

Allocations Review Guidelines

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, December 2023

Background

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) has developed allocation review guidelines to formally document the Council's approach to allocations and respond to various federal policy directives and reports on allocations. Of note is the March 2020 [Government Accountability Office \(GAO\) report](#) on its review of allocations. Among the recommendations was for councils to "document their allocation reviews, including the basis for their allocation decisions, whether fishery management plan objectives are being met, and what factors were considered in the reviews." On the [GAO website](#), it is noted that this recommendation has only been partially addressed since "the South Atlantic council has not specified how the council will document its allocation reviews that are conducted outside of Fishery Management Plan amendments, including the basis for its allocation decisions, whether Fishery Management Plan objectives are being met, and what factors were considered in the reviews."

Requested Council action

At the September 2023 meeting, the Council provided [feedback](#) on the draft allocation review guidelines and updated allocation review trigger policy¹. This feedback has since been incorporated into these documents, with the revised versions on the subsequent pages below. Changes made to address the Council's guidance are highlighted in **yellow**. An additional suggested revision is highlighted in **green**.

Council staff will review the edits and pose the following questions to the Council:

- 1) One of the indicator-based allocation review criteria is triggered when "either sector under harvests its ACL or annual optimum yield (OY) by at least 50% in three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years". Upon further review, staff identified that there has been an effort to move away from an annual OY and towards a long-term OY. Additionally, there is not an OY typically identified for a specific sector. Thus, it is suggested that annual OY be removed from the indicator-based trigger.

Does the Council approve of the suggested removal of "or annual optimum yield (OY)" from the indicator-based criteria (suggested edit highlighted in **green)?**

"Either sector under harvests its ACL **or annual optimum yield (OY)** by at least 50% in three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years"

- 2) **Does the Council approve the revised allocation review guidelines and allocation review trigger policy? If so, is the Council willing to make a motion indicating this approval?**

DRAFT MOTION: APPROVED THE ALLOCATION REVIEW GUIDELINES AND UPDATED ALLOCATION REVIEW TRIGGER POLICY.

¹ The Council wanted to make sure that a 7-year time-based trigger is aggregable with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. This appears agreeable based on the [Gulf Council's allocation review policy](#).

DRAFT Allocation Review Guidelines

South Atlantic Fishery Management
Council



Revised 12/2023

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Allocation Review Process and Documentation.....	1
An allocation review coincides with a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations	2
An allocation review does not coincide with a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations	2
Timing of the next allocation review	3
Resources	3
Appendix 1. DRAFT REVISED South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Allocation Review Trigger Policy	4
Appendix 2. Allocation Decision Trees: A Blueprint for Applying Biological, Social, and Economic Considerations in Allocation Decisions.....	6

Introduction

In response to several policy directives and reports, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) has developed allocation review guidelines to formally document the Council's approach to sector, gear, and geographic allocations. In 2016 and 2017, the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) and the Council Coordination Committee developed a Fisheries Allocation Review Policy (NMFS Policy Directive 01- 119)² and an associated procedural directive addressing criteria for initiating allocation reviews (NMFS Procedural Directive 01-119-01)³. NMFS recommended practices and factors to consider when reviewing and making allocation decisions in a subsequent policy directive (NMFS Procedural Directive 01-119-02)⁴. These allocation review policies and directives required regional fisheries management councils to develop allocation review triggers that would be considered to initiate allocation reviews. Additionally, in March 2020 the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on its review of allocations in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico⁵. Among the recommendations from the GAO was for councils to “document their allocation reviews, including the basis for their allocation decisions, whether fishery management plan objectives are being met, and what factors were considered in the reviews.” The following guidelines detail the process that the South Atlantic Council intends to follow to conduct and document allocation reviews.

The Allocation Review Process and Documentation

The term “allocation” refers to the distribution of the opportunity to participate in a fishery among user groups or individuals⁶. A review of existing allocations will occur once one of the measures in the Council's allocation review trigger policy is met (Appendix 1). Within this policy, the Council has selected indicator- and time-based triggers for a review of sector allocations. To ensure that all sector allocations are reviewed regularly, the Council has specified that reviews take place at least once every seven years. This seven year time-based criterion is the upper limit for when allocation reviews will occur and such reviews may occur sooner for some species. The indicator-based triggers may cause an allocation review to occur more frequently under the following conditions:

- 3) Either sector exceeds its annual catch limit (ACL) or closes prior to the end of its fishing year in three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years,
- 4) Either sector under harvests its ACL or annual optimum yield (OY) by at least 50% in three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years,
- 5) After a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations is approved by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and presented to the Council, and
- 6) After the Council reviews a species Fishery Performance Report (FPR), if a review of allocations is advised in the report.

² <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/01-119.pdf>

³ <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/01-119-01.pdf>

⁴ <https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/01-119-02.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-216>

⁶ <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/laws-and-policies/allocation-fishery-resources>

For the first two indicator-based criteria, “three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years” refers to the immediately preceding five fishing years of landings data available. Landings information will not be utilized if it is still considered preliminary by NMFS, thus only comprehensive and final landings data will be used as part of the indicator-based criteria. Additionally, if an allocation review is triggered, the Council may consider requesting that the appropriate advisory panel develop a FPR for that species, if it does not already exist, or update an existing FPR.

The following sections provide situational information on how allocation reviews will occur, how allocation decisions will be documented, and how such decisions will be made publicly available.

An allocation review coincides with a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations

When an allocation review is triggered after a stock assessment or a change to catch levels is recommended by the SSC, the Council will apply its allocation decision tool (as specified in Appendix 2) towards the beginning of the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) amendment development process. This tool examines relevant biologic, economic, and social information for a species and is intended to aid the Council in developing allocation actions. As an amendment is developed, the Council will be provided additional analyses and information on the anticipated biologic, economic, social, and administrative effects of different allocation scenarios. Through this process, the Council’s allocation decisions and the rationale for those decisions will be captured in the FMP amendment.

Once finalized and approved by the Council, the FMP amendment will document the allocation-related analyses and information considered, the Council’s preferred alternative for an allocation decision, and the Council’s rationale, which will include how the decision is consistent with the FMP Goals and Objectives. The FMP amendment document will be made available on the Council’s website, including on the Council’s allocation webpage (<https://safmc.net/fishery-management/sector-allocations/>).

An allocation review does not coincide with a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations

When an allocation review is triggered for reasons other than a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations, the Council will be presented with the following information at one of its quarterly meetings to determine whether a more in-depth allocation analysis is warranted:

- The appropriate FMP Goals and Objectives,
- Current allocations and rationale for setting these allocations,
- Landings and ACL usage by sector for the most recent 5-years of available data, and
- The most recent Fishery Performance Report, if available.

Based on this information, the Council may determine that current allocations are sufficient. In this case, the Council’s decision and basis for maintaining current allocations will be captured in

the Committee Report for that meeting as well as in the meeting minutes. An allocation review report will be developed that includes the summary decision, the basis for the decision, how the FMP Goals and Objectives are being met, and all information provided for the Council's consideration as outlined above. This allocation review report will be reviewed and approved at the subsequent Council meeting and then made available on the Council's allocation webpage.

If the Council determines that additional information is necessary to decide whether the existing allocations are sufficient, the Council will direct staff to provide this information at a subsequent meeting. This may include applying the allocation decision tool or any other available information that the Council may find useful. If the Council decides that a change to allocations may be warranted, the FMP amendment process will be initiated. If the Council determines that the existing allocations are sufficient, then an allocation review report will be developed as outlined in the previous paragraph.

Timing of the next allocation review

Regardless of whether an allocation review is triggered by an indicator or time criterion, the subsequent review will be scheduled seven years later. If the Council determines that the existing allocation for a species is sufficient and there is not an associated FMP amendment, then the next review will be scheduled approximately seven years from the date that the Council approves the relevant allocation review report. If the Council determines that an allocation change may be warranted through an amendment to a FMP, then the next allocation review will be scheduled seven years from the effective date of the final rule for that amendment. The timing of the next anticipated allocation review for each species will be made available on the Council's allocation webpage. In addition to allocation reviews that are scheduled based on the indicator or time-based review triggers mentioned above, the Council also foresees the need to maintain management flexibility and may initiate an allocation review at any time that it deems such a review appropriate, even if one of the outlined triggers has not been met

Resources

Click on the following links for online resources related to the Council's allocation review process and guidelines:

- [South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Allocation Webpage](#)
- [South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Allocation Review Trigger Policy](#)
- [South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Allocation Decision Tree: A Blueprint for Applying Biological, Social, and Economic Considerations in Allocation Decisions](#)
- [South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Allocation Decision Tool example](#)

Appendix 1. DRAFT REVISED South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Allocation Review Trigger Policy

Updated December 2023

In a letter to the NOAA Assistant Administrator dated July 16, 2019, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) responded to NOAA's Fisheries Allocation Review Policy (National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) Policy Directive 01-119) and the associated Procedural Directive on allocation review triggers (NMFS Procedural Directive 01-119-01). The Policy established the responsibility for the Regional Fishery Management Councils to set allocation review triggers and consider three types of trigger criteria: indicator, public interest, and time. Councils were directed to establish triggers for consideration of allocation reviews by August 2019. The Council's response has since been updated to reflect subsequent allocation reviews and other allocation related discussions that have occurred since 2019. The revised Council allocation review trigger policy is as follows:

The Council has reviewed species allocations on numerous occasions in the past. However, these reviews may not have been formally documented in a fishery management plan amendment if a decision was made not to modify sector allocations. This revised policy, along with the Council's allocation review guidelines, will ensure that all species currently having sector allocations will be reviewed on a regular basis and will formalize the allocation review process so the Council's consideration of allocations will be documented. The Council has reviewed their current sector allocations and has adopted two main types of criteria for triggering consideration of an allocation review: indicator and time.

A public interest-based criterion was not selected because the Council currently receives substantial and regular comment from the public through scoping and public hearing sessions, general public comment periods held at every Council meeting, the public comment form on the Council's website, and through other more informal channels. Thus, the Council decided that the existing Council process provides sufficient opportunity for public input on allocations.

The Council has chosen the following indicator-based criteria as triggers for an allocation review:

- 7) Either sector exceeds its annual catch limit (ACL) or closes prior to the end of its fishing year in three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years,
- 8) Either sector under harvests its ACL or annual optimum yield (OY) by at least 50% in three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years,
- 9) After a stock assessment or change to catch level recommendations is approved by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and presented to the Council, and
- 10) After the Council reviews a species Fishery Performance Report (FPR), if a review of allocations is advised in the report.

For the first two indicator-based criteria, "three out of five of the most recent consecutive fishing years" refers to the immediately preceding five fishing years of landings data available. Landings information will not be utilized if still considered preliminary by NMFS, thus only comprehensive and final landings data will be used as part of the indicator based criteria.

The Council has chosen a time-based trigger to ensure allocation reviews are regularly considered. Each species will have its sector allocations reviewed at least every seven years. This seven year time based criterion is the upper limit for when an allocation review will occur and such a review may occur sooner for some species. The timing for when the next sector allocation review will be considered by the Council is provided on the Council's website under the allocations webpage (<https://safmc.net/fishery-management/sector-allocations/>). Regardless of whether consideration of an allocation review is triggered by an indicator or time criterion, once it occurs, the next allocation review will automatically be scheduled seven years later. For species that are jointly managed with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, the timing for consideration of allocation reviews will be coordinated with that council. In addition to allocation reviews that are scheduled based on the indicator or time-based review triggers selected above, the Council also foresees the need to maintain management flexibility and may initiate an allocation review at any time that it deems such a review appropriate, even if one of the outlined triggers has not been met.

Appendix 2. Allocation Decision Trees: A Blueprint for Applying Biological, Social, and Economic Considerations in Allocation Decisions

**Allocation Decision Trees:
*A Blueprint for Applying Biological, Social,
and Economic Considerations in Allocation
Decisions***

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

Updated December 2023



Introduction

In March 2020, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) identified criteria to consider when discussing allocations that included: *landings history, expected/known discard rate, accountability of a sector, fairness, equity, market needs, importance of a species to a sector, cultural importance, and the possibility of removing sector allocations*. Additionally in March 2020, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on its review of fishery sector allocations in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico.⁷ The GAO recommended similar criteria when considering sector allocation needs: *trends in catch and landings, stock assessment results, economic analyses, social indicator analyses, and ecosystem models*.

Since the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) in 2007, which required establishing annual catch limits (ACLs) and prompted establishment of sector allocations for managed species, landings have been the primary data source used for allocation purposes in the South Atlantic region since they have been the most consistently available data and can be obtained for all species. However, the Council has acknowledged that other biological or ecosystem data sources, as well as input from economics and the other social sciences, are also important to inform sector allocation decisions.

While neither the MSA nor the National Standard Guidelines require sector allocations, they are an important management tool that is available to the Nation's fishery management councils. The Council has chosen to establish allocations for the majority of its managed species that have both recreational and commercial landings. In most cases, the Council has not used data other than landings because other types of data are at times lacking for the South Atlantic region or there has not been a consistent method to apply other criteria, such as social and economic factors. The Council has recently reconsidered sector allocations in a systematic manner that allows for consideration of additional methods that address the current and future needs of the fisheries. Also, the Council has set an allocation review trigger policy⁸ and will continue receiving stock assessments that warrant a review of sector allocations when revising the acceptable biological catch and resulting ACLs, making the development of a systematic approach to addressing allocations desirable.

The Comprehensive ACL Amendment (2012) created sector allocations for many species that did not already have them, often using landings from 1986 through 2008. The formula used a long-term "historical" time series and a more "recent" trend. Sector allocations were determined using fifty percent of the average landings from 1986 through 2008 ("historical" trend) and fifty percent of average landings from 2006 through 2008 ("recent" trend). The same amendment also put sector ACLs and accountability measures (AMs) in place. In-season harvest closures were implemented to keep landings from exceeding ACLs. Prior to 2012, in-season closures were uncommon. Since closures disrupt how the fishery would otherwise operate, and closures might occur for one sector and not the other, applying the same allocation formula to more recent years (particularly after 2012) may not reflect each sector's full harvest capacity or use when not restricted by an ACL. Hence, modifying sector allocations by using landings from years *after* AMs were implemented, particularly those used for short-term trends, could introduce a

⁷ The GAO report is available at <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-20-216>.

⁸ The Council's Allocation Review Trigger Policy at https://safmc.net/documents/draftrevised_safmc_allocationreviewtriggerpolicy-pdf/

management-induced constraining effect that should be considered when developing landings-based allocations. Nonetheless, trends in catch and landings remain a valuable source of information to help determine future modifications to sector allocations.

The Decision Tree Approach

Making sector allocation decisions is a difficult and complicated process. To help incorporate other sources of information, in addition to landings, the Council is using a decision tree approach to determine salient issues and develop an organized approach to allocation decisions. At their September 2020 meeting, the Council endorsed the concept of the decision tree approach and directed staff⁹ to work on developing the approach with input from its advisors. The Council expressed concerns over establishing an approach that would be overly prescriptive and wanted to maintain flexibility in allocation decisions on a species-by-species basis. As such, the approach seeks to be informative in a methodical and consistent manner without being prescriptive.

A decision tree approach is a systematic methodology that uses the same question pattern, or tree, for each species considered. As a question is answered, the tree “branches,” or directs the reader to the next question until all the relevant questions are answered, and a course of action is recommended for that species (**Figure 1**). By narrowing the focus, the Council can determine the most important factors to consider based on available data. The following items outline the approach:

1. The decision trees are slightly modified from the five criteria recommended by the GAO. There are four main decision tree categories based on:
 - Landings and discards
 - Stock status
 - Economic factors
 - Social factors
2. Each species will “pass through” all decision trees.
3. Some decision trees may not provide a relevant outcome for a given species.
4. A question in one decision tree could be applicable to another tree.

A portion of the first of the four main criteria, landings history, is what the Council has primarily relied upon. This information is available for species by sector and can be applied consistently. Depending on how the decision questions are worded, the landings decision tree could provide insight into whether the current allocations are working or not. For example, a decision tree could recommend the Council explore whether one sector could benefit from increased allocation without harming the ability of the other sector to continue to land fish.

The main intent of the decision tree process is to allow the Council to work through the decision tree process when review of allocations has been triggered by the Council’s allocation policy or near the beginning of a potential FMP amendment. This process is meant to aid the Council in

⁹ Working group made up of Mike Schmidtke (SAFMC), Christina Wiegand (SAFMC), John Hadley (SAFMC), Scott Crosson (SEFSC), Myra Brouwer (SAFMC), and Brian Chevront (formerly SAFMC).

making decisions such as whether allocations need to be considered in an amendment, initial structuring of allocation alternatives, and help build rationale.




Figure 1. Conceptual example of a decision tree.

Decision Tree Questions

Topic: Landings and Discards

Landings: Should future allocations be based on harvests impacted by previous or current quotas (e.g. ACL)?

Answers:

1. No. *Consider allocations developed using harvests from a historical time period without quotas that limit annual harvest or other factors addressed in other decision trees.*
2. Yes. **Have both, only one, or neither sector met or exceeded the ACLs or experienced closures due to the ACLs being projected to be met or being exceeded in any of the past five fishing years?**
 - a. Both sectors. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors addressed in other decision trees.*
 - b. One sector. *Consider reallocation of no more than the difference between the maximum annual harvest in the last five years and the ACL from the underharvesting sector. Consider a minimum threshold for the difference to avoid reallocating insignificant portions of the ACL.*

- c. Neither. *Current fisheries have not been limited by the ACLs. Consider recent proportions of total landings in allocations. Consider whether sector allocations are necessary for fair and equitable management of this fishery. If one sector has recently shown significant growth, consider this trend in setting future allocations.*

Potential analysis: Landings and quota by sector time series, in addition to record of any quota-induced closures and when those closures occurred within the fishing year.

Discards: Has discard mortality accounted for a more substantial portion of removals for either sector in three of the past five fishing years?

Answers:

1. Yes. *Consider not increasing the allocation for a sector with a substantial amount of discard mortality.*
2. No. *Neither sector is substantially impacted by discard mortality. Consider allocation advice provided by the other decision trees.*

Potential analysis: Dead discards as a percentage of annual sector removals.

Topic: Stock Status

Stock Status: Has stock status been determined?

Answers:

1. Yes. **What is the stock status? Consider advice from all applicable statuses.**
 - a. Overfished. *Prioritize reallocation towards a sector if that could increase biomass (via increased survivorship, particularly of juveniles and adult females).*
 - b. Overfishing. *Prioritize reallocation towards a sector if that could decrease dead discards. Also consider measures beyond allocation to end overfishing.*
 - c. Not Overfished/Not Overfishing. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors addressed in other decision trees.*
2. No; stock status is unknown. **Is there an adequate index of abundance showing population trends?**
 - a. Yes. **Is the population growing, stable, or decreasing?**
 - i. Stable or Growing. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors addressed in other decision trees.*
 - ii. Decreasing. *Prioritize reallocation towards a sector if that could increase biomass (via increased survivorship, particularly of juveniles and adult females) or decrease dead discards.*
 - b. No. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors addressed in other decision trees.*

Potential analysis: SEDAR stock assessments and fishery stock status updates from NOAA Fisheries.

Topic: Economic Factors

Economic Importance: Do the sectors have similar or divergent trends in relative economic importance of the species?

Answers:

1. Divergent. *Prioritize reallocation towards the sector for which the species has an increasing economic importance.*
2. Similar. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors.*

Potential analysis: Logbook information can be used to determine commercial importance through a comparison of gross revenue from a species to total gross revenue. Compare directed effort for a species to directed effort for all SAFMC-managed species in the appropriate region as a proxy for recreational importance.

Demand for the Species: Do the sectors have similar or divergent trends in demand for the species?

Answers:

1. Divergent. *Prioritize reallocation towards the sector that is exhibiting increasing demand.*
2. Similar. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors.*

Potential analysis: Use the following as proxies for demand: Trends in ex-vessel price and landings for the commercial sector. Trends in directed effort and landings for the recreational sector. Also information may be available from Fishery Performance Reports and the Public Input Gathering Tool that specifically ask about trends in demand.

Demand for Quota: Has a sector fully harvested its ACL on a consistent basis?

Answers:

1. Yes, only one sector. *Prioritize reallocation towards the sector that would likely benefit from additional ACL.*
2. Yes, both sectors. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors.*
3. No. *Consider maintaining current allocations or basing changes to allocations on other factors.*

Potential analysis: Consider historical use of sector ACLs if appropriate. Also consider projected use of new sector ACLs under the status quo allocation percentage, particularly if the methodology for estimating landings has recently changed.

Topic: Social Factors

Fishery Dependence: Among the top counties¹⁰ with the highest proportion of total [landings, trips, permits] in the region, are most of them engaged in commercial fishing, recreational fishing, or both? (Counties are considered highly engaged if they are above the one standard deviation threshold).

Answers:

1. Most are highly engaged in commercial fishing.
 - a. **Are commercial fishermen in those counties dependent on the resource for their livelihood (above the median local quotient)?**
 - i. Yes. *Consider prioritizing commercial fishing opportunities.*
 - ii. No. *Review fishing opportunities for associated species and consider whether adjustments to topic species allocations are necessary.*
2. Most are highly engaged in recreational fishing.
 - a. **Are recreational fishermen in those counties dependent on the resource (above the median number of directed trips)?**
 - i. Yes. *Consider prioritizing recreational fishing opportunities.*
 - ii. No. *Review fishing opportunities for associated species and consider whether adjustments to topic species allocations are necessary.*
3. Equally engaged in commercial and recreational fishing. *Consider removing sector allocations or allocating equally between the sectors.*

Potential analysis: Social indicators, including commercial and recreational fishing engagement, regional quotient, and local quotient.¹¹

Cultural Importance: Does the fishery play an important role in the history of fishing communities?

Answers:

1. Yes. **Does the fishery play an important role in community cultural tradition?**
 - a. Yes. **Have changes in the regulatory environment affected the role this species plays in communities?**
 - i. Yes. *Consider allocations that mirror the historical real or de facto allocations and/or current values and attitudes in the fishery, which may or may not mirror the current state of the fishery.*
 - ii. No. *Consider allocations that prioritize economic, biological, or ecosystem needs.*

¹⁰ Community is the ideal level of analysis for social factors. However, due to recreational data restrictions, the goal will be to conduct analysis at the county level. In some cases, data at the county level may be insufficient. In that case, analysis will be conducted by regions within the state or at the state level.

¹¹ **Engagement Indices** measure which communities are more dependent upon recreational or commercial fishing. **Quotients** measure the relative importance of a given species across communities or averaged by vessel.

- b. No. *Consider allocations that mirror the historical real or de facto allocations.*
2. No. *Consider allocations that reflect the current state of the fishery and would allow for growth and adjustment.*

Potential analysis: Summary of information provided in fishery performance reports and the Public Input Gathering Tool, available demographic data, and informed judgement.

Working through the Decision Tree Questions

To aid in working through the series of decision tree questions, Council staff will gather appropriate information, as available, towards the beginning of an amendment. Examples of such information is listed under “potential analysis” for each respective topic and includes sources such as landings data, discard data, effort data, SEDAR stock assessments, fishery stock status updates from NOAA, commercial logbooks, quotients and engagement indices, fishery performance reports, and the Public Input Gathering Tool (Appendix 1). This information will be summarized and presented to the Council using Shiny apps¹² in a fishery overview. Since most questions are not subjective, assuming the appropriate data are available, the outcomes should be available for the Council to review immediately. To help compile the outcomes, an online allocation tool will be available. A draft version of this tool can be viewed at:

Link: <https://safmc-shinyapps.shinyapps.io/AllocDecTrees/>

Staff will develop preliminary responses and assist the Council through the decision tree questions and resulting recommendations ahead of initial allocation decisions. Council members will be able to clarify the outcomes of each decision point, asked to address any subjective outcomes, and will review the comprehensive results through the online tool.

Working with Decision Tree Results

With multiple and varying decision tree “branches” or “nodes,” there could be many different combinations of results. The most straightforward result would be that all the decision trees would give the Council the same sector allocation advice. The most likely outcome is that not all of the decision trees will point to the same advice. The Council is then left with how to resolve the differences.

Since one of the stated preferences of the Council is to maintain flexibility and evaluate allocations on a species by species basis, there is no commitment to a ranked order or preponderance of outcomes when deciding the course of action to take from the decision tree results. The Council will resolve conflicting allocation recommendations on a case by case basis. In such situation, the outcomes of the decision tree can be used to help the Council develop a range of alternatives if the Council decides that examining allocations is desired.

Additionally, it is possible that not all decision trees are going to have meaningful input every time for every species. This could be due to lack of relevant data readily available to inform answers to the questions, or the answers to the questions may not add relevant information to make a decision about sector allocations for a given species.

¹² <https://shiny.rstudio.com/>

Review and approval of the Decision Tree Approach

The Council asked staff to develop the allocation decision tree approach and work with advisors from the Socio-Economic Panel (SEP), Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC), Advisory Panels (APs), NOAA Southeast Regional Office (SERO), and NOAA Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) to help modify and calibrate the methodology. Review of the Blueprint as well as the associated inputs from fishery performance reports and the Public Input Gathering Tool took place throughout 2021 and the first half of 2022 (**Table 1**). The comments provided through this review process have been incorporated where possible and as appropriate. Of note in the timeline for development is the Council’s approval of the decision tree approach in March 2022, the SEP’s approval of the revised social and economic components of the allocation decision tool in April 2022, and the Council’s approval of the Public Input Gathering Tool in June 2022.

Table 1. Review of the Allocation Decision Tree Approach.

Review Type	Timing
Approach reviewed by the SSC and SEP	April 2021
Approach reviewed by SERO and SEFSC	July 2021
Approach reviewed by Council AP Chairs	August 2021
Approach reviewed the Council	September 2021
Approach reviewed the Council	February 2022
Approach reviewed by the Council and approved for future use	March 2022
Approach, Fishery Performance Report, and Public Input Gathering Tool socio-economic questions reviewed by the SEP	April 2022
Public Input Gathering Tool reviewed by the Council and approved for future use	June 2022

Appendix. Public Input Gathering Tool

SALTWATER CONVERSATIONS

A Public Input Gathering Tool

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

➡ At the March 2022 meeting, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) requested staff develop an online form to gather input from the public, similar to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council’s (Gulf Council) Fishermen Feedback (formerly ‘Something’s Fishy’) tool. The purpose of this new public input tool would be to gather information from Council stakeholders’ experiences and observations on the water and in the marketplace. The information gathered would be and used in conjunction with Fishery Performance Reports to complement scientific and landings data and to aid in management decisions, specifically sector allocations.

THE TOOL

➡ In response to the Council’s request, staff has developed a public input gathering tool named Saltwater Conversations.

Members of the public will have the opportunity to provide their input on the topics such as:

- Have there been substantial changes in fishing behavior and catch levels for shadow shark over the last five years? How important is catch and release for shadow shark?
- How have social and economic influences (ex. price and demand, infrastructure, community dependence) affected the shadow shark fishery? Is shadow shark a driver of tourism?
- What environmental conditions influence the shadow shark fishery? Over the last five years have you seen changes in the distribution and size of fish, spawning months etc.
- Are there different management measures that the Council should consider or are there existing management measures (such as size limit, trip limit, bag limit, season, etc.) that should be changed?
- What else is important for the Council to know about shadow shark?

Those providing input using Saltwater Conversations will also be asked to provide their name, email, home port, state, and stakeholder affiliation (private recreational, commercial, for-hire, wholesale, non-governmental organization, or other). This information is consistent with what is provided during general Council public comment opportunities.

THE PROCESS

↔ Saltwater Conversations will be made available through the Council’s website.

Similar to Fishery Performance Reports, Saltwater Conversations would gather information on a fishery species in advance of a scheduled stock assessment or to establish a baseline for an unassessed fishery. The intent is to collect information from stakeholders during the same quarter a Fishery Performance Report is being conducted by an advisory panel.

- Availability of the tool would be advertised through various Council outreach tools, including the website, social media, and the South Atlantic Bite e-newsletter.
- The tool would remain open for the public to provide their input for approximately two months (see **Figure 1** for full timeline).
- While name and sector affiliation will be collected, individual information (e.g., email address) will be kept confidential. Only aggregate information will be presented.



Figure 1: Sample timeline for development and use of Saltwater Conversations for Shadow Shark.

THE ANALYSIS

↔ A variety of qualitative analysis can be conducted using information collected through Saltwater Conversations as well as from the Fishery Performance Reports.

Simplified Thematic Analysis

- Information submitted via Saltwater Conversations and minutes from Fishery Performance Reports would be examined to identify topics, concepts, and patterns that come up repeatedly.

Example from the Gulf Council’s Fisherman Feedback Tool for Gulf Cobia:¹³

- Many comments indicated that the average size of fish encountered is smaller than it has been historically.
- Comments indicating a negative trend in abundance noted that the spring migration had either diminished or moved farther offshore. This was attributed to red tide, influx of fresh water, or removal of structure.
- Comments indicated that the population decline has been occurring since about 2010.

Sentiment Analysis

- Submissions to Saltwater Conversations would be read by staff and classified as positive, negative, or neutral and/or an automated software would conduct the analysis.

Example from the Gulf Council’s Fisherman Feedback Tool for Gulf Cobia:




Figure 2: Most frequent words contributing to comment sentiment identified by automated sentiment analysis.

Word Clouds

- Submissions from Saltwater Conversations and minutes from Fishery Performance Reports could be used to generate a word cloud, which identifies which words and phrases are most common.

¹³ <https://gulfcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/Somethings-Fishy-Cobia-Summary.pdf>




Figure 3: Most frequent words contributing to comment sentiment identified by automated sentiment analysis.