



Snapper Grouper Amendment 18B – Golden Tilefish

Snapper Grouper Committee
December 2011

Decision Document

Background and need for this amendment:

Recent amendments to the Snapper Grouper FMP have imposed more restrictive harvest limitations on snapper grouper fishermen resulting in a greater number of fishermen targeting golden tilefish. This increase in effort is intensifying the “race to fish” that already exists, which has resulted in a shortened season. The fishing season for golden tilefish in recent years has already been shortened to such a degree that South Carolina longline fishermen--who are typically unable to fish until April or May due to weather conditions-- and hook and line fishermen from Florida--who typically do not fish until the fall--are increasingly unable to participate in the fishery. The South Atlantic Council is concerned a continued increase effort will deteriorate profits even further and result in more unsafe fishing conditions.

The following was established through Snapper Grouper Amendment 17B. Regulations became effective in January 2011.

1. Allocations were specified as 97% commercial and 3% recreational.
2. ACL was set at the F_{OY} level (Total ACL = 326,554 lbs whole weight or 291,566 lbs gutted weight).
3. Commercial ACL = 282,819 lbs gutted weight based on the allocation alternative selected (97% commercial, 3% recreational).
4. Commercial AM: prohibit harvest, possession, and retention when the quota is projected to be met. All purchase and sale is prohibited when the quota is projected to be met.
5. Recreational ACL = 1,578 fish based upon allocation alternative selected (97% commercial, 3% recreational).
6. Recreational AM: If the ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the sector ACL for the following fishing season. Compare the recreational ACL with projected recreational landings over a range of years. For

2010, use only 2010 landings. For 2011, use the average landings of 2010 and 2011. For 2012 and beyond, use the most recent three-year running average.

Specific goals of the amendment:

- Limit participation in the golden tilefish fishery
- Change the golden tilefish fishing year
- Change the golden tilefish commercial trip limits
- Update MSA parameters based on the current SEDAR stock assessment as necessary.

Management actions proposed in this Amendment:

1. Limit Participation in the Golden Tilefish Fishery
2. Establish Initial Eligibility Requirements for a Golden Tilefish Hook and Line Endorsement
3. Establish Initial Eligibility Requirements for a Golden Tilefish Longline Endorsement
4. Establish an Appeals Process
5. Allocate Commercial Golden Tilefish Quota Among Gear Groups
6. Allow for Transferability of Golden Tilefish Endorsements
7. Adjust Golden Tilefish Fishing Year
8. Establish Golden Tilefish Fishing Limits
9. Establish Trip Limits for Fishermen Who Do Not Receive a Golden Tilefish Hook-and-Line Endorsement
10. Establish Trip Limits for Fishermen Who Receive a Golden Tilefish Hook-and-Line Endorsement

Recommended additions:

11. Update MSA parameters based on the current SEDAR stock assessment as necessary
12. Revise Annual Catch Limit (ACL) and Optimum Yield (OY) for golden tilefish
13. Specify a Commercial Sector ACT
14. Specify a Recreational Sector ACT
15. Revise Accountability Measures (AMs) for golden tilefish

General Timing for this Amendment:

- Approve for public hearings – December 2011
- Public hearings – January/February 2012
- Review comments and approve all actions – March 2012
- Send to Secretary of Commerce – March/April 2012
- Regulations implemented by January 2013

Specific actions and alternatives being considered:

At the June 2011 Council meeting in Key West, Florida, the Council decided to move the actions pertaining to golden tilefish in Amendment 18A into a separate amendment. Amendment 18B now contains all actions pertaining only to the management of golden tilefish. This amendment currently has 10 actions. Staff is suggesting adding 4 more actions to the

amendment. In addition, the amendment will contain a discussion of the updated parameters from the golden tilefish assessment (SEDAR 25) recently completed.

Action 1. Limit Participation in the Golden Tilefish Fishery

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not limit effort in the golden tilefish fishery through an endorsement program.

Alternative 2. Limit golden tilefish effort through a golden tilefish gear endorsement program: Only snapper grouper permit holders with a golden tilefish longline endorsement or a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement associated with their snapper grouper permit will be allowed to possess golden tilefish.

Subalternative 2a. Individuals that meet the qualifying criteria for both hook and line and longline endorsements may receive both endorsements.

Subalternative 2b. Individuals that meet the qualifying criteria for both hook and line and longline endorsements only receive one endorsement, chosen by the individual that qualifies.

NEW Subalternative 2c (Preferred). Individuals that meet the qualifying criteria only receive a longline endorsement.

~~**Subalternative 2c.** Individuals that meet the qualifying criteria for both hook and line and longline endorsements only receive a hook and line endorsement.~~

~~**Subalternative 2d.** Individuals that meet the qualifying criteria for both hook and line and longline endorsements only receive a longline endorsement.~~

Council changes/guidance from September 2011:

1. Approved splitting of Action 1 into three actions: one to establish an endorsement program, one to establish eligibility criteria for the hook-and-line sector and one to establish eligibility criteria for the longline sector.
2. Approved deleting Subalternatives 2c and 2d.
3. Selected a subalternative 2a as preferred.
4. Added a new alternative that only establishes a longline endorsement and selected as preferred.

AP recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SUPPORT THE COUNCIL'S PREFERRED TO ESTABLISH AN ENDORSEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE LONGLINE SECTOR

Subalternative 2c (Preferred). Individuals that meet the qualifying criteria only receive a longline endorsement.

SSC Recommendation:

SSC commented that limiting access may be favorable based on the fact that the fishery has been closing earlier each year. SSC cautions that by concentrating catch to specialists, these fishermen will be more susceptible to biological and regulatory fluctuations. Council should consider that fishermen are generally in favor of limiting entry in their own fishery due to increases in personal revenue and spreading the catch among fewer participants. May not achieve goal of balancing regional differences in season.

NOTE: New biological analysis for changes since Sept 2011 is on pdf page 106 (Attachment 5a). New social analysis is on pdf page 109.

Action 2. Establish Initial Eligibility Requirements for a Golden Tilefish Hook and Line Endorsement

Action 1 (No Action) (Preferred). Do not establish initial eligibility requirements for a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement

Alternative 2. Establish initial eligibility requirements for a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement based on the following criteria:

Subalternative 2a (Preferred). To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 1,000 pounds gutted weight (gw) (with hook and line gear) when the individual's best three of five years from 2001-2005 are aggregated. (Sub-alternative devised by the GT LAP WG.)

~~**Subalternative 2b.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the individual's best three of five years from 2001-2005 are aggregated. (Sub-alternative devised by the GT LAP WG)~~

~~**Subalternative 2c.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the individual's landings from 2001-2005 are averaged.~~

~~**Subalternative 2d.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the individual's landings from 1999-2008 are averaged.~~

~~**Subalternative 2e.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 1,000 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the individual's landings from 1999-2008 are averaged.~~

~~**Subalternative 2f.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 1,000 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs 2001-05 are aggregated and at least 1 lb was landed in 2008.~~

Subalternative 2g. To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 1,000 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs 2001-05 are aggregated and at least 1 lb was landed in 2007 or 2008.

~~**Subalternative 2h.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs 2001-05 are aggregated and at least 1 lb was landed in 2008.~~

Subalternative 2i. To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs 2001-05 are aggregated and at least 1 lb was landed in 2007 or 2008.

~~**Subalternative 2j.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs 2001-05 are averaged and at least 1 lb was landed in 2008.~~

~~**Subalternative 2k.** To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs 2001-05 are averaged and at least 1 lb was landed in 2007 or 2008.~~

Subalternative 2l. To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 500 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs from 2005-2009 are aggregated. ***NOTE: This alternative added in June 2011

Subalternative 2m. To receive a golden tilefish hook and line endorsement, the permit must have a harvest level of 1,000 pounds gw (with hook and line gear) when the best 3 of 5 yrs from 2005-2009 are aggregated. ***NOTE: This alternative added in June 2011

Council changes/guidance from September 2011:

1. Clarified that landings must have already been reported into logbook.
2. Substituted the word "individual" with "permit" in the alternatives.
3. Clarified that a valid SG permit is required over the specified years.
4. Reduced the number of alternatives significantly (see strikethrough).
5. Clarified that 2005-2009 are used in Subalternatives 2l and 2m to include a more recent timeframe.
6. Selected Alternative 1 (No Action) as Preferred.

AP recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SELECT ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION) FOR ACTION 2 (Establish Initial Eligibility Requirements for a Golden Tilefish Hook and Line Endorsement).

SSC Recommendation:

May want to collect some quantitative info before making any decisions on these endorsements. May also want to consider the costs of these programs.

NOTE: New social analysis for changes since September 2011 is on pdf page 117

Action 3. Establish Initial Eligibility Requirements for a Golden Tilefish Longline Endorsement

Action 1 (No Action). Do not establish initial eligibility requirements for a golden tilefish longline endorsement

Alternative 2. Establish initial eligibility requirements for a golden tilefish longline endorsement based on the following criteria:

Subalternative 2a (Preferred). To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have a total of 2,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2006 and 2008. (Sub-alternative devised by the GT LAP WG)

Subalternative 2b. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have a total of 5,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2006 and 2008.

Subalternative 2c. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have an average of 5,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2006 and 2008.

Subalternative 2d. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have an average of 5,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2007 and 2009.

Subalternative 2e. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have an average of 10,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2007 and 2009.

NEW Subalternative 2f. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have an average of 10,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2007 and 2010.

NEW Subalternative 2g. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have an average of 20,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2007 and 2010.

NEW Subalternative 2h. To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have an average of 30,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2007 and 2010.

Council changes/guidance from September 2011:

1. Council clarified that “years between 2007 and 2009” means calendar years 2007 through 2009
2. Consider changing the wording of the alternatives similar to the hook-and line alternatives in Action 2
3. Council clarified that landings refer to logbook
4. Added new alternatives: Look at time series from 2007-2010 as the qualifying period and include subalternatives for the level of landings of 10K, 20K and 30K pounds.

AP recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SUPPORT THE COUNCIL’S PREFERRED FOR ACTION 3:

Subalternative 2a (Preferred). To receive a golden tilefish longline endorsement, the individual must have a total of 2,000 pounds gw golden tilefish caught (with longline gear) between 2006 and 2008. (Sub-alternative devised by the GT LAP WG)

AP RECOMMENDATION FOR NEW ALTERNATIVES ADDED TO AMENDMENT 18B (Look at time series from 2007-2010 as the qualifying period and include subalternatives for the level of landings of 10K, 20K and 30K pounds) – INCLUDING MORE RECENT YEARS WILL ALLOW MORE PARTICIPANTS INTO THE FISHERY. IT DOESN’T CAPTURE THE CORE PARTICIPANTS IN THE FISHERY.

SSC Recommendation:

Need to know the goals in order to evaluate whether these methods are appropriate or not (applies to all previous Actions). Should consider developing a decision tree to specify methodology for making these decisions (applies to all previous Actions).

NOTE: New biological analysis for changes since September 2011 is on pdf page 123. New social analysis is on pdf page 125.

Action 4. Establish an Appeals Process

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not establish an appeals process for fishermen who believe they were omitted from the endorsement program based on eligibility criteria.

Alternative 2 (Preferred). Establish an appeals process. (This process would be developed by NMFS and would be consistent with similar processes in the region.)

IPT Recommendations:

1. Clarify that this does not include hardship appeals.
2. Recommend adopting the following alternatives similar to what is being proposed in Wreckfish Amendment 20A and Amendment 18A

Alternative 1: No Action. Do not specify provisions for an appeals process.

Alternative 2: A period of 90 days will be set aside to accept appeals to the black sea bass endorsement program starting on the effective date of the final rule. The (RA) will review, evaluate, and render final decisions on appeals. Hardship arguments will not be considered. The RA will determine the outcome of appeals based on NMFS' logbooks. If NMFS' logbooks are not available, the RA may use state landings records. Appellants must submit NMFS' logbooks or state landings records to support their appeal.

Alternative 3: A period of 90 days will be set aside to accept appeals to the black sea bass endorsement program starting on the effective date of the final rule. The (RA) will review, evaluate, and render final decisions on appeals. Hardship arguments will not be considered. A special board composed of state directors/designees will review, evaluate, and make individual recommendations to RA on appeals. Hardship arguments will not be considered. The special board and the RA will determine the outcome of appeals based on NMFS' logbooks. If NMFS' logbooks are not available, the RA may use state landings records. Appellants must submit NMFS' logbooks or state landings records to support their appeal.

AP recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SUPPORT ALTERNATIVE 3 UNDER ACTION 4 AS PREFERRED.

SSC Recommendation: none.

Action 5. Allocate Commercial Golden Tilefish Quota Among Gear Groups

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not allocate commercial golden tilefish quota among gear groups.

Alternative 2. Allocate the golden tilefish commercial quota based on 75% longline, 25% hook and line.

Alternative 3. Allocate the golden tilefish commercial quota based on 85% longline, 15% hook and line.

Alternative 4 (Preferred). Allocate the golden tilefish commercial quota based on 90% longline and 10% hook and line.

IPT Recommendations:

1. Change action and alternatives to read as follows:

Action 5. Allocate the Commercial Golden Tilefish Annual Catch Limit (ACL) Among Gear Groups

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not allocate the commercial golden tilefish ACL among gear groups (currently commercial ACL = 282,819 pounds gw).

Alternative 2. Allocate the golden tilefish commercial ACL as follows: 75% to the longline sector and 25% to the hook and line sector (currently would be 212,114 pounds gw to longlines and 70,705 pounds gw to hook and line).

Alternative 3. Allocate the golden tilefish commercial ACL as follows: 85% to the longline sector and 15% to hook and line sector (currently would be 240,396 pounds gw to longlines and 42,423 pounds gw to hook and line).

Alternative 4 (Preferred). Allocate the golden tilefish commercial ACL as follows: 90% to the longline sector and 10% to hook and line sector (currently would be 254,537 pounds gw to longlines and 28,282 pounds gw to hook and line).

2. Clarify that Action 11 may change the commercial ACL which would change the allocations shown above.

AP recommendation (November 2010): Select Alternative 4 as preferred.

SSC RECOMMENDATION:

Should consider developing a decision tree to specify methodology for making these decisions. Council should consider how they might want to adjust these allocations over time.

Action 6. Allow for Transferability of Golden Tilefish Endorsements

Alternative 1 (No Action). Longline and hook and line golden tilefish endorsements *cannot* be transferred.

Alternative 2 (Preferred). Longline golden tilefish endorsements can be transferred between any two individuals or entities that hold valid unlimited Federal commercial snapper grouper permits and fish with longline gear.

Subalternative 2a (Preferred). Transferability allowed upon program implementation.

Subalternative 2b. Transferability not allowed during the first 2 years of the program.

Subalternative 2c. Transferability not allowed during the first 3 years of the program.

Subalternative 2d. Transferability not allowed during the first 5 years of the program.

Alternative 3 (Preferred). Hook and line golden tilefish endorsements can be transferred between any two individuals or entities that hold valid unlimited Federal commercial snapper grouper permits and fish with hook and line gear.

Subalternative 3a (Preferred). Transferability allowed upon program implementation.

Subalternative 3b. Transferability not allowed during the first 2 years of the program.

Subalternative 3c. Transferability not allowed during the first 3 years of the program.

Subalternative 3d. Transferability not allowed during the first 5 years of the program.

Alternative 4. Hook and line and longline golden tilefish endorsements can be transferred between any two individuals or entities that hold valid unlimited Federal commercial snapper grouper permits, regardless of the gear endorsement category.

Subalternative 4a. Transferability allowed upon program implementation.

Subalternative 4b. Transferability not allowed during the first 2 years of the program.

Subalternative 4c. Transferability not allowed during the first 3 years of the program.

Subalternative 4d. Transferability not allowed during the first 5 years of the program.

IPT Recommendations:

1. Approve wording change for Alternative 1 (insert the word “cannot”)
2. Determine whether the 3- & 5-year subalternatives are really necessary.

AP recommendation (November 2010): Longline endorsement should be transferrable.

SSC Recommendation:

Transferability of endorsements can only increase the economic efficiency of the amendment.

Action 7. Adjust Golden Tilefish Fishing Year

Preferred Alternative 1 (No Action). Retain existing January 1 start date for the golden tilefish fishing year.

Alternative 2. Change the start of the golden tilefish fishing year from January 1 to September 1.

Alternative 3. Change the start of the golden tilefish fishing year from January 1 to August 1.

Alternative 4. Change the start of the golden tilefish fishing year from January 1 to May 1.

IPT Recommendations:

Recommend adopting language below for alternatives under this action:

Alternative 1 (No Action). Retain the existing calendar year as the golden tilefish fishing year (January 1 through December 31).

Alternative 2. Specify the golden tilefish fishing year as September 1 through August 31.

Alternative 3. Specify the golden tilefish fishing year as August 1 through July 31.

Alternative 4. Specify the golden tilefish fishing year as May 1 through April 30.

AP recommendation (November 2010): Select Alternative 1 (No Action) as preferred.

SSC Recommendation:

In regards to the market for tilefish and keeping the fishery open during a time when other SG species are unavailable, then retaining the Jan 1 start is preferable. However, current year impacts the ability of people to fish in the northern portion of the SA. Allocating catch to the northern areas during different parts of the year, when other species are readily available, may reduce overall value of fishery.

Action 8. Establish Golden Tilefish Fishing Limits

Alternative 1 (No Action). Retain the 300 pound gutted weight trip limit when 75% of the quota ACL is taken.

Alternative 2 (Preferred). Remove the 300 pound gutted weight trip limit when 75% of the quota ACL is taken.

Alternative 3. Prohibit longline fishing after 75% of the quota ACL is taken.

IPT Recommendations:

1. Delete Action 8. The longline and hook and line sectors now have separate sector allocations, which equate to quotas. The existing trip limit may no longer be applicable.
2. If retained, change the wording of Action 8 to: “Modify the Golden Tilefish Trip Limit”.
3. If retained, approve language change in alternatives (change “quota” to “ACL”).

AP Recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: UNDER ACTION 8, SELECT ALTERNATIVE 1 AS PREFERRED

Alternative 1 (No Action). Retain the 300 pound gutted weight trip limit when 75% of the ACL is taken.

SSC Recommendation:

SSC recommends looking at the whole system holistically in order to integrate all the tools available, as well as all the limits/targets (ABC, ACL, ACT) in order to make it work better. The management, monitoring system, and data collection need to be better integrated to line up with SSC recommendations. Council should consider properly using ACTs to consider management uncertainty, using real-time data to monitor landings and adjust regulations. Electronic reporting has been used successfully to track individual quotas within catch-share programs. It should be possible to do this within the context of an open-access fishery. The SSC recommends an evaluation of the quota monitoring system to identify the problems and ways to improve them.

Action 9. Establish Trip Limits for Fishermen Who Do Not Receive a Golden Tilefish Hook-and-Line Endorsement

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not establish trip limits for the golden tilefish hook and line fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive an endorsement in the commercial golden tilefish hook and line fishery.

Alternative 2 (Preferred). Establish trip limits of 300 pounds gw for the golden tilefish hook and line fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive an endorsement in the commercial golden tilefish hook and line fishery. Vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit.

Alternative 3. Establish trip limits of 400 pounds gw for the golden tilefish hook and line fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive an endorsement in the commercial golden tilefish hook and line fishery. Vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit.

Alternative 4. Establish trip limits of 500 pounds gw for the golden tilefish hook and line fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive an endorsement in the commercial golden

tilefish hook and line fishery. Vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit.

Alternative 5 (Preferred). Establish trip limits of 100 pounds gw for the golden tilefish hook and line fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive an endorsement in the commercial golden tilefish hook and line fishery. Vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit. ***NOTE: This alternative added in June 2011 (Note: Catches under the trip limits would count towards the hook and line gear group quota established under Action 2.)

IPT Recommendations:

1. Delete this action. The existing amount of effort is more than enough to fill the quota very quickly. Distributing among those that qualify will only limit the derby to those that qualify. Fishermen have fished with longline gear under the existing 300-pound trip limit that was intended to prevent such fishing. Allowing all other commercial fishermen to target golden tilefish under a 100, 300, 400 or 500 pound trip limit will only encourage further effort shifts into the golden tilefish fishery which goes against the purpose and need of this amendment.
2. Under Preferred Alternative 4 for Action 5, the hook and line allocation is 28,282 pounds. The endorsement system and trip limits for those that receive endorsements would only apply to this small quantity of fish.

AP recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SELECT ALTERNATIVE 2 UNDER ACTION 9 AS PREFERRED

Establish Trip Limits For Fishermen Who Do Not Receive A Golden Tilefish Hook and Line Endorsement

Alternative 2 (Preferred). Establish trip limits of 300 pounds gw for the golden tilefish hook and line fishery for commercial fishermen who do not receive an endorsement in the commercial golden tilefish hook and line fishery. Vessels with longline endorsements are not eligible to fish for this trip limit.

SSC Recommendation:

Should have the goal of each action listed in order to properly evaluate the efficacy of the action in question. Should consider that a100% discard mortality when reviewing new, restrictive regulations, which may increase discards in this fishery.

Action 10. Establish Trip Limits for Fishermen Who Receive a Golden Tilefish Hook-and-Line Endorsement

NOTE: New action added by Council in June 2011

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not establish trip limits for fishermen who receive hook and line endorsements in the golden tilefish fishery.

Alternative 2. Establish trip limits of 300 pounds for fishermen who receive hook and line endorsement in the golden tilefish fishery.

Alternative 3. Establish trip limits of 400 pounds for fishermen who receive hook and line endorsement in the golden tilefish fishery.

Alternative 4. Establish trip limits of 500 pounds for fishermen who receive hook and line endorsement in the golden tilefish fishery.

IPT Recommendations:

1. If the Council considers a trip limit for the hook and line sector, then they should consider establishing a separate ACL for that sector. Action 5 establishes separate quotas for each sector. Otherwise, a trip limit for the hook and line sector simply reduces the catch for that sector and gives it to the longline sector. Action 8 includes an option to close the longline sector when 75% of the quota is met but 25% of the quota (~70K) is twice what is taken by the hook and line sector so there would be no point for a hook and line trip limit.
2. Change the wording of Action 10 to: "Modify Golden Tilefish Trip limits"
3. Change the wording of alternatives to:
 - Alternative 1 (No Action).** *Retain the existing 300-pound gutted weight trip limit when 75% of the commercial ACL is taken.*
 - Alternative 2.** *Remove the 300 pound gutted weight trip limit when 75% of the commercial ACL is taken.*
 - Alternative 3.** *Establish a trip limit of 100 pounds gutted weight for the hook and line sector (under the current preferred for Action 5, this would allow for 282 trips)*
 - Alternative 4.** *Establish a trip limit of 200 pounds gutted weight for the hook and line sector (under the current preferred for Action 5, this would allow for 141 trips)*
 - Alternative 5.** *Establish a trip limit of 300 pounds gutted weight for the hook and line sector (under the current preferred for Action 5, this would allow for 94 trips)*
 - Alternative 6.** *Establish a trip limit of 400 pounds gutted weight for the hook and line sector (under the current preferred for Action 5, this would allow for 70 trips)*
 - Alternative 7.** *Establish a trip limit of 500 pounds gutted weight for the hook and line sector (under the current preferred for Action 5, this would allow for 56 trips)*
4. Consider reducing the number of alternatives.

AP Recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SELECT ALTERNATIVE 1 (NO ACTION) UNDER ACTION 10

SSC Recommendation:

SSC cautions that the price of fuel and fish may not remain constant, which may cause a trip limit to become unprofitable. Also, fishermen may increase the number of trips to catch what they need.

Action 11. Update MSA parameters

NOTE: New action proposed by IPT

Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY), Minimum Stock Size Threshold (MSST) Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT), Overfishing Limit (OFL) and Acceptable Biological Catch (ABC) for Golden Tilefish

Current parameters for golden tilefish are shown in **Table 1** below.

Table 1. Current parameters for golden tilefish.

Criteria	South Atlantic - Current	
	Definition	Value
MSST	$SSB_{MSY}(0.75)$	1,454,063 lbs whole weight
MFMT	F_{MSY}	0.043
MSY	Yield at F_{MSY}	336,425 lbs whole weight
F_{MSY}	F_{MSY}	0.043
OY	Yield at F_{OY}	326,554 lbs whole weight
F_{OY}	$75\%F_{MSY}$	0.03225
M	n/a	0.08

SSC Recommendation on Golden Tilefish Assessment: Recommend OFL = yield at F_{msy} . Assessment is a valid basis for P^* approach. Assessment Info = Tier 1, Uncertainty Characterization = Medium (Tier 3), Stock Status = Tier 1, Productivity and Susceptibility = High Risk (Tier 3). $P^* = 0.35$

Action 12. Revise Annual Catch Limit (ACL) and Optimum Yield (OY) for Golden Tilefish

NOTE: New action proposed by IPT

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not specify an ACL for golden tilefish.

Alternative 2. ACL = OY = ABC.

Alternative 3. ACL = OY = 90% of the ABC.

Alternative 4. ACL = OY = 80% of the ABC.

AP Recommendations (October 2011):

MOTION: SELECT ALTERNATIVE 2 UNDER ACTION 12 AS THE PREFERRED

Alternative 2. ACL = OY = ABC.

MOTION: SUGGEST THAT THE TOTAL ACL INCREASE FOR GOLDEN TILEFISH NOT BE SUBJECT TO A DOUBLE JEOPARDY PENALTY

MOTION: RAISE THE ACL FOR GOLDEN TILEFISH BASED ON LATEST ASSESSMENT AND REALLOCATE THE ACL TO A 90/10 COMMERCIAL/RECREATIONAL SPLIT.

MOTION: COUNCIL SHOULD INCREASE THE ACL FOR GT BY 100K POUNDS BASED ON THE LATEST ASSESSMENT

SSC Recommendation:

Given the amount of management uncertainty, SSC recommends setting an ACL not equal to ABC, and that the buffer be proportional to the amount of management uncertainty in the fishery. Must be cautious about assuming future fishing behavior will track historic fishing behavior. The Council should understand that OY is a long-term factor that does not compare to the short-term factors, such as OFL, ABC, and ACL. Should clarify if AMs are triggered when exceeding the ACL or the ABC. Guidelines specify AMs should be triggered when the ACL is exceeded. The trigger that activates measures that are meant to prevent the catch from exceeding the limit and the limit itself are being set at the same number. There must be a trigger set below the actual limit. ACL can equal ABC if the ACT is used as the trigger.

Action 13. Specify a Commercial Sector ACT

NOTE: New action proposed by IPT

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not specify a commercial sector ACTs for golden tilefish

Alternative 2. The commercial sector ACT equals 90% of the commercial sector ACL.

Alternative 3. The commercial sector ACT equals 80% of the commercial sector ACL.

AP Recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SELECT ALTERNATIVE 1 UNDER ACTION 13 AS THE PREFERRED

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not specify a commercial sector ACTs for golden tilefish

SSC Recommendation: see Action 12 above

Action 14. Specify a Recreational Sector ACT

NOTE: New action proposed by IPT

Alternative 1 (No Action). Do not specify a recreational sector

Alternative 2. The recreational sector ACT equals 85% of the recreational sector ACL

Alternative 3. The recreational sector ACT equals 75% of the recreational sector ACL

Alternative 4. The recreational sector ACT equals sector $ACL * (1 - PSE)$ or $ACL * 0.5$, whichever is greater

Staff recommendation: The recreational sector ACL is 3% of the total ACL. Currently it is 1,578 fish. Is there a need to establish an ACT for such a small quantity of fish? There has been an interest in exploring the use of a tagging system for this sector. Perhaps the Council would like to add it to the items taken out for scoping in Jan/Feb 2012?

AP Recommendation (October 2011):

MOTION: SELECT ALTERNATIVE 4 UNDER ACTION 14 AS PREFERRED

Alternative 4. The recreational sector ACT equals sector $ACL * (1 - PSE)$ or $ACL * 0.5$, whichever is greater.

SSC Recommendation: see Action 12 above

Action 15. Revise Accountability Measures (AMs) for Golden Tilefish

NOTE: New action proposed by staff

Alternative 1 (No Action). Retain current commercial and recreational AMs for golden tilefish:

- Commercial AM: prohibit harvest, possession, and retention when the quota is projected to be met. All purchase and sale is prohibited when the quota is projected to be met.
- Recreational AM: If the ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing season by the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the sector ACL for the following fishing season. Compare the recreational ACL with projected recreational landings over a range of years. For 2010, use only 2010 landings. For 2011, use the average landings of 2010 and 2011. For 2012 and beyond, use the most recent three-year running average.

Alternative 2. Adopt new commercial AMs

Alternative 3. Adopt new recreational AMs

Commercial and recreational AMs are being proposed in the Comprehensive ACL Amendment for other snapper grouper species as follows:

Alternative 2. Specify the AM trigger.

Subalternative 2a. Do not specify an AM trigger.

Subalternative 2b. If the annual landings exceed the ACL in a given year.

Subalternative 2c. If the mean landings for the past three years exceed the ACL^{1,2}

Subalternative 2d. If the modified mean landings exceed the ACL. The modified mean is the average of the most recent 5 years of available landings data with highest and lowest landings estimates removed^{1,2}

Subalternative 2e. If the lower bound of the 90% confidence interval estimate of the MRFSS landings' population mean plus headboat landings is greater than the ACL.

Notes:

¹ Start the clock over. In any year the ACL is reduced or increased, the sequence of future ACLs will begin again starting with a single year of landings compared to the ACL for that year, followed by a 2-year average of landings compared to the 2-year average annual catch limits in the next year, followed by a 3-year average of landings compared to the 3-year average of ACLs for the third year, and so on.

² For 2011, use only 2011 landings. For 2012, use the mean landings of 2011 and 2012. For 2013 and beyond, use the most recent three-year running mean.

Alternative 3. Specify the in-season AM.

Subalternative 3a. Do not specify an in-season AM.

Subalternative 3b. The Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to close the recreational sector when the ACL is projected to be met.

Alternative 4. Specify the post-season AM.

Subalternative 4a. Do not specify a post-season AM.

Subalternative 4b. For post-season accountability measures, compare ACL with landings over a range of years. For 2011, use only 2011 landings. For 2012, use the mean landings of 2011 and 2012. For 2013 and beyond, use the most recent three-year running mean.¹

Subalternative 4c. Monitor following year. If the ACL is exceeded, the following year's landings would be monitored for persistence in increased landings. The Regional Administrator would take action as necessary.

Subalternative 4d. Monitor following year and shorten season as necessary. If the ACL is exceeded, the following year's landings would be monitored in-season for persistence in increased landings. The Regional Administrator will publish a notice to reduce the length of the fishing season as necessary.

Subalternative 4e. Monitor following year and reduce bag limit as necessary. If the ACL is exceeded, the following year's landings would be monitored for persistence in increased landings. The Regional Administrator will publish a notice to reduce the bag limit as necessary.

Subalternative 4f. Shorten following season. If the ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing year by

the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the ACL for the following fishing season.

Subalternative 4g. Payback. If the ACL is exceeded, the Regional Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the ACL in the following season by the amount of the overage.

SSC Recommendation:

Should clarify what is meant by “quota”. Need an overall management evaluation considering all the management definitions (OFL, ABC, ACL, ACT, etc.) so that we can get a better handle on how all these management tools interact. In regards to the ACL, there is no guarantee the ACL will go up. The ABC will be set based on the numbers of the SEDAR 25 report and the P* analysis. ACL should be adjusted based on estimates of F.