

Amendment 46 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region

Options Paper
December 2022

Note: Words that are [underlined and in blue font](#) provide a link to other documents.

Background

At the December 2021 South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (Council) meeting, the Snapper Grouper Committee (Committee) requested that Amendment 46 to the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for the Snapper Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic Region (Snapper Grouper FMP) be added to the agenda for discussion in March 2022. Amendment 46 was previously developed in the first half of 2018 and was approved for scoping at the June 2018 Council meeting. Due to time constraints over the Council’s workplan and the need to obtain more information on potential approaches for private recreational data gathering, the amendment was never scoped. From 2018 through 2020 staff focused instead on piloting the MyFishCount mobile app and portal. Other related efforts have also been underway, notably the convening of the Private Recreational Reporting Workgroup (workgroup) and subsequently the Snapper Grouper Recreational Permitting and Reporting AP (AP). The briefing materials and summary reports for these meetings can be found on the [Council’s website](#).

The Council’s 2016-2020 Vision Blueprint for the Snapper Grouper Fishery, previous amendments, and existing requirements

The 2016-2020 Vision Blueprint for the Snapper Grouper Fishery (Vision Blueprint) was approved in December 2015 and was intended to inform management of the snapper grouper fishery through 2020. The Vision Blueprint was also intended to serve as a “living document” to help guide future management, build on stakeholder input and how the Council envisions future management of the fishery, guide the development of new amendments that address priority objectives and strategies, and illustrate actions that could be developed through the regular amendment process. The Vision Blueprint is organized into four strategic goal areas: (1) Science, (2) Management, (3) Communication, and (4) Governance. Each goal area has a set of

objectives, strategies, and actions. The potential actions in Amendment 46 correspond to different objectives and strategies in the Vision Blueprint.

During Vision Meetings and scoping of Amendment 43 to the Snapper Grouper FMP (catch limits for red snapper), several fishermen expressed concern with the estimates of catch resulting from the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP). Some fishermen requested exploring a recreational stamp or permit for snapper grouper fishing and to improve recreational estimates by requiring recreational fishermen to report their catch. This recommendation has also been put forth by the Council's Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel numerous times. Permits and reporting requirements have been implemented for the federal for-hire component of the recreational sector and the commercial sector for the snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagic fisheries to improve estimates of effort or catch in the South Atlantic region. However, these requirements do not cover the private recreational component.

Currently, a coastal recreational fishing license, issued through the states, is required for private recreational anglers as part of the 2007 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act reauthorization to improve estimates of catch and effort. There have been other federal and state efforts to further refine information gathered on the private recreational component of the recreational sector, such as the [Large Pelagics Survey](#) that covers highly migratory species and the [Private Recreational Tilefish Permit](#) in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions. The state of Florida has also developed the [State Reef Fish Survey](#) where anglers intending to fish for certain species of snappers, groupers, jacks, triggerfish, or hogfish from a private vessel must obtain an State Reef Fish Angler designation.

Recent Council actions in 2022

At their March 2022 meeting, the Council reviewed background information, recommendations from the workgroup, and directed staff to assemble candidates for an ad hoc AP to be selected in June 2022. The Council then reviewed recommendations from the first meeting of the AP at its September 2022 meeting. At this meeting, the Council approved the following vision statement and identified the subsequent list of additional questions for the AP to consider.

Vision Statement: A permit for the private recreational sector of the South Atlantic Snapper Grouper fishery will facilitate the collection, validation, and analysis of harvest and discard data to improve the catch and effort estimates used for fisheries science and management decision-making.

Objectives for this meeting

- Review the AP's feedback and recommendations.
- Provide guidance on the options that the Committee would like to continue pursuing in Amendment 46.
- Approve Amendment 46 for scoping and provide guidance on how scoping should occur.

Tentative amendment timing

December 2022	Review options paper and approve amendment for scoping.
Winter 2023	Conduct scoping
March 2023	Review scoping comments.
June 2023	Review amendment and preliminary analysis.
September 2023	Review modifications to the amendment, select preferred alternatives, and approve for public hearings.
Fall 2023	Conduct public hearings
December 2023	Review public hearing comments and provide guidance.
March 2024	Review final draft amendment and consider approval for formal review.
2024/2025	Regulation changes effective.

Options for Potential Actions

Option 1. Establish a private recreational snapper grouper permit to fish for, harvest, or possess Snapper Grouper species in the South Atlantic Region

Discussion:

- Federal permits with reporting requirements are currently in place for the commercial and for-hire components of the snapper grouper fishery.
- Recreational anglers in other regions are required to obtain additional federal permits and endorsements in some circumstances. Endorsements or permits (issued to a vessel) are required in:
 - The Mid-Atlantic Region for blueline and golden tilefish
 - Halibut in Alaska
 - Specific areas in the Pacific Islands
 - Species managed by the NMFS Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Division. Highly migratory species include certain species of tunas, swordfish, billfishes, and sharks.
- All of the examples in **Table 1** are issued for a vessel.

Table 1. Recreational permits and endorsements issued by NMFS regional offices or HMS Division.

Region/Division	Permit	Endorsement
Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office	Tilefish	
Alaska Regional Office	Subsistence Halibut	
Pacific Islands Regional Office	Area Specific*	
Highly Migratory Species Division	HMS	Shark

*Permits include: Main Hawaiian Islands non-commercial Bottomfish, Northern Mariana Islands Bottomfish, Pacific Remote Island Areas Bottomfish, Pacific Remote Islands Areas Pelagic Troll and Handline, and Special Coral Reef Ecosystem Fishing permits, and Western and Central Pacific Convention Area Endorsement.

- Each state in the South Atlantic region has specific requirements for certain gear types, methods, or possession of certain species.
 - In Florida, there is an additional designation or stamp to fish for or possess certain reef fish species, snook, and spiny lobster and a tag to harvest tarpon.
 - The Saltwater Information Permit is a free permit added to the freshwater fishing license in Georgia.
 - The Recreational Commercial Gear License is an additional license required to use limited amounts of commercial gear in North Carolina.
 - In South Carolina, a separate license is required to bait for shrimp.
- All of the examples in **Table 2** are issued to an individual angler.

Table 2. State issued permit, licenses, stamps, and tags in the South Atlantic region in addition to a coastal or freshwater recreational fishing license.

State	Permit	License	Designation or Stamp	Tag
Florida			Reef Fish, Snook, Spiny Lobster	Tarpon
Georgia	Saltwater Information Permit			
North Carolina		Recreational Commercial Gear		
South Carolina		Shrimp Baiting		

AP Comments and Recommendations:

The following feedback was provided at the AP’s November 2022 meeting in response to the discussion topics offered by the Committee:

Improving estimates: How can a permit without a reporting requirement potentially be integrated into the existing MRIP sampling framework and the Florida State Reef Fish Survey to improve the accuracy of landings and discards estimates?

Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP):

- Could potentially be incorporated into existing sampling framework.
- Existing capture/recapture programs rely on attempted census (non-probability reporting). A permit would replace an attempted census with a non-probability sample for the private vessel mode.
 - Would have contact information from the permit. This could be integrated with other contact information databases.
 - Would likely lead to increased precision and improvements in overall recreational catch estimates.
 - On “back-end” of sampling, improvements could be made as well.
 - Since anglers respond to surveying at a different rate, could improve “non-response” adjustment.
 - If permit holders are taking more or different trips, have different response rates, etc.- creating different stratum would still lead to improvements in private vessel

level effort and catch estimates. If effort estimates are improved, then precision of catch estimates will improve as well.

- The enhancement in catch estimates is unknown. It is tough to quantify the magnitude of such immediate improvements ahead of implementing a permit.
 - In longer-term a permit, could lead to systematic improvements.
 - If able to identify vessels in the field- could create estimation domain for permitted vessels as well as the intercept survey.
 - Still improving catch estimates overall, but wouldn't necessarily be just for reef fish.
- Benefits would be some gain in precision and this would be a gain in precision across the board for private boat estimates. Likely to be modest.
 - Added benefits would be opportunities for improvement that it creates. Like “putting the foundation in place.”
 - There will be value in the longer term from implementing a permit regardless of whether staying within existing surveying or sampling designs or ultimately ends up with a specialized program.
 - How big is the universe going to be? Once known, can get a better idea of potential improvements.

Florida State Reef Fish Survey:

- Current survey is angler based. The survey is stratified based on state vessel registration information to match the database of angler permits.
 - If vessel registration number is tied to a vessel-based permit, it could be readily integrated into the existing FL state-based survey.
 - Could use vessel registration number in field to identify angler party that is or is not in database.
 - This information could be used to help generate an effort estimate.

Notes on the HMS Large Pelagics Survey (LPS): What does LPS resolve?

- Generally about 30% turnover with HMS permits in terms of angling category.
- Permit information is used as a frame in the LPS (including “late” renewals or purchases) and typically prior year permits would be retained into the second frame of sampling.
 - Helps samplers with determining whether vessels are “on or off” frame for sampling.
- LPS does have a separate telephone survey.
- HMS permits not used for fishing effort survey.

Vessel vs Individual Permit: Discuss the pros and cons of a vessel permit versus an individual permit.

- *It was noted that a vessel-based permit is recommended by the AP. See recommendations below from the August 2022 meeting for details.*
- **Potential cons of a vessel-based permit:**
 - Vessel registration number needs to be tied to permit to incorporate into existing FL State Reef Fish Survey framework.
 - U.S. Coast Guard documented vessels could be challenging to integrate with state registration framework. Would need additional work to make sure permitted vessels could be identified correctly in the field.

- The Gulf of Mexico Region (GOM) has been focused on individual state-based permits:
 - Whether future GOM regional permits will be vessel or angler based is still undecided, but if individual it could be challenging to apply information across regions if the South Atlantic is a vessel-based permit.
- The shore-based component may not be negligible for some Snapper Grouper species (gray snapper effort, gag grouper discards, etc.) and permit related improvements would be left out of a vessel-based permit.
- Is the number of vessels going to be high enough to offset cost of implementing permit?
 - It was noted that any potential fees collected would not go directly towards the program.
- **Potential pros of a vessel-based permit:**
 - Less error prone to identify a vessel and whether there is a permit in place than an individual permit (i.e., a lower potential for non-sampling errors).
 - A vessel-based permit can be used to determine angler trips.
 - Vessel-based permits could lead to lower administrative burden due to the lower number of permits that would need to be issued (vs. individual).
 - See additional notes from the August 2022 meeting.

The following guidance was provided at the AP's August 2022 meeting:

- **Permit Type: Recommend a vessel rather than individual permit since it helps reduce "the universe" of how many permits will need to be issued.**
 - Helps with survey design and validation.
 - Easier to write down vessel ID that is easily visible rather than require asking for individual permit number or paperwork.
 - Consistent with existing permits issued by SERO for commercial and for-hire vessels.
 - A vessel permit doesn't create an impediment to integrate with other programs (such as MRIP).
 - Accuracy is improved by a vessel permit and may streamline questionnaire during interview if intercepted (ability to interview one representative for vessel or all anglers at once).

Regional Utility: How can a permit be developed for potential use in other regions (Gulf of Mexico or Mid-Atlantic) to ensure consistency and standardizations?

- **There is a need for coordination and ongoing communication with SERO, GARFO, and the State of Florida on the permit requirements, timelines, and information sharing.**
 - Information sharing goes beyond MRIP. Sharing with the states, other regions, and other programs is important to ensure regional utility of a permit.
 - Need to share information in an ongoing fashion. There is so much going on across three different regions and it seems like each region is trending strategically in different directions regarding permitting requirements, reporting, etc.

- MRIP implementation teams are an important consideration in development of a permit and sharing of information.
- When developing a permit, consider whether a permit is fully compatible with existing frameworks or if there needs to be supplemental survey efforts or other changes to better integrate a new permit and information that can be collected.
- Questions for potential future consideration:
 - Is a recognition of a link to the saltwater registry a component of sharing across regions?
 - Limiting the scope to Snapper Grouper: is this constraining to potential improvements in data vs. a more universal private vessel permit and perspective that could look across regions?
 - Specialized vs universal utility
 - When balancing desire of knowledge of SG fishery vs broader federal waters perspective, idea of a permit for fishing in federal waters may be more applicable in the long-term vs a SG permit as an initial step.
 - What is a tolerable target of uncertainty or what level of precision are trying to be achieve?
 - How much catch is in state vs. federal waters? What part of the fishery does this permit actually pertain to?
 - What is the proportion of accuracy improvement using any of the varying approaches?

Renewal: What are the desirable terms and frequency of permit renewal?

- *It was noted that annual renewal is recommended by the AP. See recommendations from the August 2022 meeting for details.*
- **Timing:** *There is general support for renewal on a calendar year basis (i.e., all permits expire on the same date rather than 365 days after being issued). The intent is to target integration with the Fishing Effort Survey (FES).*
 - Renewal for the LPS was on a calendar year basis: typically saw many anglers renewing or first time purchasing closer to time of first trip than at the beginning of the year.
 - This behavior may dilute the beneficial effect of calendar year renewal.
 - If the permit database can be operationalized on a timely basis, then may mitigate this angler behavior.
 - Speed in getting database into the right hands to create a sample frame is very important.
 - From a constituent standpoint, an annual renewal date could be helpful to know and remember when a permit expires.
 - In South Carolina: Renewal timing changing from a calendar year to a moving 365 day renewal date from purchase led to an increase in expired licenses/permits.
 - Annual expiration gains the ability to see who is getting the permit. Is the population stable? Changing?

- *Need a robust quality control mechanism at the time of renewal to keep vessel and permit holder information up to date. This process needs to be mandatory and cannot be skipped over during permit renewal.*
- If a permit is vessel based- would need to build in a mechanism to recognize vessels that leave the fishery to remove permits that are not active (i.e., for vessels that are sold).
- Consider whether spacing out permit renewals is an additional administrative burden, particularly for SERO.
 - Consider administrative burden in developing the permit renewal process.
 - Vessel permits could lead to lower administrative burden due to lower number of permits that need to be issued (vs. individual).
- Other considerations: If there is a permit, then there is an audience. Could add a survey even if not intercepted.
 - Consider a survey before renewal to determine whether the permit was used in the previous calendar year.

The following guidance was provided at the AP's August 2022 meeting:

- *Recommend annual renewal requirement to purge inaccurate or inactive vessel information.*

Fee: Does charging a nominal fee effectively reduce oversubscription? What sort of information may be available on the topic?

Potential pros of charging a fee:

- Charging a nominal fee would not eliminate oversubscription. But the extent to which it does make a difference could still be valuable.
 - Example from NY- created free saltwater angler registry. Since it was free, not given much of a priority for enforcement due to lack of success in upholding violations in court. Overall chilling effect on enforcement and compliance. Also negatively impacted the sampling frame.
- Make efforts to reduce oversubscription as much as reasonably possible, including consideration of a fee.
 - HMS and existing SERO permits are in the range of \$25.
- In Florida there is a potential issue with a free permit. If there is no charge, the vendor is not prompted to ask whether the customer wants the permit. If a fee is administered, then the vendor will ask if the customer wants a given permit.
- There is always going to be some level of oversubscription.
 - In North Carolina: Estuarine gillnet permit- found that some fishermen had gotten the permit “just in case” but did not necessarily intend to use it. There are other state permits where this applies as well.
 - If a small fee is administered, then it may make potential permit holders think whether they would actually use a permit.
 - If setting the framework for reporting or future permits in other fisheries, then the incremental personal administrative burden is already decreased as other species are added.

Potential cons of charging a fee:

- A fee may lower oversubscription but reporting may do so as well.
- Fees collected from a federal permit go to the general treasury unless specifically directed otherwise. The funds collected do not necessarily come back to fund or support the federal permit program, fisheries management, or the region.
- There is an existing association of permit or stamp fees with supporting conservation which encourages some people to get the permit even if they have no intent to use it. Examples include the Florida snook stamp or federal duck stamp.
 - Fees may not be effective at discouraging people that do not need or intend to use a permit.

The following guidance was provided at the AP’s August 2022 meeting:

- “Over-subscription” could be an issue (i.e., vessels or individuals obtain a permit without the intent to use it). To address this some sort of barrier or burden could be associated with obtaining the permit.
 - Consider evaluation of charging a fee to obtain a permit.
 - At what level would it be a barrier to entry and where could it be beneficial?
 - Simply the requirement of setting up an account and entering information to get permit (i.e. burden and time) may be enough of a barrier to get the permit and mitigate the “oversubscription” issue. Only those that intend to use the permit would go through the trouble to get it.

Committee Action:

- CONSIDER AP INPUT.
- PROVIDE GUIDANCE ON THE INITIAL RANGE OF OPTIONS TO EXPLORE FURTHER.

Discussion questions:

- 1) **Does the Committee want to continue consideration of a private recreational permit in the snapper grouper fishery?**
 - a) If so, what would be the initial range of options?
 - i) Vessel-based permit?
 - ii) Angler-based permit?
 - (1) If so, who should it cover:
 - (a) All anglers?
 - (b) Only anglers fishing from a vessel?

- 2) **What species should be covered by a private recreational permit in the snapper grouper fishery?**
 - a) All snapper grouper species?
 - b) A sub-set of snapper grouper species?
 - i) If so, which species?
 - (1) Deepwater species?
 - (2) Shallow water groupers?
 - (3) Other?

- 3) **Are there any other options that should be explored under the topic of establishing a private recreational permit in the snapper grouper fishery?**
- a) Renewal terms?
 - b) Charging a fee?

Option 2. Establish an education requirement to obtain a private recreational snapper grouper permit.

Discussion:

- As part of improving education and outreach on best fishing practices and reducing post-release mortality, the Council could consider implementing an education requirement to obtain a permit or using such a requirement in place of a permit.
- Federal education requirements are in place for some Highly Migratory Species permit holders including:
 - HMS permit holders that recreationally fish for or harvest sharks must obtain a shark endorsement that requires an online shark identification and fishing regulation training course and quiz¹.
 - Vessel-based and covers all anglers fishing onboard the vessel.
 - HMS commercially permitted vessels fishing with longline or gillnet gear must possess a valid Safe Handling, Release, and Identification Workshop certificate on board for both the owner and operator.
 - Federally permitted Atlantic shark dealers, or their proxies, must attend an Atlantic Shark Identification Workshop.
 - Both HMS-related commercial fishing education requirements must be renewed every three years.
- Hunter safety courses are required by states to obtain a hunting license. These courses educate new hunters on matters such as regulations and best practices to maintain safety and capture game in an ethical manner.

AP Comments and Recommendations:

The following feedback was provided at the AP's November 2022 meeting in response to the discussion topics offered by the Committee:

Education Requirement: Weigh in on efficacy of an education certification as a proxy for a permit. Discuss mandatory versus voluntary measures.

- *An education requirement or certification may not be necessary or required on an annual basis, thus such a requirement would not be an adequate substitute for a permit.*
 - There would still need some readily available way to identify anglers in the field that took the education training. For both compliance and validation as well as sampling purposes.

¹ Additional details can be found on page 17 of the *Atlantic HMS Compliance Guide: Recreational Fishing* available at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/atlantic-highly-migratory-species/atlantic-highly-migratory-species-fishery-compliance-guides>

- There are many other opportunities to learn best fishing practices.
 - People signing up for permit may already have best fishing practices in place or are knowledgeable of such practices.
- *An education requirement would pair well with a permit, potentially in the initial issuance or renewal process.*
 - Such a requirement would provide an opportunity to educate anglers on best fishing practices, what species are within SG complex, species ID, descending devices, etc.
 - Education could include information on why the permit exists and importance of data collection.
 - An education requirement could help deter oversubscription.
 - If a permit is vessel based, the details need to be specified regarding who must obtain the education certificate.
 - Vessel owner? Vessel operator? At least one person onboard a permitted vessel?

Committee Action:

- CONSIDER AP INPUT.
- PROVIDE GUIDANCE ON THE INITIAL RANGE OF OPTIONS TO EXPLORE FURTHER.

Discussion questions:

- 1) **Does the Committee want to consider an education requirement to obtain a private recreational permit in the snapper grouper fishery?**
 - If so, what should be the renewal terms?
 - None (i.e., only required once)
 - Annual?
 - Every other year?
 - Other?
 - Should an education requirement substitute for or coincide with a permit?

Option 3. Implement reporting for private recreational anglers or vessels

Discussion:

- Electronic reporting requirements are currently in place for headboats and charter boats operating in the snapper grouper fishery. There are also reporting requirements in the commercial fishery for both vessels and dealers.
- Requiring reporting could improve data on the private angler component of the recreational sector, especially when landings are confined to a short time period, infrequently sampled, or are “rare event” species.
- For many species in the snapper grouper complex, there are few intercepts for individual species. Electronic data reporting systems can be developed to allow anglers to report varying levels of information.

- Reporting can be targeted for a specific species or group of species.
 - Example: GARFO Private Recreational Tilefish Permit requires electronic vessel trip report (eVTR) within 24 hours of returning to port for all trips that either targeted or retained golden or blueline tilefish.
- While potentially beneficial, there are notable challenges to implementing a successful reporting program including:
 - Financial and labor resources necessary to create such a program
 - Reporting burden on permit holders
 - Administrative burden
 - Enforcement
 - Validation of the data so it can be used in management
- Such challenges have been observed for some existing reporting requirements in the snapper grouper fishery such as those under the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting Program (SEFHIER) and for commercial discards.

AP Comments and Recommendations:

The following feedback was provided at the AP’s November 2022 meeting in response to the discussion topics offered by the Committee:

Necessity: Would there be utility in implementing a permit without a reporting requirement?

- *Yes, there would be considerable utility in implementing a permit without a reporting requirement. For details, see comments under the AP’s earlier discussion under “Improving Estimates.”*
- Per previous discussion at the August 2022 AP meeting – there is notable concern over the resources needed for administering a successful reporting requirement, including how data would be adequately collected and used.
- There could be greater benefits from implementing a reporting requirement in the future rather than immediately. Putting a permit requirement in place builds the foundation for a future reporting requirement.
- *When developing a permit, there should be some sort of understanding that reporting requirements may be required in the future.*
 - Leave the door open to reporting in the future. This should also be made clear to constituents.
 - Need to have a clear path forward as far as what a permit will be used for immediately and in subsequent years. How it will be used for a survey or census design?
 - How the permit is going to be used will dictate what kind of permit is put in place.
 - If reporting will eventually be required, then a permit should be developed around that intention.

The following guidance was provided at the AP’s August 2022 meeting:

- It is possible that a permit may not accomplish much without being linked to a reporting requirement.

- Having a permit in place would be helpful to get a handle on “the universe” of anglers or vessels that a reporting requirement would be covering.
- In a “perfect world,” if resource and outreach concerns were off the table:
 - Getting permit in place and established first would be a reasonable approach. Could be integrated into existing sampling of private recreational anglers. This would also help with future outreach and demonstrate compliance rates. Get to a stable place with permit and help inform design decisions with reporting.
 - Could avoid growing pains seen in other programs where permitting and reporting were all rolled out at once and required adapting to issues on the fly.
 - Small scale pilot study could help determine “full scale” costs and potential barriers to overcome.

Validation: What are the considerations for implementing a reporting requirement that can be validated?

- If a reporting requirement is implemented, it requires a great deal of resources to accommodate a validate.
 - Compliance tracking is expensive from both a monetary and labor perspective.
 - By the time a validated process is in place, a survey may look like a better choice due to lower resources that are needed to build a functional program.
 - There is concern over not having adequate validation to get full utilization of a permit.
 - More useful to get permit in place and full benefits from such a permit rather than implement reporting at the same time which may compromise efforts to incur full benefits of the permit.
 - Need to consider what benefits may come from reporting that can reasonably be used in management.

Mandatory vs Voluntary: Discuss the pros and cons of a mandatory versus a voluntary reporting requirement.

- *Recommend some level of mandatory measures or framework to provide structure to reporting if implemented.*
 - There are different levels of what can be considered “voluntary” reporting. Purely voluntary reporting will likely get limited uptake. As such, it may not be useful for the purpose of estimating catches.
 - By “purely voluntary” the AP referred to self-selected individuals reporting (vs. selected to report via a mail or telephone survey).
 - Voluntary probability based surveys can work. But if reporting is designed to be census based, then advocate for a mandatory requirement with adequate enforcement.
- Could survey sub-set of permit holders, but to get full benefits of reporting it would need be mandatory.
- Whether reporting is a logbook or survey- Mandatory requirement would help maintain consistently high compliance with submitting information.

- If mandatory, will need robust enforcement or such a requirement becomes de facto voluntary reporting over time due to poor compliance.

Committee Action:

- CONSIDER AP INPUT.
- PROVIDE GUIDANCE ON THE INITIAL RANGE OF OPTIONS TO EXPLORE FURTHER.

Discussion questions:

1) Does the Committee want to continue consideration of reporting for the private recreational component of the snapper grouper fishery?

- a) If so, should reporting be:
 - i) Mandatory or voluntary?
 - ii) Implemented immediately or phased in later?

2) What species should be covered under private recreational reporting in the snapper grouper fishery?

- a) All snapper grouper species?
- b) A sub-set of snapper grouper species?
 - i) If so, which species?
 - (1) Deepwater species?
 - (2) Shallow water groupers?
 - (3) Other?

Committee Action:

- CONSIDER APPROVING AMENDMENT 46 FOR SCOPING.
 - PROVIDE GUIDANCE ON SCOPING.

DRAFT MOTION: APPROVE AMENDMENT 46 (PRIVATE RECREATIONAL PERMITTING AND REPORTING) FOR SCOPING.