

## Draft Vision Blueprint Goal & Objective Identification: 2014 Georgia Port Meeting Comparison

Below is a summary of solutions proposed by stakeholders in Georgia during the 2014 port meetings. The document also shows where each solution is currently addressed in the draft Vision Blueprint strategic goal documents (**Goal, Objective, Strategy, and Actions**). This will document how the Council is addressing the proposed solutions and input from stakeholders when crafting the draft Vision Blueprint.

### Top issues and suggested solutions:

#### ISSUE 1: Data Collection/Science/Stock Assessments Issues

##### Solutions -

- More fishermen input – on stock assessments; best data the Council could use is what would come from the fishermen. **Science-Obj 1, Strat 1.1, Action F; Obj 2, Strat 2.2, Actions A & B**
- Use angler collected data – real experience of anglers (show photos/videos as proof). Fishermen's anecdotal information is not utilized in the stock assessment process. **Science-Obj 2, Strat 2.2, Action A&B**
- Sector management of fish – collect the data and conduct the analyses regionally, not the region as a whole; **Needs to be addressed**
- Real time data collection using information from recreational fishermen and divers – **Science-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Action 4; Obj 2, Strat 2.2, Action A**
  - web based data collection platforms;
  - A voluntary recreational program where GoPro cameras are used in data collection (underwater).
- Federal scientists should mimic data collection used by states – DNR; otolith studies are being done by our local DNR scientists, the federal scientists should do the same. **Needs to be addressed**
- Cooperative data reporting – recreational and charter folks should have to report; **Science-Obj 4, Strat 4.2, Action A**
- Web based reporting for recreational (Note: *lots of discussion about a tag program, and how it would be administered and updates on SG Amendment 22*) **Science-Obj 4, Strat 4.2, Actions A, B, F**
- Incentive based reporting – give a reward for reporting **Science-Obj 4, Strat 4.2, Action H**
- Harvest tag program; reward (incentive based); an analogy to alligator harvest tag program in other states. **Science-Obj 4, Strat 4.2, Actions F, H**
- Collecting biological data – report this information electronically **Science-Obj 4, Strat 4.2, Actions B**
- More remote sensing data should be considered when making regulations
- Tag program - mark and recapture – to monitor fishery. **Needs to be addressed**
- Adopt a biologist program- bringing scientists out on the boats **Science-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Actions B**
- Opportunities for cooperative research **Science-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Actions A, B**
- Have a fishing club representative as a part of a recreational voluntary fishing data collection program. **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.2, Action A**
- Develop a pool of local anglers willing to provide recreational catch data **Obj 2, Strat 2.2, Action A**
- Gauge release mortality **Mngmt – Obj 4, Strat 4.4, Action A, B; Science – Obj 4, Strat 4.2, Action K, L, M**
- Survey fishermen catch

#### ISSUE 2: Reducing Discards

##### Solutions -

- Have fish limit (bag) not length limit – be able to keep **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Action D, F**

- Release weights – descending devices/help the fish to get back to the bottom. **Mngmt-Obj 4, Strat 4.4, Action A**
- Many snapper die when released; change rules to 1 fish per person or 6 fish whichever is greater – red snapper in particular. **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Action D, F; Obj 4, Strat 4.3, Action A, B, & C**
- Consider change from current length limits – total creel noted or weight **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Action D**
- Promote fishing and catching optional species **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.5, Action A**
- Set bag limit and keep what you catch **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Actions A, D, F**
- No bycatch killed (full retention) **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Actions A, D, F**
- What you catch is what you count or keep (full retention) **Mngmt-Obj 2, Strat 2.1, Actions A, D, F**

### ISSUE 3: Regional Management to Address Regional Differences (both state and sector)

#### Solutions -

- Break down states into geographical zones – regional management; **Mngmt-Obj 1, Strat 1.1, Action A; Strat 1.2, Action A, B; Strat 1.3, Action B, C, D**
- Figure out a way for GA to get a bigger piece of the pie. Needs to be addressed
- Establish GA coast as its own sector – with own quota. Needs to be addressed
- Different rules for each state **Mngmt-Obj 1, Strat 1.3, Action C, D**
- Council input on changing Magnuson-Stevens Act
- Subdivide or “grid” a few areas by similar characteristics for management purposes **Mngmt- Obj 1, Strat 1.1, Action A; Obj 1, Strat 1.2, Action C**
- Segregate into more site specific areas **Mngmt-Obj 1, Strat 1.3, Action B**
- Keep Floridians out of our fishery; longitudinal boundaries. Needs to be addressed
- Regional stakeholder meetings with forecasting during meetings (similar to format of port meetings). Needs to be addressed
  - Ask each stakeholder what is happening in each area at these meetings– also goes under incorporating fishermen’s knowledge into data collection

### ISSUE 4: Communication

#### Solutions -

- Local education Public Service Announcements (where does the public go to buy local fish; educate them about seasons, what is in season locally; lionfish and invasive species) **Comm-Obj 1, Strat 1.3, Action A**
- Make data more understandable and available – more outreach tools available for understanding data **Comm-Obj 3, Strat 3.2, Action B, C**
- A moderated forum by Council staff to answer questions posed by the public. **Comm-Obj 1, Strat 1.2, Action A**
- Q/A webinar, provide a forum for folks to ask questions of Council staff. **Comm-Obj 1, Strat 1.1, Action F, G**
- Buy in from for-hire sector – rebuilding trust an issue with this sector
- Funding for Council marketing – port meetings are a start; **Comm-Obj 1, Strat 1.3, Action B**
- Develop condensed information on stock assessments in layman’s terms (not what the newsletter provides) (Note: Charter folks haven’t felt involved in the SEDAR process or with providing their data)
- 1-pagers delivered to marinas on stock assessments – brief summary after an assessment **Comm-Obj 3, Strat 3.2, Action B, C**
- Clarify/simplify dates and reasons – trying to navigate between federal and state is confusing; fishermen need to know what they can and can’t fish for and when between state and federal regulations. Needs to be addressed
- Quarterly updates, not every few weeks (on quota monitoring) Needs to be addressed

- Remove old information from internet (web site), including outdated regulations. Needs to be addressed
- Develop short segments regarding the “science” on YouTube.
- Give a longer notice for closures (one week prior to closure is not enough). Needs to be addressed
- Send notification of closures to fishing clubs not just to individuals. Needs to be addressed

### Other issues of importance:

- Dated and ineffective regulations that are based on inaccurate data.
- No stakeholder confidence in data that is used to base management decisions. **Comm-Obj 3, Strat 3.2, Action B, C**
- Management of red snapper in the region is not working (concerns about data, length of mini-season, timing of season, etc.)
- Concern about the Council member appointment process; Need to have appointees endorsed by stakeholders not just governor.
- Black sea bass management – size limits and bag limits need to be readdressed.
- Law enforcement – need to support more on the water enforcement.
- Lack of consistent supply of fish and access to the fishery affecting year round availability of fish to both fishermen and consumers (chefs/restaurants).
- Representation of the seafood consumer on the Council and within Council activities.
- Consideration of how regulations impact local economies (tourism, etc.)
- Fishing effort shifts because of seasons, closures and access to fishery.
- Concern that the resource is unable to support future harvest and effort.
- Management of the commercial vs. the recreational sector and impacts of fishing.
- Georgia has limited habitat available for the fishery and not enough habitat development programs.
- Complexity of state and federal regulations and the jurisdictions for enforcing them.
- Management of quotas - paybacks for overage but no reward for underages.
- Lack of consideration about the economic feasibility of trips with current regulations.
- Recreational representation on the Council and in general, in the fisheries management arena.