

**Presidential Executive Order on Removing Barriers to Fisheries
SAFMC RESPONSE & WORKING LIST OF TOPICS
September 2020**

ADDENDUM – Recreational Topics

During the August 7, 2020 Executive Committee Webinar, the Council was advised by SERO that recreational issues were not appropriate to consider in the response to the Executive Order. Therefore, at that meeting the Council withdrew them from consideration. After further investigation prior to this meeting, the Council was informed that recreational topics could be included. The recreational topics from the August 7 meeting review document are re-listed here for further discussion and prioritization during the September 2020 Council meeting. Proposed recommendations are based on the general guidance provided by the Executive Committee on similar types of issues. For example, the Committee recommended not including several items on the EO that the Council was already working on through normal operations in responding to updated stock assessments.

A1. Recreational catches consistently under the ACL for multiple species and complexes.

- Action by: Council
- Action: Council is either working on amendments to revise ACLs or will soon receive updated assessments that will better define the issue on a stock by stock basis. Therefore, ACL underage issues were not retained for further EO response consideration after the August 7 meeting. Council is also planning further consideration of stocks for EC designation.
- Recommendation: **Do not include on the EO response.** The Council will address issues with ACLs and Ecosystem Component designations through Council amendments, as proposed by the Executive Committee in August.

A2. Recreational Accountability Measures are inconsistent across species and may not effectively incorporate estimation uncertainty.

- Action by: Council
- Action: Council has an amendment in preparation addressing recreational AMs
- Recommendation: **Do not include in the EO response.** This is a topic the Council is already working on.

A3. Recreational fishery information provided through MRIP is inadequate. Catch and effort estimates lack adequate precision, the timeliness of estimates does not meet in-season management needs, no age samples are collected and length and weight monitoring are inadequate for many species, no information is available to characterize released fish, and information on fishing practices is overly simplistic.

- Action by: NMFS
- Action
 - Complete the work of the Rare Event Species Estimation Working group, and provide the Council recommendations on management actions it can take to improve data collection and estimation precision.
 - Develop protocols to incorporate voluntarily submitted data from anglers. Voluntary data can have many uses, a few of which include: improving characterization of fishing

effort and fishing locations; providing an alternative data stream to help validate catch and effort estimates; providing catch information for anglers using private access points; providing information on released fish, depredation, and use of best practices; and increasing observations of the biological characteristics of harvest.

- Develop methods to provide more timely estimates of harvest for those stocks requiring in-season accountability measures.
- Recommendation: **Include this topic in the EO as high priority.**
- Initiation Plan: The Council will identify this issue in its EO response and await action by NMFS.

A4. For-hire reporting in the South Atlantic lacks funding.

- Action by: NMFS
- Action: Provide funding to ensure the success of the for-hire electronic reporting in the South Atlantic. The lack of funding support jeopardizes validation and dockside sampling of the for-hire sector in the South Atlantic and therefore poses a threat to acceptance and use of data that will be submitted by for-hire operators under the recently approved mandatory reporting requirements in the South Atlantic.
- Recommendation: **Include in the EO response as a high priority.**
- Initiation Plan: The Council will identify this issue in its EO response and await action by NMFS.

A5. There is confusion within the recreational community regarding how to interpret language in the Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Act within the constraints of the National Standard 1 guidelines.

- Action by: NMFS
- Action: Evaluate the National Standard 1 guidelines relative to the Act and provide clarification on the flexibility the Councils have to implement alternative approaches for managing recreational fisheries.
- Recommendation: **Include in the EO response as a high priority.**
- Initiation Plan: The Council will identify this issue in its EO response and await action by NMFS.