

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SOCIO-ECONOMIC PANEL OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE**



**SEP Meeting Overview**

**April 13, 2021**

**Held via Webinar**

## PURPOSE

This meeting is convened to discuss and provide input to the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) on:

- Recent and developing Council actions and amendments,
- Citizen Science Program
- A social census of Georgia’s working waterfronts,
- Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint draft,
- Dolphin Wahoo Participatory Workshops,
- Using Fishery Performance Reports to evaluate management success.

## CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Recent and Developing Council Actions.....	3
3.	Update on the Citizen Science Program.....	5
4.	A Social Census of Georgia’s Working Waterfronts.....	6
5.	Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint.....	6
6.	Dolphin Wahoo Participatory Workshops.....	8
7.	Fishery Performance Reports to Evaluate Management Success.....	10
8.	Other Business.....	11
9.	Opportunity for Public Comment.....	11
10.	Report and Recommendations Review.....	11
11.	Next SEP Meeting.....	11

## DOCUMENTS

**Attachment 1a.** Socio-Economic Panel Agenda Overview

**Attachment 1b.** Minutes from the April 2021 meeting

**Attachment 2.** Recent and Developing South Atlantic Council Amendments

**Attachment 3.** Citizen Science Program update presentation

**Attachment 4.** Social Census of Georgia’s Working Waterfronts presentation

**Attachment 5a.** Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint

**Attachment 5b.** Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint presentation

**Attachment 6.** Dolphin Wahoo Participatory Workshops presentation

**Attachment 7.** Fishery Performance Report discussion document

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Documents

- **Attachment 1a.** Socio-Economic Panel Agenda Overview
- **Attachment 1b.** Minutes from the April 2021 meeting

### 1.2. ACTIONS

- Introductions
- Review and approve the agenda
- Approve April 2020 Minutes
- Opportunity for public comment

## 2. Recent and Developing Council Actions

### 2.1. Document

- **Attachment 2.** Recent and Developing South Atlantic Council Amendments

### 2.2. Overview

Council staff will provide a briefing on recent and upcoming amendments and actions (**Attachment 2**). The following amendments may be of particular interest to SEP members.

#### *Amendment 48 (Wreckfish ITQ Program Modernization)*

The Council finished its second review of the Wreckfish ITQ program in September of 2019. As part of the review there were several recommendations made to modernize the program. This amendment begins development in September 2020 and will review the ITQ goals and objectives, and actions from the 2019 review such as electronic reporting, changes to allowable landing procedures, cost recovery, etc. In addition, the Council will consider adopting updated goals and objectives for the entire Snapper Grouper FMP as part of this amendment.

At the September 2020 Council meeting the Council directed staff to hold a meeting with the Wreckfish shareholders and wholesale dealers to discuss the potential actions for the amendments and timing for the amendment ahead of the December 2020 meeting. A meeting of the Wreckfish shareholders and wholesale dealers was held via webinar on October 26, 2020. At their December 2020 meeting the Council reviewed input from the shareholders and dealers, provided guidance to staff on actions and alternatives to develop, and approved the amendment for scoping at the March 2021 meeting. At the March 2021 meeting, staff presented a revised timeline for completion of Amendment 48. Moving to an electronic reporting system will require review of the entire CFR and will take a significant amount of staff time, as a result it is unlikely that this amendment will be ready for final approval by the end of 2021. Staff presented work completed to date, including draft actions and alternatives and received guidance to continue development of the actions and alternatives, including those needed for consideration of a VMS requirement. The Council will review draft actions and alternatives for approval at the September Council meeting. A meeting of the wreckfish shareholders will be convened this summer.

### *Amendment 50 (Red Porgy Rebuilding and Allocations)*

The Council received a report of the results of SEDAR 60 for Red Porgy at their June 2020 meeting. Red Porgy are overfished, and overfishing is occurring and the stock is not making adequate progress towards rebuilding. The Council also received an ABC recommendation from the SSC in June 2020 and directed staff to begin development of an amendment. The Council is required to establish a rebuilding plan for Red Porgy no later than June 12, 2022. In September 2020, the Council reviewed an options paper to address catch levels, rebuilding, management measures, and sector allocations. At the December meeting, the Council reviewed preliminary analyses, recommendations on management measures from the Snapper Grouper AP, and approved the amendment for scoping. Scoping hearings were held February 3 and 4, 2021. The Council will review updated analyses in June 2021 and approve the amendment for public hearings.

### *Amendment 49 (Greater Amberjack Catch Levels and Allocations and Snapper Grouper Recreational Annual Catch Targets)*

In June 2020, the Council received the results of SEDAR 59 for Greater Amberjack. Greater Amberjack were determined to be neither overfished nor was overfishing occurring. This amendment will consider modifications to the annual catch limit, optimum yield, and sector allocations for Greater Amberjack. Additionally, this amendment considers removal of recreational annual catch targets that are not currently being used in management from the Snapper Grouper FMP. In March 2021, the Council approved Amendment 49 for scoping. Scoping hearings will be held on April 14 and 15, 2021. In June, the Council will review scoping comments, comments from the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel, and preliminary analyses and provide guidance to the IPT on further development of the draft amendment.

### *Dolphin Wahoo 10 (Dolphin and Wahoo management measures)*

As of the March 2021 Council meeting, the actions in Amendment 10 would accommodate updated recreational data from the Marine Recreational Information Program and new catch level recommendations from the SSC by revising the annual catch limits and sector allocations for Dolphin and Wahoo. The amendment also contains actions that implement various other management changes in the fishery including revising recreational accountability measures, accommodating possession of Dolphin and Wahoo on vessels with certain unauthorized gears onboard, removing the operator card requirement, reducing the recreational vessel limit for Dolphin, reducing the recreational bag limit for Wahoo, and implementing a recreational vessel limit for Wahoo.

### *Amendment 34 (King Mackerel Assessment and Allocations)*

In June 2020 the Council received the results of SEDAR 38 Update for King Mackerel. King Mackerel were determined to be neither overfished nor was overfishing occurring. This amendment will consider modifications to management measures and sector allocations. A meeting of the Mackerel Cobia Advisory Panel was held via webinar on November 2, 2020. The AP reviewed the amendment and provided recommendations. At their December 2020 meeting the Council reviewed input from the AP and provided guidance to staff on actions and alternatives to develop. They also approved the amendment for scoping to be held during the

March 2021 meeting. At their March 2021 meeting the Council reviewed scoping comments and approved actions and alternatives to be analyzed. In June 2021, staff will present preliminary analysis for the Council to consider when selecting preferred alternatives and approval for public hearings.

### 2.3. Presentation and Discussion

John Hadley and Christina Wiegand, SAFMC staff

### 2.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and make recommendations as appropriate. In general, this agenda item is meant to brief the SEP on potential Council actions that may be presented to the group for review later in the meeting or at a future SEP meeting.

## SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

### 3. Update on the Citizen Science Program

#### 3.1. Documents

- **Attachment 3.** Citizen Science Program update presentation

#### 3.2. Overview

Staff will present a brief update on the Council's Citizen Science Program and pilot projects, highlighting activities that have occurred since the Spring 2020 SEP meeting. Additionally, staff will provide an overview of a project to develop a customizable citizen science mobile application that encourages and supports the capture and sharing of information about Atlantic coast fish. The Council is partnering with ACCSP and NCDMF to host a series of scoping meetings this spring to develop a roadmap for the design and development of this app. A series of Town Hall meetings were held in March 2021 where fishermen, scientists, and managers were invited to share their ideas on what they would like to see out of a citizen science app.

#### 3.3. Presentation and Discussion

Julia Byrd and Allie Iberle, SAFMC staff

#### 3.4. ACTIONS

Provide feedback and guidance on some of the socio-economic issues and ideas raised during the citizen science mobile application town hall meetings.

#### Discussion Questions:

1. What niche can citizen science fill for social and economic information that is different from what we can learn through surveys and academic research?
2. How can it help inform decision making?

3. What information can't be collected through other means?
4. Which of the socio-economic town hall ideas may lend themselves well to inclusion in the customizable citizen science app?

## SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

### 4. A Social Census of Georgia's Working Waterfronts

#### 4.1. Documents

- **Attachment 4.** Social Census of Georgia's Working Waterfronts presentation

#### 4.2. Overview

Current data on the Georgia seafood industry's demographics, economics, and social conditions is missing. This research project fills that gap through its investigation of 1) Current demographic, economic, and social conditions of the seafood industry, and how these compare to historical trends, and 2) Labor supply conditions for the industry, and strategies that can address the distressed workforce and aging of the fleet. This project conducted a social census of Georgia's working waterfronts to provide a current snapshot of Georgia's seafood industry, and an assessment of changes in the industry over the last 20-40 years. This collaborative research engagement with the fishing community has produced findings that may prove useful to other working waterfronts around the nation. The project has identified labor force concerns voiced by the industry, and identified best practices to remedy these issues, assisted by case study analysis. Drawing on these case studies, the collaborative work with those in fishing communities, and analysis conducted in this project, project outreach has the potential to assist policymakers, businesses, and fishing families in identifying solutions to sustain Georgia's commercial seafood industry.

#### 4.3. Presentation

Dr. Jennifer Sweeney Tookes, Georgia Southern University/SEP Member

#### 4.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and make recommendations as appropriate. In general, this agenda item is meant to update the SEP on research relevant to south Atlantic fisheries.

## SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

### 5. Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint

#### 5.1. Documents

- **Attachment 5a.** Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint

- **Attachment 5b.** Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint presentation

## 5.2. Overview

Making sector allocation decisions is a difficult and complicated process. To help the Council incorporate other sources of information, in addition to landings, when making sector allocations, the Council is exploring the use of a Decision Tree Approach to help the determine salient issues when discussing sector allocations and develop an objective and organized approach to allocations. At the September 2020 meeting, the Council endorsed the concept of the Decision Tree Approach and directed staff to work on developing the approach with input from its advisors. The Council did express concerns over establishing an approach that would be overly prescriptive in nature and wanted to maintain flexibility in allocation decisions on a species-by-species basis. As such, the approach design seeks to be informative in a methodical and objective manner without being prescriptive in the exact outcome that the Council is obligated to take in deciding allocations.

## 5.3. Presentation

John Hadley and Christina Wiegand, SAFMC staff

## 5.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and provide feedback on the draft Allocation Decision Tree Blueprint Document, with a focus on draft decision tree questions and outcomes.

### Discussion Questions:

#### 1. Economic

- a. Keeping in mind the need to focus on readily available data and completion of the decision tree in a relatively short time (several weeks to a few months), does the SEP feel that the set of questions presented covering economic topics is adequate?
- b. Are there additional economic-related questions or topics that should be covered in this portion of the decision tree approach? Are there questions that should be removed?
- c. Does the SEP feel that the outline potential data analyses are adequate? Are there other readily available analyses or data sources that should be examined?
- d. Are the resulting recommendations from the economic decision trees appropriate? Will they help guide allocation decisions without being too prescriptive?

#### 2. Social

- a. Are there additional sociocultural-related questions or topics that should be covered in this portion of the decision tree approach? Are there questions that should be removed?
- b. Does the SEP feel that the outlined data analyses are adequate? Are there other readily available analyses or data sources that should be examined?

- c. Given the need to complete any decision tree related analysis in a short amount of time, what is the best way to summarize and present available qualitative data?
- d. Should the vulnerability social indicators be incorporated into the social decision trees?
- e. Are the resulting recommendations from the social decision trees appropriate? Are they clear enough to guide allocation decisions without being too prescriptive?
- f. Should questions listed in the decision trees be posed to Advisory Panels when conducting Fishery Performance Reports?

### 3. Overall

- a. Given the overlap of some information that falls across multiple topics, such as landings or importance of a fishery to a given sector, does the SEP suggest the continued use of a “siloe approach” where the decision tree questions remain organized by subject (Social, Economic, Landings, and Stock Status) or should a more mixed approach be used where appropriate crossing multiple topics in one branch of the decision tree? For example, the overarching topic of Landings could be addressed using biologic, social, and economic questions.
- b. Does the SEP feel that the use of a decision tree method as outlined would be useful for the Council to systematically and objectively examine allocations?
- c. It is likely that the outcomes of working through the decision tree will vary by topic.
  - i. To provide the Council more conclusive guidance, should some topics be weighted more heavily than others? If so, which ones should be prioritized?
  - ii. Would it be better to not provide a weighting to the topics and rely on a “majority rules” approach where each topic has equal ranking and the Council should consider allocation decisions based on net outcome of the topics. For example, if three of the five topics point towards additional allocation to the sector, the Council would be encouraged to prioritize additional ACL to that sector.

## SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

### 6. Dolphin Wahoo Participatory Workshops

#### 6.1. Document

- **Attachment 6.** Dolphin Wahoo Participatory Workshops presentation

#### 6.2. Overview

In March 2020, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC), along with South Atlantic Council staff, conducted a series of participatory workshops with Dolphin Wahoo fishermen at locations in Beaufort, North Carolina, Manteo, North Carolina, and Virginia Beach, Virginia. These workshops gathered information on biological, social, economic, and regulatory factors affecting fisheries for Dolphin and Wahoo, risks to these fisheries, how changes in the ecosystem



have affected fishing businesses and communities, and future research needs. This information was used to develop a social-ecological system conceptual model of the human dimensions and environmental factors that influence the fishery in the region.

A similar set of workshops was planned for locations in South Florida for the summer months of 2020 but were delayed and eventually cancelled due to complications related to COVID-19. In the spring of 2021, SEFSC and SAFMC staff made the decision to move the in-person workshops to a virtual format, first seeking input via phone from individuals conducted interviews with fishermen involved in the Dolphin Wahoo fishery from the South Florida region, and then bringing a larger group together over a webinar as a replacement for the in-person workshops. These efforts allowed researchers to gather similar types of information that was collected in North Carolina and Virginia and led to the development of a conceptual model for the Dolphin Wahoo fishery of South Florida.

In addition to the participatory workshops, SEFSC staff conducted an analysis of pictures posted on social media to collect information on for-hire vessels involved in the Dolphin Wahoo fishery including the seasonality of catch, variations in the general size of Dolphin and Wahoo landed, and other species commonly caught on for-hire trips. This research, when combined with findings from the data collected during the participatory workshops, has been used to identify emerging themes in the fishery and provide in-depth biological, social, and economic information not previously available on the Dolphin Wahoo fishery.

An overview and preliminary findings will be presented (*Attachment 6*) to the SEP by SEFSC staff.

### 6.3. Presentation

Dr. Mandy Karnauskas and Dr. Matt McPherson, SEFSC

### 6.4. ACTIONS

The cross-disciplinary research resulted in identifying several social, economic, and management factors driving the Dolphin Wahoo fishery. While there was also a notable biological component to the research, the conceptual models are heavily focused on the human dimension aspects of the fishery. As such, the SEP is being asked to review the work conducted and provide feedback.

#### Discussion Questions and Feedback Requests:

1. Please comment on the utility and appropriate application of the findings (i.e. inform managers, set research priorities, aid in analysis of social and economic effects of fishery management actions, etc.)
2. Please comment on the use of social media analysis to supplement findings.
3. Does the SEP recommend considering this approach for future research into other Council-managed fisheries?

- a. Are there specific research topics or fisheries that the SEP would like to identify that could benefit from the application of similar research efforts?

## SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

### 7. Fishery Performance Reports to Evaluate Management Success

#### 7.1. Document

- **Attachment 7.** Fishery Performance Report discussion document

#### 7.2. Overview

The purpose of fishery performance reports (FPR) is to assemble information from the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) fishery advisory panel members' experience and observations on the water and in the marketplace to complement scientific and landings data. The FPRs are used to complement stock assessment reports and aid in developing stock status recommendations, as well as inform future Council management decisions. Additionally, the FPRs are posted publicly on the [Council's website](#).

Recently, Council staff has been discussing ways to better explore the efficacy of current and past management actions. Understanding what management measures have or haven't been successful in the past could help guide the Council as they discuss modifications to the regulatory system in currently place. To that end, staff would like to get fishermen's perspective on management success through the FPR process.

#### 7.3. Presentation

Christina Wiegand, SAFMC staff

#### 7.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and provide guidance to the staff on Fishery Performance Report questions to examine management success.

#### Discussion Questions

1. Should questions about management efficacy be roped into the other discussion questions? For example, how have management measures affected the price/demand? How have management measures influenced shifts in effort to/from the fishery?
2. What other additions or improvements could be made to the discussion questions to produce more valuable information on management efficacy?
3. How can staff work to address confounding changes that may influence perceptions successful/unsuccessful management has been such as changing environmental conditions, overall change in value of stock etc.

4. How should the information gathered during the FPR process be presented and incorporated into the management process?

**SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**8. Other Business**

**9. Opportunity for Public Comment**

**10. Report and Recommendations Review**

**11. Next SEP Meeting**

- Spring 2022, Charleston SC