burden is expected to be minimal. There are expected benefits from improved quantity and quality of data from the for-hire sector. This information will help better inform stock assessments as well as provide improve economic analysis of management decisions focusing specific fishing locations.
4.3.3 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Section 3.4 (Social Environment) includes detailed information about fishermen and communities that may be affected by location reporting requirements for for-hire permit holders. In general, the expected social effects would likely be at the individual level and would be associated with a financial burden on fishermen to purchase and maintain any required equipment. Detailed analysis of the expected economic effects is included in Section 4.3.2 (economic effects). Under Alternative 1 (No Action), there would be no additional financial burden.

There are some expected benefits to the fleet and other long-term broad social benefits from the location reporting requirements under Preferred Alternative 2. Reporting location information under Preferred Alternative 2 would also improve data collection on fishing behavior and important fishing grounds. For example, impacts on charter vessels from a potential marine protected area would be clarified and quantified if data are available at a finer resolution (headboat grids). Location data could also be used in broader long-term studies to better understand fleet dynamics and environmental factors affecting fishing decisions. These benefits would not be possible under Alternative 1 (No Action).

It is likely that some charter boat and headboat owners and crew will not be supportive of reporting location (Preferred Alternative 2) because it may be perceived as an invasion of privacy or could disclose fishing areas they depend on in their for-hire businesses. Alternative 1 (No Action) would not require location information and would not be expected to result in negative perceptions from the for-hire fleet.

Overall, the expected benefits to the fleet and to the public will be reduced by the negative impacts from the additional short-term and long-term costs to purchase and maintain equipment necessary to meet location reporting requirements under Preferred Alternative 2.

4.3.4 Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

Alternative 1 (No Action), the status quo alternative, would not be expected to result in an increase in administrative burden to NMFS as this alternative does not change how data are currently collected. Preferred Alternative 2 would have a very small administrative burden relative to Alternative 1 (No Action) in that it would merely extend the current headboat requirement to report latitude and longitude or location electronically to charter vessels fishing in the South Atlantic. This system is already in place and being used by headboat operators. However, just as described for Action 1 collecting information from charter vessels would slightly increase the administrative burden due to the increase in vessels reporting.
CHAPTER 5. COUNCIL CONCLUSIONS

The intent of this amendment is to improve the timeliness and accuracy of catch data to prevent Annual Catch Limit (ACL) overages and to improve the data used in stock assessments and management evaluations. More accurate data could extend fishing seasons in a given year, project longer fishing seasons the following year, and improve other measures designed to catch more fish while ensuring healthy fish stocks. Reduced catch uncertainty could reduce the buffers used to address uncertainty in fishing level recommendations.

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) concludes it is advantageous to impose reporting consistency in the for-hire sector, and have charter vessels reporting electronically just as headboats currently report. A long term goal is to have the current Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) for-hire survey for charter vessels entirely replaced by an electronic logbook census reporting program. The Council concludes that the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) offers a proven and effective mechanism for meeting this intent, and therefore strongly recommends that NMFS consider using ACCSP when implementing the provisions of this amendment.

The Council’s intent for this amendment is to require electronic reporting of all for-hire fishing activities in areas covered by Council FMPs, and to reduce duplicate reporting and allow fishermen to file a single report that can be made available to all entities requiring reporting and data. The proposed changes, particularly the requirement for all charter vessels to report landings, could reduce uncertainty in catch and effort data for the for-hire component of three federally managed fisheries, increasing the likelihood that the Optimum Yield (OY) would be achieved and ACL overages would be avoided, as well as improving stock assessment estimates.

The Council’s goal in selecting the alternative for weekly reporting is to make data available on a more timely basis. The current MRIP for-hire data collection and monitoring system is reported in 2-month waves for all South Atlantic states and data for monitoring are available approximately 45 days after the end of each wave. This delay in availability makes timely management decisions difficult. This current combination of data collection and monitoring systems is inadequate for in-season monitoring for species with small ACLs or short recreational seasons, resulting in large ACL overruns or overly precautionary management actions. Also, the survey methods (i.e., catch and effort estimates) can be imprecise for less commonly encountered species, leading to greater scientific and management uncertainty that requires larger buffers to prevent ACL overages and may prevent the OY from consistently being achieved. Direct, weekly reporting by charter vessels could allow for catch to eventually be monitored over shorter time periods leading to improved management.

The Council’s goal is to have the logbook program begin January 1, 2017. However, there are many of details to be worked out and there is a need for flexibility as to when the reporting requirement becomes mandatory. In addition, as with any new data collection program, there will need to be a period of overlap between the existing MRIP for-hire survey approach for charter vessel monitoring and the mandatory electronic logbook census considered by the actions in this amendment. Collecting data through both approaches during the overlap period will provide
information that is critical to calibrating past survey based estimates to the proposed census logbook.

The Council’s preferred alternatives for the actions in this amendment address many of the key recommendations of the Gulf and South Atlantic Technical Subcommittee convened to develop best practice recommendations for for-hire reporting. These include recommendations for mandatory, electronic, census reporting on a weekly basis, including reports when no fishing activity takes place. The Council further recommends that the agency consider the subcommittee recommendations addressing validation, accountability measures, calibration with existing survey methods, and program coordination when implementing the provisions of this amendment.

The Council’s visioning process identified a number of objectives related to data collection (Appendix G). Through this amendment process, the Council made progress on Science Strategy 1.1 by evaluating fishery dependent data collection of for-hire catch and effort, encouraging adequate validation of data collected under this amendment, on Science Strategy 1.2 which encouraged uniform, efficient reporting, and Science Strategy 4.2, which included priority actions for the use of electronic reporting mechanism for all sectors, and consequences for lack of reporting.

The Council’s Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel (AP) reviewed this amendment on several occasions during its development. Their preferred alternatives are noted in the document. The Mackerel and Dolphin Wahoo APs also reviewed the document, with no preferred alternatives identified.

The Council’s Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) reviewed this amendment and offered suggestions on core variable, supporting collection of information on discard details such as fate and depth, overall range of depth fished, effort based on actual hours fished, and evaluation of information collected to ensure it is useful for assessment and management purposes. The SSC did not identify preferred alternatives for the proposed actions.

The Council is considering taking actions through future amendments that could consider limited entry in the for-hire sector. Compliance with the reporting requirements of this amendment may be among the factors considered by the Council when determining eligibility criteria in any future limited entry programs.
5.1 Action 1: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter Vessels

The Council prefers Alternative 2 for Action 1. Weekly, electronic reporting of fishing trips will reduce lags in catch information. The Council prefers sub-Alternative 2a, requiring reporting of all fish harvested or discarded regardless of where harvested. This is consistent with the headboat requirements and will prevent gaps in data reporting.

Electronic, weekly reporting would facilitate the availability of catch in numbers sooner than catch in pounds. The Council is considering specifying recreational ACLs in numbers of fish so that the headboat sector (and the charter vessel sector once this amendment is approved) can be tracked weekly. Specifying the recreational ACL in numbers of fish could also reduce the time in which MRIP data are available to track recreational ACLs.

Requiring reporting of all catch, regardless of where a vessel operates, will reduce gaps in catch information and therefore improve catch monitoring for federally licensed vessels. It will also provide information on species which are not managed by the council at present, which may nonetheless become more prevalent in the South Atlantic ecosystem, and thus more important to South Atlantic fisheries, at some point in the future.

The Council’s intent in selecting this action is to reduce duplicate reporting and allow fishermen to file a single report that can be made available to all entities requiring reporting and data. The Council concludes that ACCSP offers a proven and effective mechanism for meeting this intent, and therefore strongly

---

**Action 1 Alternatives**
*(preferred alternatives in bold)*

1. Alternative 1. No Action. If selected, a charter vessel operator must maintain a fishing record for each trip or portion of such trip. Reports must be postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday).

2. Preferred Alternative 2. Require that federally permitted charter vessels, while operating as a charter vessel, submit fishing records to the SRD weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Weekly = Tuesday following each fishing week. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel preferred.

   Preferred Sub-alternative 2a. Report all fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. *(current HB requirement)*

   Sub-alternative 2b. Report only South Atlantic federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. *(snapper grouper, dolphin/wahoo, & CMP species)*

   Sub-Alternative 2c. Report all federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested.

3. Alternative 3. Require that federally permitted charter vessels, while operating as a charter vessel, submit fishing records to the SRD daily via electronic reporting via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Daily = by noon of the following day.

   Sub-alternative 3a. Report all fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. *(current HB requirement)*

   Sub-alternative 3b. Report only South Atlantic federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested. *(snapper grouper, dolphin/wahoo, & CMP species)*

   Sub-Alternative 3c. Report all federally-managed fish harvested/discarded on all trips regardless of where harvested.
recommends that NMFS consider using ACCSP when implementing the provisions of this amendment.

The Council’s preferred alternatives address many of the key recommendations of the technical subcommittee convened to develop best practice recommendations for for-hire reporting. These include recommendations for mandatory, electronic, census reporting on a weekly basis, including reports when no fishing activity takes place. The Council further recommends that the agency consider the subcommittee recommendations addressing validation, accountability measures, calibration with existing survey methods, and program coordination when implementing the provisions of this amendment.

The Council’s Visioning process identified a number of objectives related to data collection (Appendix K). Through this amendment process, the Council made progress on Science Strategy 1.1 by evaluating fishery dependent data collection of for-hire catch and effort and encouraging adequate validation of data collected under this amendment. The preferred alternative chosen for Action 1 provides for electronic charter reporting that is consistent with existing headboat reporting, thereby addressing Science Strategy 1.2 which encouraged uniform, efficient reporting. This action also makes progress on Science Strategy 4.2, which included priority actions for the use of electronic reporting mechanism for all sectors, and consequences for lack of reporting.

The Council’s Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel (AP) reviewed this amendment on several occasions during its development. Their preferred alternatives are noted in the document. For Action 1, the Snapper Grouper AP preferred alternative 2.

The Council’s SSC reviewed this amendment and offered suggestions on core variable, supporting collection of information on discard details such as fate and depth, overall range of depth fished, effort based on actual hours fished, and evaluation of information collected to ensure it is useful for assessment and management purposes. The SSC did not identify preferred alternatives for the proposed actions.

Currently, charter vessels in fisheries for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics (CMP) are only required to report, if selected. None have been selected to date. The Council’s intent in considering this action is for the owner or operator of a charter vessel with a for-hire charter vessel permit for South Atlantic CMP species, South Atlantic snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin and wahoo, and whose vessel fishes for or lands CMP species, snapper grouper, or Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic or Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), to report their catch and fishing effort regardless of where they operate. All fishing trips shall be reported and all operators shall report their fishing activities, rather than just a subset of selected vessels as currently required. Reporting would be accomplished through an electronic, Internet-based system approved by the Science and Research Director (SRD), rather than paper logbook forms are currently required.

The Council’s intent is to have the entire for-hire sector’s landings available weekly, similar to commercial landings. Headboats are currently required to electronically report data weekly and, if this amendment is implemented, charter vessels will also be required to report weekly via
Having the for-hire catches updated weekly would help inform the projection process for the private recreational sector’s catches that are available 45 days after a 2-month wave.
5.2 Action 2: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Headboats

The Council prefers Alternative 2 for Action 2. Changing the timing of reporting by headboat operators prevents the need for them to split a weekend into separate reports and achieves consistency between headboat and charter operations reporting requirements. The shortened window for reporting should reduce recall bias and improve the timeliness of data availability.

The Council recommends that the agency report catch information more frequently than the current approach which mirrors the MRIP 2-month wave. Doing so will improve catch monitoring and provide the fishermen better information on the state of the fishery. More frequent tabulation of reports would also benefit validation and efforts to reduce delinquent reporting.

The Council’s preferred alternative for Action 2 addresses recommendation 4.3 of the technical subcommittee convened to develop best practice recommendations for for-hire reporting. This recommendation was for weekly reporting submitted on Tuesday.

The Council’s visioning process identified a number of objectives related to data collection. By choosing a consistent reporting period for charter and headboats, the Council’s preferred alternative for Action 2 addresses Science Strategy 1.2 which encouraged uniform, efficient reporting.

### Action 2 Alternatives
(preferred alternatives in bold)

1. **Alternative 1. No Action.** If selected, a headboat operator must submit an electronic fishing record for each trip of all fish harvested through the Southeast Region Headboat Survey. Electronic fishing records (reports) must be submitted weekly (or at intervals shorter than a week if notified) by 11:59 p.m., local time, the Sunday following a reporting week.

2. **Preferred Alternative 2.** Require that headboats, while operating as a headboat, submit fishing records to the SRD weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Weekly = Tuesday following each fishing week. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel preferred.

3. **Alternative 3.** Require that headboats, while operating as a headboat, submit fishing records to the SRD daily via electronic reporting (via NMFS approved hardware/software). Daily = by noon of the following day.
5.3 Action 3: Modify Electronic Reporting Requirements to Require Vessel or Catch Location Reporting

The Council prefers Alternative 2 for Action 3. This alternative is consistent with the method and resolution of area reporting currently required by the headboat electronic reporting program. It is therefore consistent with the visioning priority actions, under Science Strategy 1.2, of a uniform, efficient reporting mechanism. The preferred reporting resolution is consistent with the visioning priority action under Science Strategy 4.2 for improvements in existing logbook programs to include better resolution of logbook grids.

**Action 3 Alternatives**
*(preferred alternatives in bold)*

1. **Alternative 1 (No Action).** Current regulations require charter vessels participating in the for-hire survey to report area fished (inshore, state, or federal waters), if selected as part of the survey. Headboats participating in the Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS) are required to report latitude and longitude of area fished (degrees and minutes only; within 1 nm² area).

2. **Preferred Alternative 2.** Require federally permitted charters vessels to report location electronically by latitude/longitude in degrees and minutes or by clicking on a headboat chart. Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel preferred.
5.4 Recommendations of Council Advisors


The Mackerel AP reviewed this amendment in April 2015 and recommended that limited entry be considered in the for-hire sector to improve validation and compliance. In February 2016 the Mackerel AP declined to identify any preferred actions until after public hearings were held. The committee recognized that reporting could include data availability and information on the fishery, while also expressing concern with the reporting burden and validity of information reported.

The SSC reviewed this amendment in May 2016; most comments concerned the core data elements. The SSC supported collecting information on discards and evaluating data collected for use in management and assessment. Consideration of split-trip reporting was also suggested, to allow better resolution of catch and effort for trips that may include both trolling and bottom fishing activities, or cover a wide geographic area.

5.4 Recommended Reporting Program Details

It is the Council’s intent to extend the reporting requirements of the For-Hire Reporting Amendment through the Mid-Atlantic and New England Fishery Management Councils’ areas for vessels with a federal for-hire permit for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP species. Further, it is the Council’s intent to avoid duplicate reporting by individual vessels; one report submitted to, for example, Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) or the Greater Atlantic Region (GAR) Vessel Trip Reporting (VTR) system should be available to each agency needing the data. One issue to be resolved is the timing for reports: under the preferred alternatives for this amendment, any South Atlantic permitted vessel would be required to report electronically via the charter vessel logbook the Tuesday following the end of the week (Sunday) whereas the paper vessel reports for the GAR permitted vessels are currently due on or before 11:59 pm the Saturday following the end of the fishing week that is Sunday through Saturday. There is also the possibility for differences in variables collected under different programs.

Reporting Program Details

The NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) would develop the specific details of how the reporting and data management system would operate. The Council expects to be provided ample opportunity to have input into the system design. The Council recommends that the reporting and data management system include the following items as recommended by the Technical Sub-committee:

a) Logbook data collected via authorized platform, e.g., web, tablet, phone, or vessel monitoring system (VMS) application
b) Data submitted to ACCSP or Gulf Fisheries Information Network (GulfFIN);
c) Data integrated by ACCSP or GulfFIN into single composite data set;
d) Composite data set distributed to appropriate agencies for analyses and use, and made available to the public via ACCSP.

e) NMFS and/or ACCSP/GulfFIN are to develop a compliance tracking procedure that balances timeliness with available staff and funding resources.
f) NMFS is to use validation methods developed in the Gulf of Mexico logbook pilot study and the Marine Resources Information Program /South Carolina validation project as a basis to ensure that the actual logbook report is validated and standardized validation methodologies are employed among regions.
g) Dual survey methods (existing MRIP and new mandatory reporting) maintained for no less than 3 years, and no management advice expected from the new method during the first year.

h) NMFS is to require and maintain a comprehensive permit/email database of participants.

i) NMFS is to include procedures for expanding estimates for non-reporting.

j) NMFS is to allow multiple authorized applications or devices that can transmit data from sea to report data as long as they meet required data and transferability standards.

k) Explore ways to determine the impact of state permitted vessels on landings of federally managed species, and pursue a long-term strategy of including the entire fleet, federal and non-federally permitted, in the reporting program.

Core Data Elements
The Council identified core data elements to collect for each charter fishing trip. Core data elements listed below are intended to provide basic information on catch and effort required for each trip to manage the fishery and monitor the population. Core elements also include limited economic variables to improve the Councils ability to determine the economic impacts of regulations. The core data elements also include many of the specific data recommendations identified by the technical subcommittee as necessary for validation and estimation.

CORE DATA ELEMENTS. Variables to collect for each trip.

- Start Date
- Start Time
- End Date
- End Time
- Start Location
- End Location
- Vessel ID (name, License #)
- Captain ID (name, License #)
- Number of fishermen
- Number of crew
- Method (general categories, e.g., troll, bottom, spear, drift)
- Hours fished
- Primary depth fished: may be reported as a range
- Target species: may be reported in categories or groups
- Location: 1 minute grid (consistent with headboat reporting)
- Number of each species kept
- Number of each species released
- Charter fee
- Fuel used
- Fuel price per gallon
Detailed information to improve social and economic evaluations, or more precisely describe where species are encountered by the fishery, could be obtained through dedicated sampling of a sub-set of charter trips, similar to what is now done to obtain commercial discard and economic information. Providing opportunities for fishermen to provide detailed information, whether it be set-level catch records or social and economic data, should be considered when developing the reporting program to address provisions of this amendment. Additional data that could be collected on a sample or voluntary basis from both charter vessels and headboats includes:

- set-level data including retained catch, measurements and condition of released fish, and use of release mortality reduction methods and tools at specific locations and depths
- detailed economic data and social data, similar to what is currently being collected from commercial fishermen
CHAPTER 6. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

As directed by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), federal agencies are mandated to assess not only the indirect and direct impacts, but the cumulative impacts of proposed 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.

6.1 Cumulative Biological Impacts

1. Affected Area

The For-Hire Amendment includes Amendment 39 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic (Amendment 39), Amendment 9 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 9), Amendment 27 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region (CMP Amendment 27).

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) manages the snapper grouper resource in federal waters off Florida, Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina. The Council, in cooperation with the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the New England Fishery Management Council, is responsible for conservation and management of dolphin and wahoo in federal waters off the Atlantic states. The Council, in cooperation with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is responsible for the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Region.

The immediate impact area for this amendment is the federal 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the Atlantic off the coasts of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and east Florida to Key West.

The ranges of affected species are described in Section 3.2.1. Section 3.1.1 describes the essential fish habitat designation and requirements for snapper-grouper, dolphin, and CMP.

2. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions Impacting the Affected Area

For this action, the cumulative effects analysis (CEA) includes an analysis of actions and events dating back to when the original dolphin wahoo, coastal migratory pelagics, and snapper-grouper fishery management plans (FMP) were implemented, and through what is expected to take place approximately before or within 2015-2016.
The reader is referred to Chapter 1 of this document for a comprehensive list of past regulatory activity for the dolphin wahoo, CMP, and snapper grouper FMPs. For the purposes of this discussion the past, present and foreseeable actions listed below are those related to data collection in the snapper grouper, CMP, and dolphin wahoo fisheries.

**Past Actions**

**Snapper Grouper**

The following amendments to the Snapper Grouper FMP contained actions that pertained to the for-hire sector including permit and reporting requirements.

Amendment 4 (SAFMC 1991) established charterboat and headboat permits and required charterboats and headboats to report, if selected. Amendment 4 also required that recreational fishermen must make snapper grouper species, or parts thereof, available for inspection by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Science and Research Director (SRD) or an authorized representative, upon request. Amendment 4 also designated prohibited gear, defined overfishing and established rebuilding timeframes, established gear marking requirements for black sea bass traps, size limits, bag limits and spawning season closures.

Amendment 7 (SAFMC 1994) established dealer permits for both charter and headboats, allowed sale under specified conditions, and adjusted bag limits and crew specifications for charter and headboats. Amendment 7 also adjusted specified size limits for hogfish and mutton snapper, modified the management unit to include scup and specified allowable gear and made allowances for experimental gear.

Amendment 16 (SAFMC 2009) established a prohibition on captain and crew on for-hire trips retaining the bag limit of vermilion snapper and species within the 3-fish grouper aggregate. Amendment 16 also specified allocations for gag and vermilion snapper, required dehooking tools for sea turtle bycatch, established a spawning season closure for gag and a reduced bag limit and recreational closed season for vermilion. Directed commercial quotas were also established for both gag and vermilion snapper.

Amendment 15B (SAFMC 2008) prohibited the sale of bag-limit caught snapper grouper species; reduced the effects of incidental hooking on sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish; adjusted commercial renewal periods and transferability requirements; implemented plan to monitor and assess bycatch; established reference points for golden tilefish; established allocations for snowy grouper (95% commercial & 5% recreational) and red porgy (50% commercial & 50% recreational). Amendment 15B also required that commercial vessels with a snapper grouper permit, for-hire vessels with a for-hire permit, and private recreational vessels if fishing for snapper grouper species in the EEZ, shall use observer coverage, logbooks, electronic logbooks, video monitoring, or any other method deemed necessary to measure by catch by NOAA Fisheries, if selected.
Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Amendment 6 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP/Amendment 22 to the CMP FMP (SAFMC 2013a) required electronic logbook reporting for headboat vessels fishing for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP species. This amendment required selected vessels with a Federal for-hire Permit to report landings data electronically; and implemented a provision that authorizes NMFS to require weekly or daily reporting as required.

**South Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo**

The following amendments to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP contained actions that pertained to the for-hire sector including permit and reporting requirements.

The Dolphin Wahoo FMP, implemented in 2003, contained management measures such as minimum size limits, allowable gear, closed areas, and quotas. The Dolphin Wahoo FMP required owners of commercial and for-hire vessels to have vessel permits and, if selected, submit reports on their fishing activities. Dealers were also required to have permits and, if selected, submit reports. In 2004, the Dolphin Wahoo FMP required that operators of commercial and for-hire vessels that are required to have a federal vessel permit for dolphin and wahoo to display operator permits.

Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Amendment 6 to the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP/Amendment 22 to the CMP FMP (SAFMC 2013a) required electronic logbook reporting for headboat vessels fishing for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP.

**CMP Fishery**

The following amendments to the CMP FMP contained actions that pertained to the for-hire sector including permit and reporting requirements.

Amendment 2 (SAFMC 1987) to the CMP FMP (implemented in 1987) required that charter vessels and headboats fishing in the EEZ of the Gulf of Mexico or Atlantic for CMP species have permits.

Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Amendment 6 to the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP/Amendment 22 to the CMP FMP (SAFMC 2013a) required electronic logbook reporting for headboat vessels fishing for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and CMP.

**Present Actions**

Along with this reporting amendment, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is developing the Generic Amendment to the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic which would require electronic reporting for vessels fishing in the reef fish and CMP fisheries. This
amendment is on a slightly different timeline than the For Hire Amendment and may have implications for management that overlap with the For Hire Amendment.

Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

The Joint Commercial Logbook Reporting Amendment would require electronic reporting of landings information by federally-permitted commercial vessels, which would increase the timeliness and accuracy of landings data; currently, fishermen report using paper logbooks.

3. Consideration of Climate Change and Other Non-Fishery Related Issues

Climate Change

Global climate changes could have significant effects on Atlantic fisheries. However, the extent of these effects is not known at this time. Possible impacts include temperature changes in coastal and marine ecosystems that can influence organism metabolism and alter ecological processes such as productivity and species interactions; changes in precipitation patterns and a rise in sea level which could change the water balance of coastal ecosystems; altering patterns of wind and water circulation in the ocean environment; and influencing the productivity of critical coastal ecosystems such as wetlands, estuaries, and coral reefs (Link et al, 2015).

It is unclear how climate change would affect fish species in the Atlantic. Climate change can affect factors such as migration, range, larval and juvenile survival, prey availability, and susceptibility to predators. In addition, the distribution of native and exotic species may change with increased water temperature, as may the prevalence of disease in keystone animals such as corals and the occurrence and intensity of toxic algae blooms. Climate change may significantly impact species in the future, but the level of impacts cannot be quantified at this time, nor is the time frame known in which these impacts will occur.

Weather Variables

Hurricane season is from June 1 to November 30, and accounts for 97% of all tropical activity affecting the Atlantic basin. These storms, although unpredictable in their annual occurrence, can devastate areas when they occur. Although these effects may be temporary, those fishing-related businesses whose profitability is marginal may go out of business if a hurricane strikes.

Deepwater-Horizon Oil Spill

On April 20, 2010, an explosion occurred on the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil rig, resulting in the release of an estimated 4.9 million barrels of oil into the Gulf. In addition, 1.84 million gallons of Corexit 9500A dispersant were applied as part of the effort to constrain the spill. The cumulative effects from the oil spill and response may not be known for several years. The oil spill affected more than one-third of the Gulf area from western Louisiana east to the panhandle of Florida and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. The impacts of the Deepwater Horizon
MC252 oil spill on the physical environment are expected to be significant and may be long-term. Oil is dispersed on the surface, and because of the heavy use of dispersants, oil is also documented as being suspended within the water column, some even deeper than the location of the broken well head. Floating and suspended oil washed onto shore in several areas of the Gulf, as well as non-floating tar balls. Whereas suspended and floating oil degrades over time, tar balls are more persistent in the environment and can be transported hundreds of miles. Oil on the surface of the water could restrict the normal process of atmospheric oxygen mixing into and replenishing oxygen concentrations in the water column. In addition, microbes in the water that break down oil and dispersant also consume oxygen; this could lead to further oxygen depletion. Zooplankton that feed on algae could also be negatively impacted, thus allowing more of the hypoxia-fueling algae to grow. The highest concern is that the oil spill may have impacted spawning success of species that spawn in the summer months, either by reducing spawning activity or by reducing survival of the eggs and larvae. Effects on the physical environment, such as low oxygen, could lead to impacts on the ability of larvae and post-larvae to survive, even if they never encounter oil. In addition, effects of oil exposure may create sub-lethal effects on the eggs, larva, and early life stages. The stressors could potentially be additive, and each stressor may increase the susceptibility to the harmful effects of the other. The oil from the spill site was not detected in the South Atlantic region, and does not likely pose a threat to the South Atlantic species addressed in this amendment. However, the effects of the oil spill on fish species would be taken into consideration in future Southeast Data Assessment and Review assessments.

Indirect and inter-related effects on the biological and ecological environment of the fisheries in concert with the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill are not well understood. Changes in the population size structure could result from shifting fishing effort to specific geographic segments of populations, combined with any anthropogenically induced natural mortality that may occur from the impacts of the oil spill. The impacts on the food web from phytoplankton, to zooplankton, to mollusks, to top predators may be significant in the future.

4. Overall Impacts Expected from Past, Present, and Future Actions

The For Hire Amendment proposes changes to the current reporting requirements to collect data from fishermen through electronic reports and would modify the frequency of reporting for headboats. Chapters 2 and 4 of this document describe in detail the magnitude and significance of effects of the trip limit alternatives for the charter and for hire sectors of the CMP, snapper grouper and dolphin wahoo fisheries and none of the impacts have been determined to be significant.

The cumulative effects of the actions proposed in combined with effects of other past, present, and future actions, are not expected to affect the magnitude of bycatch, diversity, and ecosystem structure of fish communities, or safety at sea of fishermen. The actions in this amendment are mainly administrative in action and combined with past, present and foreseeable actions would not cause significant impacts to the resource or to the fishery participants.
This action is not likely to result in direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to unique areas, such as significant scientific cultural or historical resources, park land, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas as the proposed action is not expected to substantially increase fishing effort or the spatial and/or temporal distribution of current fishing effort within the Atlantic region. The Stellwagen Bank off the Northeastern U.S., USS Monitor, Gray’s Reef, and Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuaries are within the boundaries of the Atlantic exclusive economic zone.

5 Monitoring and Mitigation

The effects of the proposed actions are, and will continue to be, monitored through collection of landings data by NMFS, stock assessments and stock assessment updates, life history studies, economic and social analyses, and other scientific observations. The proposed actions relate to data collection, and the activity does not itself introduce non-indigenous species, and is not reasonably expected to facilitate the spread of such species through depressing the populations of native species. Additionally, the actions in the amendment do not propose any activity, such as increased ballast water discharge from foreign vessels, which is associated with the introduction or spread on nonindigenous species. None of the beneficial or adverse impacts from the proposed management action (as summarized in Chapter 2 of this document) have been determined to be significant.

See Chapter 4 for the detailed discussions of the magnitude of the impacts of the preferred alternatives on the human environment. The actions in the For Hire Amendment would not have significant biological, social, or economic effects because the actions are administrative and will not have any direct impacts on harvest of species. Therefore, the cumulative effects of the action proposed in the For Hire Amendment are not expected to affect the magnitude bycatch, diversity and ecosystem structure of fish communities, or safety at sea of fishermen targeting dolphin and wahoo, CMP or snapper grouper. Based on the cumulative effects analysis presented herein, the proposed action would not have any significant adverse cumulative impacts compared to, or combined with, other past, present, and foreseeable future actions.
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APPENDIX A: ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

2.4 Action 4: Amend the Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and Atlantic Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Management Plans to Specify Certain Aspects of Reporting for For-Hire Vessels

Alternative 1 (No Action). There is no specified time for data to be made available to the public and to the Councils.

Alternative 2. Specify the following data flow via electronic reporting:
   a) Logbook data collected via authorized platform, ex. web, tablet, phone, or VMS application
b) Data submitted to ACCSP or GulfFIN;

c) Data integrated by ACCSP or GulfFIN into single composite data set;

d) Composite data set distributed to appropriate agencies for analyses and use.

**Sub-alternative 2a.** Apply to charter vessels reporting.

**Sub-alternative 2b.** Apply to headboat reporting.

**Alternative 3.** Specify the following aspects of electronic reporting:

a) NMFS and/or ACCSP develop a compliance tracking procedure that balances timeliness with available staff and funding resources.

b) NMFS is to use validation methods developed in the Gulf of Mexico logbook pilot study as a basis to ensure that the actual logbook report is validated and standardized validation methodologies are employed among regions.

c) NMFS is to require and maintain a comprehensive permit/email database of participants.

d) NMFS is to include procedures for expanding estimates for non-reporting.

e) NMFS is to allow multiple authorized applications or devices to report data as long as they meet required data and transferability standards.

**Sub-alternative 3a.** Apply to charter vessel reporting.

**Sub-alternative 3b.** Apply to headboat reporting.

**Discussion**

The technical subcommittee recommends a multi-faceted approach where a number of reporting platforms can be used so long as the minimum data standards and security protocols are met. Data standards would need to be developed and the subcommittee agreed that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the GulfFIN, and Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (ACCSP) could work collaboratively to develop appropriate standards.

The subcommittee recommends this process for data storage and management:

1. Logbook data collected via authorized platform, ex. web, tablet, phone, or VMS application
2. Data submitted to ACCSP or GulfFIN;
3. Data integrated by ACCSP or GulfFIN into single composite data set;
4. Composite data set distributed to appropriate agencies for analyses and use.

This process could eliminate duplicate reporting for some participants (e.g., South Carolina headboats and charter vessels) so long as appropriate data standards are in place and the respective agencies agree to confidentiality standards, which would allow sharing and accepting one another’s data for use. Elimination of duplicate reporting (e.g., separate state and federal reports) would be a substantial benefit to participants in this survey program and could mitigate any additional reporting requirements for comparison to the current MRIP survey program.

The South Atlantic Council is concerned about the time it takes to get data needed to track recreational catches. The current South Atlantic blueline tilefish recreational ACL versus recreational catches is currently unknown pending receipt of the first wave of MRIP data (should be available 45 days after the end of February) and any headboat catches. Part of the time it takes to get data is related converting numbers of fish to pounds. This adds an unspecified period of time after the MRIP data are released for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to apply their
conversion factors and provide a catch estimate. The South Atlantic Council is considering specifying recreational ACLs in numbers of fish so that the headboat sector (and the charter vessel sector once this amendment is approved) can be tracked weekly. Specifying the recreational ACL in numbers of fish would also reduce the delay in using the MRIP data to track recreational ACLs.

**Action 4** addresses the following recommendations from the Technical Sub-Committee:

- Development of compliance tracking procedures that balance timeliness with available staff and funding resources.
- Use validation methods developed in the Gulf of Mexico logbook pilot study as a basis to ensure that the actual logbook report is validated and standardized validation methodologies are employed among regions.
- Require and maintain a comprehensive permit/email database of participants.
- Include procedures for expanding estimates for non-reporting.
- Allow multiple authorized applications or devices to report data as long as they meet required data and transferability standards.

The technical subcommittee recommends building upon the validation methodology developed in the Gulf of Mexico MRIP pilot study.

The technical subcommittee recommends use of an MRIP certified methodology for validation with the following elements: Gulf of Mexico MRIP pilot study methodologies, including dockside validation of catch and vessel activity, and maintenance of site and vessel registries.

The technical subcommittee recommends dual survey methods (existing and new) for no less than three years. Data from the new program would not be expected to provide management advice during the first year of operation. Moreover, this would allow the possibility of an initial phase-in or limited implementation to identify and solve significant problems prior to implementation for all participants.

The technical subcommittee recommends that the Councils move forward with development of a reporting system that includes federally permitted for-hire vessels while also exploring ways to determine the impact of state permitted vessels on landings estimates of federally managed species. Long term, the subcommittee recommends that both state and federally permitted charter vessels participate in this census to include the entire fleet of charter vessels harvesting federally managed species.

Weekly electronic dealer and headboat reporting are fully implemented. However, it takes some time to have updated landings available to the public for their use in planning trips and to the Councils for monitoring ACLs. A solution, in the Atlantic, could be to have the raw weekly data fed to ACCSP and made available to the public via the ACCSP website. The “official” numbers for quota closures would continue to be the numbers maintained by NMFS and available on the
NMFS Website but this would provide more timely and useful updates to the public.

The result would be updated and current catch data available on a daily basis for the public, states, NMFS, and the Councils to use in monitoring ACLs and planning fishing trips.
APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Survey

Allowable Biological Catch (ABC): Maximum amount of fish stock than can be harvested without adversely affecting recruitment of other components of the stock. The ABC level is typically higher than the total allowable catch, leaving a buffer between the two.

ALS: Accumulative Landings System. NMFS database which contains commercial landings reported by dealers.

Biomass: Amount or mass of some organism, such as fish.

B\textsubscript{MSY}: Biomass of population achieved in long-term by fishing at F\textsubscript{MSY}.

Bycatch: Fish harvested in a fishery, but not sold or kept for personal use. Bycatch includes economic discards and regulatory discards, but not fish released alive under a recreational catch and release fishery management program.

Caribbean Fishery Management Council (CFMC): One of eight regional councils mandated in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to develop management plans for fisheries in federal waters. The CFMC develops fishery management plans for fisheries off the coast of the U.S. Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Catch Per Unit Effort (CPUE): The amount of fish captured with an amount of effort. CPUE can be expressed as weight of fish captured per fishing trip, per hour spent at sea, or through other standardized measures.

Charter Boat: A fishing boat available for hire by recreational anglers, normally by a group of anglers for a short time period, and usually permitted to carry 6 or fewer paying passengers.

Cohort: Fish born in a given year. (See year class.)

Control Date: Date established for defining the pool of potential participants in a given management program. Control dates can establish a range of years during which a potential participant must have been active in a fishery to qualify for a quota share.

Constant Catch Rebuilding Strategy: A rebuilding strategy where the allowable biological catch of an overfished species is held constant until stock biomass reaches B\textsubscript{MSY} at the end of the rebuilding period.

Constant F Rebuilding Strategy: A rebuilding strategy where the fishing mortality of an overfished species is held constant until stock biomass reached BMSY at the end of the rebuilding period.
**Directed Fishery:** Fishing directed at a certain species or species group.

**Discards:** Fish captured, but released at sea.

**Discard Mortality Rate:** The % of total fish discarded that do not survive being captured and released at sea.

**Derby:** Fishery in which the TAC is fixed and participants in the fishery do not have individual quotas. The fishery is closed once the TAC is reached, and participants attempt to maximize their harvests as quickly as possible. Derby fisheries can result in capital stuffing and a race for fish.

**Effort:** The amount of time and fishing power (i.e., gear size, boat size, horsepower) used to harvest fish.

**Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ):** Zone extending from the shoreline out to 200 nautical miles in which the country owning the shoreline has the exclusive right to conduct certain activities such as fishing. In the United States, the EEZ is split into state waters (typically from the shoreline out to 3 nautical miles) and federal waters (typically from 3 to 200 nautical miles).

**Exploitation Rate:** Amount of fish harvested from a stock relative to the size of the stock, often expressed as a percentage.

**F:** Fishing mortality.

**Fecundity:** A measurement of the egg-producing ability of fish at certain sizes and ages.

**Fishery Dependent Data:** Fishery data collected and reported by fishermen and dealers.

**Fishery Independent Data:** Fishery data collected and reported by scientists who catch the fish themselves.

**Fishery Management Plan:** Management plan for fisheries operating in the federal produced by regional fishery management councils and submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for approval.

**Fishing Effort:** Usually refers to the amount of fishing. May refer to the number of fishing vessels, amount of fishing gear (nets, traps, hooks), or total amount of time vessels and gear are actively engaged in fishing.

**Fishing Mortality:** A measurement of the rate at which fish are removed from a population by fishing. Fishing mortality can be reported as either annual or instantaneous. Annual mortality is the percentage of fish dying in one year. Instantaneous is that percentage of fish dying at any one time.
**Fishing Power:** Measure of the relative ability of a fishing vessel, its gear, and its crew to catch fishes, in reference to some standard vessel, given both vessels are under identical conditions.

**F**$_{30\%SPR}$: Fishing mortality that will produce a static $SPR = 30\%$.

**F**$_{45\%SPR}$: Fishing mortality that will produce a static $SPR = 45\%$.

**F**$_{OY}$: Fishing mortality that will produce $OY$ under equilibrium conditions and a corresponding biomass of $B_{OY}$. Usually expressed as the yield at 85% of $F_{MSY}$, yield at 75% of $F_{MSY}$, or yield at 65% of $F_{MSY}$.

**F**$_{MSY}$: Fishing mortality that if applied constantly, would achieve MSY under equilibrium conditions and a corresponding biomass of $B_{MSY}$.

**Fork Length (FL):** The length of a fish as measured from the tip of its snout to the fork in its tail.

**Framework:** An established procedure within a fishery management plan that has been approved and implemented by NMFS, which allows specific management measures to be modified via regulatory amendment.

**Gear restrictions:** Limits placed on the type, amount, number, or techniques allowed for a given type of fishing gear.

**Growth Overfishing:** When fishing pressure on small fish prevents the fishery from producing the maximum poundage. Condition in which the total weight of the harvest from a fishery is improved when fishing effort is reduced, due to an increase in the average weight of fishes.

Greater Atlantic Region

**Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (GFMC):** One of eight regional councils mandated in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to develop management plans for fisheries in federal waters. The GFMC develops fishery management plans for fisheries off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and the west coast of Florida.

**Headboat:** A fishing boat that charges individual fees per recreational angler onboard.

**Highgrading:** Form of selective sorting of fishes in which higher value, more marketable fishes are retained, and less marketable fishes, which could legally be retained are discarded.

**Individual Fishing Quota (IFQ):** Fishery management tool that allocates a certain portion of the TAC to individual vessels, fishermen, or other eligible recipients.

**Longline:** Fishing method using a horizontal mainline to which weights and baited hooks are attached at regular intervals. Gear is either fished on the bottom or in the water column.
**Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act:** Federal legislation responsible for establishing the fishery management councils and the mandatory and discretionary guidelines for federal fishery management plans.

**Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS):** Survey operated by NMFS in cooperation with states that collects marine recreational data.

**Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT):** The rate of fishing mortality above which a stock’s capacity to produce MSY would be jeopardized.

**Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY):** The largest long-term average catch that can be taken continuously (sustained) from a stock or stock complex under average environmental conditions.

Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council

**Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST):** The biomass level below which a stock would be considered overfished.

**Modified F Rebuilding Strategy:** A rebuilding strategy where fishing mortality is changed as stock biomass increases during the rebuilding period.

**Multispecies fishery:** Fishery in which more than one species is caught at the same time and location with a particular gear type.

**National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS):** Federal agency within NOAA responsible for overseeing fisheries science and regulation.

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration:** Agency within the Department of Commerce responsible for ocean and coastal management.

**Natural Mortality (M):** A measurement of the rate at which fish are removed from a population by natural causes. Natural mortality can be reported as either annual or instantaneous. Annual mortality is the percentage of fish dying in one year. Instantaneous is that percentage of fish dying at any one time.

**Optimum Yield (OY):** The amount of catch that will provide the greatest overall benefit to the nation, particularly with respect to food production and recreational opportunities and taking into account the protection of marine ecosystems.

**Overfished:** A stock or stock complex is considered overfished when stock biomass falls below the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) (e.g., current biomass < MSST = overfished).

**Overfishing:** Overfishing occurs when a stock or stock complex is subjected to a rate of fishing mortality that exceeds the maximum fishing mortality threshold (e.g., current fishing mortality rate > MFMT = overfishing).
**Quota:** % or annual amount of fish that can be harvested.

**Recruitment (R):** Number or percentage of fish that survives from hatching to a specific size or age.

**Recruitment Overfishing:** The rate of fishing above which the recruitment to the exploitable stock becomes significantly reduced. This is characterized by a greatly reduced spawning stock, a decreasing proportion of older fish in the catch, and generally very low recruitment year after year.

Science and Research Director

**Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC):** Fishery management advisory body composed of federal, state, and academic scientists, which provides scientific advice to a fishery management council.

**Selectivity:** The ability of a type of gear to catch a certain size or species of fish.

**South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council (SAFMC):** One of eight regional councils mandated in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to develop management plans for fisheries in federal waters. The SAFMC develops fishery management plans for fisheries off North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and the east coast of Florida.

Southeast Fisheries Science Center

Southeast Region Headboat Survey

Southeast Regional Office

**Spawning Potential Ratio (Transitional SPR):** Formerly used in overfished definition. The number of eggs that could be produced by an average recruit in a fished stock divided by the number of eggs that could be produced by an average recruit in an unfished stock. SPR can also be expressed as the spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSBR) of a fished stock divided by the SSBR of the stock before it was fished.

**% Spawning Per Recruit (Static SPR):** Formerly used in overfishing determination. The maximum spawning per recruit produced in a fished stock divided by the maximum spawning per recruit, which occurs under the conditions of no fishing. Commonly abbreviated as %SPR.

**Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB):** The total weight of those fish in a stock which are old enough to spawn.

**Spawning Stock Biomass Per Recruit (SSBR):** The spawning stock biomass divided by the number of recruits to the stock or how much spawning biomass an average recruit would be expected to produce.
**Total Allowable Catch (TAC):** The total amount of fish to be taken annually from a stock or stock complex. This may be a portion of the Allowable Biological Catch (ABC) that takes into consideration factors such as bycatch.

**Total Length (TL):** The length of a fish as measured from the tip of the snout to the tip of the tail.

Vessel Monitoring System

Vessel Trip Report
APPENDIX C: OTHER APPLICABLE LAW

Relevant Federal Regulations

Code of Federal Regulations: Title 50
§ 622.2 Definitions and acronyms.

Charter vessel means a vessel less than 100 gross tons (90.8 mt) that is subject to the requirements of the USCG to carry six or fewer passengers for hire and that engages in charter fishing at any time during the calendar year. A charter vessel with a commercial permit, as required under § 622.4(a)(2), is considered to be operating as a charter vessel when it carries a passenger who pays a fee or when there are more than three persons aboard, including operator and crew, except for a charter vessel with a commercial vessel permit for Gulf reef fish or South Atlantic snapper-grouper. A charter vessel that has a charter vessel permit for Gulf reef fish and a commercial vessel permit for Gulf reef fish or a charter vessel permit for South Atlantic snapper-grouper and a commercial permit for South Atlantic snapper-grouper (either a South Atlantic snapper-grouper unlimited permit or a 225-lb (102.1-kg) trip limited permit for South Atlantic snapper-grouper) is considered to be operating as a charter vessel when it carries a passenger who pays a fee or when there are more than four persons aboard, including operator and crew. A charter vessel that has a charter vessel permit for Gulf reef fish, a commercial vessel permit for Gulf reef fish, and a valid Certificate of Inspection (COI) issued by the USCG to carry passengers for hire will not be considered to be operating as a charter vessel provided--

(1) It is not carrying a passenger who pays a fee; and
(2) When underway for more than 12 hours, that vessel meets, but does not exceed the minimum manning requirements outlined in its COI for vessels underway over 12 hours; or when underway for not more than 12 hours, that vessel meets the minimum manning requirements outlined in its COI for vessels underway for not more than 12-hours (if any), and does not exceed the minimum manning requirements outlined in its COI for vessels that are underway for more than 12 hours.

Headboat means a vessel that holds a valid Certificate of Inspection (COI) issued by the USCG to carry more than six passengers for hire.

(1) A headboat with a commercial vessel permit, as required under this part, is considered to be operating as a headboat when it carries a passenger who pays a fee or--
(i) In the case of persons aboard fishing for or possessing South Atlantic snapper-grouper, when there are more persons aboard than the number of crew specified in the vessel's COI; or
(ii) In the case of persons aboard fishing for or possessing coastal migratory pelagic fish, when there are more than three persons aboard, including operator and crew.

(2) However a vessel that has a headboat permit for Gulf reef fish, a commercial vessel permit for Gulf reef fish, and a valid COI issued by the USCG to carry passengers for hire will not be considered to be operating as a headboat provided--
(i) It is not carrying a passenger who pays a fee; and
(ii) When underway for more than 12 hours, that vessel meets, but does not exceed the minimum manning requirements outlined in its COI for vessels underway over 12 hours; or when underway for not more than 12 hours, that vessel meets the minimum manning requirements outlined in its COI for vessels underway for not more than 12-hours (if any), and does not exceed the minimum manning requirements outlined in its COI for vessels that are underway for more than 12 hours.

Science and Research Director (SRD), for the purposes of this part, means the Science and Research Director, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, NMFS (see Table 1 of § 600.502 of this chapter).

Subpart I--Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region

§ 622.170 Permits and endorsements.

(b) Charter vessel/headboat permits--(1) South Atlantic snapper-grouper. For a person aboard a vessel that is operating as a charter vessel or headboat to fish for or possess, in or from the EEZ, South Atlantic snapper-grouper, a valid charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic snapper-grouper must have been issued to the vessel and must be on board. A charter vessel or headboat may have both a charter vessel/headboat permit and a commercial vessel permit. However, when a vessel is operating as a charter vessel or headboat, a person aboard must adhere to the bag limits. See the definitions of "Charter vessel" and "Headboat" in § 622.2 for an explanation of when vessels are considered to be operating as a charter vessel or headboat, respectively.

§ 622.176 Recordkeeping and reporting

(b) Charter vessel/headboat owners and operators--
(1) General reporting requirement--(i) Charter vessels. The
owner or operator of a charter vessel for which a charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic snapper-grouper has been issued, as required under § 622.170(b)(1), or whose vessel fishes for or lands such snapper-grouper in or from state waters adjoining the South Atlantic EEZ, who is selected to report by the SRD must maintain a fishing record for each trip, or a portion of such trips as specified by the SRD, on forms provided by the SRD and must submit such record as specified in paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(iii) **Electronic logbook/video monitoring reporting.** The owner or operator of a vessel for which a charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic snapper-grouper has been issued, as required under § 622.170(b)(1), or whose vessel fishes for or lands such snapper-grouper in or from state waters adjoining the South Atlantic EEZ, who is selected to report by the SRD must participate in the NMFS-sponsored electronic logbook and/or video monitoring program as directed by the SRD. Compliance with the reporting requirements of this paragraph (b)(1)(iii) is required for permit renewal.

(2) **Reporting deadlines--(i) Charter vessels.** Completed fishing records required by paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section for charter vessels must be submitted to the SRD weekly, postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday). Completed fishing records required by paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of this section for charter vessels may be required weekly or daily, as directed by the SRD. Information to be reported is indicated on the form and its accompanying instructions.

**Subpart M—Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery off the Atlantic States**

§ 622.270 Permits.

(b) **Charter vessel/headboat permits.** (1) For a person aboard a vessel that is operating as a charter vessel or headboat to fish for or possess Atlantic dolphin or wahoo, in or from the Atlantic EEZ, a valid charter vessel/headboat permit for Atlantic dolphin and wahoo must have been issued to the vessel and must be on board. (See paragraph (c)(1) of this section for the requirements for operator permits in the dolphin and wahoo fishery.)

(2) A charter vessel or headboat may have both a charter vessel/headboat permit and a commercial vessel permit. However, when a vessel is operating as a charter vessel or headboat, a
person aboard must adhere to the bag limits. See the definitions of "Charter vessel" and "Headboat" in § 622.2 for an explanation of when vessels are considered to be operating as a charter vessel or headboat, respectively.

§ 622.271 Recordkeeping and reporting.

(b) Charter vessel/headboat owners and operators—-

(1) General reporting requirement—-(i) Charter vessels. The owner or operator of a charter vessel for which a charter vessel/headboat permit for Atlantic dolphin and wahoo has been issued, as required under § 622.270(b)(1), or whose vessel fishes for or lands Atlantic dolphin or wahoo in or from state waters adjoining the Atlantic EEZ, who is selected to report by the SRD must maintain a fishing record for each trip, or a portion of such trips as specified by the SRD, on forms provided by the SRD and must submit such record as specified in paragraph (b)(2) of this section.

(2) Reporting deadlines—-(i) Charter vessels. Completed fishing records required by paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section for charter vessels must be submitted to the SRD weekly, postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday). Information to be reported is indicated on the form and its accompanying instructions.

Subpart Q—Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources (Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic)

§ 622.370 Permits.

(b) Charter vessel/headboat permits. (1) For a person aboard a vessel that is operating as a charter vessel or headboat to fish for or possess, in or from the EEZ, Gulf coastal migratory pelagic fish or South Atlantic coastal migratory pelagic fish, a valid charter vessel/headboat permit for Gulf coastal migratory pelagic fish or South Atlantic coastal migratory pelagic fish, respectively, must have been issued to the vessel and must be on board.

(i) See § 622.373 regarding a limited access system for charter vessel/headboat permits for Gulf coastal migratory pelagic fish.

(ii) A charter vessel or headboat may have both a charter vessel/headboat permit and a commercial vessel permit. However, when a vessel is operating as a charter vessel or headboat, a person aboard must adhere to the bag limits. See the definitions
of "Charter vessel" and "Headboat" in § 622.2 for an explanation of when vessels are considered to be operating as a charter vessel or headboat, respectively.

§ 622.374 Recordkeeping and reporting.

(b) Charter vessel/headboat owners and operators--
(1) General reporting requirement--(i) Charter vessels. The owner or operator of a charter vessel for which a charter vessel/headboat permit for Gulf coastal migratory pelagic fish has been issued, as required under § 622.370(b)(1), or whose vessel fishes for or lands Gulf or South Atlantic coastal migratory fish in or from state waters adjoining the Gulf or South Atlantic EEZ, who is selected to report by the SRD must maintain a fishing record for each trip, or a portion of such trips as specified by the SRD, on forms provided by the SRD and must submit such record as specified in paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section.

(2) Reporting deadlines--(i) Charter vessels. Completed fishing records required by paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section for charter vessels must be submitted to the SRD weekly, postmarked no later than 7 days after the end of each week (Sunday). Information to be reported is indicated on the form and its accompanying instructions.
APPENDIX D: HISTORY OF MANAGEMENT

Snapper Grouper FMP for the South Atlantic

The following amendments to the Snapper Grouper FMP contained actions that pertained to the for-hire sector including permit and reporting requirements.

Amendment 4 (SAFMC 1991) Amendment 4 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic (Snapper Grouper FMP) (SAFMC, 1991) established charterboat and headboat permits and required charterboats and headboats to report, if selected. Amendment 4 also required that recreational fishermen must make snapper grouper species, or parts thereof, available for inspection by the NMFS Science and Research Director or an authorized representative, upon request. Amendment 4 also designated prohibited gear, defined overfishing and established rebuilding timeframes, established gear marking requirements for black sea bass traps, size limits, bag limits and spawning season closures.

Amendment 7 (SAFMC 1994) established dealer permits for both charter and headboats, allowed sale under specified conditions, and adjusted bag limits and crew specifications for charter and headboats. Amendment 7 also adjusted specified size limits for hogfish and mutton snapper, modified the management unit to include scup and specified allowable gear and made allowances for experimental gear.

Amendment 16 (SAFMC 2009) established a prohibition on captain and crew on for-hire trips retaining the bag limit of vermilion snapper and species within the 3-fish grouper aggregate. Amendment 16 also specified allocations for gag and vermillion snapper, required dehooking tools for sea turtle bycatch, established a spawning season closure for gag and a reduced bag limit and recreational closed season for vermillion. Directed commercial quotas were also established for both gag and vermillion snapper.

Amendment 15B (SAFMC 2008) prohibited the sale of bag-limit caught snapper grouper species; reduced the effects of incidental hooking on sea turtles and smalltooth sawfish; adjusted commercial renewal periods and transferability requirements; implemented plan to monitor and assess bycatch; established reference points for golden tilefish; established allocations for snowy grouper (95% commercial & 5% recreational) and red porgy (50% commercial & 50% recreational). Amendment 15B also required that commercial vessels with a snapper grouper permit, for-hire vessels with a for-hire permit, and private recreational vessels if fishing for snapper grouper species in the EEZ, shall use observer coverage, logbooks, electronic logbooks, video monitoring, or any other method deemed necessary to measure bycatch by NOAA Fisheries, if selected.

Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Amendment 6 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP/Amendment 22 to the Coastal Migratory Pelagic (CMP) FMP (SAFMC 2013a) required electronic logbook reporting for headboat vessels fishing for Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics. This amendment required selected vessels with a Federal for-
 Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements

hire Permit to report landings data electronically; and implemented a provision that authorizes NOAA Fisheries Service to require weekly or daily reporting as required.

**South Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo**

The following amendments to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP contained actions that pertained to the for-hire sector including permit and reporting requirements.

The Dolphin Wahoo FMP, which was implemented in 2003, contained many management measures for the operation of the fishery such as minimum size limits, allowable gear, closed areas, and quotas. The Dolphin Wahoo FMP required owners of commercial vessels and/or charter vessels/headboats to have vessel permits and, if selected, submit reports and required dealers to have permits and, if selected, submit reports. In 2004, the Dolphin Wahoo FMP required that operators of commercial vessels, charter vessels and headboats that are required to have a federal vessel permit for dolphin and wahoo must display operator permits.

Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Ammendment 6 to the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP/Ammendment 22 to the CMP FMP (SAFMC 2013a) required electronic logbook reporting for headboat vessels fishing for Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and CMP.

**Coastal Migratory Pelagic Fishery**

The following amendments to the CMP FMP contained actions that pertained to the for-hire sector including permit and reporting requirements.

Amendment 2 (SAFMC 1987) to the CMP FMP (implemented in 1987) required that charter vessels and headboats fishing in the EEZ of the Gulf of Mexico or Atlantic for CMP species have permits.

Amendment 31 to the Snapper Grouper FMP/Ammendment 6 to the Dolphin and Wahoo FMP/Ammendment 22 to the CMP FMP (SAFMC 2013a) required electronic logbook reportin

...
APPENDIX E: SUPPORTING INFORMATION

South Carolina Logbook Report

**SOUTH CAROLINA HEADBOAT LOG**

Section 50-5-1915 of the South Carolina Code of Laws requires all licensed headboats to maintain a trip log, copies of which must be submitted monthly to the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. A report must be received even if no trips were made during the month. To submit a no trips report, write “No Business For (month) in the middle of a report form. (For example, No Business For January). Date and sign the report.

To fulfill both the mandatory reporting of the NMFS and the requirements of state law without an undue burden on the permit holder, South Carolina will use the existing NMFS Headboat logbook. The white copy should be mailed or faxed to the address below so it is received no later than the 10th of the month following the report month. For example, June reports should reach our office by 10 July. The yellow copy should be retained for the NMFS representative, and the pink copy should be retained for your records. Complete a separate form for each trip. Should you need more reports, attach a note to your reports or call our office.

Please mail or FAX the white copies to the:

SCDNR - Fisheries Statistics Program  
P.O. Box 12559  
Charleston, SC 29422-2559  
**TELEPHONE:** (843) 953-9313  
**FAX:** (843) 953-9362

**INSTRUCTIONS**

To complete a trip report, record the following information in the proper blanks:

**VESSEL:** Enter vessel name and SC Charterboat Permit Number.

**DATE:** Enter the date(s) of the trip.

**DEPART TIME:** Enter the time of departure from the dock.

**ARRIVE TIME:** Enter the time of arrival back at the dock.

**OPERATOR’S LICENSE NUMBER:** Enter the vessel USCG or state documentation #.

**FULL DAY, 3/4 DAY, ETC.:** Check the appropriate box for the length of trip.

**NIGHT:** Check 1st if the trip departed between 6:00 PM and midnight. Check 2nd if the trip departed after 12:00 midnight.

**DISTANCE FROM SHORE:** Check the appropriate box.

**PAY TYPE:** Check the appropriate box.

**LOCATION:** Please enter the location code for your fishing area using the grid printed inside the flip cover.

**Example:** Refer to the grid and the small block marked X in grid 32-78 (lat/long). Read up or down the column to determine the letter code (C in this example). Read left or right across the row to determine the number code (1 in this example). This location code entry would be **32-78-C1**. Each individual small square is 10 miles long by 10 miles wide or roughly 100 square miles.

**NUMBER OF ANGLERS:** Enter the number of passengers who went to fish.

**NUMBER OF ANGLERS WHO FISHED:** Enter the number of passengers who actually fished.

**CATCH INFORMATION**

**SPECIES:** Use bulk lines to list additional species caught.

**NUMBER AND WEIGHT:** Enter the total number and weight (to the nearest whole pound) of all species retained in the NUMBER CAUGHT and TOTAL WEIGHT columns.

**NUMBER RELEASED:** Regardless of disposition, ALL FISH must be reported. Please enter the number of each species released in the appropriate column. **DO NOT** include releases in the number caught or total weight columns.
### Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements

#### SC DAILY CATCH (HEADBOAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Depart Time:</th>
<th>Arrive Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operator's License No.:</td>
<td>Full Day:</td>
<td>Night:</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>3/4 Day:</td>
<td>Overnight:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Anglers:</td>
<td>1/2 Day:</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Anglers Who Fished:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AGENCY USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Total Weight 12-37</th>
<th>Number Caught 26-31</th>
<th># Released Alive 36-40</th>
<th># Released Dead 1-41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Fish Species

**GROUPFISH**
- Gag
- Scary
- Speckled Sea Bass
- Snowy Grouper
- Red Grouper
- Warrean Grouper
- Rock Hind
- Yellowfin Grouper
- Red Hind
- Yellowfin Grouper

**SCIAENIDS**
- Red Snapper
- Black Sea Bass
- Bank Sea Bass

**GURNEYS**
- White Croaker
- Red Snapper
- Rainbow Runner
- Blue Runner
- African Pompano

**MOUTH**
- Grouper
- Porkfish

**TUNAS, etc.**

**SHARKS**
- Thresher Shark
- Sandbar Shark
- Blacktip Shark
- Smooth Dogfish
- Nurse Shark
- Dusky Shark

**TILAPIIDAE**

**Olive Croaker (Opaleye)**
- Queen Triggerfish

#### Signature

---

**SC DAILY CATCH (HEADBOAT) 4-2004**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements**

---

**90**

For-Hire Reporting Requirements
### Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements

#### SOUTH CAROLINA CHARTERBOAT LOGBOOK

**Vessel (Please Print):**

**Date:**

**Permit No.:**

**Number of Anglers:**

**Trip Start Time:**

**Actual Hours Fished:**

**Location:**

**Trip Start:**

**Artificial Target Location:**

- Estuarine
- Offshore

**Method:**

- Troll
- Cast / Fly
- Bottom
- Dive
- Gig

**Water Depth:**

- Shallowest: ______ feet
- Deepest: ______ feet

**Locate:**

**Reef Name:**

**Species:**

(please specify)

**MAIL OF FAX REPORT BY THE 10TH OF THE MONTH TO:**

SCDFR Fisheries Statistics Section, P.O. Box 12359, Charleston, SC 29422-2559

**PHONE: (843) 792-3101**

**FAX: (843) 792-3113**

#### AGENCY USE ONLY

**Yr** | **Mo** | **Day** | **Species** | **# Kept** | **Lw Kept** | **# Released Alive** | **# Released Dead** | **Location** | **Locate** | **Meth** | **Target Sp.** | **Hue** | **Reef** | **Trip Start** | **Shallowest** | **Deepest** |
-------|--------|--------|-------------|------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|---------|----------------|--------|--------|----------------|----------------|-----------|
1001   |        |        | Dolphin     | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4710   |        |        | Wahoo       | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4652   |        |        | Yellowfin Tuna | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4651   |        |        | Blackfin Tuna | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3020   |        |        | Sardine     | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
2177   |        |        | White Marlin | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
2179   |        |        | Blue Marlin  | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
1040   |        |        | King Mackerel | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3640   |        |        | Spanish Mackerel | 1         |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4653   |        |        | Little Tunny | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4330   |        |        | Romita      | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4654   |        |        | Skip Jack   | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
9180   |        |        | Barracuda   | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3810   |        |        | Spadefish   | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
9030   |        |        | Amberjack   | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
9070   |        |        | Crevette Jack | 1         |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
9230   |        |        | Spanish Mackerel | 1         |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
9730   |        |        | Coho        | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4330   |        |        | Tarpon      | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
8080   |        |        | Other Fish  | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
1010   |        |        | Largemouth Bass | 1        |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
1070   |        |        | White Crappie | 1         |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
1200   |        |        | Flopper     | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3550   |        |        | Sheephead   | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
4110   |        |        | Largemouth Bass | 1        |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
1970   |        |        | Whiting     | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
2670   |        |        | Indoors Fish | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3510   |        |        | Sharpnose Shark | 1        |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3490   |        |        | Blacktip Shark | 1         |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3580   |        |        | Bonito     | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3520   |        |        | Striped Bass | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3510   |        |        | Smooth Dogfish | 1        |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
3580   |        |        | Other Sharks | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
2860   |        |        | Stingrays   | 1          |             |                     |                   |              |           |         |                |        |        |                |                |           |
SOuth Carolina charterboat Log

Section 50-5.1915 of the south Carolina code of laws requires all permitted charter vessels to submit
daily trip reports for all trips to the marine resources division on a monthly basis. These reports must specify: 1) the
number of persons fishing, 2) the number of hours fished, 3) the number of fish of each species caught, and 4) their total weight.
Subsequent charter vessel permits will not be issued unless these requirements are met.

Please complete a logsheet for each trip following the instructions below. If you made two or more trips on a
particular date, complete a separate report for each trip. Trip reports are required even if no fish were caught. Mail or
Fax the white copy to the address below by the 10th of the following month. Retain the yellow copy for your records.

SCDNR - Fisheries Statistics Program
P.O. Box 12559
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
Telephone - (843) 953-9313   Fax - (843) 953-9362

A report must be received even if no trips were made during the month. To submit a no trip report, write
“No Business For The Month Of (month) on the middle of a report form. Date and sign the report.
The captain’s Notes space may be used to record trip data such as weather, fuel, addresses, etc.

Instructions

- Vessel: Enter the name of your vessel. If unnamed, enter the registration number of your boat, e.g. SC-1234-AB.
- Date: Enter the date of the trip.
- Permit No.: Enter your SC charter vessel permit number (number provided on your license).
- # Anglers: Enter the number of persons who fished, not including crew.
- Trip Start Time: Enter the time the boat left the dock or landing, e.g. 11:30 AM, 1:00 PM, 3:30 PM, etc.
- Hours Fished: Enter the number of hours actually fished to the nearest hour, not including travel time.
- Location: Enter the location code where most of your fishing took place. Refer to the map printed on
the inside of the flip cover and the following example. If you fished in the grid marked X, Grid 32-78, read
up or down the columns to determine the letter code (C here). Read left or right across the row to determine
the number code (L here). The proper entry for this location is 32-78-CL.
- Trip Start Location: Enter the marina/boat landing name where this trip originated/ended (i.e. where
you pick up/drop off customers).
- Artificial Reef: If you fished at an artificial reef, enter the reef name in the blank.
- Target Species: Enter the name of the species you were most interested in catching, whether any
were caught or not. Enter ANY if you had no preference.
- Locale: Check the appropriate zone fished.
- Method: Check the fishing method.
- Water Depth: Enter the shallowest water depth and deepest water depth (in feet) that were fished.
- Catch Information: Enter the number of each species caught and their weight to the nearest
whole pound in the appropriate spaces. Enter the number of each species released in the proper columns.
Additional species may be added on the blank spaces or if additional space is needed, you may cross out an
existing name and add the new species.
Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements
## Catch Information

- **Show Species Grid**
- **Show All Species**
- **Order Species By Most Reported**

### Select Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Number Kept</th>
<th>Number Released</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALMACO JACK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANDED RUDDERFISH</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTIC SHARPNOSE SHARK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK SEABASS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE TUNNY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED PORGY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED SNAPPER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMORA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOTTAIL PINFISH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAY TRIGGERFISH</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMILION SNAPPER</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Delete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[SAVE CATCH INFORMATION]
Greater Atlantic Region Reporting Requirements

§648.7 Recordkeeping and reporting requirements.

(a) Dealers—(1) Detailed report. Federally permitted dealers, and any individual acting in the capacity of a dealer, must submit to the Regional Administrator or to the official designee a detailed report of all fish purchased or received for a commercial purpose, other than solely for transport on land, within the time period specified in paragraph (f) of this section, by one of the available electronic reporting mechanisms approved by NMFS, unless otherwise directed by the Regional Administrator. The following information, and any other information required by the Regional Administrator, must be provided in each report:

(i) Required information. All dealers issued a dealer permit under this part must provide: Dealer name; dealer permit number; name and permit number or name and hull number (USCG documentation number or state registration number, whichever is applicable) of vessel(s) from which fish are purchased or received; trip identifier for each trip from which fish are purchased or received from a commercial fishing vessel permitted under this part; date(s) of purchases and receipts; units of measure and amount by species (by market category, if applicable); price per unit by species (by market category, if applicable) or total value by species (by market category, if applicable); port landed; cage tag numbers for surfclams and ocean quahogs, if applicable; disposition of the seafood product; and any other information deemed necessary by the Regional Administrator. If no fish are purchased or received during a reporting week, a report so stating must be submitted.

(ii) Exceptions. The following exceptions apply to reporting requirements for dealers permitted under this part:

(A) Inshore Exempted Species, as defined in §648.2, are not required to be reported under this part;

(B) When purchasing or receiving fish from a vessel landing in a port located outside of the Northeast Region (Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia and North Carolina), only purchases or receipts of species managed by the Northeast Region under this part, and American lobster, managed under part 697 of this chapter, must be reported. Other reporting requirements may apply to those species not managed by the Northeast Region, which are not affected by this provision; and

(C) Dealers issued a permit for Atlantic bluefin tuna under part 635 of this chapter are not required to report their purchases or receipts of Atlantic bluefin tuna under this part. Other reporting requirements, as specified in §635.5 of this chapter, apply to the receipt of Atlantic bluefin tuna.

(2) System requirements. All persons required to submit reports under paragraph (a)(1) of this section are required to have the capability to transmit data via the Internet. To ensure
compatibility with the reporting system and database, dealers are required to utilize a personal computer, in working condition, that meets the minimum specifications identified by NMFS. The affected public will be notified of the minimum specifications via a letter to all Federal dealer permit holders.

(3) **Annual report.** All persons issued a permit under this part are required to submit the following information on an annual basis, on forms supplied by the Regional Administrator:

(i) All dealers and processors issued a permit under this part must complete all sections of the Annual Processed Products Report for all species that were processed during the previous year. Reports must be submitted to the address supplied by the Regional Administrator.

(ii) Surfclam and ocean quahog processors and dealers whose plant processing capacities change more than 10 percent during any year shall notify the Regional Administrator in writing within 10 days after the change.

(iii) Atlantic herring processors, including processing vessels, must complete and submit all sections of the Annual Processed Products Report.

(iv) Atlantic hagfish processors must complete and submit all sections of the Annual Processed Products Report.

(4) [Reserved]

(b) **Vessel owners or operators**—

(1) **Fishing Vessel Trip Reports**—

(i) The owner or operator of any vessel issued a valid permit or eligible to renew a limited access permit under this part must maintain on board the vessel, and submit, an accurate fishing log report for each fishing trip, regardless of species fished for or taken, on forms supplied by or approved by the Regional Administrator. If authorized in writing by the Regional Administrator, a vessel owner or operator may submit reports electronically, for example by using a VMS or other media. With the exception of those vessel owners or operators fishing under a surfclam or ocean quahog permit, at least the following information and any other information required by the Regional Administrator must be provided: Vessel name; USCG documentation number (or state registration number, if undocumented); permit number; date/time sailed; date/time landed; trip type; number of crew; number of anglers (if a charter or party boat); gear fished; quantity and size of gear; mesh/ring size; chart area fished; average depth; latitude/longitude (or loran station and bearings); total hauls per area fished; average tow time duration; haul weight, in pounds (or count of individual fish, if a party or charter vessel), by species, of all species, or parts of species, such as monkfish livers, landed or discarded; and, in the case of skate discards, “small” (i.e., less than 23 inches (58.42 cm), total length) or “large” (i.e., 23 inches (58.42 cm) or greater, total length) skates; dealer permit number; dealer name; date sold, port and state landed; and vessel operator's name, signature, and operator's permit number (if applicable).

(ii) **Surfclam and ocean quahog vessel owners and operators.** The owner or operator of any vessel conducting any surfclam and ocean quahog fishing operations, except those conducted exclusively in waters of a state that requires cage tags or when he/she has surrendered the
surfclam and ocean quahog fishing vessel permit, shall maintain, on board the vessel, an accurate daily fishing log for each fishing trip, on forms supplied by the Regional Administrator, showing at least: Name and permit number of the vessel, total amount in bushels of each species taken, date(s) caught, time at sea, duration of fishing time, locality fished, crew size, crew share by percentage, landing port, date sold, price per bushel, buyer, tag numbers from cages used, quantity of surfclams and ocean quahogs discarded, and allocation permit number.

(2) IVR system reports—(i) Atlantic herring owners or operators issued an All Areas open access permit. The owner or operator of a vessel issued an All Areas open access permit to fish for herring must report catch (retained and discarded) of herring via an IVR system for each week herring was caught, unless exempted by the Regional Administrator. IVR reports are not required for weeks when no herring was caught. The report shall include at least the following information, and any other information required by the Regional Administrator: Vessel identification; week in which herring are caught; management areas fished; and pounds retained and pounds discarded of herring caught in each management area. The IVR reporting week begins on Sunday at 0001 hr (12:01 a.m.) local time and ends Saturday at 2400 hr (12 midnight). Weekly Atlantic herring catch reports must be submitted via the IVR system by midnight each Tuesday, eastern time, for the previous week. Reports are required even if herring caught during the week has not yet been landed. This report does not exempt the owner or operator from other applicable reporting requirements of this section.

(ii) Tilefish vessel owners or operators. The owner or operator of any vessel fishing under a tilefish IFQ allocation permit issued under this part, as described in §648.294(a), must submit a tilefish catch report by using the IVR system, or other reporting system approved by the Regional Administrator, within 48 hours after returning to port and offloading. The report shall include at least the following information, and any other information required by the Regional Administrator: Vessel identification; trip during which tilefish are caught; pounds landed; VTR pre-printed serial number; and the Federal dealer number for the dealer who purchases the tilefish. This reporting requirement does not exempt the owner or operator from other applicable reporting requirements of this section.

(3) VMS Catch Reports—(i) Atlantic herring owners or operators issued a limited access permit or Areas 2/3 open access permit. The owner or operator of a vessel issued a limited access permit or Areas 2/3 open access permit to fish for herring must report catch (retained and discarded) of herring daily via VMS, unless exempted by the Regional Administrator. The report shall include at least the following information, and any other information required by the Regional Administrator: Fishing Vessel Trip Report serial number; month and day herring was caught; pounds retained for each herring management area; and pounds discarded for each herring management area. Additionally, the owner or operator of a vessel issued a limited access permit or Areas 2/3 open access permit to fish for herring using midwater trawl or bottom trawl gear must report daily via VMS the estimated total amount of all species retained (in pounds, landed weight) by statistical area for use in tracking catch against catch caps (haddock, river herring and shad) in the herring fishery. Daily Atlantic herring VMS catch reports must be submitted in 24-hr intervals for each day and must be submitted by 0900 hr (9:00 a.m.) of the following day. Reports are required even if herring caught that day has not yet been landed. This
Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements

(A) The owner or operator of any vessel issued a limited access herring permit or Areas 2/3 open access permit must submit a catch report via VMS each day, regardless of how much herring is caught (including days when no herring is caught), unless exempted from this requirement by the Regional Administrator.

(B) Atlantic herring VMS reports are not required from Atlantic herring carrier vessels.

(C) Reporting requirements for vessels transferring herring at sea. The owner or operator of a vessel issued a limited access permit to fish for herring that transfers herring at sea must comply with these requirements in addition to those specified at §648.13(f).

(1) A vessel that transfers herring at sea to a vessel that receives it for personal use as bait must report all transfers on the Fishing Vessel Trip Report.

(2) A vessel that transfers herring at sea to an authorized carrier vessel must report all catch daily via VMS and must report all transfers on the Fishing Vessel Trip Report. Each time the vessel transfers catch to the carrier vessel is defined as a trip for the purposes of reporting requirements and possession allowances.

(3) A vessel that transfers herring at sea to an at-sea processor must report all catch daily via VMS and must report all transfers on the Fishing Vessel Trip Report. Each time the vessel offloads to the at-sea processing vessel is defined as a trip for the purposes of the reporting requirements and possession allowances. For each trip, the vessel must submit a Fishing Vessel Trip Report and the at-sea processing vessel must submit the detailed dealer report specified in paragraph (a)(1) of this section.

(4) A transfer between two vessels issued limited access permits requires each vessel to submit a Fishing Vessel Trip Report, filled out as required by the LOA to transfer herring at sea, and a daily VMS catch report for the amount of herring each vessel catches.

(ii) Atlantic mackerel owners or operators. The owner or operator of a vessel issued a limited access mackerel permit must report catch (retained and discarded) of mackerel daily via VMS, unless exempted by the Regional Administrator. The report must include at least the following information, and any other information required by the Regional Administrator: Fishing Vessel Trip Report serial number; month, day, and year mackerel was caught; total pounds of mackerel retained and total pounds of all fish retained. Daily mackerel VMS catch reports must be submitted in 24-hr intervals for each day and must be submitted by 0900 hr on the following day. Reports are required even if mackerel caught that day have not yet been landed. This report does not exempt the owner or operator from other applicable reporting requirements of this section.

(iii) Longfin squid/butterfish moratorium permit owners or operators. The owner or operator of a vessel issued a longfin squid/butterfish moratorium permit must report catch (retained and discarded) of longfin squid daily via VMS, unless exempted by the Regional Administrator. The
report must include at least the following information, and any other information required by the Regional Administrator: Fishing Vessel Trip Report serial number; month, day, and year longfin squid was caught; total pounds longfin squid retained and total pounds of all fish retained. Daily longfin squid VMS catch reports must be submitted in 24-hr intervals for each day and must be submitted by 0900 hr on the following day. Reports are required even if longfin squid caught that day have not yet been landed. This report does not exempt the owner or operator from other applicable reporting requirements of this section.

(c) When to fill out a log report. Log reports required by paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section must be filled out with all required information, except for information not yet ascertainable, prior to entering port. Information that may be considered unascertainable prior to entering port includes dealer name, dealer permit number, and date sold. Log reports must be completed as soon as the information becomes available. Log reports required by paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section must be filled out before landing any surfclams or ocean quahogs.

(d) Inspection. Upon the request of an authorized officer or an employee of NMFS designated by the Regional Administrator to make such inspections, all persons required to submit reports under this part must make immediately available for inspection copies of reports, and all records upon which those reports are or will be based, that are required to be submitted or kept under this part.

(e) Record retention—(1) Dealer records. Any record, as defined in §648.2, related to fish possessed, received, or purchased by a dealer that is required to be reported, must be retained and made available for immediate review for a total of 3 years after the date the fish were first possessed, received, or purchased. Dealers must retain the required records and reports at their principal place of business.

(2) VTRs. Copies of fishing log reports must be kept on board the vessel and available for review for at least 1 year, and must be retained for a total of 3 years after the date the fish were last possessed, landed, and sold.

(3) At-sea monitor reports. Any record, as defined in §648.2, related to fish observed by an at-sea monitor, including any reports provided to NMFS, sector managers, or another third-party service provider specified in paragraph (h) of this section, must be retained and made available for immediate review for a total of 3 years after the date the fish were first observed. At-sea monitor providers must retain the required records and reports at their principal place of business.

(f) Submitting reports—(1) Dealer or processor reports. (i) Detailed reports required by paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section must be received by midnight of the first Tuesday following the end of the reporting week. If no fish are purchased or received during a reporting week, the report so stating required under paragraph (a)(1)(i) of this section must be received by midnight of the first Tuesday following the end of the reporting week.

(ii) [Reserved]
(iii) Dealers who want to make corrections to their trip-level reports via the electronic editing features may do so for up to 3 business days following submission of the initial report. If a correction is needed more than 3 business days following the submission of the initial trip-level report, the dealer must contact NMFS directly to request an extension of time to make the correction.

(iv) Through April 30, 2005, to accommodate the potential lag in availability of some required data, the trip identifier, price and disposition information required under paragraph (a)(1) may be submitted after the detailed weekly report, but must be received within 16 days of the end of the reporting week or the end of the calendar month, whichever is later. Dealers will be able to access and update previously submitted trip identifier, price, and disposition data.

(v) Effective May 1, 2005, the trip identifier required under paragraph (a)(1) of this section must be submitted with the detailed report, as required under paragraphs (f)(1)(i) of this section. Price and disposition information may be submitted after the initial detailed report, but must be received within 16 days of the end of the reporting week.

(vi) Annual reports for a calendar year must be postmarked or received by February 10 of the following year. Contact the Regional Administrator (see Table 1 to §600.502) for the address of NMFS Statistics.

2) Fishing vessel log reports. (i) For any vessel not issued a NE multispecies; Atlantic herring permit; or any Atlantic mackerel, longfin squid, Illex squid, or butterfish permit; fishing vessel log reports, required by paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section, must be postmarked or received by NMFS within 15 days after the end of the reporting month. For any vessel issued a NE multispecies permit; Atlantic herring permit; or any Atlantic mackerel, longfin squid, Illex squid, or butterfish permit; fishing vessel log reports must be postmarked or received by midnight of the first Tuesday following the end of the reporting week. For the purposes of this paragraph (f)(2)(i), the date when fish are offloaded will establish the reporting week or month the VTR must be submitted to NMFS, as appropriate.

(ii) Surfclam and ocean quahog log reports, required by paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section, must be postmarked or received within 3 days after the end of each reporting week.

3) At-sea purchasers and processors. With the exception of the owner or operator of an Atlantic herring carrier vessel, the owner or operator of an at-sea purchaser or processor that purchases or processes any Atlantic herring, Atlantic mackerel, squid, butterfish, scup, or black sea bass at sea must submit information identical to that required by paragraph (a)(1) of this section and provide those reports to the Regional Administrator or designee by the same mechanism and on the same frequency basis.

(g) Additional data and sampling. Federally permitted dealers must allow access to their premises and make available to an official designee of the Regional Administrator any fish purchased from vessels for the collection of biological data. Such data include, but are not limited to, length measurements of fish and the collection of age structures such as otoliths or scales.
(h) *At-sea monitor/electronic monitoring reports.* Any at-sea monitor assigned to observe a sector trip and any third-party service provider analyzing data from electronic monitoring equipment deployed on a sector trip must submit reports on catch, discard, and other data elements specified by the Regional Administrator to NMFS, the sector manager, and monitoring contractor, as instructed by the Regional Administrator.
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## Abbreviations used in this Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCSP</td>
<td>Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>Exclusive Economic Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>For-hire-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWC</td>
<td>Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Fisheries Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GulfFin</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMFMC</td>
<td>Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSMFC</td>
<td>Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMS</td>
<td>Highly Migratory Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRIP</td>
<td>Marine Recreational Information Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDENR</td>
<td>North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources NRC National Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Proportional Probability Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFMC</td>
<td>South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCDNR</td>
<td>South Carolina Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERO</td>
<td>Southeast Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRHS</td>
<td>Southeast Region Headboat Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEFSC</td>
<td>Southeast Fisheries Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPWD</td>
<td>Texas Parks and Wildlife Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS</td>
<td>Vessel Monitoring System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Catch from recreational anglers comprises a substantial proportion of total catch for many species in the regions managed by the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils. For-hire charter vessels are an important component of the recreational fishery both in terms of fishing effort and harvest. There is a need to improve data collection practices for charter vessels to address evolving needs of science and management and to capitalize on the improvements of emerging electronic reporting technologies. The Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils are considering changes in management for these purposes and formed a technical subcommittee to provide recommendations to implement electronic logbook reporting for charter vessels in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils respective jurisdictions.

Currently, for-hire data collection programs gather information on fishing effort and catch by marine recreational anglers fishing on professionally licensed for-hire vessels (including charter, guide, and large party boats). NOAA Fisheries, in coordination with the states, ACCSP, and FINS, support regional programs to collect these statistics, with the ultimate goal of building a system of data collection programs that are responsive to regional needs and are coordinated at the national level to provide standard data elements for both regional and national assessments of fish stocks and associated fisheries management.

The technical subcommittee was formed from state and federal biologists and resource managers that have the requisite experience to develop best practices for an improved for-hire data collection program. The technical subcommittee was instructed to provide these recommendations by December 1, 2014 and this report reflects these recommendations. The group met May 27-28, 2014 and drafted initial recommendations for the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils' review. This guidance has been integrated into the report to the extent practicable yet, the recommendations remain those of the technical subcommittee.

The subcommittee recommends a census style, electronic reporting system that builds upon the Gulf of Mexico electronic logbook pilot program, the electronic reporting program for headboats, and the recently implemented electronic dealer reporting program. A brief overview of the recommendations is below:

- Complete census of all participants;
- Mandatory, trip level reporting with weekly electronic submission. Give flexibility to require submission more frequently than weekly if necessary. Give flexibility to declare periods of
inactivity in advance;

- Development of compliance tracking procedures that balance timeliness with available staff and funding resources;
- Implementation of accountability measures to ensure compliance;
- Use validation methods developed in the Gulf of Mexico logbook pilot study as a basis to ensure that the actual logbook report is validated and standardized validation methodologies are employed among regions;
- Minimize reporting burden to anglers by reducing (or preferably eliminating) paper reporting and eliminating duplicate reporting;
- Maintain capability for paper-based reporting during catastrophic conditions;
- Require and maintain a comprehensive permit/email database of participants;
- Develop and implement the program in close coordination with MRIP, SERO, SEFSC, HMS, state agencies, ACCSP, and GulfFIN;
- Include procedures for expanding estimates for non-reporting; and,
- Allow multiple authorized applications or devices to report data as long as they meet required data and transferability standards.

The technical subcommittee has provided these recommendations within the framework of finite fiscal and personnel resources with consideration of reporting burden and technology requirements for charter vessel operators. The recommended program should be flexible enough to accommodate changes in technology or funding availability without compromising the integrity of the long-term data series. The technical subcommittee also realizes that advances in data collection technologies will continue and the program will require evaluation, and likely subsequent improvement to meet the evolving needs of science and management.
SECTION 1. BACKGROUND

Catch from recreational anglers comprises a substantial proportion of total catch for many species in the regions managed by the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils (GMFMC, SAFMC). For-hire data collection programs gather information on fishing effort and catch by marine recreational anglers fishing on professionally licensed for-hire vessels (including charter, guide, and large party boats). NOAA Fisheries, in coordination with the states, ACCSP, and FINs, supports regional programs to collect these statistics, with the ultimate goal of building a system of data collection programs that are responsive to regional needs and are coordinated at the national level to provide standard data elements for both regional and national assessments of fish stocks and associated fisheries management.

Recreational harvest from for-hire vessels in the Southeast Region are monitored through a combination of effort and dockside intercept surveys. The Marine Recreational Information Program’s (MRIP) for-hire survey (FHS) and the Southeast Region Headboat Survey. The FHS estimates charter vessel catches of state and federally managed species off the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf coast states, with the exception of Texas and more recently Louisiana. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department conducts their own creel survey to estimate private and charter landings.

Since 1993, South Carolina has administered a paper-based logbook reporting program for every licensed six-pack charter operator. These data are primarily used for state management and quota monitoring for federally managed species occurs as part of the MRIP for-hire survey.

North Carolina is also developing an electronic logbook system for their own use with the goal of supplanting the MRIP for-hire survey once fully operational and compatible with MRIP. In recent years, interest by constituents and the Councils has been growing to implement electronic reporting requirements in the for-hire sector. There is general distrust of MRIP landings estimates for the for-hire survey and managers and fishermen have expressed a need for more timely and accurate data to support fishery monitoring, science, and management. Additionally, the National Research Council’s (NRC) review of recreational survey methods concluded that in most cases charter boats should be required to maintain logbooks of fish landed and kept. These factors led to an electronic logbook pilot study of Texas and Florida charter vessels in 2010-11 and new electronic reporting regulations for headboats in 2014. Four additional projects have also been funded by MRIP or the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation in 2014 to test new approaches for monitoring charter vessel catch and effort. The GMFMC and SAFMC have also passed motions at recent meetings expressing their interest in electronic reporting by charter vessels and they formed this technical subcommittee to develop recommendations for the Councils’ consideration by December 1, 2014, on how to best achieve an electronic reporting system for charter vessels. The technical subcommittee met May 27-28, 2014 to develop recommendations to the Councils. The technical subcommittee reached consensus of several aspects on a proposed program and identified a framework for implementation.
SECTION 2. OBJECTIVES

The Councils appointed this technical subcommittee (membership list below) to develop recommendations to implement an improved data collection program to support the needs of science, fisheries management, and address stakeholder concerns about data quality and redundancy in reporting. Specifically, the technical subcommittee was charged with developing recommendations to implement electronic reporting for charter vessels in the Gulf of Mexico and US South Atlantic in support of the following objectives:

- Increasing the timeliness of catch estimates for in-season monitoring;
- Increasing the temporal (and/or spatial) precision of catch estimates for monitoring;
- Providing vessel-specific catch histories for management;
- Reducing biases associated with collection of catch statistics; and,
- Increasing stakeholder trust and buy-in associated with data collection.
SECTION 3. TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS

3.1 Membership

- Gregg Bray – GSMFC
- Ken Brennan – SEFSC
- Mike Cahall – ACCSP
- Mike Errigo – SAFMC
- Mark Fisher - TPWD
- John Froeschke – GMFMC
- Eric Hiltz – SCDNR
- Doug Mumford – NCDENR
- Ron Salz – MRIP
- Beverly Sauls – FWC
- George Silva – HMS
- Andy Strelcheck – SERO

3.2 Timeline

- May 2014 – Technical subcommittee meeting in Tampa, Florida
- June 2014 - Provide meeting summary to Councils for review and guidance;
- July 2014 - Technical subcommittee conference call to discuss Councils’ review and guidance;
- September 2014 - Technical subcommittee webinar to discuss items needed to complete the report;
- November 2014 - Draft report sent to subcommittee for review;
- December 1, 2014 - Provide report to Gulf and South Atlantic Councils.
SECTION 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The technical subcommittee discussed trade offs and limitations of potential modifications to fisheries reporting in for-hire fisheries. The subcommittee agreed (by consensus) on preferred approaches for several aspects and discussed barriers to implementation of a new program. The subcommittee solicited and received preliminary input from both Councils following the May 27-28 meeting. This guidance has been integrated into the report to the extent practicable yet, the recommendations remain those of the technical subcommittee.

The subcommittee emphasized that the program should not be designed around a single species, and should be flexible enough to accommodate different reporting requirements for different segments of the for-hire fleet. For example, if federally permitted vessels were required to report more frequently during the recreational red snapper season, other vessels that do not participate in this fishery should be able to continue reporting at their normal frequency.

Similarly, an electronic reporting system should be able to accommodate vessels already required to carry VMS units for participation in commercial fisheries without necessarily requiring all for-hire vessels to report through VMS. Although not currently required, the Gulf Council expressed interest in using VMS and hail-out, hail-in protocols to improve effort estimates. This practice certainly could improve the quality of effort estimation in the for-hire fleet, although, implementation would not be without challenges. The cost of a VMS program both in terms of vessel equipment and agency staff/infrastructure would require additional, long-term funding (see section about costs). This may be beyond current resource availability. Rather than recommend fleet-wide implementation of VMS and hail-out, hail-in requirements, the subcommittee recommends structuring the charter fishery monitoring program such that it is scaleable and expandable as management needs, technology, and funding availability change.

This recommendation would allow improved data collection in the near term building on the recently implemented electronic reporting system for southeast region headboats (i.e., weekly, electronic reporting) and the MRIP charter vessel pilot program, yet would not require full implementation of VMS to move beyond the current process.

The current survey methodology was deemed inadequate to meet the objectives posed to the group (although not necessarily the original intent of the charter vessel survey). Specifically, timeliness, bias reduction, and stakeholder buy-in could be improved with an electronic reporting system without the inherent expense and time for implementation of VMS technology in the charter fleet (of course, the introduction of new biases is possible). These improvements are necessary given the requirement to establish annual catch limits for federally managed species and close the fishery when the target harvest level has been caught each year. This requirement for in-season quota monitoring is far beyond the management needs when the original charter vessel survey was designed and implemented and the guidance herein attempts to match the data collection effort to the needs of the current and future fisheries management.

4.1 Mandatory or voluntary participation

The technical subcommittee discussed participation in any new charter vessel monitoring program. Specifically, the subcommittee considered if participation in the program by charter vessel owner/operators could be voluntary or if mandatory participation is necessary. Voluntary
Modifications to Federally-Permitted For-Hire Reporting Requirements

Modifications to Federally-Permitted 112 reporting programs can be advantageous in that reporting burden is reduced (or absent) from participants that do not wish to participate. This would also reduce the number of reports that require processing for catch and effort estimation. However, in absence of a complete sample, estimation procedures are necessary. Estimation procedures can be accurate and robust in a well-designed survey, however, likely at the expense of reduced timeliness. Developing estimates of total catch from a volunteer program is problematic as the proportion of participants may be highly variable through time or across the survey area and volunteer participants may not be representative of all possible participants in this survey. This pattern has been demonstrated previously (e.g., angler avidity) in other studies of volunteer programs and will bias estimates when expanded to the total sector. Voluntary programs would also require careful consideration of the characteristics of the participants and those who choose not to participate as it is impossible to compare catch patterns with participants and non-participants; and an assumption that they are identical is necessary but likely inaccurate. The subcommittee agreed that the potential for bias is too great to recommend any voluntary reporting program and suggested that any program (i.e., census or survey) require reporting from participants be mandatory if selected (e.g., Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS)).

The subcommittee agreed that the potential for bias is too great to recommend any voluntary reporting program and mandatory participation is necessary for vessel/owner operators selected. This is recommended to best achieve the overarching objectives of the proposed program.

4.2 Survey or census

Both census and statistical surveys can (and are) used to estimate catch and effort in marine fisheries. Surveys are beneficial in that a representative sample of anglers (as opposed to the entire "population" of anglers in the fishery) and their catch is used to estimate the total catch. However, management often requires these estimates over relatively small areas, short-time scales, or for rare event species. In these situations, survey estimates sometimes lack the precision necessary or desired for management decisions. The common remedy is to increase sample effort (i.e., sample size) to achieve desired precision levels, however, the necessary sample size may exceed program resources. An additional challenge of surveys is that the strata (e.g., area, time-period) require complete coverage before making an estimate. In practice, this means that surveys generally have a longer lag between the time fishing occurs and when the resulting data are available for use.

A census provides a sum of the total effort and catch by tabulating these metrics from all participants in the fishery. In theory, reporting and subsequent use of these data in management can be rapid as no additional estimation procedures are necessary and the report submission frequency can be established (e.g., weekly) to balance management needs with reporting burden on fishery participants. In practice, estimating catch and effort from a census can be challenging if some participants do not report their catch and effort data within the specified reporting periods. In this event, the census is incomplete and requires an expansion factor to calculate the total catch and effort. As with any survey design, this estimation routine requires additional time, resources, and reduces precision of the estimate. In extreme cases, expanding an incomplete census to a total estimate can be difficult or impossible if the proportion of non-compliant
participants is large or if the non-compliant participants are markedly different than those that are reporting as required. Nonetheless, this capability is essential in a real-world census and is important to consider when developing reporting requirements (frequencies and accountability measures) and minimum acceptable lag-time for use in fisheries management.

The technical subcommittee recommends the development and implementation of an electronic logbook census program to estimate catch and effort for southeast region charter vessels, including procedures for expanding for non-reporting. This recommendation was based in part on the inability of the current survey to meet the needs of science and management applications and the requirement of timeliness beyond which is readily achievable through a survey approach.

4.3 **Reporting frequency**

The subcommittee discussed how often reports need to be submitted to provide timely data for science and management. Frequent reporting has at least two benefits. Reporting as frequently as practicable reduces recall error/bias when producing catch reports. Frequent reporting also can make these data available for use sooner. Currently, the GMFMC and SAFMC require electronic reporting on a weekly basis for commercial seafood dealers and federally permitted headboat operators. Similarly, the subcommittee recommends mandatory weekly reporting, or at shorter intervals if necessary (e.g., The Gulf Council may want to require daily logbook submission during the recreational red snapper season) for a new charter vessel program. A second recommendation was that reports be due from the prior fishing week as soon as practicable. Commercial seafood dealer reports must be submitted by the Tuesday following the previous fishing week (Monday through Sunday). This was considered preferable over the headboat reporting requirements where trip reports are due one week after the end of the fishing week. The reduced lag addresses both advantages identified above.

The technical subcommittee recommends trip level reporting with weekly submission due the Tuesday following each fishing week. This would include no activity reports that could be submitted in advance if periods of inactivity are known. The technical subcommittee discussed that a daily reporting requirement may not be feasible or enforceable, however, reporting systems and user interfaces should be designed to encourage "real-time" at-sea reporting of catch and catch related data elements (e.g. fishing location, fishing method, target species).

4.4 **Data collection**

A variety of software applications are available for data collection and submission including web, smart phone, and tablet based technology. Web-based software provide the capability to report fisheries data after completing the trip. Smart phone or tablet technology could be used for at-sea or real time reporting of catch and effort. This approach may limit the complexity of reporting options but could provide enhanced validation methods because catch and effort data could be submitted before returning to port allowing enhanced dockside validation. Smart phone and tablet technology can also allow for data input without a current
network connection and are also capable of recording vessel positions during a trip via global positioning system (GPS) (a far cheaper technology than VMS, but not in real-time).

The subcommittee recommends a multi-faceted approach where a number of reporting platforms can be used so long as the minimum data standards and security protocols are met. Data standards would need to be developed and the subcommittee agreed that NOAA Fisheries, the GulfFIN, and ACCSP could work collaboratively to develop appropriate standards.

These recommendations encompass two overarching objectives of the monitoring program: 1) Flexibility for specific regions, species, or time periods; 2) A flexible framework to allow incorporation of improved technologies as they become available. Electronic monitoring and reporting capabilities are rapidly evolving and the options available in the near-future may far exceed the current suite of tools. It is necessary to allow (and encourage) this development such that in can be leveraged effectively to meet the needs of fisheries management.

4.5 Data storage and management

The subcommittee discussed data storage and management that would be necessarily expanded from the status quo in a census based monitoring program. The ACCSP and GulfFIN expressed willingness to handle these raw data and indicated this could be accomplished with extant resources.

The subcommittee recommends this process:
1. Logbook data collected via authorized platform, ex. web, tablet, phone, or VMS application
2. Data submitted to ACCSP or GulfFIN;
3. Data integrated by ACCSP or GulfFIN into single composite data set;
4. Composite data set distributed to appropriate agencies for analyses and use.

This process could eliminate duplicate reporting for some participants so long as appropriate data standards are in place and the respective agencies agree to confidentiality standards, which would allow sharing and accepting one another’s data for use. Elimination of duplicate reporting (e.g., separate state and federal reports) would be a substantial benefit to participants in this survey program and could mitigate any additional reporting requirements for comparison to the current MRIP survey program.

4.6 Validation and estimation

A successful electronic for-hire program will require adequate validation of catch and effort data and will require collaboration among state, federal, and fishery information network (FIN) programs. A census is likely to be incomplete and estimation procedures for adjusting catch estimates will need to be developed in cooperation with MRIP. The time lag necessary to expand an incomplete census to an estimate (of harvest or effort) should be built into the timeliness need for science and management applications. The Gulf MRIP pilot program tested
new validation procedures and provided guidance on improvements necessary before full implementation. The pilot program was successful in that electronic reporting was used (almost exclusively) and supported many of the goals (e.g., more timely, simplified reporting process) yet, many participants failed to submit reports within the required time frame complicating the use of these data for management. The rates of compliance increased over the length of the pilot study period and similar result would be expected with full implementation highlighting the need for validation and an estimation procedure to calculate total catch and effort.

The technical subcommittee recommends building upon the validation methodology developed in the Gulf MRIP pilot study. An overview of the proposed methodology is below.

Dockside Validation of Logbook Trip Reports (Catch and Effort)
Validation procedures are critical to assessing the accuracy and completeness of submitted logbook reports. Critical components of validation include the creation and review of a site and vessel registry, and methods to validate catch and effort of self-reported data. There is currently a MRIP funded project; Pilot Project: Validation Methods for Headboat Logbooks, which is testing dockside sampling methods that could be used to validate headboat logbooks. Results from this project will be available in the spring of 2015.

Site and Vessel Registry
A registry of all vessels required to report via logbooks should include detailed docking location information for each vessel. The port city and mailing address for owners of all federally permitted vessels (both active and non-active) is available from the permit frame maintained by NMFS SERO, and may be used as a starting point for identifying where vessels are located. A regularly updated list of all active charter vessels (both federal and state permitted) with docking site information is also maintained in states where the MRIP FHS is administered. From the vessel registry, a list of all known docking locations should be generated and each site should be given a unique identification code. Information contained in the site list should also include site location descriptions, site telephone numbers, contact person at the site, GPS location coordinates, and the total number of vessels located at the site. The site registry should be used to randomly select sites for dockside validation assignments (described below).

Validation of Catch
Dockside assignments for validating harvest should be randomly selected from the site registry and stratified by region (e.g. state or sub-region within large states) using probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling with replacement, with the size measure being the number of vessels at each site. This method is used in statistical sampling designs where sample clusters (e.g. sites where charter vessels dock) differ widely with respect the number of sample units (charter vessels) contained within. PPS sampling selects sites with a higher number of vessels more frequently and prevents potential sample bias by insuring that vessels at low pressure sites do not have a higher probability for selection. Sample days should be distributed across weeks and across weekend/weekday strata, and more weight should be given towards high fishing activity periods (summer and weekends). It is recommended that the site selection program be run monthly by a regional coordinating entity, such as GSMFC, who provides draw files to local
Modifications to Federally-Permitted 116 For-Hire Reporting Requirements

Local coordinators should report tallies for the number of completed assignments and successful interviews to the regional entity weekly.

During an assignment, field samplers should arrive at the assigned site at least one hour before half-day charter fishing trips are expected to return. For sites where overnight fishing trips take place, field staff should call or visit the site the day before the assignment to determine if overnight trips are returning and arrive on site early if necessary to intercept those vessels. Upon arrival, samplers should survey the site and attempt to locate each vessel listed on the vessel register for that site. Each vessel at the site should be recorded on an Assignment Summary Form and coded as one of the following:

1 = vessel in
2 = vessel out, charter fishing (this must be verified)
3 = unable to validate (vessel sold, moved to unknown location, etc.)
4 = vessel out, NOT charter fishing (this must be verified)
5 = vessel out, fishing status unknown (use when unable to verify the fishing status)

For vessels coded as 2 (out charter fishing), the field sampler should attempt to verify the expected return time and record this time on the Assignment Summary Form. As each vessel returns from fishing, the sampler should record on a separate Dockside Intercept Survey Form the vessel name, vessel ID number, and the return date and time. Samplers should first approach the vessel operator for permission to weigh and measure all harvested fish, and the sampler should then observe the harvested catch and record the total number of fish for each species, as well as length at the mid-line (mm) and weight (kg) of whole fish that can be measured. After the catch is inspected, the field sampler should then conduct an interview in person with a crew member (captain and/or mate). It is important to conduct interviews directly with vessel operators, rather than with charter vessel clients, since the purpose of the dockside validation is to measure recall error and bias in trip data recorded by vessel operators on logbook trip reports. During the in-person interview, the following information should be recorded:

- Departure date
- Departure and return time
- Number of passengers (fishing and non-fishing, not including crew)
- Number of anglers (total number of passengers that fished at any time during the trip)
- Number of crew, including captain
- Target species
- Primary area fished (crew should be asked to identify the statistical area where the majority of fishing took place during the trip using statistical maps provided)
- The minimum and maximum depths (in feet) fished for the trip
• The percent of fishing time spent fishing in federal waters, state waters, and inland waters
• Primary fishing methods (bottom fishing, drifting, trolling, spear fishing)
• Hours fished (number of hours spent with gear in the water)
• For each species released or could otherwise not be observed by the field sampler, the total number released for each disposition:
  1 – Thrown back alive
  3 – Eaten/plan to eat
  4 – Used for bait/plan to use for bait
  5 – Sold/plan to sell
  6 – Thrown back dead/plan to throw away
  7 – Other purpose

Samplers should remain on site until the last vessel known to be out fishing has returned (with the exception of overnight trips).

Validation of Vessel Activity and Inactivity (Effort)

Validation of vessel activity (or inactivity) is critical to determining compliance with logbook reporting requirements. Information on whether or not a vessel is in or out of port on a particular day can be matched with logbook records or hail out/hail in requirements to determine if vessel activity was accurately reported. To validate vessel activity and inactivity before reporting in the logbook reporting system, sites should be clustered into groups of sufficient size that all sites within the selected region may be visited within a 6 to 8 hour time period, including driving time. Site clusters should be selected each week within a month using simple random sampling, without replacement. For small states where all sites may be visited in a single day, sites may all be included in a single cluster that is validated each week.

During a scheduled vessel activity validation assignment, the field sampler should visit all sites within a selected vessel activity validation region and attempt to verify the fishing status for all vessels at each site within that region. The sampler should record the fishing status and time for each vessel on a Vessel Status Validation Form using the following codes:

  1 – Vessel in
  2 – Vessel out, charter fishing (must be verified) 3 –
      Unable to validate
  4 – Vessel out, not charter fishing (must be verified) 5 –
      Vessel out, status unknown

If possible, the sampler should verify the fishing status with someone at the dock or in the booking booth. If unable to verify the fishing status of a vessel, the sampler should use code 5.
Dockside validation will also serve the secondary, and essential, function of collecting biological samples from the for-hire fishery. These samples are necessary to characterize the catch for use in stock assessments and to monitor the health of the stocks. If practicable, the subcommittee recommends using observers on six-pack charter vessels. Additionally, VMS in conjunction with hail-out, hail-in to improve validation could be considered to improve validation and data quality, although at the expense of additional cost and reporting burden.

The subcommittee recommends use of an MRIP certified methodology for validation with the following elements: Gulf MRIP pilot study methodologies, including dockside validation of catch and vessel activity, and maintenance of site and vessel registries.

The following additional elements should also be considered:

- At-sea observer coverage; and,
- Fine-scale discard data, depths of capture, area fished, release mortality.

If VMS and hail in/hail out requirements are implemented, methods for validation could be modified as VMS technicians could validate when trips occur through vessel position coordinates.

4.7 Accountability measures

Procedures to ensure timely and accurate reporting of data are essential to the success of any program. Late or missing reports can reduce accuracy (recall bias), increase uncertainty (e.g., requires procedure to estimate catch from missing reports), and can prevent timely use of these data for science and management. The Councils recently began requiring electronic submission of reports from commercial seafood dealers. Dealer reports and the associated problems with late or missing reports were discussed at length by the Councils. The Councils now require timely submission (weekly, with reports submitted by the Tuesday following the previous fishing week) and that seafood dealers are only authorized to purchase seafood if they are up to date on previous reports. A similar procedure should be developed for charter vessels requiring submission of previous reports to maintain a valid charter vessel permit and take passengers on for-hire trips. The subcommittee recognizes that accountability will be challenging and costly to implement due to the mobility, turnover and sheer number of charter vessels.

The principle objective is to encourage compliance without issuing fines and/or penalties.

However, the full range of potential accountability measures should be enumerated in consultation with NOAA General Counsel through development of management regulations and penalty schedules. Similar (or identical) reporting requirements should be established between the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico management regions that will ease reporting burden and aid in compliance. Extensive outreach, training (as necessary), positive messaging, and industry participation in the design of the data collection system should aid in reporting compliance and meeting the goals of the program.

The subcommittee recommends accountability measures and reporting requirements similar to those implemented for commercial seafood dealers in the southeast region (i.e., weekly
submission of trip level reports, including periods of no activity due Tuesday following each week). A charter vessel owner/operator would only be authorized to harvest or possess federally managed species if previous reports have been submitted by the charter vessel owner/operator and received by NMFS (NMFS) in a timely manner. Any delinquent reports would need to be submitted and received by NMFS before a charter vessel owner/operator could harvest or possess federally managed species from the EEZ or adjacent state waters.

4.8 Calibration with existing survey

Transitioning into the proposed program will require an upstart period of at least one year to conduct outreach and ensure a high level of compliance. The subcommittee recommends dual survey methods (existing and new) for no less than three years. This overlap in survey periods will provide a basis to calibrate the new census results to the historical catch and effort data from the existing charter vessel survey. Historical catch data are critical inputs for science (e.g., stock assessments) and management (e.g., season length) and implementation of a new system without calibration would compromise the value of the historical catch information. Additionally, implementation of the new program is likely to have start-up difficulties that require modification, as such, the existing survey would not be expected to provide the best scientific information available (at least for the first year) until the new program is deemed operational.

Data from the new program would not be expected to provide management advice during the first year of operation. Moreover, this would allow the possibility of an initial phase-in or limited implementation to identify and solve significant problems prior to implementation for all participants.

4.9 Should state permitted for-hire vessels be required to participate?

The subcommittee discussed the objectives of the proposed program (i.e., improved estimates of catch both in terms of timeliness and accuracy), as well as the importance of mandating participation from state permitted for-hire vessels. The possibility of state vessels landing federally managed species in state waters does exist but the magnitude of those landings is unknown at this time, but expected to be relatively small for most federally managed species. The difficulties in establishing rules to mandate state vessel participation may be too great and should not be a barrier to developing a reporting program for federally permitted vessels. However, incorporation of state vessels into the program should be a long-term objective that would aid in timeliness and accuracy of data from the entire for-hire fleet and could simplify validation protocols that would not require distinguishing between state and federally permitted vessels.

The subcommittee recommends that the Councils move forward with development of a reporting system that includes federally permitted for-hire vessels while also exploring ways to determine the impact of state permitted vessels on landings estimates of federally managed species. Long term, the subcommittee recommends that both state and federally permitted
charter vessels participate in this census to include the entire fleet of charter vessels harvesting federally managed species.

4.10 Program coordination

The subcommittee discussed that the success of the program requires a smooth and well-coordinated program throughout the region. This is to meet timeliness needs, improve accuracy (and precision), and minimize duplication of effort.

To this end, the subcommittee recommends that GulfFIN and ACCSP committees work jointly with end users (i.e., MRIP, SERO, SEFSC, HMS, and state agencies) to coordinate this new reporting program. Both quality control and quality assurance units in the program to ensure data meets required standards. A timeline for program implementation must be developed with the Councils, states, and other agencies.

4.11 Budgetary implications

The vision of the subcommittee is that the proposed census program may be funded through MRIP and incorporate MRIP certified validation and estimation procedures but operation would be decentralized from MRIP to regional and state entities through their FINs. It is expected that the census approach recommended by this subcommittee would result in additional costs for monitoring compliance and validating trip activity. Additional infrastructure and personnel may be necessary to maintain and process these data.

Electronic Logbook Costs

Cost estimates are an important component to the development of any new reporting program, and provide resource managers and scientists with a sense of how much funding is needed to support both implementation and maintenance of a program. Costs for electronic reporting may include: software development, reporting and/or monitoring hardware, monthly service fees, and personnel for data management, validation, and estimation. Costs are incurred both by the government, as well as fishermen who report these data. The following provides a summary of estimated costs for the electronic reporting program developed by the Technical Subcommittee. Cost estimates from existing programs and pilot studies, such as MRIP, the Southeast Headboat Survey, the commercial coastal logbook program, and the MRIP electronic logbook pilot study, are also provided for comparative purposes. Implementation of a new reporting program would require side-by-side comparative testing for calibration purposes, and those costs are not considered herein. Costs for observer coverage are also not included. Rather, costs are focused on the initial implementation, ongoing administration, data management, and statistical estimation of an electronic reporting program in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic.

Current and Pilot Study Program Costs

The Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) is the primary source of charter for-hire data in the Southeast Region. MRIP collects catch and effort data from both state-
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licensed and federally-permitted charter vessels from North Carolina through Mississippi. Charter vessel catch and effort data are also collected by the Louisiana Department of Fish and Wildlife and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department through creel surveys, and side-by-side comparison testing is planned for Louisiana in 2015. Annually, MRIP spends approximately $4.3 million dollars to conduct dockside sampling and validation in the Southeast Region (North Carolina to Louisiana) for both private and charter vessels. Costs for specifically conducting charter sampling were not estimated, as those costs are difficult to estimate due to a combination of factors (survey procedures, contractual pricing, fixed costs and staffing/administrative considerations), but obviously would be less than the overall costs indicated above. An additional $600 thousand dollars is spent conducting the for-hire telephone survey annually. A total of 3,920 charter vessels are currently included in the MRIP for-hire survey frame.

Headboat catch for 145 vessels is monitored through electronic logbooks by the SEFSC. A total of 13 federal, state, and contract personnel are involved in administering the program and monitoring fishing activity from North Carolina to Texas, including biological sampling and validation of reports of landings and effort. Costs for the program include salaries and benefits, vehicles, travel, supplies, and software development and maintenance. Total funding for the Southeast Headboat Survey is approximately $888 thousand dollars, which equates to $6,124 per vessel annually.

The SEFSC coastal logbook program for commercial fisheries is a paper-based logbook program, which obtains data from about 3,000 permit holders (vessels). Annually, the SEFSC spends $775 thousand dollars for data entry, personnel, printing, storage, software maintenance, and overhead for this program. These costs do not include Trip Interview Program sampling, which is used for validation and biological sampling of commercial landings. The costs also do not include compliance enforcement.

Lastly, MRIP conducted an electronic logbook pilot study in 2011. The study included 410 vessels from the Florida Panhandle and Port Aransas, Texas. Costs for the pilot program included $213.5 thousand dollars for start-up expenses, including a stakeholder workshop, software development, certified letters, outreach meetings, and working group meetings. Project expenses for logbook reporting and validation for one-year totaled $385.6 thousand dollars.

These expenses included salaries and overhead for a full-time coordinator, a database manager, and four field staff. Expenses were also included for travel and training expenses, equipment, printing costs, at-sea observer passenger fares, and GSMFC administrative costs. The average cost per vessel was $1,340 for Texas vessels and $658 for Florida vessels. Many more vessels were concentrated in a small geographic area in the Florida Panhandle, resulting in lower costs relative to Texas. In-kind contributions from NMFS and state employees were not included for many staff who served on the project team for the pilot study and conducted analyses, customer service, and database management. Therefore costs presented in the final report are less than the true costs of the project. On average, the cost per vessel as reported in the pilot study was $911 after excluding observer passenger fares and paper-based logbook printing.
Table 1. Estimated Costs for an Electronic Logbook Program. Estimates are based on 2,555 federally permitted charter vessels. Headboat vessels are excluded from cost estimates, as well as vessels already possessing a commercial reef fish permit and VMS unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cost Type</th>
<th>Estimated Expenses</th>
<th>Comments/Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software Development</td>
<td>Start-up (gov’t)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Costs for Web site/app development. These costs could be reduced if existing software applications (SE Headboat Survey or iSnapper) are used instead of any new software developed. However, modifications of data fields, data storage and data export procedures would be required to accommodate the increased number of vessels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/database infrastructure</td>
<td>Start-up (gov’t)</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Purchase of a server to store data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/database maintenance</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>There would be reoccurring costs for hardware/software and database maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database manager(s) and administration</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Salaries and administrative costs for database management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Letters</td>
<td>Start-up, with period reoccurring compliance letters (gov’t)</td>
<td>$15,858</td>
<td>2,643 vessels @ $6 per letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Outreach Workshops</td>
<td>Start-up (gov’t)</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>15 meetings @ $2,000 per meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Sampler – Salaries, Benefits, and Overhead</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$3,392,000</td>
<td>53 port agents @ 50 vessels per port agent. $64,000 for salary, benefits, and overhead per port agent – source SE Headboat Survey. If costs per vessel ($658- $1,340) from MRIP pilot study are used, then total costs range from $1.74 to $3.54 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analyst(s) – Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>1 Gulf and 1 South Atlantic analyst @ GS-13 salary + benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, Travel, and Equipment for Field Samplers</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$158,700</td>
<td>~$60 per vessel – source MRIP pilot study; costs are higher for more remote areas vs. ports with large concentrations of vessels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement and Compliance Monitoring – Enforcement officer salaries, benefits, and overhead.</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Data timeliness is critical for a logbook program. Additional compliance monitoring and enforcement for misreporting and non-compliance with reporting will be required. To properly conduct compliance an increase of 5 Enforcement Officers and 1 Supervisory Enforcement Officer are estimated to be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS units (if required)</td>
<td>Start-up (gov’t or industry)</td>
<td>$5,750,000 (low estimate) $7,750,000 (high estimate) (Reimbursement to fishermen for the purchase of VMS units may be available from NOAA Fisheries’ Electronic Monitoring Grant Fund, but this money is currently not in hand and OLE would need to request funds through the budgetary process)</td>
<td>Currently 107 charter for-hire vessels have a commercial reef fish permit and VMS unit and another 145 vessels participate in the SE Headboat Survey. Approximately 2,500 charter for-hire vessels would need to obtain a VMS, if required. Costs for VMS units range from $2,300 to $3,800. Up to $3,100 is currently authorized for reimbursement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS installation</td>
<td>Start-up (industry)</td>
<td>$500,000 (low estimate) $1,500,000 (high estimate)</td>
<td>2,500 vessels x $600 for marine technician to install VMS unit. Installation costs range from $200 to $600 depending upon proximity of vessel to marine electrician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS personnel</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>Salary and benefits for five VMS technical staff (monitor 500+ vessels each) and one OLE Helpdesk person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS annual service</td>
<td>Reoccurring (industry)</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$60 per month per vessel; $720 annually per vessel x 2,500 vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS unit software</td>
<td>Reoccurring (gov’t)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>If VMS units will report any unique information, units will need to have initial and periodically updated software installed at a cost up to $50,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs (w/o VMS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170,858 (Start-up) $4,735,700 (Reoccurring) $4,906,558 (Start-up + reoccurring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs (w/ VMS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,420,858 (Start-up – low est.) $9,420,858 (Start-up – high est.) $7,115,700 (Re-occurring) $13,536,558 (Total – low est.) $16,536,558 (Total – high est.)</td>
<td>If VMS is required, some expenses for port sampling validation of fishing effort and enforcement compliance may be reduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 5. CHALLENGES

5.1 Calibration with existing survey

The subcommittee recommends the use of dual survey methods (existing and new) for no less than three years. This overlap in survey periods will provide a basis to calibrate the new census results to the historical catch and effort data from the existing charter vessel survey.

Historical catch data are critical inputs for science (e.g., stock assessments) and management (e.g., season length) and implementation of a new system without calibration would compromise the value of the historical catch information. Additionally, implementation of the new program is likely to have start-up difficulties that require modification, as such, the proposed census would not be expected to provide the best scientific information available (at least for the first year) until the new program was deemed operational.

5.2 Reporting burden

Although frequent reporting with as short as practicable lags between end of fishing period and report submission is desirable, the burden of reporting on vessel operators is an important concern. Wherever feasible, the reporting burden should be minimized.

Implementation of this new program would require additional reporting burden over the status quo. To mitigate this requirement, the subcommittee recommends reducing duplicate reporting (submission of reports to multiple agencies, possibly in different formats) to ease reporting requirements. For example, charter vessels selected for the current For-Hire telephone survey should be able to submit their data electronically satisfying the submission requirements for both programs.

5.3 Compliance

Ensuring compliance is likely the biggest barrier to achieving the objectives for this program; more timely data with improved accuracy and stakeholder confidence. The MRIP Gulf logbook pilot project was negatively affected by late or missing reports from participants. In a census program, this is detrimental to both timeliness and accuracy as complete catch estimates cannot be generated with missing reports. Late reporting also affects accuracy because of recall bias (i.e., difficult to remember what was caught several weeks earlier). In addition, an incomplete census will require an estimation procedure to account for un-reported landings that requires time and adds uncertainty to the final catch and effort estimates.

Adequate accountability measures are essential to achieving high compliance rates (i.e., 100% timely reporting). The subcommittee recommended an approach similar to the accountability measures recently developed for commercial seafood dealers and headboats.

Briefly, commercial seafood dealers are only authorized (i.e., possess valid permit) to purchase seafood if their weekly purchase reports have been submitted. As is the case with headboat
reporting, charter boats would not be allow to harvest or possess federally managed species from the EEZ or adjacent state waters until previous trip (including no activity) reports have been submitted. The effectiveness of this accountability measure is dependent of the capability of law enforcement to enforce reporting requirements. The subcommittee recommends consultation with the Office of Law Enforcement and NOAA General Counsel to explore the selection of appropriate and enforceable accountability measures.

5.4 Collaboration with states

Individual States would be tasked with data collection and validation within their collective states. State requirements vary regarding reporting of fishery data with some states (e.g., South Carolina) requiring the submission of paper-based reporting. Other states (e.g., North Carolina) are progressing rapidly toward electronic logbooks with the other states within this range. Long term, the subcommittee recommends that both state and federally permitted charter vessels participate in this census to include the entire fleet of charter vessels harvesting federally managed species. In the near-term, implementation of electronic logbook reporting for the federally permitted for-hire fleet would substantially improve the data collection program but not depend on delays and uncertainties associated with requiring similar regulations for state-permitted vessels at this time. Consideration of only federally permitted vessels would ease the implementation of this process with the caveat that a large proportion of charter vessels would not be included in the census and their catch (and effort) would have to be estimated via other means that would reduce effectiveness of the census program. However, for state-permitted vessels, requiring electronic reporting without duplicate paper reporting may require legislative changes in some states (e.g., South Carolina) and there is uncertainty if or when this could be accomplished.
APPENDIX F. BYCATCH PRACTICABILITY ANALYSIS

Background/Overview

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (South Atlantic Council) is required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) §303(a) (11) to establish a standardized bycatch reporting methodology for federal fisheries and to identify and implement conservation and management measures to the extent practicable and in the following order: 1) minimize bycatch and 2) minimize the mortality of bycatch that cannot be avoided. The Magnuson-Stevens Act defines bycatch as “fish which are harvested in a fishery, but which are not sold or kept for personal use, and includes economic discards and regulatory discards. The definition does not include fish released alive under a recreational catch-and-release fishery management program” (Magnuson-Stevens Act §3(2)). Economic discards are fish that are discarded because they are undesirable to the harvester. This category of discards generally includes certain species, sizes, and/or sexes with low or no market value.

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) outlines at 50 CFR §600.350(d) (3) (i) ten factors that should be considered in determining whether a management measure minimizes bycatch or bycatch mortality to the extent practicable.

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

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

The South Atlantic Council is encouraged to adhere to the precautionary approach outlined in Article 6.5 of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries when uncertain about these factors.
Commercial Discard Rates

The increase in frequency of vessel reporting may increase the amount of discards for species that have reached their commercial sector annual catch limit (ACL). By having vessels report on daily or weekly basis versus the current basis, managers may have the ability to close the sector in a more timely manner. A season closure could result in an increase in bycatch for those fishermen that continue to fish; however, the overall level of fishing mortality would be expected to decrease. For species that have not reached their ACL, no change in discards is expected as a result of the increase in frequency of vessel reporting as these species would most likely be retained.

Recreational Discard Rates

For species that have a sector specific recreational allocation, no change in the amount of discards is expected as a result of an enhancement of reporting by the recreational sector.

Sea Turtles, Smalltooth Sawfish, and Other Protected Species Bycatch

No change in sea turtle, smalltooth sawfish, or other potential protected species bycatch is expected as a result of the increase in recreational vessel reporting. The proposed action is unlikely to alter fishing in ways that would jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species under the jurisdiction of the NMFS or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Protected resources are discussed in Sections 3.2.1 - 3.2.3 of the Environmental Assessment; the biological impacts are discussed in Sections 4.1.1, 4.2.1, and 4.3.1.

Alternatives Being Considered to Minimize Bycatch

Reductions in dead discards can be accomplished either by reducing the number of fish discarded or reducing the release mortality rate of discards. To reduce the number of discards, management measures must limit fishing effort or change the selectivity of fishing gear in such a way that reduces the harvest of sub-legal fish. To reduce the discard mortality rate, ACLs must not be exceeded or fishing seasons closed.

Practicability Analysis

Criterion 1: Population effects for the bycatch species

This amendment discusses the harvest and reporting of 64 species, and thus the net population effects on bycatch is undeterminable. However, season closures could potentially increase the amount of bycatch. A recreational season closure resulting from landings exceeding their ACL could result in an increase in the amount of bycatch should fishers continue fishing for co-occurring species. Bycatch due to management measures such as fixed closed seasons, in-season closures, and ACL payback conditions could result in loss of yield. However, better data reporting that prevents ACLs overages and allows for a species to be closed when an ACL is reached, would be expected to reduce the overall level of fishing mortality.
Criterion 2: Ecological effects due to changes in the bycatch of managed species (on other species in the ecosystem)
Relationships among species in marine ecosystems are complex and poorly understood, making the nature and magnitude of ecological effects difficult to predict. Reductions in bycatch and fishing mortality would allow stocks to increase in abundance, resulting in increased competition for prey with other predators. Consequently, it is possible that forage species and competitor species could decrease in abundance in response to in season closures resulting from ACLs being reached or exceeded. However, actions in the amendment that allow for better data reporting to prevent ACL overages and allow for a species to be closed when an ACL is reached, would be expected to reduce the overall level of fishing mortality. Thus, positive ecological effects are expected from the actions proposed in this amendment.

Criterion 3: Changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and invertebrates and the resulting population and ecosystem effects
The biological environment would benefit by the increase in the frequency of vessel reporting. Fish populations are expected to be affected in a positive manner through this amendment. The increase in the frequency of vessel reporting would assist managers in determining when species are approaching their ACL. By managing landings below their ACL, populations would be healthier and provide for a more stable environment.

Positive impacts to the biological environment include implementing accountability measures to prevent overfishing and maintain stocks at healthy levels in a consistent and structured manner across all fishery management plans.

Criterion 4: Effects on marine mammals and birds
No effects on marine mammals and birds are expected as a result of the increase in vessel reporting. The proposed action is unlikely to alter fishing in ways that would jeopardize the continued existence of any marine mammal and bird species under the jurisdiction of NMFS or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Protected resources are discussed in Sections 3.2.1 - 3.2.3 of the EA; the biological impacts are discussed in Sections 4.1.1, 4.2.1, and 4.3.1.

Criterion 5: Changes in fishing, processing, disposal, and marketing costs
Reporting landings more frequently may affect costs associated with fishing operations. Implementing in-season closures would have direct impacts to fishermen. Fishermen would incur losses in revenue due to season closures and would incur greater losses in consumer surplus resulting from a seasonal closure.

Criterion 6: Changes in fishing practices and behavior of fishermen
Seasonal closures could alter angler effort, at least initially, and may affect decisions about when and where to fish. Shifts or changes in fishing locations and seasons could have an effect on fishing behavior and practices that may potentially affect the bycatch.
Criterion 7: Changes in research, administration, and enforcement costs and management effectiveness
Establishing more timely reporting requirements for vessels would be expected to increase enforcement costs and management effectiveness. The increase in the frequency of reporting would be expected to result in more opportunities for non-compliance. This may result in an increasing the burden to law enforcement.

Criterion 8: Changes in the economic, social, or cultural value of fishing activities and non-consumptive uses of fishery resources
Economic and social effects from this proposed amendment are discussed in Section 4.1.

Criterion 9: Changes in the distribution of benefits and costs
The actions in this amendment would increase costs associated with vessel reporting to the actual vessels themselves. As a result of increasing the amount of vessel reporting the fishing industry should benefit by not exceeding its ACLs as often, which in turns leads to closed seasons and overage paybacks.

Criterion 10: Social effects
Social effects of additional vessel permit requirements would likely be associated with any added time and financial burden for vessels and seafood businesses to meet reporting requirements that would be part of the permit responsibilities.

CONCLUSIONS
Analysis of the ten bycatch practicability factors indicates there are potential negative impacts to bycatch and bycatch mortality. However, the benefits of reducing harvest, ending overfishing, and rebuilding the stocks is estimated to outweigh the benefits of further reducing discard mortality.

The South Atlantic Council will need to consider the practicability of implementing the bycatch minimization measures discussed above with respect to the overall objectives of the FMPs, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

Bycatch is currently considered to be reduced to the extent practicable in all fisheries subject to this amendment. However, increasing the frequency of reporting may impact bycatch. The precise impacts of these limits are currently unknown, but any potential increase in bycatch is believed to be outweighed by the benefits associated with enforcing ACLs. Better vessel reporting, and the ability to prohibit harvest when the ACL is met is expected to decrease the overall level of fishing mortality for a species. For species that have not reached their ACL, no change in discards is expected as a result of the increase in frequency of vessel reporting as these species would most likely be retained. Further, bycatch levels and associated implications will continue to be monitored in the future and issues will be addressed based on new information.
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Excerpt of For-Hire Data Collection Items

Science
Goal - Management decisions for the snapper grouper fishery are based upon robust, defensible science that considers qualitative and quantitative data analyzed in a timely, clear, and transparent manner that builds stakeholder confidence.

Objective 1 - Promote collection of quality data to support management plans and programs considered by the Council.

Strategy 1.1 - Evaluate existing data collection, monitoring, and reporting programs affecting fisheries managed by the Council.

Priority Actions
- Evaluate fishery dependent and independent data programs.
- Validate data collection programs.
- Identify sampling resources needed to support data programs.

Strategy 1.2 - Encourage consistency in data collection programs that incorporates standardized methods, reporting requirements and formats across the South Atlantic region.

Priority Actions
- Support efforts to create a uniform, efficient reporting mechanism for trip tickets and logbooks

Objective 2 - Encourage development of mechanisms to effectively engage and collaborate with stakeholders on cooperative research, data collection and analysis.

Strategy 2.1 – Promote and expand opportunities for cooperative research and surveys in the South Atlantic region.

Priority Actions
- Identify sources of funding (both traditional and non-traditional) for cooperative research and surveys.
- Improve partnerships between potential researchers and fishermen.
- Utilize fishing vessels and captains as alternative observer platforms.

Strategy 2.2 - Support development of citizen science programs for data collection needs in the snapper grouper fishery.

Priority Actions
- Support a volunteer angler training program to collect specific data to address a science or management need.
- Develop methods to incorporate volunteer data for use in stock assessments, and other management measures.
- Utilize fishing vessels and captains as alternative data collection platforms.
Objective 4 - Support improved and expanded monitoring and reporting programs for the snapper grouper fishery.

Strategy 4.2 – Support further development of reporting mechanisms for all sectors in the snapper grouper fishery.

Priority Actions
- **Use of electronic reporting mechanisms for all sectors of the fishery** (mobile apps, cellphones, web-based, etc.)
- **Consider the use of swipecards.**
- **Establish a recreational fishing stamp/permit/license for the snapper grouper fishery.**
- **Increase dockside biological sampling for the recreational sector.**
- **Catch card reporting program for specific species.**
- **Improvements to existing logbook programs** (Better resolution on logbook grids, Vessel Trip Report in discard logbook, etc.)
- **Incentives for reporting in all sectors.**
- **Consequences for lack of reporting.**
- **Support for law enforcement to enforce reporting requirements.**
- **Increase bycatch/discard reporting.**
- **Implement Standard Bycatch Reporting Methodology**
- **Develop a model to improve discard rate estimates for all sectors.**
- **Need better data collection from dive boat operators (recreational).**

Management

**Goal** – Adopt management strategies for the snapper grouper fishery that rebuild and maintain fishery resources, adapt to regional differences in the fishery, and consider the social and economic needs of fishing communities.

Objective 4 - Develop management measures that reduce and mitigate discards.

Strategy 4.4 Develop management approaches that support “Best Fishing Practices” to help avoid bycatch and reduce discard mortality.

Priority Actions
- **Promote opportunities for research, development, and evaluation of gear and technology to reduce bycatch** (i.e., hook type/use, gear competitions, descending devices).