# MANAGEMENT

**GOAL:** **Adopt management strategies for the snapper grouper fishery that rebuild and maintain fishery resources, adapt to regional differences in the fishery, and consider the social and economic needs of fishing communities.**

| | | | FL | | | GA | | | SC | | | NC | | | TOTAL: | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | X | √ | Ø | X | √ | Ø | X | √ | Ø | X | √ | Ø | X | √ | Ø |
| **Objective 1.** | **Strategy 1.1** | **Consider development of different types of quota-based management systems.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Develop management measures that consider sub-regional differences and issues within the fishery.** | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider species specific quota-based management such as, | 3 | | | | | | 1 | | | | 7 | | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| | | • *state-by-state commercial and/or recreational quotas (e.g., vermilion snapper, black sea bass, etc.)* | 1 | | | | 5 | | | | | | | | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| | | • *sub-regional management for deepwater species to include but not limited to snowy grouper, blueline tilefish and golden tilefish.* | | | 0 | | 1 | | | | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider voluntary sector share management, community-based quota management (commercial and for-hire), and individual fishing quota management systems. | 93 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | 12 | 1 | | 18 | 2 | | 125 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Employ tools to gauge snapper grouper permit holder support prior to consideration of any new potential individual fishing quota program (i.e, referendum for commercial sector, surveys, etc.). | | 4 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | | **NOTE:** Action B also applies to objectives 2 (access to the fishery) and 4 (reducing discards). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| | **Strategy 1.2** | **Identify the design elements needed for development of different types of quota-based management systems.** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider different design elements for quota-based management systems such as, | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 8 | | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| | | • *quota transfer by subregion* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • *using average landings over a certain time period as a system design element;* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • *developing criteria by species.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **B.** Consider different management elements for quota-based management systems such as, | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 10 | | 2 | 11 | 0 |
| | | • *allowing the sub-region (however defined) to set landings limits and/or openings/closures;* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • *managing sub-regions by effort.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **C.** Set management boundaries based on the biogeography of the fishery (i.e., species or categories). | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Strategy 1.3** | **Consider use of alternative sub-regional management strategies that are not quota-based.** | **FL-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **GA-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **SC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **NC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **T-X** | **√** | **Ø** |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Use staggered spawning season closures to address latitudinal differences in spawning activity. | 2 | 4 | | | | 0 | 1 | 4 | | | 5 | | 3 | 13 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Set regulations based on designated sub-regions (areas/zones), not on quota allocations. | | 2 | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Set state-by-state regulations for either sector. | | | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Apply sub-regional management strategies seasonally based on fish availability. | | 2 | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Consider effort control strategies such as establishing alternating 2-week windows for fishing (by sub-region) | | | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | 2 | | | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| **Objective 2.** | **Strategy 2.1** | **Support development of management approaches that address retention of snapper grouper species.** | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Develop innovative management measures that allow consistent access to the fishery for all sectors.** | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider bag limit and trip limit adjustments such as, | 7 | 4 | | | | 0 | | 3 | | | 8 | | 7 | 15 | 0 |
| | | • *Use a step-down approach when a species is approaching the ACL for either sector;* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • *Consider smaller trip limits and bag limits for certain species.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • *Institute commercial trip limits and recreational bag limits for those snapper grouper species that do not have limits.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • *Use a bag limit step down as a post-season accountability measure for the recreational sector.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **B.** Re-evaluate the grouper aggregate and manage based on area. | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 3 | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider aggregate trip limits for the commercial sector (# of boxes with no size limit)* | | 6 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 3 | | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Implement a charter boat limit instead of a per person limit on charter trips.* | | 2 | 0 | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | ***NOTE:** These actions also apply to Objective 4 (reducing discards). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Strategy 2.2** | **Support development of management approaches that address the amount of effort in the snapper grouper fishery.** | **FL-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **GA-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **SC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **NC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **T-X** | **√** | **Ø** |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider a recreational stamp/license for the snapper grouper fishery. | 1 | 8 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 9 | | 1 | 18 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Implement a limited number of days for fishing for deepwater species. (R, FH) | | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Manage effort/permits in the commercial and for-hire sectors. | | 9 | | | | 0 | | 3 | | | 2 | | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Evaluate the 2-for-1 permit requirement in the commercial sector. | 1 | 6 | | | | 0 | | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Evaluate the use of days-at-sea for the commercial sector. | | | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | **F.** Evaluate the level of overcapitalization in the fishery (carrying capacity); *What are actual profits? How much resource is available? What is the gap?* | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **G.** Explore options for a privately-funded buy-out program for the commercial sector. | | 2 | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | 2 | | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 2.3** | **Support development of management approaches that account for the seasonality of the snapper grouper fishery.** | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider a recreational season for harvest of deepwater species by region. | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider a "time-out" period of no fishing for the recreational fishery. | | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Expand the use of split seasons for the commercial fishery. | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Consider seasons for co-occurring species and stagger the seasons (use depth as a criteria – mid-shelf and deepwater). | | 2 | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Adjust the seasonal spawning closure for shallow water grouper and consider, shortening by 1-month; allow fishing but reduce bag limit; or a rolling closure throughout the region. | 1 | 2 | | | | 0 | 2 | 2 | | | 4 | | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| | | **F.** Shift the red snapper season outside of their known spawning season. | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Strategy 2.4** | **Support development of management approaches that consider flexibility in setting Annual Catch Limits.** | **FL-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **GA-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **SC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **NC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **T-X** | **√** | **Ø** |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Shift sector allocations in–season. | | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | | |
| | | **B.** Use adaptive management for almaco jack and rudderfish to slowly increase the ACL. | | 3 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Use multi-year ACLs that use blocks of years to manage the ACL for a species (multi-year catch specifications). | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Ensure more data-poor species use alternative data-poor assessment approaches. | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 2.5** | **Consider development of alternative management approaches to expand access to the fishery.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Investigate expansion of fisheries for under-utilized species. | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Evaluate applicability and develop policies for aquaculture of snapper grouper species in the region. | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Evaluate the use of harvest tags for specific snapper grouper species. | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | | | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Use depth to set zones for recreational harvest of snapper grouper species. | | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Consider measures to simplify regulations for both sectors. (i.e. limits, aggregates, etc.) | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| **Objective 3.** | **Strategy 3.1** | **Consider development of management approaches that assist fishery-dependent businesses to operate efficiently and profitably.** | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ensure that management decisions help maximize social and economic opportunity for all sectors.** | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider market availability when making management decisions. | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 4 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider predictability in for-hire business planning when making management decisions. | | 2 | | | | 0 | | 2 | | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider non-traditional stakeholders/ businesses when making management decisions (chefs, eco-tourism operators, bait/tackle shops, marinas) | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 2 | | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Consider new entrants to endorsement programs. | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Consider value of owner-operators in the fishery when making management decisions. | 1 | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 0 |

| | | | FL-X | √ | Ø | GA-X | √ | Ø | SC-X | √ | Ø | NC-X | √ | Ø | T-X | √ | Ø |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Strategy 3.2** | **Consider development of management approaches that support recreational fishing and allow increased opportunity for trip satisfaction.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider effort control strategies that include: | | 4 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| | | • Setting fishing seasons with post-season adjustments for the following season.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • In-season/post-season bag limit adjustments instead of closures.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • Set fishing seasons for co-occurring species.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | • Set bag limits that support participation (aggregate bag limits).* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **B.** Consider mechanisms based on abundance and availability of easily accessible species. | | 1 | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider development of artificial reefs or special management zones for the recreational sector only. | | 1 | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Consider development of species complex specific permits (similar to existing HMS permit). | | | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Consider number of days allowed to fish vs. bag limits for the recreational sector. | | | 0 | | 2 | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | | **F.** Consider an aggregate daily bag limit for the recreational sector with no size limit.* | | 1 | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 3 | | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | | ***** *Also applies to Strategy 2.1 (retention strategies) and Objective 4 (reducing discards).* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Objective 4.**<br><br>**Develop management measures that reduce and mitigate discards.** | **Strategy 4.1** | **Consider management approaches that consider catch limits, seasons, and the biology of the fishery in order to minimize bycatch of snapper grouper species.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Use spawning Special Management Zones. | 52 | 4 | | | 2 | | 4 | 1 | | 3 | 3 | | 59 | 10 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Use time-area closures (either by region or a specific area). | 1 | | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider a spawning closure for all snapper grouper species with a low ACL. | | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Set a fishing season at the beginning of the fishing year with known open and close dates. | | | 0 | | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Set a season for deepwater species and shallow water species by area. | | 3 | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| | | **F.** Consider time/area closure for all snapper grouper species (whole region or area specific) | | | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Strategy 4.2** | **Consider management approaches that address the impact of depth on bycatch of snapper grouper species.** | **FL-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **GA-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **SC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **NC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **T-X** | **√** | **Ø** |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider full retention of deepwater species. | | 4 | | | 3 | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Establish a season for deepwater species. | | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider removal of size limits for deepwater species. | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Consider alternative electronic monitoring methods for all sectors to obtain data on depth to monitor catch composition and location. | 95 | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 7 | | | 9 | 1 | 0 | 111 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Use zone-based management that is set by depth. | | 1 | 0 | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 4.3** | **Reconsider management strategies that use size limits to reduce bycatch.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Re-evaluate and change size limits on a species by species basis. | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider no size limits for snapper grouper species. | 1 | 3 | | | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Use differential size limits by area. | | | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 4.4** | **Develop management approaches that support "Best Fishing Practices" to help avoid bycatch and reduce discard mortality.** | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Promote opportunities for research, development, and evaluation of gear and technology to reduce bycatch (i.e., hook type/use, gear competitions, descending devices). | | 3 | | | | 0 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider gear requirement using "weak gear" or degrading hooks. | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Create an incentive program for avoiding bycatch in the recreational sector and consider development of a Bycatch Avoidance Network for the commercial sector (to communicate "bycatch hot spots"). | | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 4.5** | **Support development of management approaches that consider the use of bycatch quotas and allowances.** | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Allow a bycatch set-aside limit per commercial trip. | | 3 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 4 | | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider a bycatch allowance of up to 5% for species with a low ACL (C, FH) | | 3 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 4 | | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **C.** Consider multi-year catch specifications (averaged for accountability measures). | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| Objective 5. | Strategy 5.1 | Support the enhancement of habitat for the snapper grouper fishery. | FL-X | √ | Ø | GA-X | √ | Ø | SC-X | √ | Ø | NC-X | √ | Ø | T-X | √ | Ø |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Support management measures that incorporate ecosystem and habitat considerations for the snapper grouper fishery. | Actions: | **A.** Create new habitat using artificial reefs. | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 6 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Evaluate the use of artificial reefs as a mechanism to improve fishery production. | | 3 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider artificial reefs with limited or no fishing allowed. | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 5.2** | **Evaluate biologicial, economic, and social impacts when developing ecosystem and habitat management approaches.** | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider the impacts of human population growth and distribution on habitats. | | 3 | | | | 0 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider the use of sunset clauses for existing and newly created Marine Protected Areas. | | 1 | | | | 0 | | 1 | | | 2 | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider no new MPAs. | 2 | 26 | | | 1 | | 1 | 11 | | 2 | 8 | | 5 | 46 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 5.3** | **Consider management approaches that support monitoring and enforcement of managed areas established to protect and conserve ecosystems and habitat.** | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider the use of alternative electronic monitoring systems or other innovative technology (surveillance buoys, drones, etc.) to monitor fishing activity in all sectors. | 95 | 5 | | | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 | | 9 | 1 | | 111 | 10 | 0 |
| | **Strategy 5.4** | **Consider spatial management approaches to protect and conserve ecosystems and habitats for the snapper grouper fishery.** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider development of managed areas (MPAs, spawning SMZs) that allow no harvest of snapper grouper species. | 53 | 3 | | | | 0 | 4 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | 60 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider additional restrictions on existing managed areas (MPAs, etc.). | | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Evaluate areas that may be suitable for spawning Special Management Zones (SMZs). | 53 | 3 | | | | 0 | 4 | 3 | | 4 | 2 | | 61 | 8 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Establish clear goals for creation of Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs). | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Create no-anchor zones to protect fragile habitat. | | 2 | | | | 0 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 0 | 6 | 0 |

| Objective 6. | Strategy 6.1 | Support management approaches that consider the mechanics of designing allocation strategies (who, what, how, and social/economic considerations). | FL-X | √ | Ø | GA-X | √ | Ø | SC-X | √ | Ø | NC-X | √ | Ø | T-X | √ | Ø |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Develop management measures that support optimal sector allocations for the snapper grouper fishery.** | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider separate allocation for charter/headboat sectors. | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | 3 | | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Evaluate existing sectors and current harvest to help determine allocation strategies. | | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Truncate the recreational allocation time series from 2007 onwards due to the economy. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Consider time-based approaches for allocation decisions. (*E.g., , reallocation every 'X' number of years (TBD) based on the past 'X' number of years (TBD).)* | | 1 | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **E.** Manage by economic levels (primary, secondary, tertiary) in the fishery (1-harvesters, 2-dealers, 3-support industries). | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **F.** Incorporate fairness and economics as part of the allocation equation. | | 1 | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | 2 | | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| | | **G.** Evaluate use of a mutual allocation pool (allocation is shared between sectors) for possible use for certain species. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **H.** After evaluation of existing sectors and current harvest consider options to: | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | | *i. set multiple ACLs/allocation* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| | | *ii. set only 1 ACL/allocation* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| | | **I.** Consider setting ACLS/allocations for multiple years. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **J.** Consider individual quotas based on individual allocations or harvest levels (C, FH). | 93 | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 12 | | | 18 | 1 | | 123 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **K.** Consider revising allocations on a species-by-species basis. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| | | **L.** Consider longer timeframe for developing allocations. | | 1 | | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| | | **M.** Consider allocations by gear type. | | | 0 | | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Strategy 6.2** | Identify alternative methods for determining allocation shifts and managing allocations within the fishery. | **FL-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **GA-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **SC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **NC-X** | **√** | **Ø** | **T-X** | **√** | **Ø** |
| | **Actions:** | **A.** Consider sub-allocation shifts (for example, golden tilefish sectors). | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **B.** Consider allocation shifts for species not reaching Optimal Yield (gag, vermilion, etc.). | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **C.** Consider framework for in-season allocation shifts. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **D.** Consider establishing allocations by permit (each permit holder gets an allocation that fluctuates based on the ACL). | | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **E.** Examine reallocation for species with low ACLs. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| | | **F.** Consider reallocation for commercially/recreationally important species. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **G.** Specify the allocation focus for each sector (Commercial-offshore; Recreational-nearshore). | | 1 | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **H.** Examine recreational harvest for species that are not reaching their recreational ACL. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **I.** Consider other methods for establishing sub-allocations (IFQs, EFPs, sectors, etc.). | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| | | **J.** Before reallocation, consider increasing bag limits or other management measures first for the recreational sector. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| | | **K.** Before reallocation, consider managing for abundance of recreationally important and easily accessible species. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | | **L.** Increase the bag limit if the recreational sector does not reach their ACL. | | | 0 | | 2 | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

## NEW IDEAS - *MANAGEMENT* (All states combined)

| Comment Type | NEW Idea- Strategy/Action | Goal Addressed | Possible Objective/ Strategy Addressed | Sector (if available) | Total # of comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CS-St. Augustine | Decrease triggerfish trip limit (1000-lbs too high) | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-St. Augustine | Turtle release gear requirement not necessary | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS - Stuart | Concern about lack of law enforcement | Management | NEW | All | 1 |
| CS-Titusville | Tags to collect data but not to limit effort | Management | NEW | Recreational | 1 |
| CS - Stuart, Marathon, St. Augustine, Titusville | Permit stacking - allow more than 1 permit aboard a vessel to allow more than one trip limit | Management | NEW | Commercial | 7 |
| Written Comments | Use of weekly trip limits for commercial sector | Management | NEW | Commercial | 2 |
| CS-Titusville | Support for use of powerheads | Management | NEW | | 2 |
| CS-Marathon | Consider making 225-lb permits transferable (new entrants) | Management | NEW - Obj 2; Strat 2.2 | Commercial | 2 |
| Written Comments | Set a new control date to allow new entrants to use current catch history for future allocations/regulations | Management | NEW-Obj 2; Strat 2.2D | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Marathon | Spawning closure for mutton snapper (localized depletion) | Management | NEW - Obj 5; Strat 5.4AC | | 1 |
| CS-Titusville | Use sector catch rate to calculate additional in-season increase in allocation | Management | NEW-Obj 6; Strat 6.1 | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | No new rules or regulations | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Public votes on management measures | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Accountability for the recreational sector | Management | NEW | For-hire | 1 |
| Written Comments | No harvest of mutton snapper during May and June | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Reduce mutton snapper bag limit to 5 fish per person | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |

| Comment Type | NEW Idea- Strategy/Action | Goal Addressed | Possible Objective/ Strategy Addressed | Sector (if available) | Total # of comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Written Comments | Commercial trip limit of 250-300 lbs of yellowtail snapper during spawning season | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Mutton snapper harvest closed May and June for all sectors | Management | NEW | | 1 |
| Written Comments | Address differences in fishery access due to distance from port | Management | NEW-Obj 1; | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Develop sector specific strategies for alternative sub-regional management | Management | NEW - Obj 1; Strat 1.3 | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Approach Objective 2 separately by sector with specific strategies to address access by sector using working groups | Management | NEW-Obj 2; | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Management approaches that support fishing and increased opportunity for all sectors (not just recreational); developed using sector working groups | Management | NEW-Obj 4; Strat 3.2 | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Management measures that reduce and mitigate discards for all sectors; developed using sector working groups | Management | NEW-Obj 4 | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comments | Management measures that incorporate ecosystem/habitat considerations for all sectors; developed using sector working groups | Management | NEW-Obj 5 | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Brunswick | Add the terms Sector and Habitat Area of Particular Concern to the glossary | All | NEW | NGO | 1 |
| CS-Shellman Bluff | Supports permit stacking on commercial vessels | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Brunswick | Support for use of powerheads | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Mt. Pleasant | Consider making 225-lb permits transferable (new entrants) | **Management** | NEW - Obj 2; Strat 2.2 | Commercial | 2 |
| CS-Murrells Inlet | Supports permit stacking on commercial vessels | **Management** | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Mt. Pleasant | Harvest tag program for goliath grouper in FL | **Management** | NEW | Recreational | 1 |
| CS-Mt. Pleasant | Add red snapper to the grouper aggregate | **Management** | NEW - Obj 2; Strat 2.1B | Recreational | 1 |
| CS-Mt. Pleasant | Consider rotating closed areas on artificial reefs | **Management** | NEW - Obj 5; Strat 5.1 | Recreational | 1 |

| Comment Type | NEW Idea- Strategy/Action | Goal Addressed | Possible Objective/ Strategy Addressed | Sector (if available) | Total # of comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CS-Mt. Pleasant | Allow use of powerheads | **Management** | NEW | Recreational | 2 |
| CS-Murrells Inlet | Multi-day trip endorsement for vessels with multi-day history | **Management** | NEW - Obj 2; Strat 2.1 | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comment | Website for conducting stakeholder review and polls/votes before management measures are implemented (2/3 majority vote of permit holders) | Communication/Management | NEW-Comm - Obj 1; | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comment | Remove the black sea bass pot endorsement program | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comment | Public votes on management measures | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Wilmington | Close red grouper during the spawning season | Management | NEW-Obj 1; Strat 1.3A; Obj 2; Strat 2.1B | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Wanchese | Commercial trips should not be able to retain recreational limits of fish if commercial season is closed. | Management | NEW-Obj 2; Strat 2.1 | Recreational | 2 |
| CS-Wilmington | Create a pool of commercial permits to allow 5 new entrants per year | Management | NEW-Obj 3; Strat 3.1 | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Morehead City | Work with dive operators to collect data using video cameras | Management | NEW-Obj 4; Strat 4.2 | Recreational | 1 |
| CS-Wilmington | Supports removing circle hook requirement | Management | NEW-Obj 4; Strat 4.4A | | 1 |
| CS-Morehead City | Permit stacking | Management | NEW | Commercial | 1 |
| CS-Wanchese | Evaluate existing MPAs before putting in new closed areas | Management | NEW-Obj 5; Strat 5.4 | | 1 |
| Written Comment | Do not allow the 225-permits transferable | Management | NEW - Obj 2; Strat 2.2 | Commercial | 1 |
| Written Comment | Do not use income requirement for allocation or quota formulas | Management | NEW - Obj 6 | Commercial | 1 |

| Comment Type | NEW Idea- Strategy/Action | Goal Addressed | Possible Objective/ Strategy Addressed | Sector (if available) | Total # of comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Written Comment | Mandatory review of allocations with established timeframe/indicators to trigger reviews | Management | NEW - Obj 6 | Recreational | 1 |
| Written Comment | Focus allocation reviews on economic efficiency | Management | NEW-Obj 6; Strat 6.1 | Recreational | 1 |
| Written Comment | Consider changes in the use of the fishery when considering allocation to account for future growth of fishery (sectors, resource, etc.) | Management | NEW - Obj 6 | Recreational | 1 |
| Written Comment | Do not use catch history for setting allocations | Management | NEW- Obj 6 | Recreational | 1 |
| | Establish clear goals/objectives and evaluation of any new closed areas to help determine when objective has been met and area could reopen | Management | NEW - Obj 5 | Recreational | 1 |
| Written Comment | Use science (best available) to determine size of an area to be closed | Management | NEW - Obj 5 | Recreational | 1 |
| Written Comment | Use other measures to manage fishery before considering closed areas | Management | NEW - Obj 5 | Recreational | 1 |