

# **Socio-Economic Panel**

## **April 2022 Meeting Summary**

**June 2022 Council Meeting**  
**Dr. Scott Crosson, SEP Chair**

# Overview of SEP Meeting

- Met April 25-26 in Charleston, SC.
- Reviewed multiple topics including:
  - 1) Recent and developing Council actions
  - 2) Research on designing field experiments to assess alternative mechanisms for distributing fish to the recreational sector
  - 3) Best Fishing Practices outreach lexicon
  - 4) **An update on the Citizen Science Program**
  - 5) **An update on Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 35**
  - 6) **The economics of the longline component of the South Atlantic Golden Tilefish fishery**
  - 7) **The Revised Allocation Decision Tree**

# Update on SG Regulatory Amendment 35

- Projects are underway to model regulatory alternatives that might result in an increase in economic and social improvements in the fishery.
  - MSE project and SEFSC discard modeling.
- In the short run, staff could most effectively model the required reductions by showing the results of shutting down fishing waves, since most of the discards are a result of the recreational fishing sector.

# Citizen Science Program and Golden Tilefish LL fishery

- An update on the Citizen Science Program
  - The SEP provided feedback on maximizing feedback from the Program's evaluation survey.
- Economics of the longline component of the South Atlantic golden tilefish fishery
  - Reviewed comparison of fishery in Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic.
    - Noted derby fishery in the SA region.
  - Gini coefficient in SA fleet is .31, which means that landings are already more equally distributed than in most other regional fisheries.

# Allocation Decision Tree: Social and Economic Questions

- Given the lack of specific and dynamic information on demand combined with the need to complete a decision tree in a relatively short time frame the use of proxies is appropriate.
- Under similar caveats, the set of questions presented cover social and economic topics adequately.
- Outlined data analyses were adequate.
- Recommendations from the social and economic decision tree were appropriate and not too prescriptive.

# Allocation Decision Tree: FPRs and the Public Input Tool

- No issues with the questions being asked in the Fishery Performance Report (FPR) process.
  - Would like to review analysis methods if applied in the future.
- No concern over the Public Input Tool being overly burdensome.
- Some concerns about employing the tool in the allocation decision tree process.
  - Could be manipulated by different stakeholder groups to maximize their allocation share.
  - The SEP generally felt the tool would be beneficial to the process.

# Questions?