INNOVATIVE RECREATIONAL MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP

Approaches
Background
Discussion Questions

September 16- 17, 2018
Charleston, SC

Kari MacLauchlin Buck, Facilitator

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background

- Spatial closure to recreational fishing based on depth or distance from shore, but allowing fishing in unclosed areas
- Discussed at previous meetings

Benefits:

- Could decrease fishing pressure on stock and reduce release mortality
- May result in longer recreational season

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Would require:

- Close coordination with states
- Detailed data to select closed area

Challenges:

- May not reduce fishing pressure if most fish are caught near shore
- Compliance/enforcement
- Release mortality if fishing for other species is allowed in the closed area

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Example: Pacific Rockfish

- Closed areas for comm and recreational to reduce bycatch of overfished rockfish that co-occur with target rockfish species
- Based on depth (shore to a max depth)
- Areas closed to rec fishing for all groundfish, some non-groundfish
- Some exceptions for certain species/gear

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Example: Depth/distance-based approach for South Atlantic snapper grouper to reduce RS discards

- Presented and discussed by SAFMC in March 2017 (did not proceed)
- Options presented:

Depth	SG Species (except RS)	Red Snapper	Mgmt Measures
≤100 ft	Year-round	RS Rec Season	ACLs, bag/size limits apply; Reporting required; Catch-and-release allowed (shallower waters)
>100ft	Only during RS Rec Season		ACLs, bag/size limits apply; Reporting required; Descender device required

Options would apply to both private and for-hire. If for-hire participation is capped, permitted for-hire vessels could fish in >100ft

Other depths could be evaluated and analyzed.

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Trade-offs of limited fishing area (RS example)

- Reduced access to other species- missed rec fishing opportunities
- Reduced RS discards due to lower incidental catch → lower RS removals → potential longer RS season in the following fishing year (with open >100ft waters)

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Discussion

- What aspects of depth/distance-based management would contribute to management (Council/NMFS/States) supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What aspects would contribute to stakeholders supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What information would Council and stakeholders need to make a decision about this approach? Is it available?

DEPTH/DISTANCE-BASED MANAGEMENT: Discussion

- What species would this approach be applied to?
- Would it be the same for the whole region for X species, or would it vary throughout the region?
- What is the minimum depth/distance that would be needed to make this approach work? [to reduce discards or other goals]
- What is the maximum depth/distance that would be acceptable for this approach?
- What are the trade-offs and are they acceptable for management and stakeholders?
- What components (reporting, barotrauma reduction, EFP, etc) could be incorporated into this approach to make it successful?
- Are there other approaches that could work in combination with this approach to be successful?

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Background

- Uses *exploitation rate targets* to reach a desired rate of removal and stock biomass level

- Allowable harvest level set using on exploitation rate target and assessment info

- Desired catch levels compared to past catch levels
-
- Target and threshold parameters based on assessment and recent landings data

- An HRM approach would *focus on how Council monitors and responds to changes*, and adjusts management to reach the targets established through the assessment process.

- Allows response to changes in rec effort and the fish population using more recent info

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Background

Comparison of a harvest rate management approach (using ASMFC's Striped Bass as an example) with the current SAFMC approach with annual catch limits.

Trait		**Annual Catch Limit**	**Harvest Rate Mgmt (ex: Striped Bass)**
Exploitation Rate Target and Limit	Based on:	MSY	SSB level
Allowable harvest	Based on:	Assessment; F rate x abundance	Assessment; F rate x abundance
	Limit or target	Limit	Target
	Overage consequences	Varies, can include in-season closure or post-season payback (accountability measures)	Monitor, may adjust regulations
Annual Monitoring	Values	Catch levels	Catch, effort, JAI
	Reporting	Informal – Council receives reports on landings from NMFS	Formal - Annual plan review by ASMFC

Acronyms: MSY=Maximum Sustainable Yield; SSB=Standing Stock Biomass; F rate= Fishing Mortality Rate; JAI=Juvenile Abundance Index

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Example: ASMFC Striped Bass

- Threshold and target fishing mortality (F) to reach desired Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB) level

- Annual review of landings and biological info, compare to trends and targets

- ASMFC may direct states to adjust management, % change from prior years

- Seasons but no in-season closures

- Allows ASMFC to respond to changes in rec effort and fish population using more recent info

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Example: Gulf and Atlantic king mackerel and Spanish mackerel

- In the 1980s/90s, the Councils reviewed fishery and stock info, set quotas and management measures as needed

- Incorporated most recent info for the upcoming year, align management with current fishery conditions

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Benefits:

- Uses more recent information and may better align with current fishery conditions
- May improve stability in rec fisheries

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Would require:

- More frequent stock information
- Additional management action

Challenges:

- Process may take a long time to develop
- Additional resources (staff, time) to provide updated info each year for multiple species
- Framework actions reduce public comment opportunities

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Discussion

- What aspects of harvest rate management would contribute to management (Council/NMFS/States) supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What aspects would contribute to stakeholders supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What information would Council and stakeholders need to make a decision about this approach? Is it available?

HARVEST RATE MANAGEMENT: Discussion

- What species could this approach be applied to? Is the necessary information (from stock assessments, yearly fishery-independent surveys, etc) available?

- When would you evaluate the landings and what would you use to evaluate the landings to decide if there will be management changes in the following fishing year?

- How would the Council process be able to accommodate more frequent management changes How would the amendment process need to be revised to apply this approach?

- What components (reporting, barotrauma reduction, EFP, etc) could be incorporated into this approach to make it successful?

- Are there other approaches that could work in combination with this approach to be successful?

SEASON-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background

- Specified period each year for rec fishing of a species or group of species
- Most likely with no in-season closure
- Can be set the same time every year, or annually based on projections

Benefits:

- Improved stability and predictability
- May help with discards for some co-occurring species

SEASON-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Would require:

- Detailed data on catch combinations for rec trips
- Some revisions to accountability measures

Challenges:

- May restrict access to some species when not necessary
- Could result in missed recreational fishing opportunities

SEASON-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Existing South Atlantic recreational seasons:

- Black sea bass- set annually based on projected time for rec landings to reach the rec ACL
- Snowy grouper and blueline tilefish- May 1 through Aug 31
- Florida Keys/East Florida Hogfish-May 1 through Oct 31

SEASON-BASED MANAGEMENT: Background con't

Rec Visioning Regulatory Amendment 26:

- Deepwater aggregate
- Deepwater aggregate season
  - Current preferred alternative: May 1 - Aug 31
- Deepwater aggregate bag limit
  - Current preferred alternative: 3/person/day with 1/person/day golden tilefish, 1/vessel/day snowy grouper and wreckfish
- Aligns the aggregate with how recreational fishermen target deepwater species

SEASON-BASED MANAGEMENT: Discussion

- What aspects of season-based management would contribute to management supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What aspects would contribute to stakeholders supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What information would Council and stakeholders need to make a decision about this approach? Is it available?

SEASON-BASED MANAGEMENT: Discussion

- What species would this approach be applied to?
- Would it be the same for the whole region for X species, or would it vary throughout the region?
- What is the maximum season length that would be acceptable to make this approach work to reach the biological goals (reduce discards, etc)?
- What is the minimum season length that would be acceptable to stakeholders?
- What are the trade-offs and are they acceptable for management and stakeholders?
- What components (reporting, barotrauma reduction, EFP, etc) could be incorporated into this approach to make it successful?
- Are there other approaches that could work in combination with this approach to be successful?

HARVEST TAGS: Background

- Tags issued for each fish to be harvested
- Examples: game management; Pacific salmon
- Likely more appropriate for species with low ACLs

Benefits:

- Could be used for control of recreational effort
- Improved data collection

HARVEST TAGS: Background con't

Challenges:

- Fairness in how to distribute tags
- Potential to restrict access for active participants
- Limiting recipients may require detailed data on participation
- May qualify as a Limited Access Privilege Program under MSA; additional regulatory requirements

HARVEST TAGS: Background con't

Snapper Grouper Amendment 22

- Harvest tags for red snapper, snowy grouper, golden tilefish and Wreckfish
- Last discussed December 2013
- Concern about distribution, fairness, reduced recreational access

HARVEST TAGS: Discussion

- What aspects of harvest tags would contribute to management supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What aspects would contribute to stakeholders supporting or not supporting this approach for the South Atlantic?

- What information would Council and stakeholders need to make a decision about this approach? Is it available?

HARVEST TAGS: Discussion

- What species would this approach be applied to?
- Would tags be used for effort control or data collection?
- If tags were limited (effort control), how could tags fairly be distributed?
- What are the trade-offs and are they acceptable for management and stakeholders?
- What components (reporting, barotrauma reduction, EFP, etc) could be incorporated into this approach to make it successful?
- Any other approaches that could work in combination with this approach to be successful?