

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SOCIO-ECONOMIC PANEL OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE



SEP Meeting Overview

April 28, 2015

Crowne Plaza

4831 Tanger Outlet Boulevard

North Charleston, SC

PURPOSE

This meeting is convened to:

- Review economic analysis for Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16
- Review possible actions in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 23
- Provide guidance on social and economic evaluation measures in the draft System Management Plan
- Receive a briefing on the Snapper Grouper Visioning Project
- Discuss upcoming council actions in the South Atlantic region
- Discuss format of future SEP meetings

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16- black sea bass pot closure.....	3
3.	Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 23- golden tilefish longline management.....	4
4.	System Management Plan.....	5
5.	Snapper Grouper Visioning Project.....	6
6.	Upcoming Amendments and Actions.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.	Administrative Business.....	7
8.	Other Business.....	8
9.	Report and Recommendations Review.....	8
10.	Next SEP Meeting.....	8

DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1a. Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16 SSC Document

Attachment 1b. Draft Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16

Attachment 2. SEP Discussion Document for Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 23

Attachment 3. Draft South Atlantic Council System Management Plan

Attachment 4a: Strategic Goals for Draft Vision Blueprints

Attachment 4b: Growth Potential for the Snapper Grouper Fishery/ Summary Stats

Attachment 5: Recent and Developing Amendments

1. Introduction

1.1. Documents

Agenda
Minutes, April 2014

1.2. Action

Approve Agenda
Approve April 2014 Minutes
Introductions

2. Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16- black sea bass pot closure

2.1. Documents

Attachment 1a. Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16 SSC Document
Attachment 1b. Draft Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 16

2.2. Overview

Regulatory Amendment 16 includes two actions to address the prohibition on the use of black sea bass pots that was implemented through Regulatory Amendment 19 and became effective on October 23, 2013. The first action has alternatives that modify the closure based on variations of time, area, and depth. The second action modifies black sea bass pot gear strength and marking requirements that could make the gear less likely to get entangled with northern right whales, as well as be able to identify gear as South Atlantic black sea bass pot gear if it is recovered from a whale. Scoping meetings were held in January 2014 and the Council reviewed alternatives at the March 2014 meeting and provided guidance on changes and additional alternatives to include. The SSC reviewed a presentation of the alternatives evaluation in October 2014 and provided comment. The Council reviewed revised analyses in December 2014 meeting, and received a background and process presentation from the Protected Resources Branch. At the March 2014 meeting the Council reviewed additional biological and economic analyses of the alternatives. They did not review the revised SERO analysis of the alternatives. Public hearings will be held in August 2015, and the amendment will most likely be approved for submission to the Secretary of Commerce at the Council's December 2015 meeting. The SSC is asked to provide technical review of the revised analyses prepared by Southeast Regional Office staff, as well as the biological and economic analyses of the two actions.

2.3. Presentation

Brian Chevront, Council staff

2.4. Action

Please discuss the economic and social effects analyses for the two actions.

Action 1

Specific Questions:

1. Two time frames were used to calculate price per pound by month (ref. Figure 4.1.2.1). Would it be beneficial to include other time frames?
2. Table 4.1.1.1 uses information from an analysis by SERO that projects expected closure dates under various scenarios. Where there is a range of closure dates, it is due to estimated closure dates based on differences between three different scenarios that were used to calculate trap placement for each month. The analysis used for the economic effects only used one of the three modeled scenarios for where pots would be placed. Is there value in repeating the analyses for the other two pot placement scenarios?
3. Are there additional social or economic analyses that the SEP recommends be completed for this action?
4. What additional recommendations does the SEP have for **Action 1**?
5. Does this analysis represent BSIA?

Action 2

Specific Questions:

1. The Council has request that the SEP look at how **Action 2** is structured. Does the SEP have recommendations regarding this action?
2. Are there additional social or economic analyses that the SEP recommends be completed for this action?
3. What additional recommendations does the SEP have for **Action 2**?
4. Does this analysis represent BSIA?

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

3. Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 23- golden tilefish longline management

3.1. Document

Attachment 2. SEP Discussion Document for Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 23

3.2. Overview

Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 23 contains actions to address issues in the commercial golden tilefish fishery. The commercial sector for golden tilefish is managed as longline and hook-and-line components. The hook-and-line fishery has a trip limit of 500 lbs and longline has a trip limit of 4000 lbs. Also, 75% of the commercial ACL is allocated to the longline fishery, and 25% to the hook-and-line fishery (405,971 lbs and 135,324 lbs, respectively). A longline endorsement program implemented in 2013 (Snapper Grouper Amendment 18B) capped participation in the longline fishery at 23 vessels. The Council put these measures in place to address the early closures for commercial golden tilefish, primarily due to longline effort and rate of harvest.

Even with the limited participation and a trip limit, the longline fishery has reached its quota and closed in only a few months in recent years (5 March in 2014 and 19 February in 2015). The Council is exploring options to lengthen the longline season. While individual fishing quotas may be a viable option to address these issues, there is very little support for IFQs from longline endorsement holders, who would like to look at measures that do not include individual quotas. Additionally, the Council is considering changing the fishing year for the hook-and-line sector. Fishermen participating in the hook-and-line sector claim that the market is flooded early in the year so they would prefer to begin fishing on their quota after the longline sector has met its quota and closed for the year.

The SEP discussion document (*Attachment 2*) contains background information on the actions and about the commercial golden tilefish fishery, followed by preliminary alternatives for the Council's consideration. The discussion document also includes two appendices. Appendix A is an analysis for a previously considered action suggested by some longline fishermen for two weeks open and two weeks closed, to slow the rate of harvest and golden tilefish supply into the market (the Council decided to not pursue this measure). Appendix B is an additional economic description of the commercial golden tilefish fishery from a previous amendment.

3.3. Presentation

Kari MacLauchlin and Myra Brouwer, Council staff

3.4. Action

Discuss and make recommendations as necessary. Specific questions:

- 1) Pros and cons of the derby conditions for the golden tilefish longline fishery?
 - Is a derby always a problem?
- 2) **What are the options---other than individual fishing quotas--- to extend the longline season and/or allow a more consistent supply? The longline sector is 23 vessels fishing under a 4,000-lb trip limit and a longline quota of 405, 971 lbs.**
- 3) Comments on changing the hook-and-line fishing year?
- 4) Other recommendations?

SEP RECOMMENDATION:

4. System Management Plan

4.1. Documents

Attachment 3. Draft South Atlantic Council System Management Plan

4.2. Overview

A framework is in development for a System Management Plan (SMP) for the eight SAFMC Snapper Grouper Amendment 14 MPAs and to provide a foundation for

potential future SAFMC MPA management plans in the southeast U.S. The SMP is currently in outline form, serving as a starting point to expand the development of adaptive and effective management of the SAFMC's array of protected areas. The SMP is intended to also increase the dialogue among the SAFMC and NOAA, commercial and recreational fishers, other members of affected communities, scientists, and additional agencies and stakeholders to achieve common goals to effectively monitor and protect the resources intended by the Amendment 14 MPAs. Once the primary working outline structure is established, the component sections of the SMP will be populated and vetted through the SAFMC's public process.

To provide a foundation for the SMP, four steps for management actions are proposed: resource protection, research and monitoring, outreach and education, and administrative and financial. Additionally, management effectiveness evaluations are recommended as a fundamental component that the final SMP will contain to determine the status and utility of the MPAs in achieving the intentions set by Amendment 14. The final SMP expects to support the requirements of the reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (U.S. Public Law 109-479 2007) and aims to utilize MPAs in the southeast as a viable fishery management tool to protect and assess target resource populations and associated habitats.

Council staff will review the current status of the SMP. The SEP is asked to provide input on social and economic goals of MPAs, and to make recommendations for evaluation measures of MPAs. The SMP focuses specifically on the 8 deepwater MPAs established in Amendment 14, but will be expanded to apply to Spawning SMZs and future MPAs in the South Atlantic region.

4.3. Presentation

Kari MacLauchlin, Council staff

4.4. ACTIONS

- Provide input to staff on social and economic goals of MPAs.
- Recommend measures of evaluation of social and economic goals for the SMP.
- Provide input on types of projects that would be useful in evaluation of the MPAs.

SEP RECOMMENDATION:

5. Snapper Grouper Visioning Project

5.1. Documents

Attachment 4a. Strategic Goals for Draft Vision Blueprints

Attachment 4b. Growth Potential for the Snapper Grouper Fishery/ Summary Stats

For additional information, see <http://www.safmc.net/resource-library/council-visioning-project>.

5.2. Overview

Amber Von Harten, Council staff, will bring the SSC up to date on development of the Council's Vision Blueprint for the Snapper Grouper Fishery. The Council began the process of developing a vision statement and strategic goals and objectives in December 2012. The four draft strategic goals (Science, Management, Governance, and Communication) and objectives (Attachment 4a) have been developed over the course of the past two years with input from fishery stakeholders. The Council will collect public input on the draft strategic goals from June through September, review public input and finalize the draft goals and objectives in September, and prioritize short- and long-term action items during a Council workshop in October 2015.

5.3. Discussion

Amber Von Harten, Council staff

5.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and make recommendations as necessary.

SEP RECOMMENDATION:

6. Recent and Developing Council Actions

6.2. Document

Attachment 6. Recent and Developing Amendments

6.3. Overview

Council staff will provide a briefing on upcoming amendments and actions.

6.4. Presentation and Discussion

Kari MacLauchlin, Council staff

6.5. ACTIONS

Discuss and make recommendations as necessary.

SEP RECOMMENDATION:

7. Administrative Business

7.1. Document

None

7.2. Overview

Council staff will brief the SEP on recent changes for SEP term limits. The SEP will discuss future SEP meetings options. One option is to hold meetings via webinar a few weeks before the SSC meeting to allow time to work on the report to the SSC. In-person meetings could be held at other times, or on an as-needed basis.

7.3. Presentation and Discussion

Kari MacLauchlin, Council staff

7.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and make recommendations as necessary.

SEP RECOMMENDATION:

8. Other Business

9. Report and Recommendations Review

10. Next SEP Meeting

- April 2016, Charleston SC (or webinar?)