Comments Summary for South Atlantic Scoping for CMP Amendment 24
January 2014

General topics from public input (including recorded testimony, written comments, and informal discussion):

- some support for re-allocating to allow the total ACL to be met for each stock
- concern about validity of recreational data/MRIP
- support for an in-season mechanism to move part of a sector ACL to the other sector if one sector has not met a certain percentage of its ACL by a certain time in the year, then going back to original allocations at the start of the new year
- consideration of the variation in recreational and commercial landings in the different zones/sub-zones for Gulf king mackerel
- discussion of the value of leaving fish in the water instead of reallocating some of the recreational ACL to the commercial ACL

North Myrtle Beach, SC (1 commenter):
- One commenter (CFSF representative) supported re-allocation for Atlantic Spanish mackerel and Gulf king mackerel because the total ACL has not been exceeded.

Atlantic Beach, NC (1 commenter):
- One commenter (recreational/for-hire) supported the in-season mechanism to move unused sector allocation to the other sector if necessary; he also noted that the recreational ACL for Atlantic Spanish mackerel is not met because the bag limit (15/day/person) is higher than the number that recreational fishermen usually want to catch of one species.

Key West, FL (2 commenters):
- One commenter (FKCFA representative) supported using landings ration over a long period of time if re-allocating for fairness and also to make up for bag limit sales off the for-hire vessels, which could be moved to the commercial ACL.
- One commenter expressed concern about using old data when considering re-allocation, because of how data were collected in earlier years (before trip tickets, etc).

Cocoa Beach, FL (1 commenter):
- One commenter (SFA representative) supported a 5-10% increase for the commercial ACL for Atlantic Spanish mackerel because the recreational sector is not landing all of its allocation. The commenter also recommended an 18% increase for the commercial ACL for Gulf king mackerel to make the allocation 50/50, which would leave plenty for the recreational sector. He also recommended looking at the recreational and commercial landings by zone/subzone for Gulf king mackerel.

Jacksonville, FL (1 commenter):
- One commenter supported reallocation so that OY would be met.

5 written comments:

- One commenter felt that there should be no change in the sector allocations because the Councils should not take away allocation from the recreational sector and the commercial sector should be held accountable to stay within its allocation.
- Two commenters supported reallocation to meet the total ACL and harvest underutilized quotas.
- One written comment representing SFA tracked public testimony noted under Cocoa Beach.
- One commenter noted that subzones with smaller quotas would benefit if a portion of the Gulf king mackerel recreational ACL was moved to the commercial ACL, and recommended 10% at first.
- One commenter recommended a review and reallocation of mackerel stocks every three years.