

OVERVIEW OF CHANGES TO THE GENERIC DEALER AMENDMENT

AUGUST 2013

The document (**Attachment 6**) has been revised to clarify that requirements apply in the Mid-Atlantic and New England Council areas. One public hearing was held in the Mid-Atlantic and one in New England but there were no attendees and no written comments were received. No changes were made to the intent of the actions/alternatives. SEFSC, SERO, and Council staff expanded the analyses in the social and economic sections.

The following sections were updated:

1. **Section 1.3** Proposed Actions, Examples of how the lack of a generic dealer permit and more frequent reporting requirements have adversely affected management – Tables 1.1 & 1.2 (pdf page 18) for the Gulf and Tables 1.3 -1.6 (pdf pages 19-22) for the Atlantic were updated and now include data through 2012. The gag landings were 60% over quota in 2011 after late landings were reported; vermilion is still proving to be challenging with an overage of 152% for July-Dec 2011.
2. **Chapter 2**, Management Alternatives – minor edits to the wording of some alternatives:
 - a. Option 2a (pdf page 33) - “exclusive of” changed to “excluding”
 - b. Preferred Option 2b (pdf page 34) – “exclusive of” changed to “except”
 - c. Option 3b (pdf page 35) – deleted the following: “Dealer permits would be required to purchase species in the following fishery management plans.”
 - d. Discussion (pdf page 36) the following text was added in the first paragraph to make it very clear that the requirements apply to all South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico managed species: “It is the Councils’ intent that the generic dealer permit requirements apply to any dealer purchasing South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico managed species and to all federally permitted vessels that sell South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico managed species. This would require that permitted vessels can only sell to permitted dealers in those fisheries where a dealer’s permit exists. This will also apply to for-hire vessels with a for-hire Coastal Migratory Pelagic Permit and to vessels with a federal spiny lobster tailing or spiny lobster permit.”
 - e. Discussion (pdf page 37) – the last paragraph was added: “The Councils concluded the dealer requirements should apply to dealers and federally-permitted vessels in the Mid-Atlantic and New England to ensure accurate tracking of landings so that Annual Catch Limits (ACLs) are not exceeded.
 - f. Action 2 (pdf pages 38-40) – “local time” was added after the time shown in the options and note. In Preferred Alternative 5: “annual catch limit (ACL)” was changed to “ACL”.

- g. Action 3 (pdf page 43) – Preferred Alternative 2: “NOAA Fisheries” was changed to “NMFS”.
- 3. **Section 3.3** Description of the Economic Environment (pdf page 64) – expanded to include the northeast.
- 4. **Section 3.4** Description of the Social Environment (pdf page 70) – expanded to include the northeast.
- 5. **Chapter 4** Environmental Consequences (pdf page 91) – expanded to include the northeast. The economic and social sections in particular were expanded.
- 6. **Chapter 5** Regulatory Impact Review (pdf page 125) – expanded to include the northeast.
- 7. **Chapter 6** Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (pdf page 129) – expanded to include the northeast.