

Shrimp Amendment 7 Overview

Myra Brouwer, SAFMC staff

June 2008



Background

- **Shrimp Amendment 1:**
 - added rock shrimp to the FMU
 - Federal Rock Shrimp Permit was required Nov. 1996
 - Established rock shrimp closed area to protect *Oculina* coral
- **Shrimp Amendment 4:**
 - Established rock shrimp OY as MSY in the SA EEZ (6,829,449 pounds) and the overfishing threshold as 2 stand. dev. above mean landings 1986-1994.

Background

- **Shrimp Amendment 5:**
 - Established limited access program for rock shrimp fishery - endorsement required to fish for rock shrimp in the EEZ of Georgia and Florida.
 - Eligibility requirements: 1) Federal permit on or before Dec. 31, 2000 and 2) landings of at least 15,000 pounds in one of four consecutive years from time of issue of endorsement.
 - VMS requirement for vessels with LAE
 - Vessel operator permits

Background

- **Shrimp Amendment 6:**

Revised status determination criteria for rock shrimp:

- MSY/OY = mean total landings for the South Atlantic 1986-2000 (4,912,927 pounds);
- Overfishing = rate leading to annual landings larger than 2 stand. dev. above MSY (14,687,775 pounds) for two consecutive years; and
- Overfished = parent stock size less than $\frac{1}{2} B_{MSY}$ for two consecutive years.

Current Issues

1. Need to maintain effort and infrastructure for fishery to remain viable. Concern that makeup of the fishery could change under current requirements.
2. Potential loss of endorsements due to not meeting the landing requirement and/or confusion over renewal requirements.
3. Lack of economic data for shrimp fisheries in the region.

Actions and Alternatives

- Listed in document summary (doc. page XVII or pdf 18) along with summary of environmental consequences (impacts).
- Amendment 7 includes 5 actions:
 - Actions 1-4 are specific to the rock shrimp fishery.
 - Action 5 applies to both rock and penaeid shrimp fisheries.

Action 1 – Landing requirement

- **Alternative 1** – No action. Do not remove.
- **Alternative 2 (Preferred)** – Remove 15,000 pound landing requirement
- **Alternative 3** – Reduce landing requirement to 7,500 pounds.
- Impacts: 34% reduction in fishery participants if requirement is maintained; negative biological impacts under #2 and #3 due to increase in effort; least long- term administrative impacts under #2, **however...**

Action 1. Cont'd.

- At present, *no formal mechanism exists by which South Atlantic rock shrimp landings are compiled and reported to the Permits Office for the purpose of determining whether endorsement holders have met the landings requirement.* If this requirement is to be retained, such a mechanism will need to be created in the near future given the impending deadline for many vessels to meet the requirement. Therefore, # 1 and #3 have the potential of significant administrative impacts.

Action 2 – Endorsements lost due to not meeting landing requirement

- **Alternative 1** – No action. Do not reinstate.
- **Alternative 2 (Preferred)** – Reinstate all endorsements lost.
- **Alternative 3** – Reinstate for those vessels landing at least 7,500 pounds.
- Impacts: Adverse biological effects from #2 and #3; most beneficial socioeconomic effects and most burdensome administrative effects under #2.

Action 3 – Endorsements lost due to failure to renew

- Shrimp Amendment 5 required a *limited access rock shrimp permit* while the proposed and final rule required a *limited access endorsement*.
- Permit can be renewed at any time but endorsement is renewable for **one year** after it becomes inactive. After that it is non-renewable and it is lost to the fishery.
- A number of endorsements are currently non-renewable, some of which are linked to vessels that did meet the 15,000-pound landing requirement.

Action 3. Cont'd.

- **Alternative 1** – No action. Do not reinstate.
- **Alternative 2 (Preferred)** - Reinstate all endorsements for those who renewed their permit in the year in which they failed to renew their endorsement. Require rock shrimpers eligible to have their endorsements reinstated to apply for a limited access endorsement within one year after the effective date of the final rule of for this amendment. Note: Eligible individuals need to have had an endorsement at one time.
- **Alternative 3** - Extend the time allowed to renew rock shrimp endorsements to 1 calendar year after the effective date for this action.

Action 3. Cont'd.

- Impacts: Minimal biological impacts, if any, from #2 and #3. Most beneficial socioeconomic impacts and most burdensome administrative impacts from #2.
- Issue: Alternative 2 refers to *individuals* whereas the endorsements are issued to *vessels* not individuals. The distinction can often be important with respect to writing and implementing the regulations.

Action 4. Change names of permit and endorsement to minimize confusion

- **Alternative 1** – No action. Continue to use “open access permit” and “limited access endorsement.”
- **Alternative 2** – Create two types of permits for the rock shrimp fishery and specify that a vessel can only have one permit:
 - A. **Rock Shrimp Permit (South Atlantic EEZ)** – would allow fishing throughout the South Atlantic EEZ.
 - B. **Rock Shrimp Permit (Carolinas Zone)** – would allow fishing in the EEZ off North and South Carolina.

Action 4. Cont'd.

- Impacts: No direct biological or economic effects. Positive social effect in that confusion will be minimized over the long-term. Significant short-term administrative effects.

Action 5. Require shrimp permit holders to provide economic data

- **Alternative 1** – No action – do not require economic data collection.
- **Alternative 2** – Require economic data collection from all SA shrimp permit holders.
- **Alternative 3 (Preferred)** - Require all South Atlantic shrimp permit holders to provide economic data if selected to do so.
- Impacts: No biological effect. Beneficial economic impact and significant administrative burden from #2 and #3.



Questions?