# **Amendment 5**

to the Fishery Management Plan for the **Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery for the Atlantic** 



**Revisions to Dolphin and Wahoo Acceptable Biological** Catches, Annual Catch Limits, Recreational Annual Catch Targets, Accountability Measures; modifications to the Sector Allocations and Framework Procedure; and Trip Limits





Environmental Assessment Regulatory Impact Review Fishery Impact Statement



# Definitions, Abbreviations, and Acronyms Used in the Document

ABC	acceptable biological catch	FMI	fishery management unit
ACL	annual catch limits	rme	
AM	accountability measures	M	natural mortality rate
ACT	annual catch target	MARMAP	Marine Resources Monitoring Assessment and Prediction Program
В	a measure of stock biomass in either	MFMT	maximum fishing mortality threshold
D	weight of other appropriate unit	MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
B <sub>MSY</sub>	the stock biomass expected to exist under equilibrium conditions when fishing at F <sub>MSY</sub>	MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey
B <sub>OY</sub>	the stock biomass expected to exist	MRIP	Marine Recreational Information Program
	fishing at $F_{OY}$	MSFCMA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
<b>B</b> <sub>CURR</sub>	the current stock biomass	MSST	minimum stock size threshold
CPUE	catch per unit effort	MSY	maximum sustainable yield
DEIS	draft environmental impact statement	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
EA	environmental assessment	NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
EEZ	exclusive economic zone	NOAA	
EFH	essential fish habitat	NUAA	Administration
F	a measure of the instantaneous rate of fishing mortality	OFL	overfishing limit
Familian	fishing mortality that will produce a static SPR = 30%	OY	optimum yield
- 30%SPR		RIR	regulatory impact review
F <sub>CURR</sub>	the current instantaneous rate of fishing mortality the rate of fishing mortality expected to achieve MSY under equilibrium conditions and a corresponding biomass of B <sub>MSY</sub>	SAMFC	South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
		SEDAR	Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review
F <sub>MSY</sub>		SEFSC	Southeast Fisheries Science Center
		SERO	Southeast Regional Office
F <sub>OY</sub>	the rate of fishing mortality expected to	SIA	social impact assessment
	conditions and a corresponding	SPR	spawning potential ratio
FEIS FMP	final environmental impact statement fishery management plan	SSC	Scientific and Statistical Committee

i

## Amendment 5 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery for the Atlantic

Including an Environmental Assessment (EA), Regulatory Impact Review (RIR), and Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (RFAA)

() Legislative

() Final

#### **Type of Action:**

( ) Administrative (X) Draft

#### **Responsible Agencies:**

National Marine Fisheries Service (Lead) Southeast Regional Office 263 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Saint Petersburg, Florida 33701 727-824-5305 727-824-5308 (fax) <u>http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov</u> Contact: Nikhil Mehta nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 4055 Faber Place Dr., Suite 201, North Charleston, South Carolina 29405 843-571-4366 813-769-4520 (fax) http://www.safmc.net Contact: Brian Cheuvront brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

# **Table of Contents**

Table of Contentsiii			
List of Appendices	v		
List of Figures	. vi		
List of Tables	. vi		
SUMMARY	viii		
Chapter 1. Introduction	1		
1.1 What Actions Are Being Proposed?	1		
1.2 Who is Proposing the Actions?	1		
1.3 Where is the Project Located?	2		
1.4 Why are the Council and NMFS Considering these Actions?	2		
1.5 What are the data sources considered in this amendment?	4		
1.6 What is the History of Management for Dolphin and Wahoo?	5		
Chapter 2. Proposed Action and Alternatives	6		
2.1 Action 1. Revise acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACL), and			
annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo	6		
2.2 Action 2. Revise the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo	8		
2.3 Action 3. Modify the sector allocations for dolphin.	11		
2.4 Action 4. Revise the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP	12		
2.5 Action 5. Establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in the exclusive economic zone			
(EEZ) in the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction.	19		
2.6 Comparison Effects Summary of Alternatives	21		
Chapter 3. Affected Environment	.24		
3.1 Habitat Environment	24		
3.1.1 Essential Fish Habitat	24		
3.1.2 Habitat Areas of Particular Concern	24		
3.2 Biological and Ecological Environment	25		
3.2.1 Fish Populations	25		
3.2.2 Dolphin, <i>Coryphaena hippurus</i>	25		
3.2.3 Wahoo, Acanthocybium solanderi	26		
3.2.4 Stock Status of Dolphin and Wahoo	27		
3.2.5 Protected Species	27		
3.3 Socio-economic Environment	28		
3.3.1 Economic Description of the Commercial Sector	28		
3.3.1.1 Annual Landings, Revenues, and Effort	28		
3.3.1.2 Monthly Landings, Revenues, and Effort	29		
3.3.1.3 Average Landings, Revenues, and Effort by State	30		
3.3.1.4 Average Landings, Revenues, and Effort by Gear	31		
3.3.1.5 Permits	32		
3.3.2 Economic Description of the Recreational Sector	33		
3.3.2.1 Harvest	33		
3.3.2.2 Effort	37		
3.3.2.3 Permits	43		
3.3.2.4 Economic Values and For-Hire Vessel Financials	44		

DOLPHIN Wahoo AMENDMENT 5

3.3.3	Social Environment	47
3.4 A	Administrative Environment	58
3.4.1	The Fishery Management Process and Applicable Laws	58
3.4	.1.1 Federal Fishery Management	58
3.4	.1.2 State Fishery Management	59
3.4	.1.3 Enforcement	59
Chapter 4.	Environmental Consequences and Comparison of Alternatives	.61
4.1 A	Action 1. Revise acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACL), and	
annual c	atch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo	61
4.1.1	Biological Effects	62
4.1.2	Economic Effects	64
4.1.3	Social Effects	65
4.1.4	Administrative Effects	66
4.2 A	Action 2. Revise the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo	67
4.2.1	Biological Effects	67
4.2.2	Economic Effects	68
4.2.3	Social Effects	69
4.2.4	Administrative Effects	70
4.3 A	Action 3. Modify the sector allocations for dolphin.	71
4.3.1	Biological Effects	71
4.3.2	Economic Effects	72
4.3.3	Social Effects	73
4.3.4	Administrative Effects	73
4.4 A	Action 4. Revise the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.	74
4.4.1	Biological Effects	74
4.4.2	Economic Effects	75
4.4.3	Social Effects	75
4.4.4	Administrative Effects	76
4.5 A	Action 5. Establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in the EEZ throughout the	
SAFMC	's area of jurisdiction	77
4.5.1	Biological Effects	77
4.5.2	Economic Effects	81
4.5.3	Social Effects	82
4.5.4	Administrative Effects	83
Chapter 5.	Reasoning for Council's Choice of Preferred Alternatives	.84
Chapter 6.	Cumulative Effects	.85
6.1 E	Biological	86
6.2 S	ocioeconomic	94
Chapter 7.	List of Preparers	.96
Chapter 8.	Agencies and Persons Consulted	.98
Chapter 9.	References	.99

# List of Appendices

Appendix A.	Alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed analysis		
Appendix B.	Glossary		
Appendix C.	Other Applicable Law		
Appendix D.	History of Management		
Appendix E.	Bycatch Practicability Analysis		
Appendix F.	MRIP Ad-hoc Working Group Report		
Appendix G.	Regulatory Impact Review (economic analysis of preferred alternatives) To be completed after the Council chooses preferred alternatives.		
Appendix H.	Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (economic analysis of proposed regulations) To be completed after the Council chooses preferred alternatives.		
Appendix I.	Essential Fish Habitat and Movement to Ecosystem-Based Management		

# List of Figures

Figure 1-1.	Jurisdictional boundaries of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2
Figure 3-1.	Two components of the biological environment described in this document.

Figure 3-7. Social vulnerability for South Atlantic red snapper communities...... Error! Bookmark not defined.

# List of Tables

<b>Table 3-3-11</b> . Target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic (by state), Mid-Atlantic, and
North Atlantic, 2008-2012
Table 3-3-12. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic, Mid-
Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave and fishing mode
Table 3-3-13.       Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic (by
state), Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave
Table 3-3-14. Target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North
Atlantic, by fishing mode, 2008-2012
Table 3-3-15. Target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic (by state), Mid-Atlantic, and
North Atlantic, 2008-2012
Table 3-3-16. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic, Mid-
Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave and fishing mode
Table 3-3-17. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic (by state),
Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave 42
Table 3-3-18.South Atlantic headboat angler days, by state, 2008-2012.43
Table 3-3-19.         Average monthly distribution of headboat angler days in the South Atlantic, by state,
2008-2012
Table 3-3-20.         Number of South Atlantic for-hire dolphin-wahoo vessel permits, 2008-2012.         44
Table 3-3-21.         Southeast Communities Exceeding the Poverty and Minority Environmental Justice
Thresholds for 2011. (SERO 2012)
Table 4-1.         Commercial and recreational landings of dolphin and wahoo for 2008 – 2012, along with
percent of total landings of dolphin for the commercial sector
Table 4-2.         Proposed commercial and recreational sector allocations of dolphin under the Action 3
alternatives based on the Action 1 alternatives
Table 4-3. Trips and total pounds (ww) of dolphin landed by hook and line and longline gears north
and south of 31° N. latitude for Alternatives 2 through 7 of Action 5 averaged across the years
2008 through 2012
Table 4-4. Expected number and percent of trips (primarily longline trips north of 31° North
latitude) with expected negative economic effects for each alternative for Action 5. (Amounts
shown are in 2011 dollars.)
Table 6-1. The cause and effect relationship of fishing and regulatory actions within the time period
of the Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA)
Table 7-1. List of preparers of the document.    96
Table 7-2. List of interdisciplinary plan team members for the document.         97

# **SUMMARY**

of AMENDMENT 5 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery for the Atlantic

## Why is the South Atlantic Council Taking Action?

Recreational catch estimates for dolphin and wahoo in the Comprehensive Annual Catch Limit (ACL) Amendment (SAFMC 2011b), which included Amendment 3 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (Amendment 5) were computed using data generated by the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS). Following an independent review by the National Research Council and a mandate from Congress, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) replaced MRFSS with the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) to provide more accurate recreational catch estimates. The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (South Atlantic Council) stated in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment that they would take action as needed, via plan amendment or framework amendment, to revise the appropriate values, in 2012 and beyond. MRIP methods have been used to recalculate previous MRFSS estimates dating back to 2004, and will be the basis for all new estimates moving forward. The revisions are necessary because if the acceptable biological catch (ABC), ACL, and recreational annual catch target (ACT) values are not updated with the new MRIP estimates, ACLs would be based on MRFSS data while the landings being used to track the ACLs would be estimated using MRIP data. This would result in inconsistencies in the how ACLs are calculated versus how they are monitored. In addition to MRIP data, ACLs would be updated to include revisions to commercial and for-hire landings data.

Additionally, the South Atlantic Council is considering: revising the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo to enhance their effectiveness and move towards standardizing AMs; updating the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo FMP; SAFMC 2003) to allow items such as ACLs, ACTs, and AMs to be changed by a framework action; changing sector allocations for dolphin, and establishing trip limits for dolphin.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

viii

## What are the Actions and Alternatives in Amendment 5?

Action 1. Revise acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACL), and annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo.

Alternative 1. No action	on. <u>Acceptable</u>	e biological catches, annual catch lin	nits, and ann	ual catch	
targets for dolphin and v	wahoo are base	ed on the Marine Recreational Fishe	ries Statistic	Survey	
Data will not be updated with data from Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP),					Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
	<u>d fandings sys</u>	tem, and <u>initia for the neadboar</u> ta	<del>numgs<u>surve</u>y</del>		Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
Dolphin	Commercial	Recreational	Total	JV	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			14,596,216		Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
Allocation %	7.3%	92.7%	100%	```	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	1,065,524	13,530,692			Formatted Table
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 11,595,803			
Wahoo	Commercial	Recreational	Total		
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			1,491,785		
Allocation %	4.3%	95.7%	100%		
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	64,147	1,427,638			
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 1,164,953			
Alternative 2. Revise t	he acceptable	biological catches (ABCs), annual c	atch limits <del>(</del>	<del>CL)</del> , and	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo with landings from Marine Recreational Information Program, commercial accumulated landings system, and NMES headboat survey.					Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
Dolphin	Commercial	Recreational	Total		Formatted Table
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			15,344,846		
Allocation %	7.5%	92.5%	100%		
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	1,157,612	14,187,234			
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 12,749,594			
Wahoo	Commercial	Recreational	Total		
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			1,764,960		
Allocation %	3.9%	96.1%	100%		
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	70,550	1,724,409			
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 1,258,819			
DOLPHIN WAHOO		ix			

**AMENDMENT 5** 

<b>12</b> . Revise the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo.	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
Alternative 1. No action. AMs for dolphin and wahoo implemented by the Comprehensive	
ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011) will not change. Commercial sector. If commercial	
landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director (SRD), reach or are projected to	
reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to close the	
commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year.	
Recreational sector. If recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational	
ACL, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a	
persistence in increased randings and, if necessary, the KA shall publish a notice to reduce the	
recreational landings do not avoid the recreational ACL in the following fishing year	
However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following	
fishing year if the RA determines using the best scientific information available, that a	
reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.	
*>	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
Alternative 2. If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director	Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
(SRD), reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall	Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"
publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. If the	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
commercial ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator (RA) shall publish a notice to	
reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the species is	
overfished.	
	Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Don't add
Alternative 3. If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director	space between paragraphs of the same style
(SRD), reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. If the	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the	
tollowing season by the amount of the overage, only if the total ACL (commercial ACL and	
recreational ACL) is exceeded.	
	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Person
Alternative 4 If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Rollian
(SRD) reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall	roimatted: ront: (Default) Times New Roman
publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. If the	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the	Formatted: Don't add space between
following season by the amount of the overage, only if overfished and the total ACL	paragraphs of the same style
(commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
in the second	Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style
Alternative 5. If the recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational	Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"
ACL-is exceeded, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the RA shall publish a	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
	Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

notice to reduce the <u>recreational ACL</u> in the following <u>season fishing year</u> by the amount of the overage, only if the species is overfished. <u>However, the length of the recreational season</u> will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

Alternative 6. If the recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL is exceeded, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the recreational ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

Alternative 7. If the recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the recreational ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if overfished and the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style		
Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style		
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		
Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman		

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Action 3: Modify the sector allocations for dolphin.

Alternative 1. No action. Do not modify the current sector allocations for dolphin. The recreational sector allocation for dolphin is 92.7% (current recreational ACL = 13,530,692 lbs ww, Table 2-1). The commercial sector allocation for dolphin is 7.3% (current commercial ACL = 1,065,524 lbs ww, Table 2-1). The sector allocations for dolphin were set in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011) using the sector allocation rule where 50% of sector allocations are based on a longer term landings series (1999 – 2008) and 50% of the sector allocation are based on a shorter time series (2006-2008).

Alternative 2.- Establish the sector allocations for dolphin that were in place prior to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment making the "soft cap" allocations the sector allocations. The recreational sector allocation for dolphin would beis 87%, and Should the Council select Alternative 2 of Action 1, the new recreational ACL would be 13,350,016 lbs ww (Table 2-2).

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

The commercial sector allocation would beis 13%. Should the Council select Alternative 2 of Action 1, the new commercial ACL would be 1,994,830 lbs ww (**Table 2-2**).

Alternative 3. Set the commercial allocation at its highest percentage of the total catch over the past 5 years (2008-2012). The recreational sector allocation for dolphin is 86%, and commercial sector allocation is 14%.

Alternative 4. Set the commercial allocation at the average of the percentages of the total catch over the past 5 years (2008-2012). The recreational sector allocation for dolphin is 90%, and commercial sector allocation is 10%.

Action 4: Revise the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

Alternative 1. No action. Do not modify the framework procedure established in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 2003). The existing framework (p.160 of the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (2003) includes the following text:

If the RA concurs that the Council's recommendations are consistent with the goals and objectives of the plan, the National Standards, and other applicable law, he/she shall implement the regulations by proposed and final rules in the Federal Register prior to the appropriate fishing year or such dates as may be agreed upon with the Councils. A reasonable period for public comment shall be afforded, consistent with the urgency, if any, of the need to implement the management measure.

Appropriate regulatory changes recommended by the Council that may be implemented by the Regional Administrator by proposed and final rules in the Federal Register are:

a. Adjustment of the best estimate of maximum sustainable yield (MSY, range and/or best point estimate).

b. Adjustment of the best estimate of optimum yield (OY, range and/or best point estimate).

c. Initial specification of ABC and subsequent adjustment of the ABC range and/or best estimate when this information becomes available.

d. Setting or modifying total allowable catch (TAC).

e. Reopening of a previously closed area/season, timeframe for recovery of dolphin and wahoo should they become overfished, or fishing year which may not be adjusted by more than two months.

- f. Bag limits.
- g. Size limits.
- h. Tackle configuration (e.g., minimum hook size).
- i. Season/area closures (including spawning area closures).
- j. Gear restrictions and/or prohibitions.
- k. Permitting restrictions.
- 1. Trip limits.

m. Overfishing/overfished definitions and related thresholds (e.g., minimum stock size threshold (MSST) and maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT).

n. Annual specification/quota setting process.

DOLPHIN WAHOO	
AMENDMENT 5	

xii

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

o. Assessment Panel composition and process.

p. Identification, designation, and modification of essential fish habitat (EFH) and EFH-habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs).

q. Management measures to reduce or eliminate the impact of fishing gear/activities on EFH or EFH-HAPCs.

r. Specify quota for scientific research.

s. Designation of areas for scientific research.

t. Regulations of longline length if ongoing research with marine mammals documents usefulness.

u. Any other action to minimize the interaction of fishing gear with endangered species or marine mammals.

v. Allocations and modifications to allocations.

**Alternative 2.** Include the following in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP framework: Update the framework procedure to revise the specification of Total Allowable Catch (TAC) for the Dolphin Wahoo FMP in terms that incorporate ACLs, ACTs, and AMs. Such modifications would be based upon new scientific information indicating such modifications are prudent. Changes to the ACLs, ACTs and AMs will be made using the following procedure once the new ACLs, ACTs and AMs are established by the Council.

#### Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC), Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) and Annual Catch Targets (ACTs) Adjustment Procedure

1. Stock assessments will continue to be conducted for dolphin and wahoo in the management area through the SEDAR process.

2. Following the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC)'s review of the stock assessment and a public hearing, the Council will determine if changes are needed in the OFL, ABC, ACLs, and ACTs and so advise the RA.

3. Following a review for consistency with the FMP and applicable law, the RA may reject or may implement changes by notice in the *Federal Register* to be effective for the next fishing season.

Modifications to the ACLs, ACTs, and AMs via *Federal Register* notice would be based on new scientific information. This would eliminate the lengthy regulatory amendment process, since a regulatory amendment would not be required to make such changes. This process would entail a review of new scientific information by the South Atlantic Council, and a recommendation from the South Atlantic Council to the RA for any changes to harvest levels they determine need to be made. If the RA agrees to the South Atlantic Council's recommendations, a *Federal Register* notice would be prepared outlining the modifications and the notice would be published by the office of the *Federal Register*, after which, the changes would be effective. At this point outreach materials such as fishery bulletins, and frequently asked questions would be developed and disseminated to fishery participants to notify them of the change.

**Alternative 3.** In addition to revisions in Alternative 2, also include additional language to reflect SEDAR and SSC roles in setting MSY, OY, and ABC.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

xiii

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Section 2 seems to have language about items for an abbreviated framework. Should that be added as an alternative here?

Action 5: Establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) throughout the SAFMC's area of jurisdiction.

Alternative 1. No action. There is no commercial trip limit for dolphin.

- Alternative 2: 1,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 2a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 2b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 3: 2,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 3a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 3b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 4: 3,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 4a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 4b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 5: 4,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 5a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 5b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 6: 5,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 6a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 6b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 7: 10,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 7a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 7b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 8: 15,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 8a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 8b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 9: 20,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 9a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 9b: north of 31° N. Latitude

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

# **Summary of Effects**

Action 1. Revise acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACL), and annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo.

Alternative 2 – Revise the ABCs, ACLs, and recreational ACTs for dolphin and wahoo with updated data from MRIP, commercial, and for-hire landings.

#### **Biological Effects**

Although negligible, greater biological benefits are expected under **Alternative 2** as opposed to **Alternative 1** (**No Action**), because it is based on the best available data. While the percent differences in the revised ABCs and ACLs in Amendment 5 may be relatively small from the status quo levels, the data revealed by the new and updated methodology more accurately represent the fishing effort for these species, and would be more likely to trigger AMs when needed. In contrast, **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) could either result in triggering an AM when it is not needed, or not triggering an AM when it is needed. Therefore, both direct and indirect biological effects to the fishery resource could be expected.

#### Economic Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not revise the ABCs, ACLs (including sector ACLs), and ACTs that were established in 2012 for dolphin and wahoo, despite more recent improvements in landings data. Thus, the status quo alternative would retain biological standards (and management measures) that are no longer based on the best available data. In the long run, Alternative 1 (No Action) could yield smaller net economic benefits than Alternative 2 because the former is not based on the best available data.

#### Social Effects

The social effects of potential changes in the ACLs for dolphin and wahoo (Alternative 2) are expected to occur in the short and long term, and are closely associated with biological and economic impacts of these actions. Overall, adjustments in ACLs based on improved information (Alternative 2) would be beneficial to the species and would likely produce long-term benefits to the fishermen, coastal communities, and fishing businesses by contributing to sustainable harvest of these fish in the present and future.

#### Administrative Effects

The mechanisms for monitoring and documentation of ABCs, ACLs, ACTs, and AMs are already in place through implementation of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b), Amendment 17A to the Snapper Grouper FMP (SAFMC 2010), and Amendment 17B to the Snapper Grouper (SAFMC 2010), and reflects **Alternative 1** (No Action). The administrative impacts of **Alternative 2** would be similar to **Alternative 1** (No Action). Other administrative burdens that may result from revising the values under **Alternative 2** would take the form of development and dissemination of outreach and education materials for fishery participants and law enforcement.

#### Action 2. Revise the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo

*Alternatives* 2 - 7 – *Consider adding a pay-back provision to the existing AMs for dolphin and wahoo.* 

#### **Biological Effects**

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not modify the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery in the southeast is prosecuted; nor would this action increase fishing or change fishing methods for species targeted within the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Therefore, no adverse effects to the protected species most likely to interact with the dolphin wahoo fishery (e.g., sea turtles) are likely to result under this alternative. Alternatives 2-7 are unlikely to alter fishing behavior in a way that would cause new adverse effects to these species.

#### Economic Effects

When an AM is triggered, there is the possibility of negative economic effects due to lost opportunity to continue fishing. The magnitude of that potential loss cannot be estimated unless one knows when a fishery will close. In the past 5 fishing seasons, only the commercial wahoo fishery was closed prior to the end of the calendar year. However, the commercial sector of that fishery closed December 19, 2012 with only 13 days left in the season.

Of all the remaining combinations of alternatives, **Alternatives 3** and **6** have the next greatest probability of triggering AMs. **Alternatives 2, 4, 5,** and **7** all require that to trigger AMs for these fisheries, the stock must be considered overfished. An overfished status of a stock is typically determined as the result of a SEDAR stock assessment or other determination used by the SSC. As neither of these stocks has been assessed, nor has the SSC determined them to be overfished, **Alternatives 2, 4, 5,** and **7** could not trigger AMs. Of these four alternatives, **Alternatives 4** and **7** have the lowest probability of triggering AMs because of the requirement for the stock to be overfished and for the combined sector ACLs needing to exceed the total ACL.

The potential for negative economic effects through lost opportunity in the current fishing year in the case of an in-season closure for a commercial sector and the potential for reductions of the sector ACL in the following season for either sector when ACLs are exceeded, the order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects is **Alternative 1**, **Alternatives 3** and **6**, **Alternatives 2** and **5**, and then **Alternatives 4** and **7**.

#### Social Effects

AMs can have significant direct and indirect social effects because, when triggered, can restrict harvest in the current season or subsequent seasons. Currently there is no post-season AM (pay-back) for the commercial sector or recreational sector. Under **Alternative 1** (No Action) there would be no expected negative impacts on commercial and recreational fishermen from a pay-back provision, but there may be some negative long-term impacts on the fleets and private recreational anglers if the ACLs are exceeded over several years and have negative impact on the stocks. The AMs under **Alternatives 2-7** would help to provide this protection to the stock and would contribute to sustainable harvest of dolphin and wahoo.

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

xvi

#### Administrative Effects

Current AMs for dolphin and wahoo were implemented by the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, therefore, the mechanisms for monitoring and enforcing the ACLs are already in place. The South Atlantic Council is working towards having consistent AMs for all its managed species. Consistency in regulations among different species could help reduce confusion in the general public, could better aid law enforcement, and could possibly reduce the instances of ACLs being exceeded. Therefore, while in the short term, there might be additional administrative costs, these might be offset in the long term by fewer instances of AMs being triggered and their related administrative costs.

Action 3. Modify the sector allocations for dolphin.

Alternative 2 – Establish the sector allocations for dolphin that were in place prior to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment making the "soft cap" allocations the sector allocations. The recreational sector allocation for dolphin would be 87% (13,350,016 lbs ww). The commercial sector allocation would be 13% (1,994,830 lbs ww).

Alternatives 3 and 4 – Set the commercial allocation at its highest percentage of the total catch; or at the average of the percentages of the total catch, over the past 5 years (2008-2012).

#### **Biological Effects**

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not modify the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery in the southeast is prosecuted; nor would this action increase fishing or change fishing methods for species targeted within the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Therefore, no adverse effects to the protected species most likely to interact with the dolphin wahoo fishery (e.g., sea turtles) are likely to result under this alternative. Alternatives 2-4 are unlikely to alter fishing behavior in a way that would cause new adverse effects to these species. The biological benefits to sea turtles from Alternatives 2-4 are unclear. If the sector allocations perpetuate the existing amount of fishing effort, they are unlikely to change the level of interaction between sea turtles and the fishery as a whole. This scenario is likely to provide little additional biological benefits to sea turtles, if any. However, if these alternatives reduce the overall amount of effort in the fishery the risk of interaction with sea turtles will likely decrease, providing additional biological benefits to these species.

#### Economic Effects

The lower the ACL for the commercial sector, the sooner there would be a potential in-season closure, creating a potential for a larger direct negative economic effect do to lost opportunity. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the commercial sector is **Alternative 1**, **Alternative 4**, **Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3**. However, reducing potential direct negative economic effects for the commercial sector comes at the expense of increasing the potential direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector is **Alternative 3**, **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 4** and **Alternative 1**.

#### Social Effects

Modifications in sector allocations of the dolphin ACL could result in some changes in fishing behavior and impacts to the social environment. Although sector allocations are currently in place under **Alternative 1** (No Action), changes could increase perceptions of scarcity and change the

DOLPHIN V	VAHOO
AMENDME	NT 5

xvii

fishing behavior of those within a particular sector. Because there has been an initial sector allocation between the commercial and recreational, **Alternative 1** (No Action) may have few direct social effects. However, if one sector has not or does not reach its ACL, the resource may be underutilized and available quota would not be available to the other sector. The increase for the commercial allocation under **Alternatives 2- 4** would be beneficial to the commercial sector and have minimal impact on the recreational sector as long as the recreational sector continues a consistent harvest patterns. If the recreational sector grows, a reduced recreational allocation under **Alternatives 2-4** could trigger AMs and reduce recreational fishing opportunities.

#### Administrative Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would retain the current allocations of 92.7% recreational and 7.3% commercial. NMFS currently monitors commercial and recreational landings. Changing allocations is not expected to result in an increase in the frequency of AMs being triggered in either the commercial or recreational sectors. There would not be any measurable differences in the administrative effects between Alternatives 1 (No Action), 2, 3, and 4.

Action 4. Revise the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

Alternatives 2 and 3 – Include the following in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP framework: Update the framework procedure to revise the specification of Total Allowable Catch (TAC) for the Dolphin Wahoo FMP in terms that incorporate ACLs, ACTs, and AMs. Such modifications would be based upon new scientific information indicating such modifications are prudent. Changes to the ACLs, ACTs and AMs will be made using the following procedure once the new ACLs, ACTs and AMs are established by the Council. Also include additional language to reflect SEDAR and SSC roles in setting MSY, OY, and ABC.

#### **Biological Effects**

Under Alternatives 2 and 3, adjustments to ABCs, ACLs, ACTs, AMs, MSY, and OY could be through the framework process rather than with a plan amendment. As a result, changes could be made relatively quickly as new fishery and stock abundance information becomes available. Alternatives that would update or revise the current procedure would likely be biologically beneficial for dolphin and wahoo because they would also allow periodic adjustments to harvest parameters, and management measures could be altered in a more timely manner in response to stock assessment, survey results, or other similar information. When stock assessments indicate large decreases in the ACLs are needed, a quick adjustment to the catch level would likely have positive biological effects. The SEDAR process currently only produces one stock assessment for a species every three to five years. As such, the data utilized in the assessment are at least one year old by the time the assessment results become available and can be used for management purposes. It is, therefore, advantageous to make any modifications to the existing management process, as proposed under Alternatives 2 and 3, to expedite fishing level adjustments for dolphin and wahoo.

This action is administrative in nature and would not significantly alter the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery is prosecuted in the Atlantic Region. Therefore, no impacts on ESA-listed marine species, EFH, HAPCs, or coral HAPCs are expected as a result of updating the Dolphin Wahoo Framework Procedure.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

xviii

#### Economic Effects

Without an abbreviated framework process, **Alternative 1** (No Action) could negatively impact the recreational and commercial fishing sectors should new data indicate that a stock had improved but the South Atlantic Council had no means to rapidly increase the ACL, resulting in loss of opportunity, income, and/or recreational angling experiences. However, if an assessment indicated a substantial decrease in the ACL was needed **Alternative 1** (No Action) would retain a more deliberative process of ensuring the public was well-informed regarding the needed changes in catch levels. **Alternative 2** could result in positive or negative economic effects. When stock assessments indicate ACLs can be increased, quick adjustments for ACLs would allow for positive economic effects without negatively affecting the sustainability of the stock. On the other hand, when stock assessments indicate large decreases in the ACLs are needed, it is likely that negative economic effects would result from moving quickly with a decrease in a catch level. However, depending on the timing of the implementation of the ACLs, the positive or negative economic effect would be short-lived as the overall net economic effect to the economy is likely to remain unchanged by this action. **Alternative 3**, regardless of whether it is selected as a preferred alternative or not, is primarily administrative in nature and is not expected to have economic effects.

#### Social Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would allow for neither updates in the management framework procedure nor development of a process to incorporate new information to adjust ACLs. This could negatively impact the recreational and commercial fishing sectors should new data indicate that a stock had improved but the South Atlantic Council had no means to rapidly increase the ACL, resulting in loss of opportunity, income, and/or recreational angling experiences.

Alternative 2 and 3 would generate indirect positive effects on the social environment with the framework modifications to incorporate a procedure for adjusting ACLs in a timely manner; updating text to reflect adoption of SEDAR as the source of stock assessment information (Alternative 2 and 3) would provide consistency in language with regulatory changes and have few effects on the social environment. Consistency and timeliness in the regulatory process are positive social benefits as they remove uncertainty and subsequent displeasure with regard to changes in management while protecting the stock.

#### Administrative Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would be the most administratively burdensome of the three alternatives being considered, because all modifications to ABCs, ACLs, ACTs, and AMs would need to be implemented through an plan amendment, which is a more laborious and time consuming process than a framework action. Alternative 2 would allow ABC, ACLs, AMs, and ACTs to be modified via a framework procedure intended to shorten the length of time it takes to implement routine changes in harvest limits. It is anticipated that this streamlined approach to would eliminate the lengthy regulatory amendment process, and would minimize administrative impacts since a regulatory amendment would not be required to make such changes. Alternative 3 would clarify the framework procedure to reflect SEDAR and SSC roles in setting MSY, OY, and ABC.

Action 5. Establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in the EEZ throughout the SAFMC's area of jurisdiction.

Alternatives 2 - 9 (and related sub-alternatives) – Explore a range of trip limits South, and North of  $31^{\circ}$  N. Latitude:

- -1,000 lb
- -2,000 lb
- -3,000 lb
- -4,000 lb
- -5,000 lb
- -10,000 lb
- -15,000 lb
- -20,000 lb

#### **Biological Effects**

Alternatives 2-9 include a wide range of trip limits from 1,000 lbs ww under Alternative 2, which is the most restrictive alternative, to 20,000 lbs ww, under Alternative 9, which is the least restrictive alternative. Alternatives 2-9 would have very little effect on constraining harvest of dolphin as 98% of the trips harvested 1,000 lbs ww or less of dolphin. Longline gear is more efficient at harvesting large quantities of dolphin than hook-and-line, and would be most affected by trip limits. Although there were very few trips, only the longline sector had trips of 3,000 lbs ww to 5,000 lbs ww (Alternatives 4-6), and they were the dominant gear for trips landing 1,000 lbs ww and 2,000 lbs ww (Alternatives 8 and 9). ACLs and AMs are in place to ensure overfishing of dolphin and does not occur; therefore, biological effects of Alternatives 1-9 for dolphin are expected to be similar. However, bycatch of protected species such as sea turtles are documented with longline gear; therefore, alternatives that would establish a higher trip limit, that would likely be met using longline gear, and would be expected to have lower biological benefits.

#### Economic Effects

Setting trip limits has economic effects. In general, the lower the trip limit, the greater the direct negative effect that comes as a result of ending a trip sooner to keep from going over the trip limit. Trip limits are employed largely to avoid localized depletion or to extend a fishing season. A trip limit tends to increase trip costs per pound of fish landed. The lower the trip limit, the greater the trip cost effect on the resulting value of the catch.

On average, there were 72 longline trips north of 31° North latitude each year from 2008 through 2012. While the majority (60%) of longline trips landed less than 1,000 lbs ww north of 31° North latitude, 40% of the longline trips from this area landed more than 1,000 lbs. However, there were no longline trips north of 31° North latitude that landed more than 15,000 lbs. However, there were no average each year landed more than 10,000 lbs ww of dolphin north of 31° North latitude. In order from least to most expected direct economic effects, **Alternative 2** would be expected to have the greatest effects at \$249,762 annually, followed in order by **Alternative 3**, **4**, **5**, **6**, and **7**. Like **Alternative 1** (**No Action**), **Alternatives 8** and **9** are not expected to have a direct economic effect on the commercial fishery.

#### Social Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would be expected to generate little or no social impacts (positive or negative). The highest proposed trip limit under Alternative 9 would be the most beneficial to vessels harvesting dolphin, and Alternative 2 would be the most restrictive for vessels with the capacity to harvest more 1,000 lbs ww. Although lower trip limits may contribute to a longer fishing season, the more restrictive limits may cause some vessels to target other species to increase the economic efficiency of fishing trips. Requiring a trip limit only for certain areas under Options a and b under Alternatives 2-9 could result in some issues of fairness between fishermen in the northern and southern areas. However, different trip limits in different areas could reduce the likelihood of localized depletion or user conflicts.

#### Administrative Effects

Alternatives 2 through 9 would add administrative burdens when compared with Alternative 1 (No Action). Enforcement costs could increase due to the establishment of commercial trip limits, since these would now have to be monitored and enforced. Additionally, legal costs would be incurred from prosecuting any violations that could occur.

## Chapter 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 What Actions Are Being Proposed?

Management measures for dolphin and wahoo in the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo FMP) are being proposed:

- Revisions to acceptable biological catch estimates (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACLs) (including sector ACLs), recreational annual catch targets (ACTs), and accountability measures (AMs) implemented through the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011c).
- Modifications to the sector allocations for dolphin.
- Revisions to the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.
- Inclusion of a commercial trip limit for dolphin.

# 1.2 Who is Proposing the Actions?

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (South Atlantic Council) is proposing the actions. The South Atlantic Council recommends management measures and submits them to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) who ultimately approves, disapproves, or partially approves, and implements the actions in the amendment through the development of regulations on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce. NMFS is an agency in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

### South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

- Responsible for conservation and management of fish stocks
- Consists of 13 voting members: 8 appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, 1 representative from each of the 4 South Atlantic states, the Southeast Regional Director of NMFS; and 4 non-voting members
- Responsible for developing fishery management plans and amendments under the Magnuson-Stevens Act; recommends actions to NMFS for implementation
- Management area is from 3 to 200 miles off the coasts of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and east Florida through Key West with the exception of Mackerel which is from New York to Florida, and Dolphin-Wahoo, which is from Maine to Florida





# 1.3 Where is the Project Located?

Management of the federal dolphin and wahoo fishery located off the eastern United States (Atlantic) in the 3-200 nautical miles U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone is conducted under the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, SAFMC 1983) (**Figure 1-1**).



**Figure 1-1**. Jurisdictional boundaries of the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Management Plan for the Atlantic as managed by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

#### 1.4 Why are the Council and NMFS Considering these Actions?

Recreational catch estimates for dolphin and wahoo in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011c) were computed using data generated by the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS). Following an independent review by the National Research Council and a mandate from Congress, NMFS replaced MRFSS with the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) to provide more accurate recreational catch estimates. The South Atlantic Council stated in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment that they would take action as needed, via plan amendment or framework amendment, to revise the appropriate values, in 2012 and beyond. MRIP methods have been used to recalculate previous MRFSS estimates dating back to 1986, and will be the basis for all new estimates moving forward.

The revisions are necessary because if the ABC, ACL, and ACT values are not updated with the new MRIP estimates, ACLs would be be based on MRFSS data while the landings being used to track the ACLs would be estimated using MRIP data. This would result in a disconnect in how ACLs are calculated versus how they are monitored. In addition to MRIP data, ACLs would be updated to include revisions to commercial and for-hire landings. The changes in data impacts the allocations to the commercial and recreational sectors for dolphin and wahoo; however, because the underlying formula used to establish the allocations remains unchanged from what was implemented previously in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, the magnitude change is very small. Using MRIP values to estimate recreational landings, as well as updates to headboat and commercial landings represent the best available data and are therefore, in accordance with National Standard 2 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

An action is being considered by the South Atlantic Council to modify sector allocations for dolphin. The action alternatives for allocations consider adopting the previous "soft cap" as well as using recent landings information. The South Atlantic Council is also considering revising the AMs for dolphin and wahoo and establishing trip limits for dolphin South and North of 31° N. Latitude.

Finally, the South Atlantic Council is considering revising the framework action established in the original Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 2003) to include ACLs, ACTs, and AMs.

### **Purpose for Action**

The purpose of Amendment 5 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery for the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5) is to revise the ABCs, ACLs, recreational ACTs, and sector AMs for dolphin and wahoo. The revisions incorporate updates to the recreational data as per MRIP, as well as revisions to commercial and for-hire landings. The revisions are necessary to avoid triggering AMs for dolphin and wahoo based on ACLs that were established by the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (77 FR 15916) using recreational data under the MRFSS system. MRFSS ceased to exist in January 2013, and was replaced with MRIP. Additionally, this amendment would revise the framework procedure for dolphin and wahoo; modify the sector allocations, and establish commercial trip limits for dolphin.

## **Need for Action**

The intent of Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5 is to base conservation and management measures upon the best scientific information available, and to prevent unnecessary negative socioeconomic impacts that may otherwise be realized in the dolphin wahoo fishery and fishing community, in accordance with the provisions set forth in the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

# 1.5 What are the data sources considered in this amendment?

The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011c) established methods for the computation of ABC, allocations of ABC to sectors for the establishment of sector ACLs, and recreational ACTs. Since the implementation of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, there have been substantial improvements in the data collection and catch estimation methodologies that are used to generate the data for the computation of ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs.

Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5 presents ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs computed using methods identical to those used in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment. All changes are due to improvements in the underlying data only.

The first dataset referred to as the "New MRFSS & Commercial" data contains updated Southeast Fisheries Science Center Headboat Survey and MRFSS data (1986-2008) and updated commercial data (1986-2008). The 30 August 2012 recreational ACL and the 3 July 2012 commercial datasets were used to generate these combined data. In addition to minor revisions of historical catch data generated by removal of duplicate records and other quality control activities, these data feature two major differences from the datasets used in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment: (1) A more statistically robust MRFSS weight backfill procedure and (2) an improved charter calibration method for MRFSS (1986-2004) data (see SEDAR25 Data Workshop Report in SEDAR25 (2011), for details). The updated ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs computed from these data are shown simply to facilitate a more direct comparison with the impacts of switching from MRFSS-based to MRIP-based recreational data.

The final dataset, referred to herein as the "MRIP & New Commercial" data, replaces the MRFSS-based recreational data with MRIPbased recreational data. These are the data that are used in Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5 under Alternative 2 in Action 1 to generate the revised ABC, allocation, ACL, and ACT values. These data are based upon the 3 July 2012 commercial ACL and the 1 October 2012 recreational ACL datasets. The updated recreational ACL dataset contains MRIP official re-estimates (2004-2008) and recalibrated MRFSS data (1986-2003).

The MRIP process was begun in 2004 to address issues identified by the National Research Council (NRC) in the existing MRFSS program. The goal of MRIP is to provide more detailed, timely, and reliable estimates of marine recreational fishing catch and effort. One step in this process was to take old MRFSS data (2004-2011) and re-estimate it using MRIP methods that remove sources of bias identified by the NRC. Using these official MRIP estimates, the Southeast Regional MRIP Recalibration Working Group developed recalibration methods to address regional needs, following the procedures recommended by the MRIP Ad-Hoc Working Group (Appendix F). The MRFSS data (1986-2003) are recalibrated to be more appropriately scaled to MRIP using a ratio of mean landings in numbers at the stock, subregion, and mode level (when available), based upon the MRFSS (2004-2011) and MRIP (2004-2011) data. These ratios were then applied at each stratum (stock, sub-region, year, wave, state, mode, and area) to the catches to develop the recalibrated MRFSS dataset. Average weights were then assigned to strata using the SEFSC's statistically robust weight estimation procedure, and total landings in pounds were computed.

4

#### 1.6 What is the History of Management for Dolphin and Wahoo?

Dolphin and wahoo were originally a part of the Fishery Management Plan for Coastal Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Regions. Under that plan, a control date of May 21, 1999, for possible future limited entry was established for the commercial dolphin and wahoo fishery in the South Atlantic.

Dolphin and wahoo regulations were first implemented in 2003 through a separate Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (SAFMC 2003). That plan established:

- 1. A separate management unit for dolphin and wahoo in the US Atlantic
- 2. A dealer permit
- 3. For-hire and commercial vessel permits
- 4. For-hire and commercial operator permit
- 5. Reporting requirements
- 6. Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) and Optimal Yield (OY)
- 7. Defined overfishing
- 8. A management framework
- Prohibit recreational sale of dolphin or wahoo except by for-hire vessels with a commercial permit
- 10. A 1.5 million lb or 13% of the total catch soft cap for the commercial sector
- 11. A recreational bag limit of 10 dolphin per person, 60 dolphin per vessel maximum
- 12. A minimum size limit of 20 inches fork length off Georgia and Florida
- 13. A commercial trip limit of 500 lb of wahoo with no at-sea transfer
- 14. A recreational bag limit of 2 wahoo per person, per day
- 15. Allowable gear for dolphin and wahoo in the Atlantic EEZ as longline; hook and line gear including manual, electric, or hydraulic rod and reels; bandit gear; handline; and spearfishing gear (including powerheads).

- 16. A prohibition on the use of surface and pelagic longline gear for dolphin and wahoo within any "time or area closure" in the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction (Atlantic Coast) which is closed to the use of pelagic gear for highly migratory pelagic species.
- 17. The fishing year of January 1 to December 31 for the dolphin and wahoo fishery
- Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for dolphin and wahoo as the Gulf Stream, Charleston Gyre, and Florida Current
- Essential Fish Habitat-Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (EFH-HAPC) for dolphin and wahoo in the Atlantic to include The Point, The Ten-Fathom Ledge, and Big Rock (North Carolina);
- 20. 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; and The "Wall" off of the Florida Keys

The Fishery Management Plan for Pelagic Sargassum Habitat in the South Atlantic Region (SAFMC 2002) and the Comprehensive Ecosystem-Based Amendment 1 (SAFMC 2009) designated additional EFH and EFH-HAPCs for dolphin and wahoo.

The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) established the ABC control rule, ABC, ACL, optimum yield, and AMs in the dolphin and wahoo fishery for both the commercial and recreational sectors. The Comprehensive ACL Amendment set an ACT for the recreational sector dolphin and wahoo.

5

# Chapter 2. Proposed Action and Alternatives

# 2.1 Action 1. Revise acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACL), and annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo.

Alternative 1. (No action). <u>Acceptable biological catches, annual catch limits, and annual catch targets for dolphin and wahoo are based on the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey, commercial accumulated landings system, and NMFS headboat survey. Data will not be updated with data from Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP), commercial, and for hire landings.</u>

Alternative 2. Revise the acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACL), and annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo with landings from Marine Recreational Information Program, commercial accumulated landings system, and NMFS headboat survey.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.31", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

Table 2-1. Alternative 1 ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs for dolphin and wahoo, as implemented throu	gh the
Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011).	-

Dolphin	Commercial	Recreational	Total
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			14,596,216
Allocation %	7.3%	92.7%	100%
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	1,065,524	13,530,692	
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 11,595,803	
Wahoo	Commercial	Recreational	Total
Wahoo ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)	Commercial	Recreational	Total 1,491,785
Wahoo ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww) Allocation %	Commercial  4.3%	Recreational  95.7%	Total 1,491,785 100%
Wahoo ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww) Allocation % Sector ACL (lbs ww)	Commercial  4.3% 64,147	<u>Recreational</u>  95.7% 1,427,638	Total 1,491,785 100% 

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

**Table 2-2.** Alternative 2 Revised ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs for dolphin and wahoo using MRIP and updated commercial data.

Dolphin	Commercial	Recreational	Total
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			15,344,846
Allocation %	7.54398%	92.45602%	100%
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	1,157,612	14,187,234	
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 12,749,594	
Wahoo	Commercial	Recreational	Total
ACL=OY=ABC (lbs ww)			1,794,960
Allocation %	3.93047%	96.06953%	100%
Sector ACL (lbs ww)	70,550	1,724,409	
Sector ACT (lbs ww)	None	ACT equals [sector ACL *(1-PSE)] or [ACL*0.5], whichever is greater = 1,258,819	

# 2.2 Action 2. Revise the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo.

#### Alternative 1 (No Action).

- (3) Alternative 1. No action. Commercial sector. If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director (SRD), reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year.
- (4) Recreational sector. If recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure recreational landings do not exceed the recreational ACL in the following fishing year. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

Alternative 2. If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director (SRD), reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the species is overfished.

Alternative 3. If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director (SRD), reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.

Alternative 4. If commercial landings as estimated by the Science and Research Director (SRD), reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if overfished and the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.

Alternative 5. If recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the recreational ACL in the following fishing year by the amount of the overage, only if the species is overfished. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

8

Alternative 6. If recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the recreational ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

Alternative 7. If the recreational landings, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the recreational ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if overfished and the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

<u>No action. § 622.49 (e) Atlantic dolphin (1) Commercial sector.</u> If commercial landings for Atlantic dolphin, as estimated by the SRD, reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL of 1,065,524 lb (483,314 kg), round weight, the AA will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. On and after the effective date of such a notification, all sale or purchase of Atlantic dolphin is prohibited and harvest or possession of this species in or from the South Atlantic EEZ is limited to the bag and possession limit. This bag and possession limit applies in the South Atlantic snapper grouper has been issued, without regard to where such species were harvested, <u>i.e.</u>, in state or Federal waters.

(2) <u>Recreational sector</u>. If recreational landings for Atlantic dolphin, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL of 13,530,692 lb (6,137,419 kg), round weight, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the AA will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register, to reduce the length of the following recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure recreational landings do not exceed the recreational ACL in the following fishing year. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

<u>(1) Atlantic wahoo</u> (1) <u>Commercial sector</u>. If commercial landings for Atlantic wahoo, as estimated by the SRD, reach or are projected to reach the commercial ACL of 64,147 lb (29,097 kg), round weight, the AA will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register to close the commercial sector for the remainder of the fishing year. On and after the effective date of such a notification, all sale or purchase of Atlantic wahoo is prohibited and harvest or possession of this species in or from the South Atlantic EEZ is limited to the bag and possession limit. This bag and possession limit applies in the South Atlantic on board a vessel for which a valid Federal charter vessel/headboat permit for South Atlantic snapper grouper has been issued, without regard to where such species were harvested, i.e., in state or Federal waters.

(2) <u>Recreational sector</u>. If recreational landings for Atlantic wahoo, as estimated by the SRD, exceed the recreational ACL of 1,427,638 lb (647,566 kg), round weight, then during the following fishing year, recreational landings will be monitored for a persistence in increased landings and, if necessary, the AA will file a notification with the Office of the Federal Register, to reduce the length

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5 **Chapter 2. Proposed Actions** 

Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

of the following recreational fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure recreational landings do not exceed the recreational ACL in the following fishing year. However, the length of the recreational season will also not be reduced during the following fishing year if the RA determines, using the best scientific information available, that a reduction in the length of the following fishing season is unnecessary.

Alternative 2. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator (RA) shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the species is overfished.

Alternative 3. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.

Alternative 4. If the commercial ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if overfished and the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.

Alternative 5. If the recreational ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the species is overfished.

Alternative 6. If the recreational ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.

Alternative 7. If the recreational ACL is exceeded, the RA shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage, only if overfished and the total ACL (commercial ACL and recreational ACL) is exceeded.

#### 2.3 Action 3. Modify the sector allocations for dolphin.

Alternative 1. No action. Do not modify the current sector allocations for dolphin. The recreational sector allocation for dolphin is 92.7% (current recreational ACL = 13,530,692 lbs ww, Table 2-1). The commercial sector allocation for dolphin is 7.3% (current commercial ACL = 1,065,524 lbs ww, Table 2-1). The sector allocations for dolphin were set in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011) using the sector allocation rule where 50% of sector allocations are based on a longer term landings series (1999 – 2008) and 50% of the sector allocation are based on a shorter time series (2006-2008).

Alternative 2. Establish the sector allocations for dolphin that were in place prior to the Comprehensive ACL Amendment making the "soft cap" allocations the sector allocations. The recreational sector allocation for dolphin would beis 87% and the commercial sector allocation is 13%. Should the Council select Alternative 2 of Action 1, the new recreational ACL would be 13,350,016 lbs ww (Table 2-2). The commercial sector allocation would be 13%. Should the Council select Alternative 2 of Action 1, the new commercial ACL would be 1,994,830 lbs ww (Table 2-2).

Alternative 3. Set the commercial allocation at its highest percentage of the total catch over the past 5 years (2008-2012). The recreational sector allocation for dolphin is 86%, and commercial sector allocation is 14%.

Alternative 4. Set the commercial allocation at the average of the percentages of the total catch over the past 5 years (2008-2012). The recreational sector allocation for dolphin is 90%, and commercial sector allocation is 10%.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.31", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style

### 2.4 Action 4. Revise the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

**Alternative 1.** No action. Do not modify the framework procedure established in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 2003). The existing framework (p.160 of the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (2003) includes the following text: If the RA concurs that the Council's recommendations are consistent with the goals and objectives of the plan, the National Standards, and other applicable law, he/she shall implement the regulations by proposed and final rules in the Federal Register prior to the appropriate fishing year or such dates as may be agreed upon with the Councils. A reasonable period for public comment shall be afforded, consistent with the urgency, if any, of the need to implement the management measure.

Appropriate regulatory changes recommended by the Council that may be implemented by the Regional Administrator by proposed and final rules in the Federal Register are:

- a. Adjustment of the best estimate of maximum sustainable yield (MSY, range and/or best point estimate).
- b. Adjustment of the best estimate of optimum yield (OY, range and/or best point estimate).
- c. Initial specification of ABC and subsequent adjustment of the ABC range and/or best estimate when this information becomes available.
- d. Setting or modifying total allowable catch (TAC).
- e. Reopening of a previously closed area/season, timeframe for recovery of dolphin and wahoo should they become overfished, or fishing year which may not be adjusted by more than two months.
- f. Bag limits.
- g. Size limits.
- h. Tackle configuration (e.g., minimum hook size).
- i. Season/area closures (including spawning area closures).
- j. Gear restrictions and/or prohibitions.
- k. Permitting restrictions.
- 1. Trip limits.
- m. Overfishing/overfished definitions and related thresholds (e.g., minimum stock size threshold (MSST) and maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT).
- n. Annual specification/quota setting process.
- o. Assessment Panel composition and process.
- p. Identification, designation, and modification of essential fish habitat (EFH) and EFH-habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs).
- q. Management measures to reduce or eliminate the impact of fishing gear/activities on EFH or EFH-HAPCs.
- r. Specify quota for scientific research.
- s. Designation of areas for scientific research.
- t. Regulations of longline length if ongoing research with marine mammals documents usefulness.
- u. Any other action to minimize the interaction of fishing gear with endangered species or marine mammals.
- v. Allocations and modifications to allocations.

**Alternative 2.** Include the following in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP framework: Update the framework procedure to revise the specification of Total Allowable Catch (TAC) for the Dolphin Wahoo FMP in

terms that incorporate ACLs, ACTs, and AMs. Such modifications would be based upon new scientific information indicating such modifications are prudent. Changes to the ACLs, ACTs and AMs will be made using the following procedure once the new ACLs, ACTs and AMs are established by the Council.

## Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC), Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) and Annual Catch Targets (ACTs) Adjustment Procedure

1. Stock assessments will continue to be conducted for dolphin and wahoo in the management area through the SEDAR process.

2. Following the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC)'s review of the stock assessment and a public hearing, the Council will determine if changes are needed in the OFL, ABC, ACLs, and ACTs and so advise the RA.

3. Following a review for consistency with the FMP and applicable law, the RA may reject or may implement changes by notice in the *Federal Register* to be effective for the next fishing season.

Modifications to the ACLs, ACTs, and AMs via *Federal Register* notice would be based on new scientific information. This would eliminate the lengthy regulatory amendment process, since a regulatory amendment would not be required to make such changes. This process would entail a review of new scientific information by the South Atlantic Council, and a recommendation from the South Atlantic Council to the RA for any changes to harvest levels they determine need to be made. If the RA agrees to the South Atlantic Council's recommendations, a *Federal Register* notice would be prepared outlining the modifications and the notice would be published by the office of the *Federal Register*, after which, the changes would be effective. At this point outreach materials such as fishery bulletins, and frequently asked questions would be developed and disseminated to fishery participants to notify them of the change.

The language for the proposed abbreviated framework is as follows and appears as item 9 in the full framework language following **Table 2.3**:

Adjustments to ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs according to the existing ABC Control Rule(s) and formulas for specifying ACLs and ACTs that have been approved by the Council and that were implemented in a fishery management plan amendment to the FMP. This abbreviated process is authorized as follows:

- **a.** Following the Scientific and Statistical Committee's (SSC's) review of the stock assessment, the Council will determine if changes are needed to ABC, ACL, and/or ACT and will so advise the RA.
- **b.** The Council will first hold a public hearing during the Council meeting during which they will review the stock assessment and the SSC's recommendations. In addition, the public will be advised prior to the meeting that the Council is considering potential changes to the ABC, ACL, and/or ACT and the Council will provide the public the opportunity to comment on the potential changes prior to and during the Council meeting.
- **c.** If the Council then determines that modifications to the ABC, ACL, and/or ACT are necessary and appropriate, they will notify the RA of their recommendations in a letter with the Council's analysis of the relevant biological, economic, and social information necessary to support the Council's action.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

13

- **d.** The RA will review the Council's recommendations and supporting information. If the RA concurs that the Council's recommendations are consistent with the objectives of the FMP, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and all other applicable law, the RA is authorized to implement the Council's proposed action through publication of appropriate notification in the Federal Register, providing appropriate time for additional public comment as necessary.
- e. If the Council chooses to deviate from the ABC control rule(s) and formulas for specifying ACLs and ACTs that the Council previously approved and that were implemented in a fishery management plan amendment to the FMP, this abbreviated process would not apply, and either the framework procedure would apply with the preparation of a regulatory amendment or a fishery management plan amendment would be prepared. Additionally, the Council may choose to prepare a regulatory amendment or a fishery management plan amendment or a fishery management plan amendment or a fishery management plan amendment even if they do not deviate from the previously approved ABC control rule(s) and formulas for specifying ACLs and ACTs.

Alternative 3. In addition to revisions in Alternative 2, also include additional language to reflect SEDAR and SSC roles in setting MSY, OY, and ABC.

Items retained from the current framework	Items added to current framework
Adjustment of the best estimate of MSY, range and/or best point estimate.	Use of SEDAR reports or other documentation the South Atlantic Council deems appropriate to provide biological analyses.
Adjustment of the best estimate of OY, range and/or best point estimate.	The SSC prepares a written report to the South Atlantic Council specifying OFL and a range of ABCs for species in need of catch reductions to achieve OY.
Setting or modifying TAC.	
Initial specification of ABC and subsequent adjustment of the ABC range and/or best estimate when this information becomes available.	The SEDAR report or SSC will recommend rebuilding periods.
Adjustments to or implementation of trip limits.	Adjustment to ACLs and/or sector ACLs.
Adjustments to or implementation of bag limits.	Adjustment to or implementation of ACTs and/or sector ACTs.
Adjustments to or implementation of size limits.	Adjustments to or implementation of AMs.
Tackle configuration (e.g., minimum hook size).	
Season/area closures (including spawning area closures).	

Table 2-3. Proposed framework modifications for the South Atlantic Council's Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5
Items retained from the current framework	Items added to current framework
Reopening of a previously closed area/season, timeframe for recovery of dolphin and wahoo should they become overfished, or fishing year which may not be adjusted by more than two months.	
Gear restrictions and/or prohibitions.	
Permitting restrictions.	
Overfishing/overfished definitions and related thresholds (e.g. MSST and MFMT).	
Annual specification/quota setting process.	
Assessment Panel composition and process.	
Identification, designation, and modification of EFH and EFH- HAPCs.	
Management measures to reduce or eliminate the impact of fishing gear/activities on EFH or EFH-HAPCs.	
Specify quota for scientific research.	
Designation of areas for scientific research.	
Regulations of longline length if ongoing research with marine mammals documents usefulness.	
Any other action to minimize the interaction of fishing gear with endangered species or marine mammals.	
Allocations and modifications to allocations.	

# Dolphin Wahoo FMP Framework Procedure for Specification of Annual Catch Limits, Annual Catch Targets, Overfishing Limits, Acceptable Biological Catch, and annual adjustments:

Procedure for Specifications:

1. At times determined by the SEDAR Steering Committee, and in consultation with the South Atlantic Council and NMFS Southeast Regional Office (SERO), stock assessments (or future assessment updates) will be conducted under the SEDAR process for stocks managed under the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Each SEDAR stock assessment update will: a) assess to the extent possible the current biomass, biomass proxy, or SPR levels for each stock; b) estimate fishing mortality (F) in relation to  $F_{MSY}$  (MFMT) and  $F_{OY}$ ; c) determine the overfishing limit (OFL); d) estimate other population parameters deemed appropriate; e) summarize statistics on the fishery for each stock or stock complex; f) specify the geographical variations in stock abundance, mortality recruitment, and age of entry into the fishery for each stock or stock complex; and g) develop estimates of  $B_{MSY}$ .

**2**. The South Atlantic Council will consider SEDAR stock assessments or other documentation the South Atlantic Council deems appropriate to provide the biological analysis and data listed above in paragraph 1. Either the SEFSC or the stock assessment branch of a state agency may

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

serve as the lead in conducting the analysis, as determined by the SEDAR Steering Committee. After reviewing the SEDAR stock assessments, the SSC will prepare a written report to the South Atlantic Council specifying an OFL and may recommend a range of ABCs for each stock complex that is in need of catch reductions for attaining or maintaining OY. The OFL is the annual harvest level corresponding to fishing at MFMT ( $F_{MSY}$ ). The ABC range is intended to provide guidance to the SSC and is the OFL as reduced due to scientific uncertainty in order to reduce the probability that overfishing will occur in a year. To the extent practicable, the probability that overfishing will occur at various levels of ABC and the annual transitional yields (i.e., catch streams) calculated for each level of fishing mortality within the ABC range should be included with the recommended range.

For overfished stocks, the recommended range of ABCs shall be calculated so as to end overfishing and achieve stock population levels at or above  $B_{MSY}$  within the rebuilding periods specified by the South Atlantic Council and approved by NMFS. The SEDAR report or SSC will recommend rebuilding periods based on the provisions of the National Standard Guidelines, including generation times for the affected stocks. Generation times are to be specified by the stock assessment panel based on the biological characteristics of the individual stocks. The report will recommend to the South Atlantic Council a  $B_{MSY}$  level and a MSST from  $B_{MSY}$ . The report may also recommend more appropriate estimates of  $F_{MSY}$  for any stock. The report may also recommend more appropriate levels for the MSY proxy, OY, the overfishing threshold (MFMT), and overfished threshold (MSST). For stock or stock complexes where data are inadequate to compute an OFL and recommended ABC range, the SSC will use other available information as a guide in providing their best estimate of an OFL corresponding to MFMT and ABC range that should result in not exceeding the MFMT.

**3.** The SSC will examine SEDAR reports or other new information, the OFL determination, and the recommended range of ABC. In addition, the SSC will examine information provided by the social scientists and economists from the South Atlantic Council staff and from the SERO Fisheries Social Science Branch analyzing social and economic impacts of any specification demanding adjustments of allocations, ACLs, ACTs, AMs, quotas, bag limits, or other fishing restrictions. The SSC will use the ABC control rule to set their ABC recommendation at or below the OFL, taking in account scientific uncertainty. If the SSC sets their ABC recommendations equal to OFL, the SSC will provide its rational why it believes that level of fishing will not exceed MFMT.

**4.** The Council may conduct a public hearing on the reports and the SSC's ABC recommendation at, or prior, to the time it is considered by the Council for action. Other public hearings may be held also. The Council may request a review of the report by its Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel and optionally by its socioeconomic experts and convene these groups before taking action.

**5.** The South Atlantic Council, in selecting an ACL, ACT, AM, and a stock restoration time period, if necessary, for each stock or stock complex for which an ABC has been identified, will, in addition to taking into consideration the recommendations and information provided for in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4, utilize the following criteria:

**a.** Set ACL at or below the ABC specified by the SSC or set a series of annual ACLs at or below the projected ABCs in order to account for management uncertainty. If the South Atlantic Council sets ACL equal to ABC, and ABC has been set equal to OFL,

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

the South Atlantic Council will provide its rationale as to why it by it believes that level of fishing will not exceed MFMT.

- **b.** May subdivide the ACLs into commercial, for-hire, and private recreational sector ACLs that maximize the net benefits of the fishery to the nation. The Sector ACLs will be based on allocations determined by criteria established by the South Atlantic Council and specified by the South Atlantic Council through a plan amendment. If, for an overfished stock, harvest in any year exceeds the ACL or sector ACL, management measure and catch levels for that sector will be adjusted in accordance with the AMs established for that stock.
- **c.** Set ACTs or sector ACTs at or below ACLs and in accordance with the provision of the AM for that stock. The ACT is the management target that accounts for management uncertainty in controlling the actual catch at or below the ACL. If an ACL is exceeded repeatedly, the South Atlantic Council has the option to establish an ACT if one does not already exist for a particular stock and adjust or establish AMs for that stock as well.

**6.** The South Atlantic Council will provide the SSC specification of OFL; SSC recommendation of ABC; and its recommendations to the NMFS RA for ACLs, sector ACLs, ACTs, sector ACTs, AMs, sector AMs, and stock restoration target dates for each stock or stock complex, estimates of  $B_{MSY}$  and MSST, estimates of MFMT, and the quotas, bag limits, trip limits, size limits, closed seasons, and gear restrictions necessary to avoid exceeding the ACL or sector ACLS, along with the reports, a regulatory impact review and proper National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation, and the proposed regulations within a predetermined time as agreed upon by the South Atlantic Council and RA. The South Atlantic Council may also recommend new levels or statements for MSY (or proxy) and OY.

7. The RA will review the South Atlantic Council's recommendations and supporting information, and, if he concurs that the recommendations are consistent with the objectives of the FMP, the National Standards, and other applicable law, he shall forward for publication notice of proposed rules to the Assistant Administrator (providing appropriate time for additional public comment). The RA will take into consideration all public comment and information received and will forward for publication in the *Federal Register* of a final rule within 30 days of the close of the public comment, or such other time as agreed upon by the South Atlantic Council and RA.

**8.** Appropriate regulatory changes that may be implemented by final rule in the *Federal Register* include:

- **a.** ACLs or sector ACLs, or a series of annual ACLs or sector ACLs.
- **b.** ACTs or sector ACTs, or a series of annual ACTs or sector ACTs and establish ACTs for stocks which do not have an ACT.
- **c.** AMs or sector AMs.
- **d.** Bag limits, size limits, vessel trip limits, closed seasons or area, gear restrictions, and quotas designed to achieve OY and keep harvest levels from exceeding the ACL or sector ACL.
- e. The time period specified for rebuilding an overfished stock, estimated MSY and MSST for overfished stocks, and MFMT.
- **f.** New levels or statements of MSY (or proxy) and OY for any stock.
- **g.** New levels of total allowable catch (TAC).

**h.** Adjust fishing seasons/years.

**9.** Adjustments to ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs according to the existing ABC Control Rule(s) and formulas for specifying ACLs and ACTs that have been approved by the Council and that were implemented in a fishery management plan amendment to the FMP. This abbreviated process is authorized as follows:

- **a.** Following the Scientific and Statistical Committee's (SSC's) review of the stock assessment, the Council will determine if changes are needed to ABC, ACL, and/or ACT and will so advise the RA.
- **b.** The Council will first hold a public hearing during the Council meeting during which they will review the stock assessment and the SSC's recommendations. In addition, the public will be advised prior to the meeting that the Council is considering potential changes to the ABC, ACL, and/or ACT and the Council will provide the public the opportunity to comment on the potential changes prior to and during the Council meeting.
- **c.** If the Council then determines that modifications to the ABC, ACL, and/or ACT are necessary and appropriate, they will notify the RA of their recommendations in a letter with the Council's analysis of the relevant biological, economic, and social information necessary to support the Council's action.
- **d.** The RA will review the Council's recommendations and supporting information. If the RA concurs that the Council's recommendations are consistent with the objectives of the FMP, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and all other applicable law, the RA is authorized to implement the Council's proposed action through publication of appropriate notification in the Federal Register, providing appropriate time for additional public comment as necessary.
- e. If the Council chooses to deviate from the ABC control rule(s) and formulas for specifying ACLs and ACTs that the Council previously approved and that were implemented in a fishery management plan amendment to the FMP, this abbreviated process would not apply, and either the framework procedure would apply with the preparation of a regulatory amendment or a fishery management plan amendment would be prepared. Additionally, the Council may choose to prepare a regulatory amendment or a fishery management plan amendment even if they do not deviate from the previously approved ABC control rule(s) and formulas for specifying ACLs and ACTs.

**10.** If NMFS decides not to publish the proposed rule for the recommended management measures, or to otherwise hold the measures in abeyance, then the RA must notify the South Atlantic Council of its intended action and the reasons for NMFS concern along with suggested changes to the proposed management measures that would alleviate the concerns. Such notice shall specify: 1) The applicable law with which the amendment is inconsistent; 2) the nature of such inconsistencies; and 3) recommendation concerning the action that could be taken by the South Atlantic Council to conform the amendment to the requirements of applicable law.

# 2.5 Action 5. Establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) in the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction.

Alternative 1. No action. There is no commercial trip limit for dolphin.

Alternative 2: 1,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 2a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 2b: north of 31° N. Latitude

Alternative 3: 2,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 3a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 3b: north of 31° N. Latitude

- Alternative 4: 3,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 4a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 4b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 5: 4,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 5a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 5b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 6: 5,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 6a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 6b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 7: 10,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 7a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 7b: north of 31° N. Latitude
- Alternative 8: 15,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 8a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 8b: north of 31° N. Latitude

Alternative 9: 20,000 lbs ww trip limit Sub-Alternative 9a: south of 31° N. Latitude Sub-Alternative 9b: north of 31° N. Latitude

Table 2-4. Average number of trips and pounds (ww) of dolphin landed by hook and line and longline
gear north and south of 31° N. latitude for Alternatives 2 through 7 in Action 5 during 2008 through
2012. (No trips met the landings criteria of Alternatives 8 and 9 from 2008 through 2012 and are not
included in this table.)

				Alternative 2		Alternative 3		Alternative 4		Alternative 5		Alternative 6		Alternative 7	
		<1,0	000 lb	1,00	00 lb	2,000 lb		3,000 lb		4,000 lb		5,000 lb		10,000 lb	
Zone	Gear	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds
	Hook & Line	903	67,817	3	4,285	1	1,327	0	749	0	919	0	0	0	0
North 31	Longline	43	6,440	10	15,044	6	14,983	4	13,968	2	6,880	5	34,965	2	27,688
51	Total (N 31)	946	74,257	13	19,329	7	16,310	4	14,717	2	7,799	5	34,965	2	27688
	Hook & Line	1,311	86,680	3	3,248	1	3,251	0	0	0	988	0	0	0	0
South 31	Longline	11	429	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51	Total (S 31)	1,322	87,109	3	3,248	1	3,251	0	0	0	988	0	0	0	0
To (both	otal N & S)	2,268	161,366	16	22,577	8	19,561	4	14,717	2	8,787	5	34,965	2	27,688

(Source: NMFS SERO)

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

# 2.6 Comparison Effects Summary of Alternatives

This section describes the environmental effects of these alternatives through concise descriptive summary of such impacts in a comparative form (**Table 2-5**). Chapter 4 describes the effects in detail.

Actions & Alternatives	Effects								
Action	is & Alternatives	Biological	Economic	Social	Administrative				
Action 1	Revision of ABCs,								
	ACLs, and ACTs.								
Alt. 1	No Action.								
Alt. 2	Revision of ABCs,								
	ACLs, and ACTs								
	using updated MRIP,								
	commercial, and for-								
	hire landings.								
Action 2	Revise the AMs for								
	dolphin and wahoo.								
Alt. 1	No Action.								
Alt. 2									
Alt. 3									
Alt. 4									
Alt. 5									
Alt. 6									
Alt. 7									
Action 3	Modify the sector								
	allocations for								
	dolphin.								
Alt. 1	No Action.								
Alt. 2	Rec. alloc. 87%;								
	Comm. alloc. 13%.								
Alt. 3	Comm. alloc. at								
	highest percentage of								
	the total catch (2008-								
	2012).								

Table 2-5. A summary and comparison of the effects of the alternatives.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

		Effects									
Action	s & Alternatives	Biological	Economic	Social	Administrative						
Alt. 4	Comm. alloc. at										
	average of										
	percentages of the										
	total catch (2008-										
-	2012).										
	De la de										
Action 4	Revise the										
	in Dalahin Wahaa										
	In Dolphin wanoo										
Alt 1	FIMP.										
	Incorporate										
AIL. 2	adjustments to ACLs										
	ACTs and AMs										
	using an abbreviated										
	procedure.										
Alt. 3	Include additional										
	language to reflect										
	SEDAR and SSC										
	roles in setting MSY,										
	OY, and ABC, in the										
	framework										
	procedure.										
Action 5	Establish a										
	commercial trip limit										
	for dolphin in the										
	EEZ throughout the										
	SAFMC's area of										
	jurisdiction.										
Alt. 1	No Action.										
Alt. 2	1000 lb trip limit.										
Sub-alt. 2a	South of $31^{\circ}$ N. Lat.										
Sub-alt. 2b	North of 31" N. Lat.										
Alt. 3	2000 lb trip limit.										
Sub-alt. 3a	South of $31^{\circ}$ N. Lat.										
Sub-alt. 3b	North of 31° N. Lat.										
Alt. 4	3000 lb trip limit.				1						

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

A			Effects		
Action	s & Alternatives	Biological	Economic	Social	Administrative
Sub-alt. 4a	South of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Sub-alt. 4b	North of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Alt. 5	4000 lb trip limit.				
Sub-alt. 5a	South of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Sub-alt. 5b	North of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Alt. 6	5000 lb trip limit.				
Sub-alt. 6a	South of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Sub-alt. 6b	North of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Alt. 7	10,000 lb trip limit.				
Sub-alt. 7a	South of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Sub-alt. 7b	North of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Alt. 8	15,000 lb trip limit.				
Sub-alt. 8a	South of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Sub-alt. 8b	North of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				
Alt. 9	20,000 lb trip limit.				
Sub-alt. 9a	South of $31^0$ N. Lat.				
Sub-alt. 9b	North of 31 <sup>0</sup> N. Lat.				

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

# Chapter 3. Affected Environment

This section describes the affected environment in the proposed project area. The affected environment is divided into four major components:

# Affected Environment

• Habitat environment (Section 3.1)

Examples include coral reefs, sea grass beds, and rocky hard-bottom substrates

Biological and ecological environment (Section 3.2)

Examples include populations of dolphin and wahoo, corals, and turtles

• Human environment (Section 3.3)

Examples include fishing communities and economic descriptions of the fisheries

• Administrative environment (Section 3.4)

Examples include the fishery management process and enforcement activities

# 3.1 Habitat Environment

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

### 3.1.1 Essential Fish Habitat

Essential fish habitat (EFH) for dolphin and wahoo is the Gulf Stream, Charleston Gyre, Florida Current, and pelagic *Sargassum*.

Note: This EFH definition for dolphin was approved by the Secretary of Commerce on June

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5 1999, as a part of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's (South Atlantic Council) Comprehensive Habitat Amendment (SAFMC, 1998c). Dolphin was included within the Fishery Management Plan for the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region (Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP). This definition does not apply to extra-jurisdictional areas.

### 3.1.2 Habitat Areas of Particular Concern

EFH-habitat of particular concern (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

**Chapter 3. Affected Environment** 

3.

Islamorada, Florida; The Marathon Hump off Marathon, Florida; The "Wall" off of the Florida Keys; and Pelagic Sargassum.

Note: This EFH-HAPC definition for dolphin was approved by the Secretary of Commerce on June 3, 1999 as a part of the South Atlantic Council's Comprehensive Habitat Amendment (dolphin was included within the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP).

# 3.2 Biological and Ecological Environment

The marine environment in the Atlantic management area affected by actions in this environmental assessment is defined by two components (**Figure 3-1**). Each component will be described in detail in the following sections.



Figure 3-1. Two components of the biological environment described in this document.

### 3.2.1 Fish Populations

Dolphin and wahoo are highly migratory pelagic species occurring in tropical and subtropical waters worldwide. In the western Atlantic, dolphin and wahoo are distributed from Nova Scotia to Brazil, including Bermuda and the greater Caribbean region, and the Gulf of Mexico. They are found near the surface around natural and artificial floating objects, including *Sargassum* (in the Atlantic).

Dolphin eat a wide variety of species, including small pelagic fish, juvenile tuna, billfish, jacks, and pompano, and pelagic larvae of nearshore, bottom-living species. They also eat invertebrates such as cephalopods, mysids, and jellyfish. Large tuna, rough-toothed dolphin, marlin, sailfish, swordfish, and sharks feed on dolphin, particularly juveniles. Wahoo mainly feed on squid and fish, including frigate mackerel, butterfish, porcupine fish, and round herring. They generally compete with tuna for the same kind of food, but can feed on larger prey. A number of predators such as sharks and large tuna that share their habitat feed on young wahoo. Dolphin and Wahoo are likely to be caught when longline fishermen target other species such as billfish and tuna. Additional background information regarding the fish populations for dolphin and wahoo can be found in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 1983) at: http://www.safmc.net/Library/Dolphin/Wahoo/ta bid/410/Default.aspx

# 3.2.2 Dolphin, Coryphaena hippurus

In the western Atlantic ocean, dolphin are most common from North Carolina, throughout the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean, to the northeast coast of Brazil (Oxenford 1999). Dolphin are highly migratory and pelagic; with adults found in open water and juveniles with floating seagrass and marine debris; and

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5



Maximum age is 4 years (mean <2 years)</li>

occasionally found in esturaries and harbors (Palko et al. 1982; Johnson 1978).

In a study by Schwenke and Buckel (2008) off North Carolina, dolphin ranged from 89 mm fork length (FL) to 1451 mm FL. Mean dolphin weight ranged from 6.44 kg for males to 3.44 kg for females. Estimated average growth rate was 3.78 mm/day during the first six months, and maximum reported age was 3 years. Size at 50% maturity was slightly smaller for female dolphin (460 mm FL), when compared with males (475 mm FL); and peak spawning occurred from April through July off North Carolina (Schwenke and Buckel 2008). Prager (2000) estimated natural mortality for dolphin to be between 0.68 and 0.80.

For a more comprehensive record of the literature on the biology of dolphin, see **Section 3.0** in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 1983) found at:

http://www.safmc.net/Library/Dolphin/Wahoo/ta bid/410/Default.aspx

# 3.2.3 Wahoo, Acanthocybium solanderi

In the western Atlantic, the highly migratory, pelagic wahoo are found from New York through Columbia including Bermuda, the Bahamas, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean (Theisen et al. 2008; Garber et al. 2005; Collette 2002). Wahoo typically occur far offshore, inhabit waters around pinnacles, reef edges, and walls, and may be attracted to oceanic frontal zones and temperature discontinuities (Garber et al. 2005).

In studies off Florida and the northern Bahamas, McBride et al. (2008) reported rapid growth to a large size, with sizes ranging from 628 mm FL to 1956 mm FL. Males were smaller than females, with the largest male at 32.8 kg and the largest female was 46.0 kg. Maximum age was 9.3 years. Maki Jenkins and McBride (2009) reported size and age at 50% maturity for female wahoo at 925 mm FL and 0.64 years, respectively, with peak spawning in the summer.

For a more comprehensive record of the literature on the biology of wahoo, see **Section 3.0** in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 1983) found at:

http://www.safmc.net/Library/Dolphin/Wahoo/ta bid/410/Default.aspx

# 3.2.4 Stock Status of Dolphin and Wahoo

To date, there is no recent stock assessment available for dolphin and wahoo, and it is unknown whether they are overfished/undergoing overfishing. Prager (2000) conducted an exploratory assessment of dolphin, but the results were not conclusive. A Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) stock assessment for dolphin and wahoo is scheduled for 2015. The SEDAR process, initiated in 2002, is a cooperative Fishery Management Council process intended to improve the quality, timeliness, and reliability of fishery stock assessments in the South Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and U.S. Caribbean. SEDAR is managed by the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils in coordination with NMFS and the Atlantic and Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commissions.

Oxenford and Hunte (1986) suggested that there were at least two separate unit stocks of dolphin in the northeast and southeast Caribbean Sea. Oxenford (1999) suggested that it was very likely that additional stocks of dolphin existed in the Gulf of Mexico and central/western Caribbean. Theisen et al. (2008) indicated that a worldwide stock for wahoo consisted of a single globally distributed population. However, Zischke et al. (2012) concluded that despite genetic homogeneity in wahoo, multiple discrete phenotypic stocks existed in the Pacific and eastern Indian oceans.

Life-history characteristics of dolphin and wahoo such as rapid growth rates, early maturity, batch spawning over an extended season, a short life span, and a varied diet could help sustain fishing pressures on these species (Schwenke and Buckel 2008; McBride et al., 2008; Prager 2000; and Oxenford 1999). Dolphin and wahoo are listed as species of "least concern" under the International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List, i.e. species that have a low risk of extinction. See **Section 1.5** for a history of recent management of dolphin and wahoo.

### 3.2.5 Protected Species

There are 40 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 NMFS. Thirty-one of these species are marine mammals protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). Six of these marine mammal species are also listed as endangered under the ESA (i.e., sperm, sei, fin, blue, humpback, and North Atlantic right whales). 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 also occur within the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction. Section 3.5 in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b), and Section 3.2.2 in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 13, describe the life history characteristics in detail for these species. Section 3.5 of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment and 3.2.2 of Regulatory Amendment 13 are hereby incorporated by reference and may be found at: http://www.safmc.net/ecosystem/Home/Ecosyste mHome/tabid/435/Default.aspx and http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/pdfs/Reg13\_FINAL Dec2012.pdf, respectively. The potential impacts from the continued authorization of the Atlantic dolphin wahoo fishery on all ESA-listed species have been considered in previous ESA Section 7 consultations. Summaries of those consultations and their determination are in Appendix C. Those consultations indicate that

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

of the species listed above, sea turtles are the most likely to interact with the dolphin wahoo fishery.

# 3.3 Socio-economic Environment

# 3.3.1 Economic Description of the Commercial Sector

Additional information on the commercial dolphin wahoo fishery is contained in previous amendments [Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (SAFMC 2003), and Comprehensive ACL Amendment for the South Atlantic Region (SAFMC 2011c)] and are incorporated herein by reference. Presented below is selected information on the commercial sector of the black sea bass portion of the snapper grouper fishery.

The major source of data summarized in this description is the Federal Logbook System (FLS), supplemented by average prices calculated from the Accumulated Landings System (ALS) and price indices taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Real (inflation adjusted) prices are reported in 2011 constant dollars. Nominal values are reported in the dollar value of the individual year without adjustment for inflation. Landings are expressed in whole weight to match with the method for collecting ex-vessel price information for dolphin and wahoo.

The data reported in this section and its subsections do not represent the entire range of landings from the entire management area because not all fishermen who land dolphin and wahoo are required to have a federal permit (e.g. some landings from other states, landings from state waters). The dolphin wahoo fishery encompassed by this amendment includes the entire US Atlantic coast; however, logbooks are required only for federally permitted fishermen in the four South Atlantic states.

# 3.3.1.1 Annual Landings, Revenues, and Effort

There are no discernible trends on the pounds of landings, number of vessels or trips for dolphin from year to year in the time series shown in **Table 3-4-1.** The average 2007-2011 landings as shown in the table below were 157,435 pounds of dolphin. For 2007-2011, an average of 2,379 trips that landed at least one pound of dolphin were taken by 566 permitted vessels. Over the years 2007 through 2011 dolphin trips landed 787,184 lbs ww, of dolphin valued at about \$1.608 million in 2011 prices (**Table 3-4-1**). On average from 2007 through 2011, dolphin price per pound was \$1.98, or \$2.06 when adjusted for inflation (2011 \$).

There are no discernible trends on the pounds of landings, number of vessels or trips for wahoo from year to year in the time series shown in **Table 3-4-1.** The average 2007-2011 landings as shown in the table below were 25,194 pounds of wahoo. For 2007-2011, an average of 430 trips that landed at least one pound of wahoo were taken by 221 permitted vessels. Over the years 2007 through 2011 wahoo trips landed 125,972 lbs ww, of wahoo valued at about \$363,984 in 2011 prices (**Table 3-4-1**). On average from 2007 through 2011, wahoo price per pound was \$2.78, or \$2.89 when adjusted for inflation (2011 \$).

Dolphin		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011
# Trips		2,356		2,394		2,913		1,996		2,238
# Vessels		540		580		642		546		521
# Dealers		188		187		190		193		180
Lbs Landed		151,752		146,933		208,203		129,468		150,818
Nominal										
Revenue	\$	311,381	\$	284,218	\$.	358,996	\$	257,466	\$.	331,284
Nominal										
Price/lb	\$	2.05	\$	1.93	\$	1.72	\$	1.99	\$	2.20
Real Revenue										
(2011 \$)	\$	337,848	\$	297,008	\$.	376,228	\$	265,705	\$.	331,284
Real Price/lb										
(2011 \$)	\$	2.23	\$	2.02	\$	1.81	\$	2.05	\$	2.20
(====+)	Ŧ		Ŧ		· ·				· ·	
Wahoo	-	2007	Ŧ	2008		2009		2010		2011
Wahoo # Trips	-	2007 528	+	2008 353		2009 470		2010 354		2011 446
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels	-	2007 528 247	-	2008 353 176		2009 470 235		2010 354 207		2011 446 240
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers	-	2007 528 247 116		2008 353 176 84		2009 470 235 98		2010 354 207 92		2011 446 240 95
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed		2007 528 247 116 30,821	-	2008 353 176 84 18,853		2009 470 235 98 25,255		2010 354 207 92 23,134		2011 446 240 95 27,909
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal		2007 528 247 116 30,821		2008 353 176 84 18,853		2009 470 235 98 25,255		2010 354 207 92 23,134		2011 446 240 95 27,909
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal Revenue	\$	2007 528 247 116 30,821 77,196	\$	2008 353 176 84 18,853 49,509	\$	2009 470 235 98 25,255 68,513	\$	2010 354 207 92 23,134 67,553	\$	2011 446 240 95 27,909 86,973
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal Revenue Nominal	\$	2007 528 247 116 30,821 77,196	\$	2008 353 176 84 18,853 49,509	\$	2009 470 235 98 25,255 68,513	\$	2010 354 207 92 23,134 67,553	\$	2011 446 240 95 27,909 86,973
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal Revenue Nominal Price/lb	\$	2007 528 247 116 30,821 77,196 2.50	\$	2008 353 176 84 18,853 49,509 2.63	\$	2009 470 235 98 25,255 68,513 2.71	\$	2010 354 207 92 23,134 67,553 2.92	\$	2011 446 240 95 27,909 86,973 3.12
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal Revenue Nominal Price/lb Real Revenue	\$	2007 528 247 116 30,821 77,196 2.50	\$	2008 353 176 84 18,853 49,509 2.63	\$	2009 470 235 98 25,255 68,513 2.71	\$	2010 354 207 92 23,134 67,553 2.92	\$	2011 446 240 95 27,909 86,973 3.12
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal Revenue Nominal Price/lb Real Revenue (2011 \$)	\$ \$	2007 528 247 116 30,821 77,196 2.50 83,758	\$	2008 353 176 84 18,853 49,509 2.63 51,737	\$\$\$	2009 470 235 98 25,255 68,513 2.71 71,802	\$ \$	2010 354 207 92 23,134 67,553 2.92 69,715	\$\$\$	2011 446 240 95 27,909 86,973 3.12 86,973
Wahoo # Trips # Vessels # Dealers Lbs Landed Nominal Revenue Nominal Price/lb Real Revenue (2011 \$) Real Price/lb	\$ \$ \$	2007 528 247 116 30,821 77,196 2.50 83,758	\$ \$ \$	2008 353 176 84 18,853 49,509 2.63 51,737	\$ \$ \$	2009 470 235 98 25,255 68,513 2.71 71,802	\$ \$ \$	2010 354 207 92 23,134 67,553 2.92 69,715	\$ \$ \$	2011 446 240 95 27,909 86,973 3.12 86,973

 Table 3-3-1. Selected characteristics for trips landing at least one pound (whole weight) of dolphin,

 2007-2011.

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook and Accumulated Landings Data Base Systems (2013).

# 3.3.1.2 Monthly Landings, Revenues, and Effort

Dolphin and wahoo commercial seasons have not been closed early in any year due to their ACLs having been met. On average, the greatest number of trips that land dolphin occur in May and June (**Table 3.3.2**). There is a large increase in trips from March to April and July and August see declines from the highs from the late spring months. Likewise, the numbers of participating vessels, pounds landed and ex-vessel revenue earned by fishermen follow the same trend. Most trips that land dolphin last about two days, however in July the length of trips approaches an average of three days.

The occurrence of wahoo trips is more constant across the year than are dolphin trips. The peak tends to be in May, as with dolphin, however, there are only an average of 50 trips that land wahoo in that month and a low of 21 trips on

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

average in February. Trips on which wahoo are landed tend to last about two days.

Table 3-3-2. Selected monthly average characteristics for trips landing at least one pound (ww) of dolphi	n and
wahoo, 2007-2011.	

Dolphin	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Trips	52	49	64	171	557	528	296	217	139	120	141	72
Vessels	35	29	33	81	153	142	97	86	68	59	59	43
Days Away	1.84	1.87	2.06	1.91	2.24	2.34	2.72	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.07	1.89
Lbs Landed	1,669	2,431	3,416	8,780	54,009	40,399	15,852	10,237	8,161	5,187	4,534	2,787
Nominal												
Revenue	\$3,588	\$5,624	\$7,069	\$20,388	\$95,318	\$79,467	\$31,829	\$23,251	\$14,408	\$10,904	\$9,916	\$6,907
Wahoo	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
Trips	36	21	24	39	50	33	36	56	31	32	40	32
Vessels	22	16	19	26	31	22	24	32	23	23	30	22
Days Away	1.90	2.64	2.55	2.16	2.53	2.64	2.17	2.04	2.53	2.24	2.37	1.78
Lbs Landed	1,964	2,054	1,520	2,056	2,103	1,595	1,720	2,446	1,931	2,468	2,795	2,543
Nominal												
Revenue	\$ 5 225	\$6120	\$ 1 155	\$ 5 225	\$ 5 504	\$ 1.282	\$ 1865	\$ 7186	\$ 5/130	\$ 6363	\$7876	\$7.208

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook and Accumulated Landings Data Base Systems (2013).

# **3.3.1.3** Average Landings, Revenues, and Effort by State

On average, North Carolina (30% of the total landings) landed slightly more pounds annually than did the east coast of Florida (26% of the total landings). However, all vessels from other states with a South Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo Permit, landed more dolphin than did fishermen from any of the South Atlantic states other than North Carolina at 28% of the total average landings (Table 3-3-3). These states included Gulf of Mexico states, as well as states north of North Carolina. Trips from South Carolina and Georgia, while fewer in number and lower in landings, tended to average 6 to 7 days per trip, while trips from other states typically were one to two days.

The east coast of Florida averaged more trips and pounds landed of wahoo than any other state (Table 3-3-3) with 44% of the average annual landings. Trips from South Carolina and Georgia, while fewer in number and lower in landings, tended to average 5 to 7 days per trip, while trips from other states typically were one to two days.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

Table 3-3-3. wahoo, by si	Selected a tate, 2007-2	average c 2011.	haracterist	ics for trips	s landing a	at least or	ne pound	(whole we	eight) of	dolphin a
Dolphin	E. FL	GA	SC	NC	Other					
Trips	958	33	228	715	445	1				
¥7 1-	501	0	71	240	269	1				

Vessels	591	9	71	340	268
Days Away	1.44	6.57	6.65	2.44	1.62
Lbs Landed	41,166	2,310	22,009	47,805	44,144
Nominal					
Revenue	\$89,169	\$3,815	\$47,949	\$87,641	\$80,094
Wahoo	E. FL	GA	SC	NC	Other
Trips	190	2	67	100	71
Vessels	63	2	9	34	18
Days Away	1 34	5.18	6.73	1.82	1.12
	1.54	0.10	0.78	1.02	
Lbs Landed	11,058	99	3,349	7,169	3,520
Lbs Landed Nominal	11,058	99	3,349	7,169	3,520

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook and Accumulated Landings Data Base Systems, (2013).

# **3.3.1.4** Average Landings, Revenues, and Effort by Gear

The majority of dolphin (63%) on average, is commercially landed using hook and line gear (**Table 3-3-4**). Dolphin made up 9% of the total landings on all trips where dolphin was landed, including those trips where dolphin were not targeted, but were encountered. Other major gears include longline and trolling. The average dolphin trip using hook and line lands almost 63 lbs of dolphin. The majority of trips that land dolphin, but do not target them are hook and line trips. Longline trips average 218 lbs of dolphin per trip. Trolling trips that land dolphin average 59 lbs per trip.

Wahoo on average are landed almost exclusively using hook and line (48%) and trolling gears (40%). Wahoo made up 7% of the total landings on all trips where wahoo was landed, including those trips where wahoo were not targeted, but were encountered. The average wahoo trip using hook and line lands almost 52 lbs of wahoo. Trolling trips average 55 lbs of wahoo per trip (**Table 3-3-4**).

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

Dolphin	Hook	& Line	Longline	Trolling	Other
Trips		1,591	91	673	24
Vessels		177	11	112	11
Days Away		2.74	2.79	1.13	2.03
Lbs Dolphin		99,810	16,870	39,855	901
Total Lbs	1,4	424,096	230,062	155,192	19,146
Dolphin					
Revenue	\$ 2	205,119	\$ 19,606	\$ 82,136	\$ 1,808
Total Revenue	\$ 3,	734,279	\$496,475	\$ 315,946	\$56,929
Wahoo	Hook	& Line	Longline	Trolling	Other
Wahoo Trips	Hook	233 £	Longline 6	Trolling 183	Other 7
Wahoo Trips Vessels	Hook	233 75	Longline 6 3	Trolling 183 60	Other 7 6
Wahoo Trips Vessels Days Away	Hook	233 75 3.10	Longline 6 3 4.42	Trolling 183 60 1.19	Other 7 6 1.49
Wahoo Trips Vessels Days Away Lbs Wahoo	Hook	233 75 3.10 12,108	Longline 6 3 4.42 279	Trolling 183 60 1.19 9,982	Other 7 6 1.49 2,825
Wahoo Trips Vessels Days Away Lbs Wahoo Total Lbs	Hook	233 75 3.10 12,108 258,916	Longline 6 3 4.42 279 22,926	Trolling 183 60 1.19 9,982 49,866	Other 7 6 1.49 2,825 5,775
Wahoo Trips Vessels Days Away Lbs Wahoo Total Lbs Wahoo	Hook	& Line           233           75           3.10           12,108           258,916	Longline 6 3 4.42 279 22,926	Trolling           183           60           1.19           9,982           49,866	Other 7 6 1.49 2,825 5,775
Wahoo Trips Vessels Days Away Lbs Wahoo Total Lbs Wahoo Revenue	Hook	& Line           233           75           3.10           12,108           258,916           34,218	Longline 6 3 4.42 279 22,926 \$ 718	Trolling           183           60           1.19           9,982           49,866           \$ 27,331	Other           7           6           1.49           2,825           5,775           \$ 7,682

Table 3-3-4. Selected average characteristics for trips landing at least one pound (whole weight) of dolphin and wahoo, by gear type, 2007-2011.

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook and Accumulated Landings Data Base Systems, (2013).

### 3.3.1.5 **Permits**

A commercial permit is required to harvest or possess commercial quantities of dolphin and wahoo from the EEZ in the South Atlantic. North of the North Carolina/Virginia state line, no permit is required, however, trips are limited to 200 lbs combined of dolphin and wahoo. The number of South Atlantic Commercial Dolphin Wahoo Permits for 2008-2012 is provided in **Table 3-3-5**. Every year from 2008 through 2012, the number of vessels landing at least one pound of snapper grouper was significantly lower than the number of dolphin wahoo permits (**Table 3-3-1** and **Table 3-3-5**). This is not totally unexpected. The South Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo Permit is not a limited access permit. Many commercial fishing operations have multiple federal permits. Presumably, vessel operators by the permit each year in case they do catch dolphin or wahoo so they can sell the fish.

Table 3-3-5. Number of South Atlantic commercial dolphin-wahoo permits, 2008 - 2012.

	Number of Permits
2008	2,526
2009	2,526
2010	2,563
2011	2,614
2012	2,685
Average	2,583

Source: NMFS SERO Permits Data Base

### **3.3.1.6** Economic Activity

Estimates of the average annual economic activity (impacts) associated with the commercial harvest of dolphin and wahoo were derived using the model developed for and applied in NMFS (2010) and are provided in **Table 3-3-6**. Business activity for the commercial sector is characterized in the form of full-time equivalent jobs, income impacts (wages, salaries, and self-employed income), and output (sales) impacts (gross business sales). Income impacts should not be added to output (sales) impacts because this would result in double counting.

The estimates of economic activity include the direct effects (effects in the sector where an expenditure is actually made), indirect effects (effects in sectors providing goods and services to directly affected sectors), and induced effects (effects induced by the personal consumption expenditures of employees in the direct and indirectly affected sectors). The estimate of exvessel value for 2011 is replicated from **Table 3-3-1**.

Tuble e e officeruge annuar economic activity associated what dorphin and wanoo, 2007 2011										
Species	Average Revenue (millions) <sup>1</sup>	Total Jobs	Harvester Jobs	Output (Sales) Impacts (millions) <sup>1</sup>	Income Impacts (millions) <sup>1</sup>					
Dolphin	\$0.331	56	7	\$3.959	\$1.677					
Wahoo	\$0.087	16	2	\$1.099	\$0.466					

Table 3-3-6. Average annual economic activity associated with dolphin and wahoo, 2007-2011.

<sup>1</sup>2011 dollars.

Source: NMFS SERO

# 3.3.2 Economic Description of the Recreational Sector

Additional information on the recreational sector of the snapper grouper fishery contained in previous or concurrent amendments is incorporated herein by reference [see Amendment 13C (SAFMC 2006), Amendment 15A (SAFMC 2008a), Amendment 15B (SAFMC 2008b), Amendment 16 (SAFMC 2009a), Amendment 17A (SAFMC 2010a), Amendment 17B (SAFMC 2010b), Regulatory Amendment 9 (SAFMC 2011b), Regulatory Amendment 11 (SAFMC 2011b), Regulatory Amendment 11 (SAFMC 2011a), Comprehensive ACL Amendment for the South Atlantic Region (SAFMC 2011c), and Amendment 24 (SAFMC 2011d)]. The following description focuses mainly on the recreational sector of the dolphin and wahoo fishery in the Atlantic.

The recreational fishery is comprised of the private sector and for-hire sector. The private sector includes anglers fishing from shore (all land-based structures) and private/rental boats. The for-hire sector is composed of the charter boat and headboat (also called partyboat) sectors. Charter boats generally carry fewer passengers and charge a fee on an entire vessel basis, whereas headboats carry more passengers and payment is per person.

### 3.3.2.1 Harvest

Harvest information for dolphin is summarized in **Table 3-3-6** and **Table 3-3-7**, and those for

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

wahoo, in **Table 3-3-8** and **Table 3-3-9**. At this stage, it is instructive to point out that harvest estimates are sometimes subject to relatively high proportional standard errors (PSE), reflecting a high level of imprecision in the estimates. This has particular relevance to the relatively low harvests of the species in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Atlantic as well as to the harvest estimates by wave.

The annual trend of recreational harvest of dolphin in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic was not uniform across fishing modes during 2008-2012 (**Table 3-3-6**). Charter boat harvests fell in 2009, rose in 2010, and fell in 2011 and 2012. Harvests by headboats and private/rental modes, on the other hand, went the opposite way, except in 2012 when private/rental mode harvests fell with charter boat harvests. The private/rental mode was the dominant sector in the harvest of dolphin, followed by charter boats and headboats, which were way behind of the former two fishing modes. There were no reported harvests of dolphin by the shore mode.

Harvest trend for dolphin also differed across the four South Atlantic states and across the three regions in the Atlantic (**Table 3-3-6**). Harvests in Florida decreased in 2009 and 2010 but increased in the subsequent two years; the relatively low harvests in Georgia mostly rose throughout, except in 2010; harvests in North Carolina followed a seesaw pattern; and, harvests

in South Carolina mostly rose throughout, except in 2011. Apparent in the table is the substantial harvest increase in 2009, followed by a substantial decrease in 2010, for Georgia. South Carolina also reported a substantial harvest increase in 2009 and substantial harvest decrease in 2011. Worthy of note here is that high PSEs characterize the estimates in Georgia and South Carolina. Harvests in the Mid-Atlantic increased in 2009 but consecutively decreased in the following years. The North Atlantic reported harvests of dolphin only in 2011 and 2012. The South Atlantic clearly dominated the other regions in the harvest of dolphin, and within this region, North Carolina was the dominant state, followed by Florida, South Carolina, and Georgia.

The peaks and troughs of average (2008-2012) dolphin harvests by wave were similar for all fishing modes (**Table 3-3-7**). Peaks occurred in Wave 3 for all fishing modes and troughs occurred in Wave 1 for all fishing modes. In addition, the peaks and troughs of harvests by wave were similar for all states in the South Atlantic (**Table 3-3-7**). Peaks occurred in Wave 3 and troughs occurred in Wave 1 for all states. The peaks in the Mid- and North Atlantic occurred in Wave 4, noting that the Mid-Atlantic reported dolphin harvests only in Wave 3 through Wave 5, and the North Atlantic in Wave 4 only.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average				
By Fishing Mode										
Charter	3,246,604	1,820,523	2,353,472	2,219,069	1,744,489	2,276,832				
Headboat	12,825	24,138	19,442	20,128	20,437	19,394				
Private/Rental	4,964,915	5,672,189	3,814,986	4,289,060	3,851,123	4,518,455				
TOTAL	8,224,344	7,516,851	6,187,899	6,528,257	5,616,049	6,814,680				
By State/Region										
Florida East	4,553,132	2,503,705	1,685,442	2,638,967	2,653,128	2,806,875				
Georgia	856	128,226	127	909	3,265	26,676				
N. Carolina	3,349,185	3,848,165	3,276,882	3,492,208	2,280,333	3,249,355				
S. Carolina	66,384	501,764	881,065	40,465	549,852	407,906				
Mid-Atlantic	254,788	534,992	344,383	309,338	113,409	311,382				
North Atl.	0	0	0	46,370	16,064	12,487				
TOTAL	8,224,344	7,516,851	6,187,899	6,528,257	5,616,049	6,814,680				

**Table 3-3-6**. Harvests of dolphin in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, 2008-2012.Harvests are in pounds whole weight.

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: The Headboat Survey, NMFS, SEFSC, Beaufort Lab; SEFSC ACL database, NMFS, SERO.

Table 3-3-7. Average (2008-2012) harvests of dolphin in the South Atlantic, Mid	I-Atlantic, and North
Atlantic, by wave. Harvests are in pounds whole weight.	

		1	U								
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6					
By Fishing Mode											
Charter	14,843	84,848	1,244,581	757,478	141,365	33,717					
Headboat	1,224	2,645	7,049	3,905	2,056	2,515					
Private/Rental	124,719	600,172	1,909,594	1,056,867	479,382	347,721					
TOTAL	140,786	687,664	3,161,224	1,818,250	622,803	383,953					
By State/Region											
Florida East	138,973	450,721	1,022,669	419,461	417,659	357,392					
Georgia	0	667	25,890	65	17	37					
N. Carolina	1,812	72,167	1,892,917	1,082,466	173,487	26,506					
S. Carolina	0	164,110	201,070	36,660	6,048	18					
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	18,679	267,112	25,592	0					
North Atl.	0	0	0	12,487	0	0					
TOTAL	140,786	687,664	3,161,224	1,818,250	622,803	383,953					

Wave 1: Jan-Feb; Wave 2: Mar-Apr; Wave 3: May-Jun; Wave 4: Jul-Aug; Wave 5: Sep-Oct; Wave 6: Nov-Dec

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: The Headboat Survey, NMFS, SEFSC, Beaufort Lab; SEFSC ACL database, NMFS, SERO.

### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

Harvest trends for wahoo were closely uniform across fishing modes (**Table 3-3-8**). Harvests generally rose throughout the period, falling only in 2010 for the charter and private/rental modes and in 2011 for headboats. Peak harvests occurred in 2012 for the charter and private/rental fishing modes, whereas for headboats peak harvests occurred in 2010. On average, the private/rental mode dominated all other fishing modes, followed by charter boats and headboats.

Harvest trends for wahoo varied mostly across states in the South Atlantic and across regions (**Table 3-3-8**). Harvests in Florida and North Carolina followed similar pattern—they increased in 2009, fell in 2010 and increased in the next two years. Georgia reported harvests only in 2009 and 2010. Harvests in South Carolina rose in 2009 and 2010, fell in 2011, and rose again in 2012. Again, high PSEs characterized harvests in Georgia and South Carolina. Wahoo harvests in the Mid-Atlantic fell in 2009 and 2010 but rose in the next two years. North Atlantic reported no harvests of wahoo in 2008-2012. Within the South Atlantic region, North Carolina was the dominant state in the harvest of wahoo, followed by Florida, South Carolina, and Georgia.

On average, peak harvests occurred in Wave 5 for charter boats, Wave 4 for headboats, and Wave 2 for the private/rental mode (**Table 3-3-9**). The troughs occurred in Wave 1 for all fishing modes. For all fishing modes combined, Wave 4 registered the highest harvests. Peak harvests occurred in Wave 6 for Florida, Wave 2 for Georgia and South Carolina, and Wave 5 for North Carolina. Georgia recorded harvest only in Wave 2. Harvest troughs occurred in Wave 1 for all states, except Florida whose trough occurred in Wave 3. The Mid-Atlantic region reported harvests only in Wave 4 and Wave 5, whereas the North Atlantic did not report any harvest of wahoo.

**Table 3-3-8**. Harvests of wahoo in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, 2008-2012. Harvests are in pounds whole weight.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average					
By Fishing Mode											
Charter	206,539	208,835	200,407	254,215	546,716	283,342					
Headboat	2,767	3,369	4,606	1,633	3,844	3,244					
Private/Rental	457,069	583,845	391,958	444,273	880,745	551,578					
TOTAL	666,375	796,050	596,970	700,120	1,431,306	838,164					
By State/Region											
Florida East	317,036	336,227	136,115	179,647	334,854	260,776					
Georgia	0	578	41,556	0	0	8,427					
N. Carolina	311,867	410,789	375,580	449,513	759,574	461,465					
S. Carolina	734	25,839	32,907	202	250,655	62,067					
Mid-Atlantic	36,739	22,616	10,813	70,758	86,223	45,430					
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0					
TOTAL	666,375	796,050	596,970	700,120	1,431,306	838,164					

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: The Headboat Survey, NMFS, SEFSC, Beaufort Lab; SEFSC ACL database, NMFS, SERO.

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6
By Fishing Mode			·	•		·
Charter	3,151	16,764	32,661	99,536	115,101	16,129
Headboat	242	490	620	1,189	456	247
Private/Rental	42,752	149,314	43,975	130,375	105,175	79,987
TOTAL	46,145	166,568	77,256	231,100	220,731	96,364
By State/Region						
Florida East	41,590	41,624	22,753	46,374	32,089	76,346
Georgia	0	8,427	0	0	0	0
N. Carolina	4,556	60,290	53,433	155,586	167,588	20,012
S. Carolina	0	56,228	1,070	3,896	868	5
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	0	25,243	20,186	0
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	46,145	166,568	77,256	231,100	220,731	96,364

**Table 3-3-9.** Average (2008-2012) harvest of wahoo in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave. Harvests are in pounds whole weight.

Wave 1: Jan-Feb; Wave 2: Mar-Apr; Wave 3: May-Jun; Wave 4: Jul-Aug; Wave 5: Sep-Oct; Wave 6: Nov-Dec

2012 data are preliminary

Source: The Headboat Survey, NMFS, SEFSC, Beaufort Lab; SEFSC ACL database, NMFS, SERO.

### 3.3.2.2 Effort

Recreational effort can be characterized in terms of the number of trips as follows:

Target effort - The number of individual angler trips, regardless of trip duration, where the intercepted angler indicated that the species was targeted as either the first or the second primary target for the trip. The species did not have to be caught.

Catch effort - The number of individual angler trips, regardless of trip duration and target intent, where the individual species was caught. The fish caught did not have to be kept. All recreational trips - The total estimated number of recreational trips taken, regardless of target intent or catch success.

Estimates of target and catch effort for dolphin are presented in **Table 3-3-10** through **Table 3-3-11** and those for wahoo are presented in **Table 3-3-12** through **Table 3-3-13**. Clearly apparent in these tables is the substantial difference between target and catch trips, with target trips being higher than catch trips. This is very much unlike the case with most snapper grouper species when target trips generally are substantially lower than catch trips. Dolphin and wahoo are in a sense highly targeted species but many target trips are unsuccessful in harvesting the species. The shore mode recorded very few target and catch trips for dolphin and none for wahoo. As with recreational harvests of dolphin and wahoo, target and catch trips for these species were characterized with relative high PSEs, especially in fishing modes, states/regions, and waves with low target or catch trips.

The annual variation in dolphin target trips matched well with the annual variation in catch trips for charter boats but not quite well for the private/rental mode (**Table 3-3-10**). For charter boats, target and catch trips decreased in 2009, rose in 2010, and fell in the next two years. For the private/rental mode, changes in target and catch trips matched in 2009 and 2010 but not in 2011 and 2012. The private/rental mode was by far the dominant fishing mode in both target and catch trips.

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

In the South Atlantic region, the variation in target trips did not match well with the variation in catch trips across states, except for Florida where negative and positive changes in target trips matched exactly with the corresponding changes in catch trips (**Table 3-3-11**). In the other states, negative changes in target trips occurred with positive changes in catch trips in most years. Georgia recorded no target trips but had some catch trips. For both target and catch trips, Florida, by far, dominated all other states, followed by North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. In the Mid-Atlantic, target trips rose in 2009 and 2010 but fell in the next two years, whereas catch trips followed a seesaw pattern.

Peaks for both target and catch trips occurred in Wave 3 for charter boats and the private/rental

mode (**Table 3-3-12**). The troughs for both target and catch trips occurred in Wave 1 for charter boats and the private/rental mode. The shore mode recorded target trips in Waves 2, 4, and 6 and catch trips in Waves 3 and 5.

The timing of the peaks and troughs for target and catch trips were similar for all states in the South Atlantic (**Table 3-3-13**). Peaks occurred in Wave 3 and troughs in Wave 1 for all states. Georgia reported catch trips in some waves that did not have target trips. The peak for both target and catch trips in the Mid-Atlantic region occurred in Wave 4, noting that this region recorded target trips in Waves 3 through 6 and catch trips in Waves 3 through 5. The North Atlantic region had a record of catch trips in Wave 4 but no record of target trips in any wave.

**Table 3-3-10**. Target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by fishing mode, 2008-2012.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average				
Target Trips										
Shore	2,467	0	10,536	0	0	2,601				
Charter	42,037	25,985	38,176	37,816	20,571	32,917				
Private	790,157	859,161	596,645	654,861	639,253	708,015				
TOTAL	834,661	885,146	645,357	692,677	659,824	743,533				
Catch Trips										
Shore	0	0	642	0	1,593	447				
Charter	36,493	28,027	37,511	27,515	24,245	30,758				
Private	259,235	294,114	258,817	251,690	254,810	263,733				
TOTAL	295,728	322,141	296,970	279,205	280,648	294,938				

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average				
Target Trips										
Florida East	740,609	717,476	501,830	600,660	568,069	625,729				
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0				
N. Carolina	63,754	128,202	100,145	69,607	54,696	83,281				
S. Carolina	17,285	15,492	17,111	6,104	33,201	17,839				
Mid-Atlantic	13,012	23,976	26,270	12,750	1,618	15,525				
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Catch Trips										
Florida East	236,983	198,828	197,218	205,689	199,802	207,704				
Georgia	1,208	902	5	31	65	442				
N. Carolina	43,530	84,130	60,589	43,832	42,206	54,857				
S. Carolina	3,624	10,635	14,943	1,769	25,665	11,327				
Mid-Atlantic	10,384	27,642	24,215	26,108	11,450	19,960				
North Atl.	0	0	0	1,774	1,462	647				
0010 1										

**Table 3-3-11**. Target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic (by state), Mid-Atlantic, and NorthAtlantic, 2008-2012.

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

**Table 3-3-12**. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave and fishing mode.

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6				
Target Trips										
Shore	0	1,655	0	493	0	452				
Charter	1,341	4,660	15,705	7,934	1,400	1,876				
Private	43,890	118,392	236,587	161,895	75,638	71,614				
TOTAL	45,231	124,707	252,292	170,322	77,039	73,942				
Catch Trips										
Shore	0	0	319	0	128	0				
Charter	1,027	2,709	12,873	10,385	2,600	1,164				
Private	13,530	42,222	100,613	60,310	26,122	20,936				
TOTAL	14,558	44,931	113,805	70,695	28,850	22,100				

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6				
Target Trips										
Florida East	45,052	116,488	167,196	123,876	71,144	72,036				
Georgia	0	0	0	146	565	0				
N. Carolina	179	4,187	38,324	30,088	3,598	605				
S. Carolina	0	4,032	5,965	4,325	171	0				
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	777	11,564	1,560	1,301				
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Catch Trips	•	·	·	<u>.</u>		<u>.</u>				
Florida East	14,471	38,574	76,588	32,238	24,251	21,582				
Georgia	0	21	413	2	1	5				
N. Carolina	86	2,943	29,816	18,176	3,323	513				
S. Carolina	0	3,393	6,238	1,437	260	0				
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	751	18,195	1,014	0				
North Atl.	0	0	0	647	0	0				

**Table 3-3-13**. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for dolphin in the South Atlantic (by state), Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave.

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

The annual variation in target trips for wahoo did not quite match with the annual variation in target trips across fishing modes during 2008-2012 (**Table 3-3-14**). For charter boats, target trips increased throughout except in 2012 whereas catch trips were down in 2009 and 2010 and rose in the two subsequent years. For the private/rental mode, changes in target trips matched well with changes in catch trips in 2010 and 2012, but the exact opposite occurred in the other years. The private/rental mode was the dominant fishing mode in both target and catch trips, with its target trips being substantially higher than those of charter boats are.

The variation in target trips for wahoo also did not match well with the variation in catch trips across states in the South Atlantic (**Table 3-3-15**). In Florida, changes in target trips matched exactly with change in catch trips in 2010 and 2011, but the exact opposite occurred in the other years. In North Carolina, positive and negative changes in target trips matched exactly with the corresponding changes in catch trips. In South Carolina, changes in target trips followed a seesaw pattern, but changes in catch trips were all positive, except in 2011. Florida dominated in terms of target trips, followed by North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. On the other hand, North Carolina dominated all other states in terms of catch trips, followed by Florida, South Carolina, and Georgia. Target trips in the Mid-Atlantic region followed a seesaw pattern, whereas catch trips fell in 2009 and 2010 and rose in the next two years. The North Atlantic region did not record any target or catch trips for wahoo.

The timing of peaks and troughs for target and catch trips varied from one another and across fishing modes (**Table 3-3-16**). Peaks for charter boats occurred in Wave 3 for target trips and Wave 1 for catch trips; peaks for the private/rental mode occurred in Wave 4 for target trips and Wave 5 for catch trips. For charter boats, the troughs occurred in Wave 1 for target trips and Wave 3 for catch trips; for the private/rental mode, the troughs occurred in Wave 3 for target trips and Wave 4 for catch trips. As noted before, there were no recorded target or catch trips for the shore mode.

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

While the timing of the peaks and troughs for target and catch trips across states in the South Atlantic varied, there were some apparent similarities (**Table 3-3-17**). For North Carolina, the peaks for both target and catch trips occurred in Wave 4, and for South Carolina the peaks for both target and catch trips occurred in Wave 2.

In addition, the troughs for both target and catch trips occurred in Wave 3 for Florida and in Wave 1 for South Carolina. The Mid-Atlantic region recorded target trips only in Waves 4 and 5 and catch trips only in Wave 4. As noted earlier, there were no recorded target or catch trips for wahoo in the North Atlantic region.

**Table 3-3-14**. Target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by fishing mode, 2008-2012.

2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average
0	0	0	0	0	0
4,973	5,354	9,262	9,414	5,676	6,936
124,844	100,880	92,818	128,104	139,071	117,143
129,817	106,234	102,080	137,518	144,747	124,079
0	0	0	0	0	0
9,091	5,936	4,920	5,998	8,727	6,934
18,251	22,826	13,192	10,870	26,186	18,265
27,342	28,762	18,112	16,868	34,913	25,199
	2008 0 4,973 124,844 129,817 0 9,091 18,251 27,342	2008         2009           0         0           4,973         5,354           124,844         100,880           129,817         106,234           0         0           9,091         5,936           18,251         22,826           27,342         28,762	2008         2009         2010           0         0         0         0           4,973         5,354         9,262           124,844         100,880         92,818           129,817         106,234         102,080           0         0         0           9,091         5,936         4,920           18,251         22,826         13,192           27,342         28,762         18,112	2008         2009         2010         2011           0         0         0         0         0           4,973         5,354         9,262         9,414           124,844         100,880         92,818         128,104           129,817         106,234         102,080         137,518           0         0         0         0           9,091         5,936         4,920         5,998           18,251         22,826         13,192         10,870           27,342         28,762         18,112         16,868	2008         2009         2010         2011         2012           0         0         0         0         0         0           4,973         5,354         9,262         9,414         5,676           124,844         100,880         92,818         128,104         139,071           129,817         106,234         102,080         137,518         144,747           0         0         0         0         0           9,091         5,936         4,920         5,998         8,727           18,251         22,826         13,192         10,870         26,186           27,342         28,762         18,112         16,868         34,913

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

**Table 3-3-15.** Target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic (by state), Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, 2008-2012.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average				
Target Trips	Target Trips									
Florida East	108,643	89,609	75,330	120,749	112,004	101,267				
Georgia	0	0	1,224	2,825	0	810				
N. Carolina	13,018	12,814	17,003	12,663	15,071	14,114				
S. Carolina	5,325	3,243	7,488	1,281	17,305	6,928				
Mid-Atlantic	2,831	566	1,036	0	368	960				
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Catch Trips										
Florida East	12,959	16,391	6,039	6,147	11,315	10,570				
Georgia	0	75	1,224	0	0	260				
N. Carolina	12,728	11,425	10,137	8,387	12,814	11,098				
S. Carolina	0	285	496	0	5,597	1,276				
Mid-Atlantic	1,652	587	108	2,334	5,189	1,974				
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0				

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

		0				
	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6
Target Trips						
Shore	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charter	238	751	2,082	1,739	1,650	475
Private	16,751	23,547	13,418	27,218	20,742	15,468
TOTAL	16,989	24,298	15,501	28,958	22,391	15,942
Catch Trips						
Shore	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charter	9,091	5,936	4,920	5,998	8,727	6,934
Private	18,251	22,826	13,192	10,870	26,186	18,265
TOTAL	27,342	28,762	18,112	16,868	34,913	25,199
2012 1	1					

**Table 3-3-16**. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic,and North Atlantic, by wave and fishing mode.

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

**Table 3-3-17**. Average (2008-2012) target and catch trips for wahoo in the South Atlantic (by state), Mid-Atlantic, and North Atlantic, by wave.

	Wave 1	Wave 2	Wave 3	Wave 4	Wave 5	Wave 6
Target Trips		-	·			
Florida East	16,399	18,424	10,882	22,951	17,418	15,193
Georgia	0	245	0	0	565	0
N. Carolina	590	1,978	2,377	4,466	4,141	562
S. Carolina	0	3,652	2,242	836	11	187
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	0	591	256	0
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0
Catch Trips		•	•			
Florida East	1,551	2,081	1,004	2,136	1,016	2,782
Georgia	0	260	0	0	0	0
N. Carolina	50	1,505	2,533	3,805	2,870	336
S. Carolina	0	1,209	15	33	18	0
Mid-Atlantic	0	0	0	1,974	0	0
North Atl.	0	0	0	0	0	0

2012 data are preliminary.

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

Similar analysis of recreational effort is not possible for the headboat sector because the headboat data are not collected at the angler level. Estimates of effort in the headboat sector are provided in terms of angler days, or the number of standardized 12-hour fishing days that account for the different half-, three-quarter-, and full-day fishing trips by headboats. **Table 3-3-** **18** displays the annual angler days by state in the South Atlantic for 2008-2012 and **Table 3-3-19** displays their average (2008-2012) monthly distribution. Confidentiality issues required combining Georgia estimates with those of Northeast Florida.

Headboat angler days (trips) varied from year to year across various states. Total headboat angler

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

trips increased in 2009, fell in the next two years, and increased in 2012 (Table 3-3-18). Southeast Florida registered the highest number of angler trips, followed by Georgia/Northeast Florida, South Carolina, and North Carolina. Florida clearly dominated all other states in terms of headboat angler days.

On average (2008-2012), overall angler days peaked in July and troughed in November

(Table 3-3-19). All states recorded peak angler trips in July, similar to the overall peak month. None of the states, however, had the same trough month as the overall angler trips. North Carolina had a trough in February, South Carolina and Georgia/Northeast Florida in January, and South Carolina in October.

Table 3-3-18.         South Atlantic headboat angler days, by state, 2008-2012.								
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	AVERA		
NC	16,982	19,468	21,071	18,457	20,766	19,349		
SC	47,287	40,919	44,951	44,645	41,003	43,761		
GA/NEFL	52,521	66,447	53,676	46,256	8,800	12,822		
SEFL	71,598	69,973	69,986	77,785	130,823	116,751		
TOTAL	188.388	196.807	189.684	187.143	201.392	192.683		

Т

Source: The Headboat Survey, NMFS, SEFSC, Beaufort Lab.

Table 3-3-19.	Average monthly	distribution of	of headboat	angler	days in	the South	Atlantic,	by state	;,
2008-2012.									

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
NC	26	12	224	1,142	2,372	3,908	4,331	3,478	1,851	1,659	321	23
SC	70	196	1,234	3,203	3,897	9,363	11,614	8,118	3,093	2,236	618	118
GA/NEFL	158	357	734	1,344	1,631	2,389	2,459	1,478	894	662	403	312
SEFL	7,927	9,732	12,911	12,934	10,985	13,239	14,868	10,035	5,385	5,141	5,662	7,930
TOTAL	8,181	10,298	15,103	18,624	18,885	28,900	33,272	23,109	11,224	9,698	7,004	8,384

Source: The Headboat Survey, NMFS, SEFSC, Beaufort Lab.

### 3.3.2.3 Permits

For-hire vessels are required to have a dolphinwahoo for-hire permit to fish for or possess dolphin or wahoo in the Atlantic EEZ. The number of vessels with for-hire dolphin-wahoo permits for 2008-2012 is provided in Table 3-3-**20**. This sector operates as an open access fishery and not all permitted vessels are necessarily active in the fishery. Some vessel

owners may have obtained open access permits as insurance for uncertainties in the fisheries in which they currently operate.

The number of for-hire permits issued for the South Atlantic dolphin-wahoo fishery increased from 1,965 permits in 2008 to 2,019 permits in 2012. Based on applications for dolphin-wahoo for-hire permits, an average of about 80 percent of for-hire permitted vessels was home-ported in the South Atlantic states, 15 percent in the Mid-

#### **DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5**

Atlantic states, 1 percent in the North Atlantic states, and the rest in the Gulf and other states. Among the South Atlantic states, Florida accounted for the greatest proportion of homeported for-hire vessels, followed by South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia. In the Mid-Atlantic (not shown in the table), Maryland had, on average, the most number of homeported for-hire vessels, followed by New Jersey, Delaware, Virginia, and New York. In the North Atlantic (not shown in the table), most of the permitted for-hire vessels were home-ported in Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The number of vessels in the Gulf and other states with for-hire dolphin-wahoo permits has remained steady over the years.

Table 3-3-20. Number of South Atlantic for-hire dolphin-wahoo vessel permits, 2008-2012.

Home Port State	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Average
Florida	1,011	1,021	1,015	1,031	1,052	1,026
Georgia	24	28	24	23	25	25
South Carolina	401	412	394	393	368	394
North Carolina	137	148	147	140	141	143
Mid-Atlantic	291	299	313	303	301	301
North Atlantic	14	19	21	21	22	19
Gulf States (AL-						
TX)	66	73	78	86	91	79
Other States	21	21	14	17	19	18
Total	1,965	2,021	2,006	2,014	2,019	2,005

Source: NMFS, SERO Permits Data Base.

For-hire permits do not distinguish charter boats from headboats. Some vessels could operate solely as charter boats, others solely as headboats, while still others could operate either as charter boats or headboats (not both at the same time) at some period during the fishing year. Based on a 1997 survey, Holland et al. (1999) estimated that a total of 1,080 charter vessels and 96 headboats supplied for-hire services in all South Atlantic fisheries during 1997. By 2013, the estimated number of headboats supplying for-hire services in all South Atlantic fisheries had fallen to 75 (K. Brennan, Beaufort Laboratory, SEFSC, personal communication, 2013).

According to the Southeast Regional Office Website, the Constituency Services Branch (Permits) unofficially listed 1,623 holders of South Atlantic for-hire dolphin-wahoo permits as of April 23, 2013. There are no specific permitting requirements for recreational anglers to harvest dolphin or wahoo in the South Atlantic. Instead, anglers are required to possess either a state recreational fishing permit that authorizes saltwater fishing in general, or be registered in the federal National Saltwater Angler Registry system, subject to appropriate exemptions.

### 3.3.2.4 Economic Values and For-Hire Vessel Financials

Participation, effort, and harvest are indicators of the value of saltwater recreational fishing. However, a more specific indicator of value is the satisfaction that anglers experience over and above their costs of fishing. The monetary value of this satisfaction is referred to as consumer surplus. The value or benefit derived from the recreational experience is dependent on several quality determinants, which include fish size,

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

catch success rate, and the number of fish kept. These variables help determine the value of a fishing trip and influence total demand for recreational fishing trips.

The NMFS Southeast Science Center (Table 7, Carter and Liese, 2012) developed estimates of consumer surplus per angler trip. These estimates were culled from various studies -Haab et al. (2009), Dumas et al. (2009), and NOAA SEFSC SSRG (2009). The values/ranges of consumer surplus estimates are (in 2009 dollars) \$112 to \$128 for red snapper, \$123 to \$128 for grouper, \$11 for other snappers, and \$80 for snapper grouper. Haab et al. (2009) also estimated consumer surplus for dolphin of two general sizes. They estimated that for one additional fish caught and kept this consumer surplus would range from \$37 to \$412 (2000 dollars) for dolphin greater than 20 inches and from \$4 to \$23 (2000 dollars) for smaller dolphin. Carter and Liese (2012) also estimated the mean willingness to pay per fish, per trip for dolphin (in 2003 dollars) of \$11.81, \$7.87, \$5.80, \$4.57, and \$3.77, respectively for the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth fish caught and kept. They also estimated declining mean willingness to pay for additional fish caught and released due to the size or bag limit.

While anglers receive economic value as measured by the consumer surplus associated with fishing, for-hire businesses receive value from the services they provide. Producer surplus is the measure of the economic value these operations receive. Producer surplus is the difference between the revenue a business receives for a good or service, such as a charter or headboat trip, and the cost the business incurs to provide that good or service. Estimates of the producer surplus associated with for-hire trips are not available. However, proxy values in the form of net operating revenues are available (Christopher Liese, NMFS SEFSC, personal communication, August 2010). These estimates were culled from several studies – Liese et al.

(2009), Dumas et al. (2009), Holland et al. (1999), and Sutton et al. (1999). Estimates of net operating revenue per angler trip (2009 dollars) on representative charter trips (average charter trip regardless of area fished) are \$146 for Louisiana through east Florida, \$135 for east Florida, \$156 for northeast Florida, and \$128 for North Carolina. For charter trips into the EEZ only, net operating revenues are \$141 in east Florida and \$148 in northeast Florida. For fullday and overnight trips only, net operating revenues are estimated to be \$155-\$160 in North Carolina. Comparable estimates are not available for Georgia, South Carolina, or Texas.

Net operating revenues per angler trip are lower for headboats than for charter boats. Net operating revenue estimates for a representative headboat trip are \$48 in the Gulf of Mexico (all states and all of Florida), and \$63-\$68 in North Carolina. For full-day and overnight headboat trips, net operating revenues are estimated to be \$74-\$77 in North Carolina. Comparable estimates are not available for Georgia and South Carolina.

A study of the North Carolina for-hire fishery provides some information on the financial status of the for-hire fishery in the state (Dumas et al., 2009). Depending on vessel length, regional location, and season, charter fees per passenger per trip ranged from \$168.14 to \$251.59 for a full-day trip and from \$93.63 to \$123.95 for a half-day trip; headboat fees ranged from \$72.50 to \$81.78 for a full-day trip and from \$38.08 to \$45 for a half-day trip. Charter boats generated a total of \$55.7 million in passenger fees, \$3.2 million in other vessel income (e.g., food and beverages), and \$4.8 million in tips. The corresponding figures for headboats were \$9.8 million in passenger fees, \$0.2 million in other vessel income, and \$0.9 million in tips. Nonlabor expenditures (e.g., boat insurance, dockage fees, bait, ice, fuel) amounted to \$43.6 million for charter boats and \$5.3 million for headboats. Summing across vessel lengths and regions.

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

charter vessels had an aggregate value (depreciated) of \$120.4 million and headboats had an aggregate value (depreciated) of \$10.2 million.

A more recent study of the for-hire sector provides estimates on gross revenues generated by the charter boats and headboats in the South Atlantic (Holland et al. 2012). Average annual revenues (2011 dollars) for charter boats are estimated to be \$126,032 for Florida vessels, \$53,443 for Georgia vessels, \$100,823 for South Carolina vessels, and \$101,959 for North Carolina vessels. For headboats, the corresponding estimates are \$209,507 for Florida vessels and \$153,848 for vessels in the other states.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

# 3.3.3 Social Environment

Descriptions of the social and cultural environment of the dolphin wahoo fishery are contained in the original Dolphin Wahoo FMP (SAFMC 2003), and the Comprehensive Annual Catch Limit Amendment (SAFMC 2011c) and are incorporated herein by reference where appropriate.



**Figure 3-1.** Dophin Value and Pounds Regional Quotient for South Atlantic Fishing Communities in 2011. (Source: SERO).

**Figure 3-1** provides a depiction of dolphin regional quotient pounds and value of landings for the top twenty South Atlantic communities with dolphin landings in 2011. A regional quotient is the amount of local landings and/or value divided by the total landings and value for the region. For this analysis, total landings for Florida Keys communities were included in the South Atlantic region as we are unable to disaggregate landings at the community level to Gulf or Atlantic at this time. Values for regional quotient of pounds and value are not reported to address confidentiality concerns. However, **Figure 3-1** still provides an indication of the proportion of dolphin that is landed by the top twenty communities. For more detailed discussions and demographic characteristics of some communities included in **Figure 3-1** see SAFMC (2003); SAFMC (2011c) or Jepson et al. (2005).

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28



Figure 3-2. Dophin Pounds Landed for Northeast Fishing Communities in 2011. (Source: NEFSC).

**Figure 3-2** depicts the communities that reported commercial landings of dolphin in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic for 2011. The actual number of pounds landed has been removed from the graph to address confidentiality concerns. New Bedford, Massachusetts is the leading port in terms of dolphin landings with Ocean City, Maryland a distant second. Several other communities follow with near comparable amounts of dolphin landed but far less than the leading community. Wahoo landings for 2011 were far less than dolphin with only three communities reporting landings: New Bedford, Massachusetts; Hatteras, North Carolina; and Cape May, New Jersey. For more detailed descriptions of some Northeast and Mid-Atlantic communities see McCay and Cieri (2000) and Hall Arber et al. (2002). More up-to-date information can also be found at http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/read/socialsci/communitySnapshots.php.

Recreational landings of dolphin are reported for the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic communities in **Figure 3-3** from charter and headboat landings. New Jersey communities are the top three in terms of number of dolphin landed from recreational fishing for-hire vessels. Numerous other communities from a variety of states have landings reported. Recreational landings of wahoo were far less than dolphin with numbers of 3 or less for all communities reporting landings. Many of the same communities in **Figure 3-3** have wahoo landings, but with so few fish, ranking them seemed unnecessary. See the references above for more detailed descriptions of recreational fishing communities listed in **Figure 3-3**.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28



Figure 3-3. Dolphin Number of Fish Landed for Northeast Fishing Communities by Charter/Headboats in 2011. (Source: NEFSC).



**Figure 3-4.** Wahoo Value and Pounds Regional Quotient for South Atlantic Fishing Communities in 2011. (Source: SERO/ALS).

Figure 3-4 provides a depiction of wahoo regional quotient pounds and value of landings for the top twenty South Atlantic communities with wahoo landings in 2011. Again, values for regional quotient of

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

pounds and value are not reported to address confidentiality concerns. Palm Beach Gardens, Florida leads in terms of value of catch landed, but Wadamalaw Island, South Carolina has the most pounds landed. Most communities with wahoo landings are in either Florida or North Carolina, with Younges Island and McCellanville the only other South Carolina communities included in the top twenty.

#### Southeast Commercial and Recreational Engagement and Reliance on Fishing

Selecting the most comprehensive set of communities from figures for regional quotient for both dolphin and wahoo, a comparison of two indices recently developed to understand overall dependence on both commercial and recreational fishing are presented below. To better capture how South Atlantic and Northeast fishing communities are engaged and reliant on fishing, indices were created using secondary data from permit and landings information for the commercial and recreational sectors (Colburn and Jepson, 2012; Jacob et al., 2012). Fishing engagement is primarily the absolute numbers of permits, landings and value. Fishing reliance has many of the same variables as engagement divided by population to give an indication of the per capita impact of this activity.

Using a principal component and single solution factor analysis each community receives a factor score for each index to compare to other communities. With the top eighteen communities from both component fisheries, factor scores of both engagement and reliance for both commercial and recreational fishing were plotted onto radar graphs. Each community's factor score is located on the axis radiating out from the center of the graph to its name. Factor scores are connected by colored lines and are standardized, therefore the mean is zero. Two thresholds of one and ½ standard deviation above the mean are plotted onto the graphs to help determine a threshold for significance. Because the factor scores are standardized a score above 1 is also above one standard deviation. A score above ½ standard deviation is considered moderately engaged or reliant, while over 1 standard deviation is considered very engaged or reliant (Census data were not available for Mayport, Florida, Younges Island, South Carolina; or Hatteras, North Carolina and therefore do not have indices developed at this time).

Using the thresholds of fishing dependence of ½ half and one standard deviation, **Figure 3-5** suggests that several communities that land dolphin in the Southeast are substantially engaged in commercial fishing. The communities of Islamorada, Key West, Marathon, Florida; Atlantic Beach, North Carolina; Beaufort, North Carolina and Wanchese, North Carolina are both engaged and reliant on commercial fishing.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28


**Figure 3-5.** Commercial Fishing Engagement and Reliance for Southeast Dolphin and Wahoo Fishing Communities.

Source: SERO Social Indicators Database.

As mentioned above, similar indices were created for recreational fishing. The communities of Islamorada Florida, Key West, Florida; Marathon, Florida; St. Augustine, Florida; Atlantic Beach, North Carolina, Morehead City, North Carolina; Nags Head; Wanchese, North Carolina; Wrightsville Beach and Murrell's Inlet are above the threshold for recreational engagement and reliance as shown in **Figure 3-6**. These communities would most likely have local economies with some dependence upon recreational fishing and its supporting businesses.

In terms of overall fishing dependence, the communities of Islamorada, Key West, Marathon, Florida Atlantic Beach, North Carolina and Wanchese, North Carolina are engaged and reliant for both commercial and recreational fishing. These communities would have an especially strong dependence upon fishing throughout their overall economy with substantial support infrastructure.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28



**Figure 3-6.** Recreational Fishing Engagement and Reliance for Southeast Dolphin and Wahoo Fishing Communities.

Source: SERO Social Indicators Database.

#### Northeast Commercial and Recreational Engagement and Reliance on Fishing

As depicted in **Figure 3-7**, for Northeast communities, Ocean City, Maryland; Belmar, New Jersey; Cape May New Jersey; Point Pleasant, New Jersey; Montauk, New York; Virginia Beach, Virginia; Watchapreague, Virginia; Boston, Massachusetts; Barnegat Light, Massachusetts; New Bedford, Massachusetts; and Point Lookout, New York are all over either the engaged or reliant threshold for commercial fishing or both.

For those communities that exceed the threshold for either the engagement or reliance indices, it would be expected that the local economy has some dependence upon commercial fishing. Where the community exceeds both thresholds a much stronger dependence upon commercial fishing should be found.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28





Source: SERO/NEFSC Social Indicators Database.

In terms of recreational fishing engagement and reliance for Northeast communities with dolphin and wahoo landings, almost every community is over the threshold for either engagement or reliance for recreational fishing as shown in **Figure 3-8**. Only four communities do not exceed either threshold: Absecon, New Jersey; Barnegat, New Jersey; Seaford, New York and Shelter Island, New York.



**Figure 3-8.** Recreational Fishing Engagement and Reliance for Northeast Dolphin and Wahoo Fishing Communities.

Source: SERO/NEFSC Social Indicators Database.

#### Environmental Justice

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 (EJ).

Commercial fishermen, recreational fishermen, and coastal communities in the South Atlantic and Northeast would be expected to be impacted by the proposed action. However, information on the race and income status for many of these individuals involved in fishing is not available. Because the proposed action could be expected to impact fishermen and community members in several states within the South Atlantic, census data have been assessed to examine whether any coastal communities have poverty or minority rates that exceed thresholds for raising EJ concerns.

The threshold for comparison used was 1.2 times the state average for the proportion of minorities and population living in poverty (EPA 1999). If the value for the community is greater than or equal to 1.2

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

times this average, then the community is considered an area of potential EJ concern. Census data from the American Community Survey for the year 2010 were used to calculate the percentages and thresholds.

			Percent Over
Community	Percent in Poverty	State threshold	threshold
Cocoa, FL	27	16.56	10.44
Fort Lauderdale, FL	18.2	16.56	1.64
Hialeah, FL	20.1	16.56	3.54
Miami, FL	27.3	16.56	10.74
St. Augustine, FL	21.1	16.56	4.54

Five communities exceed the poverty threshold and are listed in **Table -3-3-21** and all are in Florida. There were two Florida communities that exceeded the threshold for minorities: Hialeah, Florida and Miami, Florida. We do not have these same EJ threshold data for communities in the Northeast and therefore use another approach to examine similar factors that can encompass more communities. To take a closer look, a recently created database for both Northeast and Southeastern communities offers a comparable suite of measures of social vulnerabilities.

Another suite of indices created to examine the social vulnerability of coastal communities is depicted in **Figure 3-9.** The three indices are poverty, population composition and personal disruptions. The variables included in each of these indices have been identified through the literature as being important components that contribute to a community's vulnerability. Indicators such as increased poverty rates for different groups, more single female-headed households and households with children under the age of 5, disruptions such as higher separation rates, higher crime rates and unemployment all are signs of populations experiencing vulnerabilities. These vulnerabilities signify that it may be difficult for anyone living in these communities to be able to recover from social disruptions that might come from something like a significant change in their ability to work or make a decent wage that may be a result of regulatory change.

As depicted in **Figure 3-9** the communities of Cocoa, Florida; Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Hialeah, Florida; Margate, Florida; Miami, Florida; Beaufort, North Carolina; Morehead City, North Carolina; and Wanchese, North Carolina exceed the threshold of ½ standard deviation above the mean for at least one or more of the social vulnerability indices. The communities of Cocoa, Florida; Hialeah, Florida; and Miami, Florida exceed the thresholds for all three of the indicators, which correlates with the EJ thresholds above. It would be expected that these communities may exhibit vulnerabilities to social or economic disruption because of regulatory change that may have a negative social impacts dependent upon their engagement and reliance upon fishing and whether the regulatory change would have negative effects. Those communities that exhibit several index scores exceeding the threshold, especially 1 standard deviation would be the most vulnerable. This is not to say that these communities will be negatively affected, but they may be if there were to be negative impacts from the actions within this amendment, these are the communities that would be most at risk depending upon their fishing engagement and reliance. Wanchese, North Carolina is engaged and reliant on both commercial and

recreational fishing, while Morehead City, North Carolina is highly engaged and reliant on recreational fishing.





Communities in the Northeast that exhibit social vulnerabilities are depicted in **Figure 3-10**. Three communities exceed the thresholds for all three indices: New London, Connecticut; Boston, Massachusetts and New Bedford, Massachusetts. While Boston, Massachusetts is highly engaged in commercial fishing, neither it nor New London, Connecticut, is reliant on commercial fishing. New Bedford, Massachusetts on the other hand is both reliant on and engaged in commercial fishing and may be susceptible to negative effects from regulatory change.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28



Figure 3-10. Social Vulnerability Indices for Northeast Dolphin and Wahoo Fishing Communities. Source: SERO/NEFSC Social Indicators Database.

Although we have information concerning a community's overall status with regard to minorities, poverty and social vulnerability indices, we do not have such information for fishermen individually. Therefore, we can only place our fishing activity within the community as a proxy for understanding the role that these social vulnerabilities may have in gauging how those affected by regulatory change may respond. While subsistence fishing is also an activity that can be affected by regulatory change, we have very little, if any, data on this activity at this time. We assume that the effects to other sectors will be similar to those that affect subsistence fishermen who may rely on dolphin and wahoo. Because dolphin and wahoo are pelagic and likely would require a vessel to fish, there may be few if any subsistence fishermen who rely on this species.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

#### 3.4 Administrative Environment

### 3.4.1 The Fishery Management Process and Applicable Laws

#### 3.4.1.1 Federal Fishery Management

Federal fishery management is conducted under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), originally enacted in 1976 as the Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The Magnuson-Stevens Act claims sovereign rights and exclusive fishery management authority over most fishery resources within the EEZ, an area extending 200 nm 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 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 Magnuson-Stevens Act and with other applicable laws. In most cases, the Secretary has delegated this authority to NMFS.

The South Atlantic 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. These waters extend from 3 to 200 mi offshore from the seaward boundary 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 South Atlantic 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. On the South Atlantic Council, 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, State Department, and Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). The South Atlantic Council has adopted procedures whereby the non-voting members serving on the South Atlantic Council Committees have full voting rights at the Committee level but not at the full South Atlantic Council level. South Atlantic 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 for discussing personnel matters, are open to the public. The South Atlantic Council uses its Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) 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 Procedure Act, in the form of "notice and comment" rulemaking.

#### SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

#### 3.4.1.2 State Fishery Management

The state governments of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida have the authority to manage fisheries that occur in waters extending three nautical miles from their respective shorelines. The Department of Marine Fisheries is responsible for marine fisheries in Maine's state waters. In New Hampshire, marine fisheries are managed by the Marine Fisheries Division of the New Hampshire Fish and Game Department. Massachusetts's marine fisheries are managed by the Division of Marine Fisheries of the Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game. Rhode Island's marine fisheries are managed by the Division of Fish and Wildlife of Rhode Island's Department of Environmental Management. Connecticut manages its marine fisheries through the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. New York's marine fisheries are managed by the Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources of the Department of Environmental Conservation. New Jersey manages its marine fisheries through the Division of Fish and Wildlife of the Department of Environmental Protection. Pennsylvania manages its fisheries through the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission. Marine fisheries in Delaware are managed by the Fisheries Section of the Division of Fish and Wildlife. Maryland's Department of Natural Resources manages its marine fisheries. Marine fisheries in Virginia are managed by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission. North Carolina's marine fisheries are managed by the Marine Fisheries Division of the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 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 South Atlantic 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 Atlantic States are also involved through the ASMFC in management of marine fisheries. 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 is also represented at the South Atlantic Council level, but does not have voting authority at the South Atlantic Council level.

NMFS' State-Federal Fisheries Division is responsible for building cooperative partnerships to strengthen marine fisheries management and conservation at the state, interregional, 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.

#### 3.4.1.3 Enforcement

Both the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Office for

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

Law Enforcement (NOAA/OLE) and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) have the authority and the responsibility to enforce South Atlantic 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.

The NOAA Office of General Counsel Penalty Policy and Penalty Schedules can be found at www.gc.noaa.gov/enforce-office3.html.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

### **Chapter 4.** Environmental Consequences and **Comparison of Alternatives**

#### Action 1. Revise acceptable biological catches (ABCs), annual catch 4.1 limits (ACL), and annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and Alternatives<sup>1</sup> wahoo. (preferred alternatives in red)

#### **Two Alternatives Considered**

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) acknowledges there are two alternatives for this action. Section 1502.14(a) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 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 South Atlantic Fishery Management (South Atlantic Council). Alternative 2 represents the accepted formula used for specifying ACLs for the majority of assessed species that are not overfished nor undergoing overfishing.

The two alternatives in this action do not change the methodology used in the Comprehensive Annual Catch Limit (ACL) Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) which set ACL equal to the acceptable biological catch (ABC) and optimum yield (OY); and specified recreational ACTs for dolphin, wahoo, numerous snapper grouper species. The same methodology was used in Amendment 24 to the Snapper Grouper FMP (Amendment 24;

1. No action. Do not modify the ABCs, ACLs or ACTs for dolphin and wahoo. Dolphin: ABC =  $14,596,216^2$  lbs ww Commercial ACL = 1,065,524 lbs ww Recreational ACL = 13,530,692 lbs ww Recreational ACT = 11,595,803 lbs ww Wahoo: ABC = 1,491,785 lbs ww

Commercial ACL = 64,147 lbs ww Recreational ACL = 1,427,638 lbs ww Recreational ACT = 1,164,953 lbs ww

- 2. Revise ABCs, ACLs and ACTs for dolphin and wahoo to reflect data from MRIP and other data updates. Dolphin: ABC = 15,344,846 lbs ww Commercial ACL = 1,157,612 lbs ww
  - Recreational ACL = 14,187,234 lbs ww Recreational ACT = 12,749,594 lbs ww Wahoo: ABC = 1,794,960 lbs ww Commercial ACL = 70,550 lbs ww
  - Recreational ACL = 1,724,409 lbs ww Recreational ACT = 1.258.819 lbs ww

<sup>1</sup>See Chapter 2 for a more detailed description of the alternatives. <sup>2</sup>Pounds are in whole weight.

SAFMC 2011e), and the recently approved Regulatory Amendment 13 to the Snapper Grouper FMP (Regulatory Amendment 13; SAFMC 2013).

The South Atlantic Council and NMFS are not considering options beyond the two alternatives listed because: (1) setting ACL=ABC=OY was the preferred alternative in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, Amendment 24, and Regulatory Amendment 13; (2) monitoring efforts have improved significantly within the past year, which has reduced the likelihood that the commercial ACLs for dolphin and wahoo would be exceeded and overfishing would occur; (3) the South Atlantic Council has approved an amendment that, if

**DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5** 

implemented, would require dealers to report landings electronically once a week; and (4) recreational landings have remained well below the recreational dolphin and wahoo ACLs since they were implemented through the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b). Therefore, the South Atlantic Council and NMFS determined it is not reasonable to include additional alternatives that incorporate a buffer between the ABC and ACL.

#### 4.1.1 Biological Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would retain the ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs that were analyzed and implemented by the final rule for the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b). ABCs were initially established for dolphin and wahoo in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b). The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) followed the South Atlantic Council Scientific and Statistical Committee's (SSC) recommendations for the specification of ABCs based on the South Atlantic Council's approved ABC control rule. The ABC control rule involves a systematic inspection of all sources of uncertainty, including variables such as susceptibility, vulnerability, bycatch, and discard information.

The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) set the ACL equal to the ABC and OY. To specify sector specific ACLs for dolphin and wahoo, the ABC was allocated between the recreational and commercial based on landings information from 1999-2008 and 2006-2008; thereby, combining past and present participation. The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) also established recreational annual catch targets (ACTs) for dolphin and wahoo. The ACTs adjust the ACLs by 50% or by one minus the proportional standard error (PSE) from the Marine Recreational Statistical Survey (MRFSS), whichever is greater, to be the recreational ACT. The South Atlantic Council chose to use the average PSE (14.3) from 2007-2009 for dolphin and average PSE (18.4) from 2005-2009 for wahoo because these years better represented catches for the two species. The South Atlantic Council concluded including the PSE for the catch estimates into a formula to establish ACT adds a buffer to account for variability in landings data, and management uncertainty. For the commercial sector of dolphin and wahoo, the South Atlantic Council concluded that quota monitoring and AMs specified in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) were sufficient to account for management uncertainty. Therefore, the South Atlantic Council did not establish commercial ACTs for dolphin and wahoo.

Alternative 2 would update ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs using the data described in Section 1-5 of Amendment 5 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic (Dolphin Wahoo Amendment 5). These are the based on the best available data, as they include Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP), which replaced MRFSS and updated commercial data (Table 2-2).

Due to the absence of stock assessments for dolphin and wahoo, it is unknown whether dolphin and wahoo are overfished or undergoing overfishing. Prager (2000) conducted an exploratory assessment of dolphin, but the results were not conclusive. A Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) stock assessment for dolphin and wahoo is scheduled for 2015. The biological effects of the new ABC values from **Alternative 2** would be negligible compared to **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) for dolphin and wahoo. The new ABC for dolphin would increase from 14,596,216 lbs ww to 15,344,846 lbs ww (**Tables 2-1** and **2-2**), which translates to a 2.5% increase (748,630 lbs ww) in ABC. Similarly, the new ABC for wahoo

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

would increase from 1,491,785 lbs ww to 1,794,960 lbs ww (**Tables 2-1** and **2-2**), which translates to a 9.2% increase (303,175 lbs ww) in ABC. Life-history characteristics of dolphin and wahoo such as rapid growth rates, early maturity, batch spawning over an extended season, a short life span, and a varied diet can probably help sustain fishing pressures on these species (Schwenke and Buckel 2008; McBride et al., 2008; Prager 2000; and Oxenford 1999). Dolphin and wahoo are currently listed as species of "least concern" under the International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List, i.e. species that have a low risk of extinction.

Inclusion of data from MRFSS and updated commercial data have little effect on changes in the allocations of dolphin and wahoo. Biological effects of allocations are qualitative in nature; overall fishing mortality and its consequences to a certain stock determines the health of that stock. Amendment 5 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP would not change the methodology used in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b) to allocate the ACLs to commercial and recreational sectors for dolphin and wahoo. However, changes in data used to determine allocations would result in modifications to ACLs allocated to the commercial and recreational sectors. As shown in **Tables 2-1** and **2-2**, percent differences for dolphin would increase from 7.3% to 7.5% for the commercial sectors. Percent differences for wahoo would decrease from 4.3% to 3.9% for the commercial sector; and an increase from 95.7% to 96.1% (**Tables 2-1** and **2-2**), again, a very small change (0.4%) in the magnitude of the allocations.

Similar to the ABCs, the revised ACLs under Alternative 2 would have negligible biological effects when compared with Alternative 1 (No Action). The ACL for the commercial sector for dolphin would increase by 92,088 lbs ww, from 1,065,524 lbs ww to 1,157,612 lbs ww (Tables 2-1 and 2-2). Similarly, the ACL for the recreational sector for dolphin would increase by 656,542 lbs ww, from 13,530,692 lbs ww to 14,187,234 lbs ww (Tables 2-1 and 2-2). The ACL for the commercial sector for wahoo would increase by 6,403 lbs ww, from 64,147 lbs ww to 70,550 lbs ww (Tables 2-1 and 2-2); and, the ACL for the recreational sector for wahoo would increase by 296,771 lbs ww, from 1,427,638 lbs ww to 1,724,409 lbs ww (Tables 2-1 and 2-2).

Recreational ACTs would increase for dolphin and wahoo under **Alternative 2** in Amendment 5 (**Tables 2-1** and **2-2**). For dolphin, the recreational ACT would increase by 1,153,791 lbs ww, from 11,595,803 lbs ww to 12,749,594 lbs ww; and for wahoo, the recreational ACT would increase by 93,866 lbs ww, from 1,164,953 lbs ww to 1,258,819 lbs ww. The current ACTs implemented by the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (2011b) function as a performance standard, and do not trigger an AM. If an evaluation concludes that the ACT and ACL are being chronically exceeded for a species, and post-season AMs are repeatedly needed to correct for ACL overages, adjustments to management measures would be made. Furthermore, alternatives in **Action 2** of this amendment would modify the AMs for dolphin and wahoo, potentially providing additional protection in the event the ACLs are exceeded for these two species. Therefore, the biological benefits of **Alternative 2** would be negligible.

Although negligible, greater biological benefits are expected under **Alternative 2** as opposed to **Alternative 1** (**No Action**), because it is based on the best available data. While the percent differences in the revised ABCs and ACLs in Amendment 5 may be relatively small from the status quo levels, the data revealed by the new and updated methodology more accurately represent the fishing effort for these species, and would be more likely to trigger AMs when needed. In contrast, **Alternative 1** (**No Action**)

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

could either result in triggering an AM when it is not needed, or not triggering an AM when it is needed. Therefore, both direct and indirect biological effects to the fishery resource could be expected.

There is likely to be no additional biological benefit to protected species from either Alternative 1 (No Action) or Alternative 2. Alternative 1 would perpetuate the existing level of risk for interactions between Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species and the fishery. Previous ESA consultations determined the dolphin wahoo fishery was not likely to adversely affect marine mammals, smalltooth sawfish, Atlantic sturgeon, or *Acropora* species (See Appendix C for discussion of most recent ESA Section 7 consultations). The impacts from Alternative 2 on sea turtles are unclear. If these ABCs, ACLs, and ACTs perpetuate the existing amount of fishing effort, they are unlikely to change the level of interaction between sea turtles and the fishery as a whole. This scenario is likely to provide little additional biological benefits to protected species, if any. However, if these alternatives cause reductions in the overall amount of effort in the fishery, and do not simply shift effort elsewhere, the risk of interaction between sea turtles and the fishery may decrease.

#### 4.1.2 Economic Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not revise the ABCs, ACLs (including sector ACLs), and ACTs that were established in 2012 for dolphin and wahoo, despite more recent improvements in landings data. Thus, the status quo alternative would retain biological standards (and management measures) that are no longer based on the best available data. In the long run, Alternative 1 (No Action) could yield smaller net economic benefits than Alternative 2 because the former is not based on the best available data.

Alternative 2 would use MRIP and more recent commercial data to revise the ABCs, ACLs (including sector ACLs), and ACTs for dolphin and wahoo. These revisions, especially the revised ACLs, could affect annual commercial and/or recreational landings of these species and the net economic benefits that derive from these landings.

Table 2-2 indicates that Alternative 2 would allow for increased harvest of both dolphin and wahoo for both the commercial and recreation sectors over what would be allowed by Alternative 1 (No Action).

**Table 4-1** shows the commercial and recreational landings of dolphin and wahoo from 2008 through the 2012 fishing seasons. Had either alternative been in place during this entire time series, the commercial dolphin fishery, left unconstrained as it was in 2009, would have exceeded either ACL. The recreational ACL would not have exceeded its dolphin ACL under either alternative in any year of the time series. The commercial sector of the wahoo fishery did not exceed its ACL under either alternative in the time series. However, in 2012, the commercial sector for wahoo closed in December to keep from going over the ACL. In 2012, the recreational sector of the wahoo fishery came very close to meeting its ACL. On average, neither dolphin nor wahoo fishery would have exceeded their respective sector ACLs under either **Alternative 1 (No Action)** or **Alternative 2**.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

Table 4-1.	Commercial	and red	creational	landings	of dolphin	and wa	ahoo for	2008 -	2012,	along with
percent of t	otal landings	of dolp	ohin for th	e comme	rcial sector	r.				

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012*	Average
Dolphin						
Commercial	780,818	1,221,914	704,922	912,172	408,654	805,696
Recreational	8,224,344	7,516,851	6,187,899	6,528,256	5,595,613	6,810,593
% Comm.	9%	14%	10%	12%	7%	10%
Wahoo						
Commercial	40,525	45,056	43,275	63,428	64,117	51,280
Recreational	666,375	796,050	596,970	700,120	1,427,462	837,395

Data Source: NMFS SERO

\* Data for 2012 are preliminary and were downloaded from

<u>sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable\_fisheries/acl\_monitoring/commercial\_sa/historical/index.html</u>, and <u>sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable\_fisheries/acl\_monitoring/recreational\_sa/index.html</u> (Accessed on March 15, 2013). They will be updated with the verified numbers after June 2013.

Given the changeable nature of the commercial and recreational sector landings for dolphin and wahoo, neither alternative is likely to have a significant economic effect based on the last five fishing seasons. However, **Alternative 2**, with its higher overall sector ACLs, provides the greatest protection against exceeding ACLs in the future. Therefore, **Alternative 2** has the potential for greater positive economic effect for fishermen than does **Alternative 1** (No Action).

#### 4.1.3 Social Effects

The social effects of potential changes in the ACLs for dolphin and wahoo (Alternative 2) are expected to occur in the short and long term, and are closely associated with biological and economic impacts of these actions. Overall, adjustments in ACLs based on improved information (Alternative 2) would be beneficial to the species and would likely produce long-term benefits to the fishermen, coastal communities, and fishing businesses by contributing to sustainable harvest of these fish in the present and future.

Incorporation of the best available data into the ABC/ACL calculations (**Alternative 2**) is expected to more accurately estimate recreational and commercial landings and better reflect actual fishing behavior than not updating catch limits under **Alternative 1** (No Action) because MRFSS landing estimates will no longer be calculated. Future recreational landings would be estimated using MRIP. **Alternative 2** would result in future MRIP estimates being compared to ACLs determined using previous MRIP estimates. Although the proposed updated ACLs are considered to be based on the best available information, the proposed changes may not prevent AMs from being triggered or minimize impacts but the proposed changes under **Alternative 2** would still be expected to improve management of the dolphin and wahoo fishery and possibly minimize negative social impacts on AMs more than under **Alternative 1** (No Action). Some impacts may not occur immediately but could be expected in the future. This is particularly significant for the recreational sector of the dolphin and wahoo fishery because ACLs (of any level) may constrain growth in recreational effort, which is tied to the increasing pattern of coastal population growth, and national population growth in general. Therefore, even if recent recreational catch of a particular species does not meet or even come close to the adjusted recreational ACLs for dolphin and

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

wahoo under **Alternative 2**, there may still be future impacts on private recreational anglers because there will a limited number of fish available to a continually increasing number of people.

#### 4.1.4 Administrative Effects

The mechanisms for monitoring and documentation of ABCs, ACLs, ACTs, and AMs are already in place through implementation of the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011b), Amendment 17A to the Snapper Grouper FMP (SAFMC 2010), and Amendment 17B to the Snapper Grouper (SAFMC 2010), and reflects **Alternative 1** (**No Action**). The administrative impacts of **Alternative 2** would be similar to **Alternative 1** (**No Action**). Other administrative burdens that may result from revising the values under **Alternative 2** would take the form of development and dissemination of outreach and education materials for fishery participants and law enforcement.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

## 4.2 Action 2. Revise the accountability measures (AMs) for dolphin and wahoo.

#### 4.2.1 Biological Effects

Commercial and recreational landings for dolphin and wahoo show increasing trend in harvest during 2008-2012 (**Table 4-1**). In 2009, before ACLs were implemented, commercial landings for dolphin exceeded the current ACL; and in 2012, the commercial harvest of wahoo closed two weeks before the end the fishing season because the ACL was met (**Table 4-1**). Recreational ACLs for dolphin and wahoo have not come close to being met.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 address the commercial sector. Current AMs for the commercial sector prohibit harvest and retention of dolphin or wahoo if their ACLs are met or are projected to be met. Under Alternatives 2-4, the in-season closure of the species would remain in place; however, the alternatives would provide additional protection to the stocks.

The biological benefits of **Alternative 2** would be greater than **Alternative 1** because in addition to an in-season closure if the commercial ACL was expected to be met, **Alternative 2** would reduce the length of the following commercial fishing when a commercial ACL overage occurred but only if the stock is overfished. **Alternative 3** would have a greater biological benefit than either **Alternative 1** or **2** because **Alternative 3** would prohibit harvest when the commercial ACL is met in-season, and would reduce the length of the following commercial fishing if the overall ACL (commercial and recreational) is met, regardless of the overfished status. **Alternative 4** is similar to **Alternative 3**, with the exception that the length of the following Alternatives<sup>1</sup>

(preferred alternatives in red)

- 1. No action. <u>Commercial Inseason closure</u> if commercial ACL is met or projected to be met. Recreational – If high landings persist, reduce the length of the following fishing season. No revisions to AMs for dolphin and wahoo
- Alternatives 2 4 affect only the <u>commercial</u> fisherysector. Inseason closure would take place if commercial ACL is met or projected to be met.
- If commercial ACL is exceeded, Rreduce the commercial ACL by the amount of the commercial overage in the following season only if:
- 2. The species is overfished.
- 3. The total ACL is exceeded.
- 4. The species is overfished <u>AND</u> the total ACL is exceeded.
- Alternatives 5 7 affect only the <u>recreational</u> <u>fisherysector. If recreational ACL is</u> <u>exceeded</u>, <u>recreational landings in</u> <u>following fishing season would be</u> <u>monitored for persistence and landings.</u>
- <u>Reduce tThe recreational ACL would be</u> reduced by the amount of the recreational overage in the following season only if:
- 5. The species is overfished.
- 6. The total ACL is exceeded.
- 7. The species is overfished <u>AND</u> the total ACL is exceeded.

commercial fishing season would only be reduced if the total ACL is met, and the stock is overfished. Therefore, **Alternative 4** would be expected the least amount of biological benefit among **Alternatives 2-4** but a greater biological effect than **Alternative 1** (**No Action**).

Alternatives 5, 6, and 7 address the recreational sector. Under Alternative 5, if the recreational ACL was exceeded, recreational landings would be monitored for a persistence in increased recreational landings, and if necessary, the length of the following fishing season would be reduced but only if the stock is overfished. In contrast, Alternative 1 (No Action) reduces the length of the following

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

recreational fishing season following an ACL overage regardless of the overfished status of the stock. Therefore, the biological benefits of **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) would be greater than **Alternative 5**. In the event of a recreational ACL overage, **Alternative 6** would reduce the length of the following recreational fishing season but only if the total ACL (commercial and recreational) is exceeded. Therefore, **Alternative 6** could be expected to have a greater biological benefit than **Alternative 5** but less than **Alternative 1** (**No Action**). However, if the commercial sector were to greatly exceed it ACL and cause the overall ACL to be met, then Alternative 6 could have a greater biological benefit than **Alternative 1** (**No Action**). **Alternative 7** is similar to **Alternative 6** with the exception that the length of the following recreational fishing season would only be reduced if the total ACL was exceeded and the stock was overfished. As a result, the biological benefits of **Alternative 7** would be the least among the recreational AM alternatives. **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) and the stock of **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) and the stock was overfished. As a result, the biological benefits of **Alternative 7** would be the least among the recreational AM alternatives. **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) and the stock of **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) and **Alternative 1** (**No Action**) would be expected to have the greatest biological benefit among the recreational AM alternatives.

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not modify the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery in the southeast is prosecuted; nor would this action increase fishing or change fishing methods for species targeted within the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Therefore, no adverse effects to the protected species most likely to interact with the dolphin wahoo fishery (e.g., sea turtles) are likely to result under this alternative. Alternatives 2-7 are unlikely to alter fishing behavior in a way that would cause new adverse effects to these species. The biological benefits to sea turtles from Alternative 3 is likely to be beneficial since it could lower the risk of interactions between sea turtles and the fishery.

#### **4.2.2 Economic Effects**

Action 2 would not change the AMs for either sector of the dolphin wahoo fishery. This action proposes to modify what would trigger an AM. Alternative 1 (No Action) would trigger an AM if a sector's ACL is exceeded or projected to be exceeded for the dolphin and wahoo fisheries. Alternatives 2 - 7 allow for other trigger mechanisms and separates out the trigger mechanisms by commercial and recreational sector, but not by fishery. Alternatives 2 - 4 related to the commercial sector, while Alternatives 5 - 7 are related to the recreational sector.

Alternatives 2 and 5 would reduce the ACL the following season by the amount of the overage only if the species is overfished. Alternatives 3 and 6 would reduce the ACL the following season by the amount of the overage only if the combined landings of the commercial and recreational sectors for that fishery exceeded the overall ACL. Alternatives 4 and 7 would reduce the ACL the following season by the amount of the overage only if the species is overfished <u>and</u> the combined landings of the commercial and recreational sectors for that fishery exceeded the overall ACL.

Alternative 1 (No Action) has the greatest probability of triggering an AM. Should a sector exceed its ACL in either fishery, there is the possibility of negative economic effects due to lost opportunity to continue fishing. The magnitude of that potential loss cannot be estimated unless one knows when a fishery will close. In the past 5 fishing seasons, only the commercial wahoo fishery was closed prior to the end of the calendar year. However, the commercial sector of that fishery closed December 19, 2012 with only 13 days left in the season.

Of all the remaining combinations of alternatives, **Alternatives 3** and **6** have the next greatest probability of triggering AMs. **Alternatives 2, 4, 5,** and **7** all require that to trigger AMs for these fisheries, the stock

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

must be considered overfished. An overfished status of a stock is typically determined as the result of a SEDAR stock assessment or other determination used by the SSC. As neither of these stocks has been assessed, nor has the SSC determined them to be overfished, **Alternatives 2, 4, 5,** and **7** could not trigger AMs. Of these four alternatives, **Alternatives 4** and **7** have the lowest probability of triggering AMs because of the requirement for the stock to be overfished and for the combined sector ACLs needing to exceed the total ACL.

The potential for negative economic effects through lost opportunity in the current fishing year in the case of an in-season closure for a commercial sector and the potential for reductions of the sector ACL in the following season for either sector when ACLs are exceeded, the order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects is **Alternative 1**, **Alternatives 3** and **6**, **Alternatives 2** and **5**, and then **Alternatives 4** and **7**.

#### 4.2.3 Social Effects

AMs can have significant direct and indirect social effects because, when triggered, can restrict harvest in the current season or subsequent seasons. Currently there is no post-season AM (pay-back) for the commercial sector or recreational sector. Under **Alternative 1** (No Action) there would be no expected negative impacts on commercial and recreational fishermen from a pay-back provision, but there may be some negative long-term impacts on the fleets and private recreational anglers if the ACLs are exceeded over several years and have negative impact on the stocks. The AMs under **Alternatives 2-7** would help to provide this protection to the stock and would contribute to sustainable harvest of dolphin and wahoo.

While the negative effects are usually short-term, they may at times induce other indirect effects through changes in fishing behavior or business operations that could have long-term social effects. Some of those effects are similar to other thresholds being met and may involve switching to other species or discontinuing fishing altogether. Those restrictions usually translate into reduced opportunity for harvest, which in turn can change fishing behaviors through species switching if the opportunity exists. That behavior can increase pressure on other stocks or amplify conflict. If there are no opportunities to switch species then losses of income or fishing opportunities may occur which can act like any downturn in an economy for fishing communities affected. If there is a substantial downturn then increased unemployment and other disruptions to the social fabric may occur. While these negative effects are usually short term, they may at times induce other indirect effects through the loss of fishing infrastructure that can have a lasting effect on a community.

Section 3.3.3 describes communities that would be expected to be affected by any negative impacts resulting from a payback provision. The communities of Islamorada, Key West, Marathon, Florida; Atlantic Beach, North Carolina; Beaufort, North Carolina; and Wanchese, North Carolina are engaged and reliant on commercial and recreational fishing, and participate in the dolphin and wahoo fishery, although the two species are not the most important target species in these communities. In the Northeast, the fishing communities that would be expected to experience impacts from AMs for the dolphin and wahoo fishery include New Bedford Massachusetts; Barnegat, Point Pleasant and Brielle, New Jersey; Virginia Beach Virginia; and Montauk New York.

Alternative 1 (No Action) would put no new AMs in place and would risk further harm to the stock if bag limits in place were not sufficient to keep the ACLs from being exceeded. This would avoid short-

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

term negative social impacts mentioned above, but may incur longer term impacts if stock status were jeopardized. The addition of a payback provision for the commercial sector under **Alternatives 2-4** could result in some negative impacts on the fleet if there was a substantial reduction in the subsequent year's commercial ACL. However, some negative social and economic impacts could be reduced with the requirement that the stock must be overfished and the total ACL exceeded under **Alternative 4**. The addition of a payback provision for the recreational sector under **Alternatives 5-7** could also result in some negative impacts if the reduced ACL for the subsequent year reduces the fishing opportunities for dolphin or wahoo. However the flexibility in requirements for payback under **Alternative 7** would likely result in the lowest level of negative impacts on the recreational sector.

#### 4.2.4 Administrative Effects

Current AMs for dolphin and wahoo were implemented by the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, therefore, the mechanisms for monitoring and enforcing the ACLs are already in place. Alternatives 2 through 7 would be expected to have beneficial administrative effects when compared with Alternative 1 (No Action). The South Atlantic Council is working towards having consistent AMs for all its managed species. Consistency in regulations among different species could help reduce confusion in the general public, could better aid law enforcement, and could possibly reduce the instances of ACLs being exceeded. Therefore, while in the short term, there might be additional administrative costs, these might be offset in the long term by fewer instances of AMs being triggered and their related administrative costs.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

#### 4.3 Action 3. Modify the sector allocations for dolphin.

#### 4.3.1 Biological Effects

Dolphin is predominantly harvested by the recreational sector. The current allocation is 92.7% of the total ACL to the recreational sector (Alternative 1 No Action). The allocation was based on the following formula for each sector: Sector allocation = (50% \* average of long catch range (lbs) 1999-2008) + (50% \* average of recent catch trend (lbs) 2006-2008).

The Dolphin Wahoo FMP established a non-binding allocation of 13% on the commercial harvest and 87% for the recreational harvest in the Atlantic exclusive economic zone (SAFMC 2003). The Dolphin Wahoo FMP established this allocation as a soft cap on the commercial sector. This soft cap did not trigger a closure of the commercial sector; however, it did trigger a review of the data and a determination whether action is necessary. The South Atlantic Council's intent, when the Dolphin Wahoo FMP was developed, was to monitor landings and if commercial landings exceeded the nonbinding allocation, determine if additional regulations were necessary.

#### Alternatives<sup>1</sup> (preferred alternatives in red)

1. No action. Do not modify the sector allocations (currently, recreational = 92.7% and commercial = 7.3%).

- 2. Set the allocations to 13% commercial and 87% recreational to reflect the "soft cap" that was in place prior to implementing ACLs.
- 3. Set the commercial allocation at its <u>highest</u> percent of total catches from 2008 through 2012. The highest percent of commercial landings (14%) was in 2009. The commercial allocation is 14% and the recreational allocation is 86%.
- 4. Set the commercial allocation at its <u>average</u> percent of total catches from 2008 through 2012. The average percent of commercial landings was 10%. The commercial allocation is 10% and the recreational allocation is 90%.

Alternative 2 would revert the sector allocations to the percentages (87% recreational/13% commercial) implemented by the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (2003). As shown in **Table 4-1** (and analyzed in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (2011b), in 2009 (before ACLs were implemented), the commercial for dolphin exceeded the current ACL. Therefore, an in-season closure for commercial harvest of dolphin would have been expected if the current ACL were in place in 2009. The allocations (86% recreational/14% commercial) under Alternative 3 would be based on the highest commercial catches from 2008-2012, and would be very similar to Alternative 2. Alternative 3 would set the commercial allocation at the very same percent (14%) that was harvested in 2009 (Table 4-1). Alternative 4 would allocate a greater proportion (90% recreational/10% commercial) of the ACL to the recreational sector than any of the action alternatives considered.

**Table 4-2** shows the values of the sector ACLs under the different alternatives.**Alternatives 2** through 4would increase the ACL for the commercial sector and decrease the ACL for the recreational sector.Neither the commercial sector nor recreational sector has never exceeded its ACL; although, commerciallandings exceeded the present ACL in 2009.Allocating more of the ACL to the commercial sector in**Alternatives 2-4** decreases the chance commercial ACLs would be met.However, since none of thealternatives under this action would change the total ACL for dolphin and wahoo, and ACLs and AMs arein place to ensure overfishing of dolphin and wahoo does not occur, the biological effects of **Alternatives** 

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

**1-4** for dolphin are expected to be similar. However, bycatch of protected species such as sea turtles are documented with longlines (NMFS 2003), and portion of the commercial catch of dolphin is taken with this gear type (Table 3), Therefore, alternatives that would allocate a greater amount of the ACL to the commercial sector could be expected to have reduced biological benefits for protected species.

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not modify the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery in the southeast is prosecuted; nor would this action increase fishing or change fishing methods for species targeted within the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Therefore, no adverse effects to the protected species most likely to interact with the dolphin wahoo fishery (e.g., sea turtles) are likely to result under this alternative. Alternatives 2-4 are unlikely to alter fishing behavior in a way that would cause new adverse effects to these species. The biological benefits to sea turtles from Alternatives 2-4 are unclear. If the sector allocations perpetuate the existing amount of fishing effort, they are unlikely to change the level of interaction between sea turtles and the fishery as a whole. This scenario is likely to provide little additional biological benefits to sea turtles, if any. However, if these alternatives reduce the overall amount of effort in the fishery the risk of interaction with sea turtles will likely decrease, providing additional biological benefits to these species.

#### 4.3.2 Economic Effects

The economic effects of **Action 3** depend on which alternative the South Atlantic Council chooses as its preferred alternative in **Action 1**. **Table 4-2** shows what the ACLs would be for each sector under all 4 alternatives for **Action 3** based on both alternatives from **Action 1**.

 Table 4-2.
 Proposed commercial and recreational sector allocations of dolphin under the Action 3 alternatives based on the Action 1 alternatives.

iternatives based on the <b>Action 1</b> alternatives.								
Action 3	Action 1							
Alternative 1	Alternative 1	Alternative 2						
Commercial	1,065,524	1,157,612						
Recreational	13,530,692	14,187,234						
Alternative 2								
Commercial	1,897,508	1,994,830						
Recreational	12,698,708	13,350,016						
Alternative 3								
Commercial	2,040,943	2,145,622						
Recreational	12,555,273	13,199,225						
Alternative 4								
Commercial	1,516,433	1,594,210						
Recreational	13,079,783	13,750,636						

Comparing the proposed sector ACLs from **Table 4-2** to the landings of dolphin from 2008 through 2012 as shown in **Table 4-1**, shows the recreational ACL would not have been exceeded in any of the years in the time series. Under **Alternatives 1** and **2** of **Action 3**, the commercial ACL would have exceeded its sector ACL regardless of the alternative preferred in **Action 1**.

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

To understand the potential economic effects of the alternatives of this action, it must be understood that there would only be negative economic effects if one or both sectors would be required to stop fishing or have its ACL reduced in a future season, and that to reduce the potential for direct negative economic effects in one sector would be at the expense of potentially increasing the direct negative economic effects for the other sector.

The lower the ACL for the commercial sector, the sooner there would be a potential in-season closure, creating a potential for a larger direct negative economic effect do to lost opportunity. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the commercial sector is **Alternative 1**, **Alternative 4**, **Alternative 2** and **Alternative 3**. However, reducing potential direct negative economic effects for the commercial sector comes at the expense of increasing the potential direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative economic effects to the least potential for direct negative economic effects for the recreational sector. The order of greatest direct negative **3**, **Alternative 2**, **Alternative 4** and **Alternative 1**.

#### 4.3.3 Social Effects

Modifications in sector allocations of the dolphin ACL could result in some changes in fishing behavior and impacts to the social environment. Although sector allocations are currently in place under **Alternative 1 (No Action)**, changes could increase perceptions of scarcity and change the fishing behavior of those within a particular sector. Because there has been an initial sector allocation between the commercial and recreational, **Alternative 1 (No Action)** may have few direct social effects. However, if one sector has not or does not reach its ACL, the resource may be underutilized and available quota would not be available to the other sector. The increase for the commercial allocation under **Alternatives 2- 4** would be beneficial to the commercial sector and have minimal impact on the recreational sector grows, a reduced recreational allocation under **Alternatives 2-4** could trigger AMs and reduce recreational fishing opportunities.

#### 4.3.4 Administrative Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would retain the current allocations of 92.7% recreational and 7.3% commercial. NMFS currently monitors commercial and recreational landings. Changing allocations is not expected to result in an increase in the frequency of AMs being triggered in either the commercial or recreational sectors. There would not be any measurable differences in the administrative effects between Alternatives 1 (No Action), 2, 3, and 4.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

#### 4.4 Action 4. Revise the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP.

#### 4.4.1 Biological Effects

This administrative action would have indirect positive biological effects in that adjustments to harvest levels would not be subject to regulatory delays as is currently the case under **Alternative 1** (**No Action**). As such, biological benefits may result due to the ability to implement appropriate levels of harvest quickly in response to the latest scientific information to maintain harvest levels at or below the ACL.

The South Atlantic Council has three different regulatory vehicles for addressing fishery management issues. First, a fishery management plan or plan amendment may be developed to implement management measures. The amendment process can take one to three years depending on the analysis needed to support the amendment actions.

### Alternatives<sup>1</sup>

(preferred alternatives in red)

- 1. No action. Do not modify the existing framework.
- 2. Revise the framework language to reflect the new terminology used for managing fisheries and institute an abbreviated process for revising ABCs, ACLs and ACTs according to the existing ABC Control Rule.
- 3.Revise the framework language to reflect SEDAR and SSC roles in setting MSY, OY, and ABC.

<sup>1</sup>See Chapter 2 for a more detailed description of the alternatives.

Second, the South Atlantic Council may vote to request an interim or emergency rule that could remain effective for 180 days with the option to extend it for an additional 186 days. Interim and emergency rules are only meant as short-term management tools while permanent regulations are developed through an amendment. Third, the South Atlantic Council may prepare a regulatory amendment, based on the framework procedure, previously included through a plan amendment, which allows changes in specific management measures and parameters. Typically, framework actions take less than a year to implement, and are effective until amended.

Under **Alternatives 2** and **3**, adjustments to ABCs, ACLs, ACTs, AMs, MSY, and OY could be through the framework process rather than with a plan amendment. As a result, changes could be made relatively quickly as new fishery and stock abundance information becomes available. Alternatives that would update or revise the current procedure would likely be biologically beneficial for dolphin and wahoo because they would also allow periodic adjustments to harvest parameters, and management measures could be altered in a more timely manner in response to stock assessment, survey results, or other similar information. When stock assessments indicate large decreases in the ACLs are needed, a quick adjustment to the catch level would likely have positive biological effects. The SEDAR process currently only produces one stock assessment for a species every three to five years. As such, the data utilized in the assessment are at least one year old by the time the assessment results become available and can be used for management purposes. It is, therefore, advantageous to make any modifications to the existing management process, as proposed under **Alternatives 2** and **3**, to expedite fishing level adjustments for dolphin and wahoo.

This action is administrative in nature and would not significantly alter the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery is prosecuted in the Atlantic Region. Therefore, no impacts on ESA-listed marine species,

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

EFH, HAPCs, or coral HAPCs are expected as a result of updating the Dolphin Wahoo Framework Procedure.

#### 4.4.2 Economic Effects

Without an abbreviated framework process, **Alternative 1** (No Action) could negatively impact the recreational and commercial fishing sectors should new data indicate that a stock had improved but the South Atlantic Council had no means to rapidly increase the ACL, resulting in loss of opportunity, income, and/or recreational angling experiences. However, if an assessment indicated a substantial decrease in the ACL was needed **Alternative 1** (No Action) would retain a more deliberative process of ensuring the public was well-informed regarding the needed changes in catch levels. **Alternative 2** could result in positive or negative economic effects. When stock assessments indicate ACLs can be increased, quick adjustments for ACLs would allow for positive economic effects without negatively affecting the sustainability of the stock. On the other hand, when stock assessments indicate large decreases in the ACLs are needed, it is likely that negative economic effects would result from moving quickly with a decrease in a catch level. However, depending on the timing of the implementation of the ACLs, the positive or negative economic effect would be short-lived as the overall net economic effect to the economy is likely to remain unchanged by this action. **Alternative 3**, regardless of whether it is selected as a preferred alternative or not, is primarily administrative in nature and is not expected to have economic effects.

#### 4.4.3 Social Effects

Modification of the framework procedure to update language would be expected to result in broad, longterm social benefits, and minimal negative social effects. Although a framework is currently in place (Alternative 1 (No Action)), the proposed modifications to improve timeliness and incorporate regulatory updates (Alternatives 2 and 3) would be expected to contribute to improved management of the dolphin and wahoo and would allow the South Atlantic Council to respond to management needs. Public participation and the review process would continue as part of the framework procedure under all alternatives.

Alternative 1 (No Action) would allow for neither updates in the management framework procedure nor development of a process to incorporate new information to adjust ACLs. This could negatively impact the recreational and commercial fishing sectors should new data indicate that a stock had improved but the South Atlantic Council had no means to rapidly increase the ACL, resulting in loss of opportunity, income, and/or recreational angling experiences.

Alternative 2 and 3 would generate indirect positive effects on the social environment with the framework modifications to incorporate a procedure for adjusting ACLs in a timely manner; updating text to reflect adoption of SEDAR as the source of stock assessment information (Alternative 2 and 3) would provide consistency in language with regulatory changes and have few effects on the social environment. Consistency and timeliness in the regulatory process are positive social benefits as they remove uncertainty and subsequent displeasure with regard to changes in management while protecting the stock.

**DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5** 

#### 4.4.4 Administrative Effects

Alternative 1 (No Action) would be the most administratively burdensome of the three alternatives being considered, because all modifications to ABCs, ACLs, ACTs, and AMs would need to be implemented through an plan amendment, which is a more laborious and time consuming process than a framework action. Alternative 2 would allow ABC, ACLs, AMs, and ACTs to be modified via a framework procedure intended to shorten the length of time it takes to implement routine changes in harvest limits. It is anticipated that this streamlined approach to would eliminate the lengthy regulatory amendment process, and would minimize administrative impacts since a regulatory amendment would not be required to make such changes. Alternative 3 would clarify the framework procedure to reflect SEDAR and SSC roles in setting MSY, OY, and ABC.

The process under **Alternatives 2** and **3** would entail a review of new scientific information (SEDAR or other stock assessment documents) by the South Atlantic Council's SSC, and a recommendation from the South Atlantic Council to the Regional Administrator for any changes to harvest levels they determine need to be made. The recommendation from the South Atlantic Council would be accompanied by biological, economic, and social impacts information supported by the best available scientific information. The South Atlantic Council request would need to contain adequate information for NMFS to conduct a Regulatory Impact Review, a Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, a Fishery Impact Statement, a Bycatch Practicability Analysis, a Social Impact Assessment, and to complete the appropriate supporting documentation to fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

If the Regional Administrator agrees to the South Atlantic Council's recommendations, NMFS would prepare supporting documentation required under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act), NEPA, and any other applicable law to initiate development of a proposed rule for the action. NMFS would publish a proposed rule and take comment on the rule for no less than 15 days. The action would then be codified through a final rule published in the *Federal Register*, with a 30-day wait period unless otherwise waived. During the proposed and final rule stages outreach materials such as fishery bulletins, and frequently asked questions would be developed and disseminated to fishery participants to notify them of the change.

Public comments on actions implemented through the abbreviated framework procedure could be taken several times during the process. The public would be notified in advance of the South Atlantic Council meeting during which the action is planned to be proposed. During the meeting, at which such changes are discussed by the South Atlantic Council, the public would be given the opportunity to provide comments on the action. If public hearings happen to coincide with the timing of development of an abbreviated framework action, the public may again have the opportunity to provide written and verbal comments on the proposed changes. Under the Administrative Procedures Act, opportunity for public comment on the proposed action would be provided during the proposed rule stage of the rulemaking process for no less than 15 days. Additionally, if the action to be taken under the abbreviated framework process requires the development of an environmental impact statement, or an environmental assessment, comments would be taken as required under NEPA.

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

### 4.5 Action 5. Establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in the EEZ throughout the SAFMC's area of jurisdiction

#### 4.5.1 Biological Effects

In the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (2003), the South Atlantic Council considered establishing trip limits as an appropriate method to regulate and cap commercial harvest of dolphin; insure highly efficient gear are not employed for dolphin; and prevent a rapid increase in commercial landings which could shift allocation from the recreational sector to the commercial sector. The trip limit action was not endorsed because longline gear was being used in North Carolina. A 1,000 lb trip limit would have negatively affected fishermen using this gear (**Alternative 1 No Action**). Commercial catches south of 31° N. latitude had traditionally been taken by hook-and-line, and rarely exceeded 1,000 lbs.

As shown in **Table 4-3**, and **Figures 4-1**, **4-2**, and **4-3**), most of the commercial harvest of dolphin continues to be north of 31° N. latitude, and hook-and-line gear is used primarily south of 31° N. latitude. During 2008-2012, almost all of the trips targeted less than 3,000 lbs ww, with no commercial landings in excess of 15,000 lbs ww, and only two trips reported landings in excess of 10,000 lbs ww (**Table 4-3**). Hook-and-line gear was the dominant gear used both north and south of 31° N. latitude to commercially harvest dolphin (**Table 4-3**).

Trip limits are often considered for a species to reduce the rate that the quota is met, reduce derby

Alternatives<sup>1</sup> (preferred alternatives in red)

- 1. No action. Do not establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin. Currently, there is no commercial trip limit for dolphin.
- Alternatives 2 through 9 have two subalternatives that would apply the trip limit only south and/or north of 31° N. Latitude.
- 2. 1,000<sup>2</sup> pound trip limit
- 3. 2,000 pound trip limit
- 4. 3,000 pound trip limit
- 5. 4,000 pound trip limit
- 6. 5,000 pound trip limit
- 7. 10,000 pound trip limit
- 8. 15,000 pound trip limit
- 9. 20,000 pound trip limit

<sup>1</sup>See Chapter 2 for a more detailed description of the alternatives. <sup>2</sup>Pounds are in whole weight.

conditions, prevent the market from being flooded by fish, and prevent localized depletion. Trip limits can be an effective tool to constrain harvest in the absence of a commercial quota or ACL, and can also be useful in extending the fishing season for species with small quotas or ACLs. The commercial ACL for dolphin has been in effect since 2011, and it has not been met. Prior to 2011, a soft cap was in place, which would not trigger a closure of the commercial sector; however, it would trigger a review of the data and a determination whether action is necessary.

Alternatives 2-9 include a wide range of trip limits from 1,000 lbs ww under Alternative 2, which is the most restrictive alternative, to 20,000 lbs ww, under Alternative 9, which is the least restrictive alternative. Alternatives 2-9 would have very little effect on constraining harvest of dolphin as Table 4-3 reveals that 98% of the trips harvested 1,000 lbs ww or less of dolphin. Longline gear are more efficient

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

at harvesting large quantities of dolphin than hook-and-line, and would be most affected by the trip limit **Alternatives 2-7**. Although there were very few trips, only the longline sector had trips of 3,000 lbs ww to 5,000 lbs ww (**Alternatives 4-6**), and they were the dominant gear for trips landing 1,000 lbs ww and 2,000 lbs ww (**Alternatives 2** and **3**). There were no trips that landed 15,000 lbs ww or 20,000 lbs ww (**Alternatives 8 and 9**) (**Table 4-3**). ACLs and AMs are in place to ensure overfishing of dolphin and does not occur; therefore, biological effects of **Alternatives 1-9** for dolphin are expected to be similar. However, bycatch of protected species such as sea turtles are documented with longline gear; therefore, alternatives that would establish a higher trip limit, that would likely be met using longline gear, and would be expected to have lower biological benefits.

Alternative 1 (No Action) would not modify the way in which the dolphin wahoo fishery in the southeast is prosecuted; nor would this action increase fishing or change fishing methods for species targeted within the Dolphin Wahoo FMP. Therefore, no adverse effects to the protected species most likely to interact with the dolphin wahoo fishery (e.g., sea turtles) are likely to result under this alternative. Alternatives 2-9 could alter fishing behavior in a way that would cause adverse effects to these species. Bycatch of protected species such as sea turtles are documented with longline gear (NMFS 2003). Therefore, alternatives that would establish a higher trip limit, that would likely be met using longline, would be expected to have lower biological benefits.

				Alternative 2		Altern	Alternative 3		Alternative 4		Alternative 5		Alternative 6		Alternative 7	
		<1,000 lb		1,000 lb		2,000 lb		3,000 lb		4,000 lb		5,000 lb		10,000 lb		
Zone	Gear	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	Trips	Pounds	
	Hook & Line	903	67,817	3	4,285	1	1,327	0	749	0	919	0	0	0	0	
North 31	Longline	43	6,440	10	15,044	6	14,983	4	13,968	2	6,880	5	34,965	2	27,688	
51	Total (N 31)	946	74,257	13	19,329	7	16,310	4	14,717	2	7,799	5	34,965	2	27688	
	Hook & Line	1,311	86,680	3	3,248	1	3,251	0	0	0	988	0	0	0	0	
South 31	Longline	11	429	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
51	Total (S 31)	1,322	87,109	3	3,248	1	3,251	0	0	0	988	0	0	0	0	
To (both	otal N & S)	2,268	161,366	16	22,577	8	19,561	4	14,717	2	8,787	5	34,965	2	27,688	

**Table 4-3.** Trips and total pounds (ww) of dolphin landed by hook and line and longline gears north and south of 31° N. latitude for **Alternatives 2** through **7** of **Action 5** averaged across the years 2008 through 2012.

Source: NMFS SERO.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5



**Figure 4-1.** Number of logbook-reported trips that commercially harvested dolphin for the five most recent fishing years (n= 11,582 trips).



**Figure 4-2.** Number of logbook-reported trips that commercially harvested dolphin from 2008 to 2012 separated by gear (n= 11,582 trips).

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5



**Figure 2.** Number of logbook-reported trips that commercially harvested dolphin from 2008 to 2012 separated by fishing areas north and south of latitude 31  $^{\circ}$  N. latitude (n= 11,582 trips).

#### 4.5.2 Economic Effects

Setting trip limits has economic effects. In general, the lower the trip limit, the greater the direct negative effect that comes as a result of ending a trip sooner to keep from going over the trip limit. Trip limits are employed largely to avoid localized depletion or to extend a fishing season. A trip limit tends to increase trip costs per pound of fish landed. The lower the trip limit, the greater the trip cost effect on the resulting value of the catch.

Alternative 1 (No Action) imposes no trip limits on commercial dolphin catches and therefore would not be expected to have economic effects. Trip limits would hardly have an economic impact for any hook and line trips, or on longline trips south of 31° North latitude. In each case, the average number of trips across the years 2008 through 2012 where more than 1,000 lbs ww of dolphin were landed on a single trip was less than 1% of all the trips (**Table 4-3**). Trip limits could largely have economic effects for longline trips north of 31° North latitude.

On average, there were 72 longline trips north of 31° North latitude each year from 2008 through 2012 (**Table 4-3**). While the majority (60%) of longline trips landed less than 1,000 lbs ww north of 31° North latitude, 40% of the longline trips from this area landed more than 1,000 lbs. However, there were no longline trips north of 31° North latitude that landed more than 15,000 lbs ww, and only two trips on average each year landed more than 10,000 lbs ww of dolphin north of 31° North latitude. Therefore, **Alternatives 8** and **9** are not expected to have any economic effects.

**DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5** 

Using the price per pound of dolphin for 2011 as shown in **Table 3-4-1**, **Table 4-4** shows the expected direct negative economic effects of each of the alternatives for **Action 5**. In order from least to most expected direct economic effects, **Alternative 2** would be expected to have the greatest effects at \$249,762 annually, followed in order by **Alternative 3**, **4**, **5**, **6**, and **7**. Like **Alternative 1** (**No Action**), **Alternatives 8** and **9** are not expected to have a direct economic effect on the commercial fishery.

**Table 4-4.** Expected number and percent of trips (primarily longline trips north of 31° North latitude) with expected negative economic effects for each alternative for **Action 5.** (Amounts shown are in 2011 dollars.)

		Economic				
	Trips	Trips	Pounds*	Effect		
Alt 1 (No Action)	0	0%	0	\$ -		
Alternative 2	29	40%	113,528	\$249,762		
Alternative 3	19	26%	98,484	\$216,665		
Alternative 4	13	18%	83,501	\$183,702		
Alternative 5	9	13%	69,533	\$152,973		
Alternative 6	7	10%	62,653	\$137,837		
Alternative 7	2	3%	27,688	\$ 60,914		
Alternative 8	0	0%	0	\$ -		
Alternative 9	0	0%	0	\$ -		

Data Source: NMFS SERO

\* Data for 2012 are preliminary and were downloaded from

sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable\_fisheries/acl\_monitoring/commercial\_sa/historical/index.html, and sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sustainable\_fisheries/acl\_monitoring/recreational\_sa/index.html (Accessed on March 15, 2013). They will be updated with the verified numbers after June 2013.

#### 4.5.3 Social Effects

In general, trip limits may be effective in slowing harvest and lengthening a season, which would be somewhat beneficial to crew, dealers, and communities because dolphin may be available for a longer period and market gluts could be avoided. However, trip limits also have the potential to restrict efficiency of fishing trips. The negative social impacts of trip limits are associated with the economic costs if a vessel has the capacity to harvest more than the proposed trip limits.

Alternative 1 (No Action) would be expected to generate little or no social impacts (positive or negative). The highest proposed trip limit under Alternative 9 would be the most beneficial to vessels harvesting dolphin, and Alternative 2 would be the most restrictive for vessels with the capacity to harvest more 1,000 lbs ww. Although lower trip limits may contribute to a longer fishing season, the more restrictive limits may cause some vessels to target other species to increase the economic efficiency of fishing trips. Requiring a trip limit only for certain areas under Options a and b under Alternatives 2-9 could result in some issues of fairness between fishermen in the northern and southern areas. However, different trip limits in different areas could reduce the likelihood of localized depletion or user conflicts.

**DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5** 

#### 4.5.4 Administrative Effects

Alternatives 2 through 9 would add administrative burdens when compared with Alternative 1 (No Action). Enforcement costs could increase due to the establishment of commercial trip limits, since these would now have to be monitored and enforced. Additionally, legal costs would be incurred from prosecuting any violations that could occur.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

### **Chapter 5. Reasoning for Council's Choice of Preferred Alternatives**

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5 **Chapter 5. Council's Choice of Preferreds** 

### 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 be either additive or synergistic. A synergistic effect is when the combined effects are greater than the sum of the individual effects.

Various approaches for assessing cumulative effects have been identified, including checklists, matrices, indices, and detailed models (MacDonald 2000). The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) offers guidance on conducting a Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA) in a report titled "Considering Cumulative Effects under the National Environmental Policy Act". The report outlines 11 items for consideration in drafting a CEA for a proposed action.

- 1. Identify the significant cumulative effects issues associated with the proposed action and define the assessment goals.
- 2. Establish the geographic scope of the analysis.
- 3. Establish the timeframe for the analysis.
- 4. Identify the other actions affecting the resources, ecosystems, and human communities of concern.
- 5. Characterize the resources, ecosystems, and human communities identified in scoping in terms of their response to change and capacity to withstand stress.
- 6. Characterize the stresses affecting these resources, ecosystems, and human communities and their relation to regulatory thresholds.
- 7. Define a baseline condition for the resources, ecosystems, and human communities.
- 8. Identify the important cause-and-effect relationships between human activities and resources, ecosystems, and human communities.
- 9. Determine the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects.
- 10. Modify or add alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant cumulative effects.
- 11. Monitor the cumulative effects of the selected alternative and adapt management.

This CEA for the biophysical environment will follow a modified version of the 11 steps. Cumulative effects for the socio-economic environment will be analyzed separately.

**Chapter 7. List of Preparers** 

#### 6.1 Biological

### 1. Identify the significant cumulative effects issues associated with the proposed action and define the assessment goals.

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) cumulative effects guidance states that this step is done through three activities. The three activities and the location in the document are as follows:

I. The direct and indirect effects of the proposed actions (Chapter 4);

II. Which resources, ecosystems, and human communities are affected (Chapter 3); and

III. Which effects are important from a cumulative effects perspective (information

#### revealed in this Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA)

#### 2. Establish the geographic scope of the analysis.

The South Atlantic 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 immediate impact area would be the federal 200-mile limit 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. In light of the available information, the extent of the boundaries would depend upon the degree of fish immigration/emigration and larval transport, whichever has the greatest geographical range. 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 dolphin and wahoo; additional details are included in **Appendix I**. The most measurable and substantial effects would be limited to the Atlantic region.

#### **3.** Establish the timeframe for the analysis.

Establishing a timeframe for the CEA is important when the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are discussed. It would be advantageous to go back to a time when there was a natural, or some modified (but ecologically sustainable) condition. However, data collection for many fisheries began when species were already fully exploited. Therefore, the timeframe for analyses should be initiated when data collection began for the various fisheries. In determining how far into the future to analyze cumulative effects, the length of the effects will depend on the species and the alternatives chosen. Long-term evaluation is needed to determine if management measures have the intended effect of improving stock status.

# 4. Identify the other actions affecting the resources, ecosystems, and human communities of concern (the cumulative effects to the human communities are discussed in Section 4).

**Chapter 7. List of Preparers**
Listed are other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions occurring in the South Atlantic region. These actions, when added to the proposed management measures, may result in cumulative effects on the biophysical environment.

#### I. Fishery-related actions affecting dolphin and wahoo and associated species.

#### A. Past

The reader is referred to **Section 1.6** and **Appendix D** (History of Management) of this document for past regulatory activity for dolphin and wahoo. These include bag and size limits, commercial quotas, and gear prohibitions and limitations.

The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011c) fulfilled the 2011 mandate of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to establish annual catch limits (ACLs) and accountability measures (AMs) for species managed by the South Atlantic Council that are not undergoing overfishing. The amendment addressed dolphin and wahoo, a number of species in the snapper grouper fishery management unit, as well as golden crab and *Sargassum*. The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (SAFMC 2011c) established the acceptable biological catch (ABC) control rule, ABC, ACL, optimal yield (OY), and AMs in the dolphin and wahoo fishery for both the commercial and recreational sectors. The amendment also set an ACT for the recreational sector for dolphin and wahoo. The Comprehensive ACL Amendment was implemented in January 2012.

#### B. Present

In addition to dolphin and wahoo fishery management issues being addressed in this amendment, several other snapper grouper amendments have been developed concurrently, and are in the process of approval and implementation. Not all of these amendments directly affect the species in this amendment.

The South Atlantic Council has recently completed and is developing amendments for snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagic species, golden crab, shrimp, and corals/live-hard bottom. See the South Atlantic Council's Web site at <u>http://www.safmc.net</u> for further information on South Atlantic Council managed species.

#### C. Reasonably Foreseeable Future

The Joint Commercial Logbook Reporting Amendment would be similar to the Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendments for the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic regions. This amendment would require electronic reporting of landings information by federally-permitted commercial vessels, which would increase the timeliness and accuracy of landings data.

The Joint Charter Boat Reporting Amendment would be similar to the Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment by requiring charter vessels to regularly report their landings information electronically. Including charter boats in the recreational harvest reporting system would further improve the agency's ability to monitor recreational catch rates in-season.

## II. Non-Council and other non-fishery related actions, including natural events affecting the species in this amendment

**DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5** 

A.	Past
В.	Present
C.	Reasonably foreseeable future

In terms of natural disturbances, it is difficult to determine the effect of non-Council and nonfishery related actions on stocks of snapper grouper species. Annual variability in natural conditions such as water temperature, currents, food availability, predator abundance, etc. can affect the abundance of young fish that survive the egg and larval stages each year to become juveniles (i.e., recruitment). This natural variability in year class strength is difficult to predict as it is a function of many interactive and synergistic factors that cannot all be measured (Rothschild 1986). Furthermore, natural factors such as storms, red tide, cold water upwelling, etc. can affect the survival of juvenile and adult fishes; however, it is very difficult to quantify the magnitude of mortality these factors may have on a stock. Alteration of preferred habitats for dolphin and wahoo could affect survival of fish at any stage in their life cycles. However, estimates of the abundance of fish, which utilize any number of preferred habitats, as well as determining the impact habitat alteration may have on dolphin and wahoo, is problematic and limited. Dolphin and wahoo are highly migratory pelagic species occurring in tropical and subtropical waters worldwide. Other natural events such as spawning seasons and aggregations of fish in spawning condition can make some species especially vulnerable to targeted fishing pressure. As of this writing, there is no stock assessment available for dolphin and wahoo, and it is unknown whether they are overfished/undergoing overfishing. A Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) stock assessment for dolphin and wahoo is scheduled for 2015. Lifehistory characteristics of dolphin and wahoo such as rapid growth rates, early maturity, batch spawning over an extended season, a short life span, and a varied diet could help sustain fishing pressures on these species (Schwenke and Buckel 2008; McBride et al., 2008; Prager 2000; and Oxenford 1999). Dolphin and wahoo are listed as species of "least concern" under the International Union for Conservation of Nature Red List, i.e. species that have a low risk of extinction. See Section 3.2 and the references cited therein for more information.

How global climate changes will affect the dolphin wahoo fishery is unclear. Climate change can impact marine ecosystems through ocean warming by increased thermal stratification, reduced upwelling, sea level rise, increases in wave height and frequency, loss of sea ice, and increased risk of diseases in marine biota. Decreases in surface ocean pH due to absorption of anthropogenic  $CO_2$  emissions may impact a wide range of organisms and ecosystems, particularly organism that absorb calcium from surface waters, such as corals and crustaceans (IPCC 2007, and references therein).

The BP/Deepwater Horizon oil spill event, which occurred in the Gulf of Mexico on April 20, 2010, did not impact fisheries operating in the Atlantic. Oil from the spill site has not been detected in the Atlantic region, and did not likely to pose a threat to the species addressed in this amendment.

5. Characterize the resources, ecosystems, and human communities identified in scoping in terms of their response to change and capacity to withstand stress.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

In terms of the biophysical environment, the resources/ecosystems identified in earlier steps of the CEA are the fish populations directly or indirectly affected by the regulations. This step should identify the trends, existing conditions, and the ability to withstand stresses of the environmental components.

The species most likely to be impacted by alternatives considered in this amendment are dolphin and wahoo. Trends in the condition of dolphin and wahoo are determined through the SEDAR process. More information on the SEDAR process and specific information on dolphin and wahoo are included in **Section 3.2.4**, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

## 6. Characterize the stresses affecting these resources, ecosystems, and human communities and their relation to regulatory thresholds.

This step is important in outlining the current and probable stress factors on snapper grouper species identified in the previous steps. The goal is to determine whether these species are approaching conditions where additional stresses could have an important cumulative effect beyond any current plan, regulatory, or sustainability threshold (CEQ 1997). Sustainability thresholds can be identified for some resources, which are levels of impact beyond which the resources cannot be sustained in a stable state. Other thresholds are established through numerical standards, qualitative standards, or management goals. The CEA should address whether thresholds could be exceeded because of the contribution of the proposed action to other cumulative activities affecting resources.

#### Fish populations

This document updates thresholds (ACLs and ACTs) already specified for dolphin and wahoo to ensure future overfishing does not occur, and to ensure these stocks can be maintained at sustainable levels. Modifying the current AMs in place for both species would make it unlikely that these thresholds would be exceeded. If the harvest limits are exceeded, management measures would be in place to either restrict further fishing or correct for the overage in the following fishing season. Modifying the framework procedure would also benefit fish populations since revisions to fishing thresholds would be updated in a timely manner. See **Section 3.2** for more information on fish populations.

#### Climate change

Global climate changes could have significant effects on South 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 (IPCC 2007; Kennedy et al. 2002).

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

It is unclear how climate change would affect dolphin and wahoo 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 dolphin and wahoo 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.

#### 7. Define a baseline condition for the resources, ecosystems, and human communities.

The purpose of defining a baseline condition for the resource and ecosystems in the area of the proposed action is to establish a point of reference for evaluating the extent and significance of expected cumulative effects. Oxenford and Hunte (1986) suggested that there were at least two separate unit stocks of dolphin in the northeast and southeast Caribbean Sea. Oxenford (1999) suggested that it was very likely that additional stocks of dolphin existed in the Gulf of Mexico and central/western Caribbean. Prager (2000) conducted an exploratory assessment of dolphin, but the results were not conclusive. Theisen et al. (2008) indicated that a worldwide stock for wahoo consisted of a single globally distributed population. However, Zischke et al. (2012) concluded that despite genetic homogeneity in wahoo, multiple discrete phenotypic stocks existed in the Pacific and eastern Indian oceans. To date, there is no stock assessment available for dolphin and wahoo, and it is unknown whether they are overfished/undergoing overfishing. A SEDAR stock assessment for dolphin and wahoo is scheduled for 2015. Status determination criteria for dolphin and wahoo are outlined in the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan (2003) and the Comprehensive ACL Amendment (2011c).

For more details on the baseline conditions of dolphin and wahoo, the reader is referred to additional sources referenced in **Section 3** of the document and **Item Number 6** of this CEA.

## 8. Identify the important cause-and-effect relationships between human activities and resources, ecosystems, and human communities.

The dolphin wahoo fishery is not as highly regulated as the snapper grouper fishery. Regulations that have affected the resource, ecosystem, and human communities are shown in **Table 6-1**.

Time period/dates	Cause	Observed and/or Expected Effects
Effective June 28, 2004	Fishery Management Plan for the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery off the Atlantic states (Dolphin Wahoo FMP).	1) A 20-inch fork length minimum size limit for dolphin off the coasts of Georgia and Florida with no size restrictions elsewhere; (2) prohibition of longline fishing for dolphin and wahoo in areas closed to the use of such gear for highly migratory pelagic species; and (3) allowable gear to be used in the fishery (hook-and-line gear

**Table 6-1.** The cause and effect relationship of fishing and regulatory actions within the time period of the Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA).

DOLPHIN WAHOO	01	Chapter 7. List of Preparers
AMENDMENT 5	<b>71</b>	

Time period/dates	Cause	<b>Observed and/or Expected</b>
-		Effects
		including manual, electric, and hydraulic rods and reels; bandit gear; handlines; longlines; and spearfishing (including powerheads) gear. In addition, other approved portions of the FMP were also effective on this date, including (1) the management unit and designations of stock status criteria for the unit; (2) a fishing year of January 1 through December 31; (3) a 1.5 million pound (or 13% of the total harvest) cap on commercial landings; (4) establishment of a framework procedure by which the SAFMC may modify its management measures; and (5) designations of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and EFH-Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC).
Effective September 24, 2004	Dolphin Wahoo FMP	1) owners of commercial vessels and/or charter vessels/headboats must have vessel permits and, if selected, submit reports; (2) dealers must have permits and, if selected, submit reports; (3) longline vessels must comply with sea turtle protection measures; (4) a recreational bag limit of 10 dolphin and 2 wahoo per person per day, with a limit of 60 dolphin per boat per day (headboats are excluded from the boat limit); (5) prohibition on recreational sale of dolphin and wahoo caught under a bag limit unless the seller holds the necessary commercial permits; and (6) a commercial trip limit of 500 pounds for wahoo.
Effective November 23, 2004	Dolphin Wahoo FMP	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.
Effective Date July 22, 2010	Amendment 1 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (Comprehensive Ecosystem Based Amendment (CE-BA) 1)	
Effective Date April 16, 2012	Amendment 2 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP (Comprehensive ACL Amendment SAFMC 2011C)	Updated spatial information of Council-designated EFH and EFH- HAPCS.

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

T:	Co	
Time period/dates	Cause	Observed and/or Expected
		Effects
Target 2014	Amendment 5 to the Dolphin Wahoo FMP	Revisions to acceptable biological catch estimates (ABCs), annual catch limits (ACLs) (including sector ACLs), recreational annual catch targets (ACTs), and accountability measures (AMs) implemented through the Comprehensive ACL Amendment; modifications to the sector allocations for dolphin; revisions to the framework procedure in the Dolphin Wahoo FMP; and commercial trip limits for dolphin.
Target 2013	Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment	Require all federally-permitted headboats in the South Atlantic to report landings information electronically and on a weekly basis.
Target 2014	Joint Commercial Logbook Reporting Amendment	Require all federally-permitted commercial fin fish fishermen in the southeast to report electronically.
Target 2014/2015	Joint Charterboat Reporting Amendment	Require all federally-permitted charterboats to report landings information electronically.

#### 9. Determine the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects.

Dolphin and wahoo are not assessed species, a SEDAR stock assessment for both is scheduled for 2015. When their stock status is known, changes to regulations may be required. In addition, changes in management regulations, fishing techniques, social/economic structure, etc. can result in shifts in the percentage of harvest between user groups over time. As such, the South Atlantic Council has determined that certain aspects of the current management system should be restructured. **Chapters 2** and **4** of this document describe in detail the magnitude and significance of effects of the alternatives considered which consider a procedure for updating the ABCs, ACLs, recreational ACTs, and AMs; modifying the framework procedure; and considering sector allocations and trip limits for dolphin. None of the impacts have been determined to be significant.

The proposed actions would not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as these are not in the South Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). 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 South Atlantic region. The U.S. Monitor, Gray's Reef, and Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuaries are within the boundaries of the South Atlantic EEZ. The proposed actions are not likely to cause loss or destruction of these national marine sanctuaries.

## 10. Modify or add alternatives to avoid, minimize, or mitigate significant cumulative effects.

The cumulative effects on the biophysical environment are expected to be negligible. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation are not applicable.

#### 11. Monitor the cumulative effects of the selected alternative and adopt management.

The effects of the proposed actions are, and will continue to be, monitored through collection of data by NMFS, states, stock assessments and stock assessment updates, life history studies, and other scientific observations.

#### 6.2 Socioeconomic

Biological forces that either motivate certain regulations or simply influence the natural variability in fish stocks have likely played a role in determining the changing composition of the fisheries addressed by this document. Additional factors, such as changing career or lifestyle preferences, stagnant to declining prices due to imports, increased operating costs (gas, ice, insurance, dockage fees, etc.), and increased waterfront/coastal value leading to development pressure for other than fishery uses have impacted both the commercial and recreational fishing sectors.

Given the variety of factors that affect fisheries, persistent data issues, and the complexity of trying to identify cause-and-effect relationships, it is not possible to differentiate actual or cumulative regulatory effects from external cause-induced effects. For each regulatory action, expected effects are projected. However, these projections typically only minimally, if at all, are capable of incorporating the variety of external factors, and evaluation in hindsight is similarly incapable of isolating regulatory effects from other factors, as in, what portion of a change was due to the regulation versus due to input cost changes, random species availability variability, the sale of a fish house for condominium development, or even simply fishermen behavioral changes unrelated to the regulation.

In general, it can be stated, however, that the regulatory environment for all fisheries has become progressively more complex and burdensome, increasing, in tandem with other adverse influences, the pressure on economic losses, business failure, occupational changes, and associated adverse pressures on associated families, communities, and industries. Some reverse of this trend is possible and expected.

A description of the human environment, including a description of the commercial and recreational dolphin and wahoo fishery, as well as associated key fishing communities is contained in **Section 3.4** and incorporated herein by reference.

Because of the recent overall downturn in the economy, any actions to provide more economic opportunity should have beneficial social effects. The commercial and for-hire sectors of the dolphin and wahoo fishery have seen changes in regulatory actions. With the recent

DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

adoption of annual catch limits (ACLs), early closures of some fisheries are occurring which can change fishing behavior by initiating switching target behavior to other fisheries and adding pressure on other stocks, however, this has not yet happened for either the commercial or recreational sectors of the dolphin and wahoo fishery, but could in the future. If the choices available to fishermen are limited, then fishermen are also limited in their flexibility to adapt to regulatory change. Without other options on the water, they may need to make changes in household economics that can have further impacts that extend to the larger community. Much of this discussion is based upon assumption as we do not have enough detailed information on fishermen's businesses or households.

# Chapter 7. List of Preparers

Name	SAFMC	Title
Brian Cheuvront	SAFMC	IPT Lead/Economist
David Dale	NMFS/HC	EFH Specialist
Nikhil Mehta	NMFS/SF	IPT Lead/Fishery Biologist
Adam Brame	NMFS/PR	Fishery Biologist
Mike Jepson	NMFS/SF	Social Scientist
Mike Larkin	NMFS/SF	Data Analyst/Fishery Biologist
Jack McGovern	NMFS/SF	Fishery Biologist
Monica Smit-Brunello	NMFS/GC	Attorney
Kari McLauchlin	SAFMC	Social Scientist
Andy Strelcheck	NMFS/SF	Fishery Biologist
Tony Lamberte	NMFS/SF	Economist

### Table 7-1 L ist of preparers of the document

NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service, SAFMC = South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, SF = Sustainable Fisheries Division, PR = Protected Resources Division, SERO = Southeast Regional Office, HC = Habitat Conservation Division, GC = General Counsel, Eco=Economics

Name	Organization	Title
Brian Cheuvront	SAFMC	IPT Lead/Economist
John Carmichael	SAFMC	Fishery Stock Assessment
Brian Cheuvront	SAFMC	Fishery Economist
Anik Clemens	NMFS/SF	Technical Writer Editor
David W. Carter	NMFS/SEFSC	Economist
David Dale	NMFS/HC	EFH Specialist
Nikhil Mehta	NMFS/SF	IPT Lead/Fishery Biologist
Otha Easley	NMFS/LE	Supervisory Criminal Investigator
Nick Farmer	NMFS/SF	Data Analyst/Fishery Biologist
Mike Larkin	NMFS/SF	Data Analyst/Fishery Biologist
Adam Brame	NMFS/PR	Fishery Biologist (Protected Resources)
Mike Jepson	NMFS/SF	Social Scientist
David Keys	NMFS/SER	Regional NEPA Coordinator
Tony Lamberte	NMFS/SF	Economist
Kari MacLauchlin	SAFMC	Fishery Social Scientist
Gregg Waugh	SAFMC	Deputy Executive Director
Anna Martin	SAFMC	Fishery Biologist
Roger Pugliese	SAFMC	Fishery Biologist
Kevin Craig	NMFS/SEFSC	Fishery Biologist
Matthew Lauretta	NMFS/SEFSC	Fishery Biologist
Monica Smit-Brunello	NOAA/GC	Attorney

**Table 7-2.** List of interdisciplinary plan team members for the document.

NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service, SAFMC = South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, SF = Sustainable Fisheries Division, PR = Protected Resources Division, SERO = Southeast Regional Office, HC = Habitat Conservation Division, GC = General Counsel, Eco=Economics

#### DOLPHIN WAHOO AMENDMENT 5

## **Chapter 8.** Agencies and Persons Consulted

Responsible Agency for EA NMFS, Southeast Region 263 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701 (727) 824-5301 (TEL) (727) 824-5320 (FAX)

List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Consulted SAFMC Law Enforcement Advisory Panel SAFMC Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel SAFMC Scientific and Statistical Committee SAFMC Information and Education Advisory Panel North Carolina Coastal Zone Management Program South Carolina Coastal Zone Management Program Georgia Coastal Zone Management Program Florida Coastal Zone Management Program Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Georgia Department of Natural Resources South Carolina Department of Natural Resources North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries North Carolina Sea Grant South Carolina Sea Grant Georgia Sea Grant Florida Sea Grant Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Development Foundation Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council National Marine Fisheries Service

- Washington Office
- Office of Ecology and Conservation
- Southeast Regional Office
- Southeast Fisheries Science Center

**Chapter 8. Entities Consulted** 

## Chapter 9. References

Allen, G. R. 1985. FAO species catalogue. Vol. 6. Snappers of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of lutjanid species known to date. FAO Fish. Synop. 6(125): 208 pp.

Allman, R. J., G. R. Fitzhugh, and W. A. Fable. 2002. Report of Red Snapper Otolith Ageing; 2000 Data Summary. NMFS, SEFSC, Panama City Laboratory Contribution Series: 02-02. 18 p.

Bigelow, H. B. and W. C. Schroeder. 1953. Sawfishes, guitarfishes, skates and rays, pp. 1-514. *In:* Tee-Van, J., C.M Breder, A.E. Parr, W.C. Schroeder and L.P. Schultz (eds). Fishes of the Western North Atlantic, Part Two. Mem. Sears Found. Mar. Res. I.

Carter, D. and C. Liese. 2012. The Economic Value of Catching and Keeping or Releasing Saltwater Sport Fish in the Southeast USA. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 32:613-625.

CEQ (Council on Environmental Quality). 1997. Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act. U.S. Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, DC. 64 pp.

Colburn, L. L. and M. Jepson. 2012 Social Indicators of Gentrification Pressure in Fishing Communities: A Context for Social Impact Assessment. <u>Coastal Management</u> 40(3): 289-300.

Collette, B. B. (2002). Scombridae. In 'The Living Marine Resources of the Western CentralAtlantic.Volume 2: Bony Fishes Part 2 (Opistognathidae to Molidae), Sea Turtles and Marine Mammals. FAO Species Identification Guide for Fishery Purposes and American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists Special Publication No. 5'. (Ed. K. E. Carpenter.) pp. 1701–1722. (Food Agricultural Organization: Rome.)

Dumas, C. F., J.C. Whitehead, C. E. Landry, and J. H. Herstine. 2009. Economic Impacts and Recreation Value of the North Carolina For-Hire Fishing Fleet. North Carolina Sea Grant FRG Grant Report 07-FEG-05.

Garber, A. F., M. D. Tringali, and J. S. Franks. (2005). Population genetic and phylogeographic structure of wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri*, from the western Atlantic and central Pacific Oceans. Marine Biology (Berlin) 147, 205–214. doi:10.1007/S00227-004-1533-1

Goodyear, C.P. 1995. Red snapper in U.S. waters of the Gulf of Mexico. NOAA Contribution: MIA-95/96-05.

Grimes, C. B. 1987. Reproductive biology of the Lutjanidae: a review. Pages 239-294 In J.J. Polovina and S. Ralston (eds.). Tropical snappers and groupers: biology and fisheries management. Westview Press. Boulder, Colorado.

Haab, T. C., R. Hicks, K. Schnier, and J. C. Whitehead. 2009. Angler Heterogeneity and the Species-Specific Demand for Recreational Fishing in the Southeastern United States. Draft Final Report Submitted for MARFIN Grant #NA06NMF4330055.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

Hall-Arber, Madeleine, Chris Dyer, John Poggie, James McNally, Renee Gagne M. (2002). New England's Fishing Communities. A final report for Northeast MARFIN grant #NA87FF0547.

Hoenig, J. M. 1983. Empirical use of longevity data to estimate mortality rates. Fish. Bull. 82: 898-903.

Holland, S. M., A. J. Fedler, and J. W. Milon. 1999. The Operation and Economics of the Charter and Headboat Fleets of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Coasts. University of Florida Office of Research, Technology, and Graduate Education. Report prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service. Grant Number NA77FF0553.

Holland, S. M., C. Oh, S. L. Larkin, and A. W. Hodges. 2012. The Operations and Economics of For-Hire Fishing Fleets of the South Atlantic States and the Atlantic Coast of Florida. Report prepared for the National Marine Fisheries Service. MARFIN Grant Number NA09NMF4330151.

IPCC, 2007: Climate Change 2007: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, Pachauri, R.K and Reisinger, A. (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 104 pp.

Jacob, S., P. Weeks, B. Blount, and M. Jepson. 2012 Development and Evaluation of Social Indicators of Vulnerability and Resiliency for Fishing Communities in the Gulf of Mexico. <u>Marine Policy</u> 26(10): 16-22.

Jepson, M., K. Kitner, A. Pitchon, W.W. Perry, and B. Stoffle. 2005. Potential fishing communities in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida: An effort in baseline profiling and mapping. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405.

Johnson, G. D. 1978. Development of fishes of the Mid-Atlantic Bight. An atlas of egg, larval, and juvenile stages. Vol. IV Carangidae through Epruppidae. U.S. Dep. Inter., Fish Wildl. Serv., BioI. Serv. Prog. *FWS/OBS-78!12*, Jan. 1978: 123-128.

Kennedy, V.S., R. R. Twilley, J. A. Kleypas, J. H. Cowan, Jr., and S. R. Hare. 2002. Coastal and Marine Ecosystems & Global Climate Change: Potential Effects on U.S. Resources. Pew Center on Global Climate Change. 52 p.

Liese, C. D., W. Carter, and R. Curtis. 2009. Surveying the For-Hire Sector: Economic Heterogeneity in the Southeast Charter Boat Industry. Submitted to the Proceedings of the 5th World Recreational Fishing Conference.

MacDonald, L. H. 2000. Evaluating and managing cumulative effects: process and constraints. Environmental Management 26(3): 299-315.

Maki Jenkins, K.L. 2009. Reproductive biology of wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri*, from the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Bahamas. Marine and Freshwater Research. 60:893-897.

Manooch, C.M., III and J.C. Potts. 1997. Age, growth and mortality of greater amberjack from the southeastern United States. Fish. Res. 30: 229-240.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

100

Manooch, C. S., III, J. C. Potts, M. L. Burton, and D. S. Vaughan. 1998. Population assessment of the vermilion snapper, *Rhomboplites aurorubens*, from the southeastern United States. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS–SEFSC–411. 59pp.

McBride, R. S., A. K., Richardson, and K. L.Maki. (2008). Age, growth, and mortality of wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri*, from the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Bahamas. Marine and Freshwater Research 59, 799–807. doi:10.1071/MF08021

McCay, Bonnie and Marie Cieri. (2000). Fishing Ports of the Mid-Atlantic. A Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Dover, Delaware, April 2000.

McInerny, S. A. 2007. Age and Growth of Red Snapper *Lutjanus campechanus*, from the Southeastern United States. A thesis submitted to the University of North Carolina Wilmington.

Moe, M. A. 1963. A survey of offshore fishing in Florida. Florida State Board of Conservation, Marine Laboratory, Maritime Base (St. Petersburg, FL). Professional Papers Series, No. 4. 117 pp.

NOAA SEFSC SSRG. 2009. Economic Value of Catch and Keep in the Southeastern U.S.: Evidence from a Choice Experiment.

Palko, B. J., G. L. Beardsley, and W. J. Richards. 1982. Synopsis of the biological data on dolphin fishes, *Coryphaena hippurus* Linnaeus and *Coryphaena equiselis* Linnaeus. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Rept. NMFS Circ. 443, 28 p.

Robins, C. R. and G. C. Ray. 1986. A field guide to Atlantic coast fishes of North America. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, U.S.A. 354 pp.

Oxenford, H. A. 1999. Biology of the dolphinfish (*Coryphaena hippurus*) in the western central Atlantic: a review. Scientia Marina. 63 (3-4): 277-301.

Oxenford, H. A. and W. Hunte. 1986. A preliminary investigation of the stock structure of the dolphin, *Coryphaena hippurus*, in the western central Atlantic. Fishery Bulletin, U.S. 84: 451-460.

Prager, M. H. 2000. Exploratory Assessment of Dolphinfish, *Coryphaena hippurus*, based on U.S. landings from the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. NMFS, SEFSC 18pp.

Rothschild, B. J. 1986. Dynamics of Marine Fish Populations. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts. 277 pp.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 1983. Fishery Management Plan, Regulatory Impact Review and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 1 Southpark Circle, Suite 306, Charleston, South Carolina, 29407-4699.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 1988. Amendment 1 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

101

and Regulatory Impact Review. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 63 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 1991. Amendment 4 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, and Regulatory Impact Review. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 243 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 1993. Amendment 6 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, and Regulatory Impact Review. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 161 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 1998. Amendment Number 9, Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis/Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement for the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 1 Southpark Cir., Suite 306, Charleston, S.C. 29407-4699. 246 pp.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2006. Amendment 13C to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Biological Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 631 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2007. Amendment 14 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Biological Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 601 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2008a. Amendment 15A to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Biological Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 325 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2008b. Amendment 15B to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Biological Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 324 pp. plus appendices.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2009a. Amendment 16 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 608 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2009b. Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the South Atlantic Region. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place, Ste 201, North Charleston, S.C. 29405.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2010a. Amendment 17A to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 385 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2010b. Amendment 17B to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 406 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011a. Regulatory Amendment 10 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 101 pp. with appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011b. Comprehensive Annual Catch Limit Amendment for the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 755 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011c. Regulatory Amendment 11 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 86 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011d. Amendment 18A to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 292 pp. plus appendices.

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011e. Amendment 24 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 256 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011f. Amendment 20A to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 128 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2011g. Regulatory Amendment 9 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 1 Southpark Cir., Suite 306, Charleston, S.C. 29407-4699. 185 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2012a. Regulatory Amendment 12 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 106 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2012b. Amendment 18A to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405. 238 pp. plus appendices.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2012c. Amendment 18B to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 2013. Regulatory Amendment 15 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region with Final Environmental Assessment, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 4055 Faber Place Drive, Ste 201, Charleston, S.C. 29405.

Schwenke, K. L., and Buckel, J. A. (2008). Age, growth, and reproduction of dolphinfish (*Coryphaena hippurus*) caught off the coast of North Carolina. Fishery Bulletin 106, 82–92.

SEDAR 15. 2008. Stock Assessment Report 1 (revised March, 2009). South Atlantic Red Snapper. Available from the SEDAR website: <a href="https://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/">www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/</a>

SNAPPER GROUPER AMENDMENT 28

104

SEDAR 24. 2010. Stock Assessment Report. South Atlantic Red Snapper. Available from the SEDAR website: <a href="http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/">www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/</a>

Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Meeting Report. November 8-10, 2010. Holiday Inn, North Charleston, SC 29405.

Sutton, S.G., R.B. Ditton, J.R. Stoll, and J.W. Milon. 1999. A Cross sectional study and longitudinal perspective on the social and economic characteristics of the charter and party boat fishing industry of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas. Report by the Human Dimensions of Recreational Fisheries Research Laboratory, Texas A&M for NMFS, MARFIN program grant number NA 77FF0551.

Szedlmayer, S. T. and J. D. Lee. 2004. Diet shifts of juvenile red snapper (*Lutjanus campechanus*) with changes in habitat and fish size. Fish. Bull. 102:366–375.

Theisen, T. C., B.W. Bowen, W. Lanier, and J.D. Baldwin. (2008). High connectivity on a global scale in the pelagic wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri* (tuna family Scombridae). Molecular Ecology 17, 4233–4247.

USDOC (U.S. Department of Commerce). 2009. Fisheries Economics of the United States 2006. Economic and Sociocultural Status and Trend Series. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. 158 pp.

White, D. B. and S. M. Palmer. 2004. Age, growth and reproduction of the red snapper, *Lutjanus campechanus*, from the Atlantic waters of the southeastern United States. Bull. Mar. Sci. 75: 335-360.

Zischke, M. T., S. P. Griffiths, I. R. Tibbetts, and R. J. G. Lester. 2012. Stock identification of wahoo (Acanthocybium solandri) in the Pacific and Indian Oceans using morphometrics and parasites. ICES Journal of Marine Science 10.1093/icesjms/fss164.