

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SOCIO-ECONOMIC PANEL OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE



SEP Meeting Overview

February 6-7, 2018

**Crowne Plaza Hotel
4831 Tanger Outlet Blvd.
North Charleston, SC**

PURPOSE

This meeting is convened to discuss and provide input to the SSC and Council on:

- The Citizen Science Program
- Recent and developing Council actions
- Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Review
- Trip metrics used to estimate the economic impacts of recreational fisheries for SAFMC managed species
- Results from a socio-economic profile of the commercial snapper grouper fishery in the South Atlantic
- An outline of socio-economic report for SAFMC managed fisheries
- Analysis methods used in Snapper Grouper Amendment 27
- Snapper Grouper Amendment 46 (Recreational Reporting)

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	Update on the Citizen Science Program	3
3.	Recent and Developing Council Actions.....	4
4.	Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) Review	6
5.	Trip metrics used in estimating the economic impacts of recreational fishing.....	8
6.	Results from the socio-economic profile of the Snapper Grouper fishery	9
7.	Socio-economic profile of fisheries for species managed by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council	10
8.	Analysis methods used in Snapper Grouper Amendment 27	10
9.	Red snapper management and recreational reporting	12
10.	Other Business	13
11.	Opportunity for Public Comment	13
12.	Report and Recommendations Review	13
13.	Next SEP Meeting.....	13

DOCUMENTS

Attachment 1. SAFMC Citizen Science Action Team Progress Summary

Attachment 2. Recent and Developing SAFMC Amendments

Attachment 3a. Draft Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Program Review Report

Attachment 3b. Presentation slides for the Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Program Review

Attachment 3c. Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Program Review Report, 2009

Attachment 4a: Draft report on economic impacts of fisheries for SAFMC managed species

Attachment 4b: Presentation slides for SEP discussion on economic impact report

Attachment 5. Presentation slides for findings of Snapper Grouper Socio-Economic Profile Report

Attachment 6a. Outline for socio-economic profile of fisheries for species managed by the SAFMC

Attachment 6b. Presentation slides for SEP discussion of socio-economic profile outline

Attachment 7a. Excerpt from Regulatory Amendment 27 Impact Analysis

Attachment 7b. Excerpt from October 2017 SSC report

Attachment 7c. October 2017 SSC meeting minutes

Attachment 8a. Revised Snapper Grouper Amendment 46 Options Paper

Attachment 8b. MyFishCount 2017 Red Snapper Mini-Season Report

Attachment 8c. Draft survey on recreational reporting

1. Introduction

1.1. Documents

Agenda

Minutes, April 2017

1.2. ACTIONS

- Approve Agenda
- Approve April 2017 Minutes
- Introductions
- Opportunity for public comment

2. Update on the Citizen Science Program

2.1. Documents

Attachment 1. SAFMC Citizen Science Action Team Progress Summary

Additional reference for discussion:

- 1) Details about the Citizen Science Program are available on the Council's website at:
<http://safmc.net/citizen-science-initiative/>

2.2. Overview

For many years, the Council has grappled with the challenge of ensuring adequate and timely science to support management despite limited resources, a multitude of species to manage, and a complex and highly diverse ecosystem. Discussions of data shortcomings and the resulting scientific uncertainties often lead to offers from fishermen to provide their vessels as research

platforms, collect samples and record their own observations to help increase scientific knowledge and 'fill the gaps'. The Council recognizes the desire of constituents to get involved and the need to have a well-designed program and accompanying sampling protocols to ensure that information collected through such efforts is useful. To meet this growing need, the Council is developing a comprehensive Fishery Citizen Science Program. Amber Von Harten, the SAFMC Citizen Science Program Manager, will brief the SEP on the recent actions of the SAFMC Citizen Science Program (*Attachment 1*).

2.3. Discussion

Amber Von Harten, SAFMC staff

2.4. ACTIONS

No specific action is being requested of the SEP, but interested SEP members are encouraged to become involved with the SAFMC Citizen Science Program.

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

3. Recent and Developing Council Actions

3.1. Document

Attachment 2. Recent and Developing SAFMC Amendments

3.2. Overview

Council staff will provide a briefing on recent and upcoming amendments and actions (*Attachment 2*). The briefing will go into specific details on the proposed Snapper Grouper for-hire permit moratorium (Amendment 47), the Snapper Grouper visioning amendments (Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendments 26 and 27), recreational reporting amendment (Amendment 46).

Snapper Grouper Amendment 47 (For-Hire Permit Moratorium)

At several recent meetings, the Council has discussed establishing a limited entry permit for the for-hire sector of the Snapper Grouper fishery. Currently, the for-hire permit is open access, with approximately 1,400 to 1,600 active permits. In June 2017, the Council instructed staff to begin work on an amendment that would explore a moratorium on the for-hire component of the snapper grouper fishery. The Council discussed an [options paper](#) at their December 2017 meeting and decided to revisit the topic at their March 2017 meeting.

Snapper Grouper Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 26 (Recreational Management Measures)

In June 2016, the Council directed staff to begin development of an amendment to address items identified in the Vision Blueprint addressing recreational management measures. In September 2016 the Council reviewed an options paper and directed staff to prepare a scoping

document. Scoping meetings were held in late January/early February 2017 and the Council reviewed public comments and gave direction to staff at their March 2017 meeting. In June 2017, the Council provided further guidance but did not approve the amendment for public hearings. Actions in the amendment include modification to the composition and limits of the recreational aggregates, measures to reduce discards, establishment or modification of recreational seasons, and gear restrictions/modifications. During the September 2017 meeting, the Council approved an alternative approach for structuring the amendment that would better reflect the Council's Vision and how the fishery currently operates. Because of this change, the Council also approved a revised timeline for amendment development with formal approval expected in September 2018. The Council revised actions and alternatives in the amendment at their December 2017 meeting. Actions being considered in this amendment are listed below:

1. Modify the species composition of the recreational aggregates
2. Specify recreational management measures for the deep-water species aggregate
Specify seasonal prohibition for the deep-water species aggregate
 - Remove the recreational minimum size limits for certain deep-water species
 - Specify the aggregate bag limit for the deep-water species aggregate
 - Specify gear requirements for the deep-water species aggregate
3. Specify management measures for species in the shallow-water grouper aggregate
 - Modify the seasonal prohibition for red grouper in the Exclusive Economic Zone off South Carolina and North Carolina
 - Specify the aggregate bag limit for the shallow-water grouper aggregate
4. Specify management measures for the other shallow-water species aggregate
 - Reduce the recreational minimum size limit for gray triggerfish in the exclusive economic zone off east Florida
 - Specify the aggregate bag limit for the other shallow-water species aggregate
5. Specify the aggregate bag limit for the snapper grouper species aggregate

Snapper Grouper Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 27 (Commercial Management Measures)

In June 2016, the Council directed staff to begin development of an amendment to address items identified in the Vision Blueprint addressing commercial management measures. In September 2016 the Council directed staff to prepare a scoping document and scoping meetings were held in late January/early February 2017. The Council reviewed public comments and gave direction to staff at their March 2017 and June 2017 meetings. Actions include commercial split seasons and/or trip limit adjustments for several species/complexes; re-evaluation of the shallow water grouper closure, and gear restrictions/modifications. The Council revised alternatives at their September 2017 meeting and approved the same timeline for development as that for the recreational amendment (see above). At their December 2017 meeting, the Council further revised actions and alternatives in the amendment. Actions being considered in this amendment are listed below:

1. Establish a commercial split season and modify the commercial trip limit for blueline tilefish
2. Establish a commercial split season for snowy grouper
3. Establish a commercial split season and modify commercial trip limit for greater amberjack
4. Establish a commercial split season and modify commercial trip limit for red porgy

5. Modify the commercial trip limit for vermilion snapper
6. Implement a minimum size limit for almaco jack for the commercial sector
7. Implement a commercial trip limit for the Other Jacks Complex
8. Modify the seasonal prohibition on commercial harvest and possession of red grouper in the Exclusive Economic Zone off South Carolina and North Carolina
9. Remove the commercial minimum size limits for deep-water snapper species
10. Reduce the commercial minimum size limit for gray triggerfish in the Exclusive Economic Zone off east Florida

Snapper Grouper Amendment 46 (red snapper and recreational reporting)

In June 2017, the Council instructed staff to move actions formerly in Amendment 43, except an action to specify a red snapper ACL in 2018, to Amendment 46. The amendment would specify OFL/ABC/ACL for red snapper, address recreational permitting and reporting for private recreational fishermen, best fishing practices (also include an option to remove circle hook requirements for snapper grouper fishing), and removing powerhead restrictions in special management zones off South Carolina (action formerly included in the Visioning amendments). OFL/ABC/ACL for red snapper based on SEDAR 41 (2017) have not been adopted through the amendment process; however, the SEFSC could not provide new projections due to the time since the last amendment, uncertainty in recreational landings and discards, and upcoming changes to recreational landings estimates. During their meeting in October 2017, the SSC formed a workgroup whose task is to determine an approach to obtain an ABC for red snapper. The Council reviewed an options paper for Amendment 46 at their December 2017 meeting and provided guidance on further developing the amendment.

3.3. Presentation and Discussion

John Hadley, SAFMC staff

3.4. 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:

4. Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) Review

4.1. Documents

Attachment 3a. Draft Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Program Review Report

Attachment 3b. Presentation slides for the Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Program Review

Attachment 3c. Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota Program Review Report, 2009

Additional reference for discussion:

- 1) T. Yandle, S. Crosson. Whatever Happened to the Wreckfish Fishery? An Evaluation of the Oldest Finfish ITQ Program in the United States. *Marine Resource Economics*, Volume 30, Number 2 (2015) 193–217.

4.2. Overview

In May 2016 the NMFS issued draft guidance intended to ensure the reviews of Catch Share Programs are comprehensive, conducted in a coordinated and transparent fashion, and meet the statutory requirements. The Wreckfish Individual Transferable Quota (ITQ) Program is the only program implemented in the South Atlantic that will need to undergo review under the current guidance. The wreckfish ITQ program has been in place for over two decades and has been examined multiple times throughout its existence (**Attachment 3c** and *additional reference material*). The current review is ongoing, with a draft report planned for the Council to review at the March 2018 and subsequent updated reports at the June 2018 and September 2018 meeting.

4.3. Presentation

Brian Chevront, SAFMC staff

4.4. ACTIONS

SAFMC staff will provide a presentation with background information on the Wreckfish ITQ program and the review (**Attachment 3a and 3b**). The SEP will be asked to provide feedback on research and data going into the review process as well as how the review will be structured.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does the SEP have input on the data and confidentiality issues beyond what the SSC has already discussed?
2. If SERO is unable to obtain waivers from all past fishery participants (from the time series in consideration, does the SEP have suggestions for providing additional detail other than annual aggregates?
3. Based on the draft review document in the briefing book, what recommendations does the SEP have for this Wreckfish ITQ Review regarding:
 - a. Eligibility and Participation
 - b. Sector Allocation
 - c. Share Transferability
 - d. Share Caps
 - e. Price Analysis
 - f. Catch and Sustainability
 - g. Safety at Sea
 - h. New Entrants into the Fishery
 - i. Monitoring and Enforcement
 - j. Privilege Duration & Subsequent Distribution

4. Are there other topics the SEP recommends covering in the ITQ review?
5. While the review is not yet complete, does the social and economic information provided in the outline review represent the best available information to profile the performance of the fishery?

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

5. Trip metrics used in estimating the economic impacts of recreational fishing

5.1. Documents

Attachment 4a: Draft report on economic impacts of fisheries for SAFMC managed species

Attachment 4b: Presentation slides for SEP discussion on economic impact report

5.2. Overview

As part of an ongoing effort to compile comprehensive information on SAFMC managed fisheries across species and throughout their range, a report has been drafted examining the economic impacts of fisheries for SAFMC managed species. The report is attempting to respond to the research question of “what are the economic impacts of fisheries for SAFMC managed species (both recreational and commercial)?”, specifically focusing on jobs, income, value added, and business sales.

Council staff will provide an overview of the report (*Attachment 4a*), the model used, and the type of recreational trip estimates provided by the Marine Recreational Information Program (*Attachment 4b*).

5.3. Presentation

John Hadley, SAFMC staff

5.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and provide feedback to staff on appropriate recreational trip metrics to use when examining the economic impacts of recreational fisheries for SAFMC managed species.

Discussion Questions:

1. Given the various recreational trip estimates available, is there a specific metric that the SEP would recommend over what is currently used? Would a range between two of the trip types be better than a point estimate using one trip type as is currently practiced?
2. When presented with results of economic impact models, reactions often vary, with some reviewers feeling that numbers are inflated while others feeling that the numbers presented

are too low. Given your knowledge of previous experience with I/O models and economic impact estimates of recreational fishing, do you feel the results provided in the report are within reason given the data that are available?

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

6. Results from the socio-economic profile of the Snapper Grouper fishery

6.1. Document

Attachment 5. Presentation slides for findings from the Snapper Grouper Socio-Economic Profile Report

6.2. Overview

As part of Vision Blueprint Regulatory Amendment 27 (Commercial Management Measures), the public was asked to comment on management approaches that would meet the needs of “traditional bandit boats.” In addition, the Council expressed the need for an in-depth characterization of the fishery before considering substantial changes to how the fishery is managed. Hence, in March 2017 the Council directed staff to begin work on a socio-economic characterization of the commercial Snapper Grouper (SG) fishery. The SEP provided input on the work plan and outline for this project at their April 2017 meeting. Due to constraints on staff time, this analysis was contracted to former Council staff member, Dr. Kari MacLauchlin for completion by March 2018. Dr. MacLauchlin will provide the SEP with a presentation on results and findings from the report (*Attachment 5*).

6.3. Presentation

Kari MacLauchlin, report author and former SAFMC staff

6.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and provide feedback on the Snapper Grouper socio-economic characterization project. Additionally, this presentation will help provide background information for the next agenda item that seeks to expand on some of the work completed for this report.

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

7. Socio-economic profile of fisheries for species managed by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

7.1. Document

Attachment 6a. Outline for a socio-economic profile of fisheries for species managed by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

Attachment 6b. Presentation slides for SEP discussion of socio-economic profile outline

7.2. Overview

This report is being pursued as part of an effort to further extend the work completed for the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan and to provide comprehensive information on South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) managed fisheries. At their December 2017 meeting, the Council directed staff to begin work on a socio-economic characterization of fisheries for Council-managed species. This report will include a description of fishing communities (demographics, engagement and reliance on fishing), fishing trends (effort, landings, fleet characteristics, seasonality of landings), competition from imported seafood, fishing infrastructure, and safety at sea. Council staff will provide an overview of the work plan, and timing for the project (*Attachment 6a and 6b*).

7.3. Presentation

Christina Wiegand, SAFMC staff

7.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and provide guidance to the staff on the outline for the SAFMC fisheries characterization project (discussion questions included in *Attachment 6a*).

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

8. Analysis methods used in Snapper Grouper Amendment 27

8.1. Document

Attachment 7a. Excerpt from Regulatory Amendment 27 Impact Analysis

Attachment 7b. Excerpt from October 2017 SSC report

Attachment 7c. October 2017 SSC meeting minutes (see pages 233-236)

Additional references for discussion:

- 1) N. Farmer, J. Froeschke. Forecasting for Recreational Fisheries Management: What's the Catch?. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 35:4, (2015) 720-735

8.2. Overview

In June 2016, the Council directed staff to begin development of an amendment to address items identified in the Vision Blueprint addressing commercial management measures. In September 2016 the Council directed staff to prepare a scoping document and scoping meetings were held in late January/early February 2017. The Council reviewed public comments and gave direction to staff at their March 2017 and June 2017 meetings. Actions include commercial split seasons and/or trip limit adjustments for several species/complexes; re-evaluation of the shallow water grouper closure, and size limit modifications. The Council revised alternatives at their September 2017 meeting and approved the same timeline for development as that for the recreational amendment. At their December 2017 meeting, the Council further revised actions and alternatives in the amendment.

Technical analyses conducted to date on the amendment would benefit from SEP and SSC review. In particular, the SEP should comment on the appropriateness of the two models and methodologies used to predict landings under various scenarios. Analyses were performed by NMFS SERO staff and a sub-set of the results are included in *Attachment 7a*. At their October 2017 meeting, the SSC discussed the preliminary results from both models and suggested using the results from the “Last 3” model instead of the SARIMA model (*Attachment 7b*). Despite this recommendation, the SSC did have some questions on the SARIMA model that could not be answered during the meeting, as the analyst was not available to comment (*Attachment 7c*). Also, analyses have been revised and more analyses have been completed since the October 2017 SSC meeting. As such, the SSC will be discussing this topic again at their upcoming meeting in May 2018.

While the models generally agree for some analyses, divergent results presented by the two models under some circumstances (see red porgy analysis in *Attachment 7a*) are at the crux of the request from the amendment’s IPT for the SEP and SSC to provide guidance on the appropriate model results to use for the biological, economic, and social effects. The SEP’s discussion is intended to help the IPT with the analysis of the social and economic effects for actions in the amendment as well as contribute to the SSC’s upcoming discussion on the topic at their next meeting in May 2018. Council staff will provide an overview of the models used and the model results to facilitate the discussion.

8.3. Presentation

John Hadley, SAFMC staff

8.4. ACTIONS

Discuss and comment on the use and uncertainties of the two methods used in Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 27 to analyze the effects of the actions and alternatives.

Discussion Questions:

1. Is one methodology more appropriate for use in these analyses?
2. Do either of these approaches provide clearer management advice to the Council?
3. Are there differences in relative risk or uncertainty between the two methods?

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

9. Red snapper management and recreational reporting

9.1. Document

Attachment 8a. Revised Snapper Grouper Amendment 46 Options Paper

Attachment 8b. MyFishCount 2017 Red Snapper Mini-Season Report

Attachment 8c. Draft survey on recreational reporting

Additional references for discussion:

1) MyFishCount feedback correspondence #1

2) MyFishCount feedback correspondence #2

3) K. Garvy. The Emergence and Use of Angler Self-Reporting Apps in Recreational Fisheries. Masters Thesis (2015).

9.2. Overview

The Council requested that staff begin development of Amendment 43 (red snapper) in June 2016 to address items related to management of red snapper and other directly and indirectly related items that would ultimately result in an adaptive management approach and respond to items in the Vision Blueprint (i.e., recreational stamp, recreational season, time-area closures, etc.). At their June 2017 meeting, the Council directed staff to finalize development of Amendment 43 with only one action: to remove the process currently in place to set ACLs and set an ACL for red snapper for 2018 and beyond in order to allow limited harvest. The remainder of the actions in Amendment 43 will continue to be developed in Amendment 46 in 2017-2018.

The Council is challenged with the quality of recreational data for red snapper and several other species occurring in the South Atlantic region. A primary management objective for the Council is to improve data streams for many recreationally caught species. The Council is considering alternatives for permitting and reporting for fishermen on private recreational vessels. One approach could be self-reported data from anglers. As such, staff is in the process of developing a mobile phone app, MyFishCount, that will allow anglers to electronically report information on landed and discarded fish caught during recreational trips. Another primary objective of the Council is to reduce the number of dead discards through regulations or through best release practices. Both self-reporting and implementing best management practices will benefit from the use of incentives if they are to become common practice among the recreational community.

Council staff will facilitate discussion on recently considered management options (*Attachment 8a*) to implement recreational reporting, improve the survival of released fish, and manage the dive fishery. Staff will give an overview of the catch reporting app and ask the SEP for further input on reports sent to anglers who used the MyFishCount, an electronic recreational reporting platform during the 2017 red snapper mini-season (*Attachment 8b*), and determining angler motivation and participation to recreational report through a survey-based approach (*Attachment 8c*).

9.3. Presentation

Chip Collier and Kelsey Dick, SAFMC staff

9.4. Actions

Discuss and provide recommendations to the Council and staff on potential ways to incentivize recreational reporting and best management practices.

Discussion Questions:

1. Literature indicates the importance of providing information and feedback to citizen science project participants. Is the MyFishCount report messaging and content clear and cohesive? Does the report provide information that would be of interest to anglers?
2. Limited literature and research exists on angler motivations to recreationally report or participate in recreational reporting projects. This information is important as it can guide outreach and messaging content to ultimately increase participants. Is the survey clear and cohesive? Does the survey aim to answer the research questions provided?
3. Are there other readily achieved social or economic approaches that could be used to incentivize anglers to regularly use the recreational reporting app?

SEP RECOMMENDATIONS:

10. Other Business

11. Opportunity for Public Comment

12. Report and Recommendations Review

13. Next SEP Meeting

- Spring 2019, Charleston SC