


# Modifications to Greater Amberjack Allowable Harvest and Management Measures



BP

**Framework Action to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico including Draft Environmental Assessment, Regulatory Impact Review, and Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis**

**July 2015**



*This is a publication of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council Pursuant to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Award No. NA10NMF4410011.*

This page intentionally blank

# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT COVER SHEET

## Name of Action

Modifications to Greater Amberjack Allowable Harvest and Management Measures

## Responsible Agencies and Contact Persons

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) 813-348-1630  
2203 North Lois Avenue, Suite 1100 813-348-1711 (fax)  
Tampa, Florida 33607  
John Froeschke ([john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org](mailto:john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org)) <http://www.gulfcouncil.org>

National Marine Fisheries Service (Lead Agency) 727-824-5305  
Southeast Regional Office 727-824-5308 (fax)  
263 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South <http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov>  
St. Petersburg, Florida 33701  
Rich Malinowski ([Rich.Malinowski@noaa.gov](mailto:Rich.Malinowski@noaa.gov))

## Type of Action

Administrative  
 Draft

Legislative  
 Final

## ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

ABC	Acceptable biological catch
ACL	Annual catch limit
ACT	Annual catch target
AMs	Accountability measures
ALS	accumulated landings system
B <sub>MSY</sub>	Stock biomass level capable of producing an equilibrium yield of MSY
Council	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
CS	consumer surplus
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFH	Essential fish habitat
EIS	Environmental impact statement
ELMR	Estuarine living marine resources
ESA	Endangered Species Act
F	Fishing mortality
FL	fork length
FMSY	Fishing mortality rate corresponding to an equilibrium yield of MSY
F <sub>30% SPR</sub>	Fishing mortality corresponding to 30% spawning potential ratio
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
GMFMC	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
HAPC	Habitat area of particular concern
IRFA	Initial regulatory flexibility analysis
lbs	Pounds
M	Natural mortality
Magnuson-Stevens Act	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MFMT	Maximum fishing mortality threshold
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
mp	million pounds
MRFSS	Marine Recreational Fisheries Survey and Statistics
MRIP	Marine Recreational Information Program
MSST	Minimum stock size threshold
MSY	Maximum sustainable yield
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOAA Fisheries	Same as NMFS
NOR	net operating revenues
NOS	National Ocean Service
NS1	National Standard 1 guidelines
OFL	Overfishing level
OY	Optimum yield
PS	Producer surplus
PW	Product Weight
RIR	Regulatory impact review

SAV	Submerged aquatic vegetation
Secretary	Secretary of Commerce
SEDAR	Southeast Data, Assessment and Review
SEFSC	Southeast Fisheries Science Center
SERO	Southeast Regional Office
SSBR	Spawning stock biomass per recruit
SSC	Scientific and Statistical Committee
SPR	Spawning potential ratio
TAC	Total allowable catch
TPWD	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
ww	whole weight
YPR	Yield per recruit

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Environmental Assessment Cover Sheet .....	iii
Abbreviations Used in this Document .....	iv
List of Tables .....	ix
List of Figures .....	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Purpose and Need .....	5
1.3 History of Management .....	5
Chapter 2. Management Alternatives .....	8
2.1 Action 1 - Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Annual Catch Limits and Annual Catch Targets.....	8
2.2 Action 2 - Recreational Management Measures .....	11
Action 2.1: Modify the Recreational Minimum Size Limit for Greater Amberjack .....	11
Action 2.2: Modify the Recreational Closed Seasons for Greater Amberjack .....	17
2.3 Action 3 - Commercial Management Measures .....	20
Chapter 3. Affected Environment .....	23
3.1 Description of the Physical Environment .....	23
3.2 Description of the Biological/Ecological Environment .....	26
3.3 Description of the Economic Environment.....	36
3.3.1 Economic Description of the Commercial Sector .....	36
3.3.2 Economic Description of the Recreational Sector .....	41
3.4 Description of the Social Environment .....	53
3.4.1 Fishing Communities .....	54
3.4.2 Environmental Justice Considerations .....	58
3.5 Description of the Administrative Environment .....	61
3.5.1 Federal Fishery Management.....	61
3.5.2 State Fishery Management.....	62
Chapter 4. Environmental Consequences .....	63
4.1 Action 1 - Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Annual Catch Limits and Annual Catch Targets.....	63
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment.....	63
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment .....	64
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment .....	65

Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment .....	67
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment .....	69
4.2 Action 2 - Recreational Management Measures .....	69
4.2.1 Action 2.1 - Modifications to the Recreational Minimum Size Limit for Greater Amberjack.....	69
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment.....	69
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment .....	69
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment .....	70
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment .....	72
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment .....	73
4.2.2 Action 2.2 - Modifications to the Recreational Closed Season for Greater Amberjack.....	73
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment.....	73
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment .....	74
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment .....	74
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment .....	78
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment .....	79
4.3 Action 3 - Commercial Management Measures .....	80
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment.....	80
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment .....	81
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment .....	82
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment .....	85
Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment .....	89
4.4 Cumulative Effects .....	89
Chapter 5. Regulatory Impact Review .....	91
5.1 Introduction .....	91
5.2 Problems and Objectives .....	91
5.3 Description of Fisheries.....	91
5.4 Impacts of Management Measures.....	91
5.4.1 Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Annual Catch Limits (ACL) and Annual Catch Targets (ACT).....	91
5.4.2.1 Modifications to the Recreational Minimum Size Limit for Greater Amberjack.....	92
5.4.2.2 Modify the Recreational Closed Seasons for Greater Amberjack .....	92
5.4.3 Commercial Management Measures.....	93
5.5 Public and Private Costs of Regulations .....	93
5.6 Determination of Significant Regulatory Action .....	94

Chapter 6. Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis.....	95
6.1 Introduction.....	95
6.2 Statement of the need for, objective of, and legal basis for the proposed action.....	95
6.3 Description and estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed action would apply .....	96
6.4 Description of the projected reporting, record-keeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed action .....	96
6.5 Identification of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed action.....	97
6.6 Significance of economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities.....	97
6.7 Description of the significant alternatives to the proposed action and discussion of how the alternatives attempt to minimize economic impacts on small entities .....	98
Chapter 7. List of Preparers .....	100
Chapter 8. List of Agencies, Organizations, and Persons Consulted.....	101
Chapter 9. References .....	102
Appendix A. Considered But Rejected Alternatives .....	111
Appendix B. Other Applicable Law .....	112
Appendix C. Summaries of Public Comments Received .....	120
Appendix D. Bycatch Practicability Analysis .....	121

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1.1.1.</b> Commercial and recreational landings of greater amberjack (pounds whole weight) from 2002 to 2013.....	2
<b>Table 1.1.2.</b> Summary of recent annual commercial landings relative to management targets (pounds whole weight).....	4
<b>Table 1.1.3.</b> Summary of recent annual recreational landings relative to management targets (pounds whole weight).....	4
<b>Table 2.2.1.</b> Proportion of mature females at selected lengths for greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico.....	14
<b>Table 2.2.1.</b> Recreational sector season length in days under selected closed seasons (Action 2.2), minimum size limits (Action 2.1), and ACT options (Action 1).....	19
<b>Table 2.3.1.</b> Total greater amberjack commercial landings (2008 - 2013). The commercial ACL was exceeded each year from 2009 to 2013. ....	21
<b>Table 2.3.2.</b> Estimated commercial season length (i.e., days open) under five management alternatives.....	22
<b>Table 3.2.1.</b> Summary of habitat use by life history stage for species in the FMP for Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico.....	29
<b>Table 3.2.2.</b> Species of the Reef Fish FMP grouped by family.....	34
<b>Table 3.3.1.</b> Number of vessels, number of trips and landings (pounds [lbs] gutted weight [gw]) by year.....	37
<b>Table 3.3.2.</b> Number of vessels and ex-vessel revenues by year (2013 dollars)*.....	37
<b>Table 3.3.3.</b> Number of trips with greater amberjack (GAJ) landings in excess of each trip limit option and number of vessels that took such trips (2009-2013 Average).....	39
<b>Table 3.3.4.</b> Average annual business activity (2009 through 2013) associated with the commercial harvest of greater amberjack and the harvest of all species by vessels that landed greater amberjack. All monetary estimates are in 2013 dollars.....	41
<b>Table 3.3.5.</b> Recreational landings (lbs whole weight (ww)) and percent distribution of greater amberjack and reef fish, 2009 - 2013.....	41
<b>Table 3.3.6.</b> Recreational landings (lbs ww) and percent distribution of greater amberjack across all modes, by state, 2009 - 2013. ....	42
<b>Table 3.3.7.</b> Recreational landings (lbs ww) and percent distribution of greater amberjack across all states, by mode, 2009 - 2013. ....	43
<b>Table 3.3.8.</b> Recreational landings (lbs ww) and percent distribution of greater amberjack, by month, 2009-2013.....	44
<b>Table 3.3.9.</b> Target trips for greater amberjack and reef fish, 2009 -2013. ....	45
<b>Table 3.3.10.</b> Greater amberjack target trips and percent distribution across all modes by state, 2009 - 2013. ....	46
<b>Table 3.3.11.</b> Greater amberjack target trips and percent distribution across all states, 2009 - 2013.....	46
<b>Table 3.3.12.</b> Greater amberjack target trips and percent distribution across all modes and states, by month, 2009 - 2013.....	47
<b>Table 3.3.13.</b> Headboat angler days and percent distribution, by state, 2009 - 2013. ....	48
<b>Table 3.3.14.</b> Headboat angler days and percent distribution, by month, 2009 - 2013.....	49
<b>Table 3.3.15.</b> Number of vessels with a Gulf of Mexico for-hire permit by homeport state, 2009-2013.....	50



## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1.1.2.</b> Recreational, commercial, and total landings in pounds whole weight of greater amberjack from 2002 through 2013.....	3
<b>Figure 2.2.1.</b> Size frequency distribution of recreational greater amberjack landings in 2012-2013 in the Gulf of Mexico.....	13
<b>Figure 2.2.2.</b> Proportion of mature females by length for greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico. ....	14
<b>Figure 2.2.3.</b> Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack spawning potential ratio plotted against fishing mortality rates for three different minimum size limits. ....	15
<b>Figure 2.2.4.</b> Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack yield-per-recruit plotted against fishing mortality rates for three different minimum size limits. ....	16
<b>Figure 3.1.1.</b> Mean annual sea surface temperature derived from the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer Pathfinder Version 5 sea surface temperature data set .....	23
<b>Figure 3.1.2.</b> Map of most fishery management closed areas in the Gulf of Mexico. ....	25
<b>Figure 3.4.1.</b> Top 16 recreational fishing communities' engagement and reliance. ....	55
<b>Figure 3.4.2.</b> Proportion of greater amberjack commercial landings (value and pounds) for 15 Gulf of Mexico communities out of total pounds and landings of greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico (2012). Source: Accumulated landings system (ALS) dealer reports. ....	56
<b>Figure 3.4.3.</b> Proportion (local quotient, lq) of commercial landings and value for top 15 species in 2012 out of total landings and value for all commercial species landed in Destin, FL. Source: ALS dealer reports 2012. ....	57
<b>Figure 3.4.4.</b> Social vulnerability indices for selected greater amberjack commercial fishing communities. Source: Southeast Regional Office, Social indicators database (2012). ....	59
<b>Figure 3.4.5.</b> Social vulnerability indices for recreational fishing communities. ....	60

# CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

Secretarial Amendment 2 (GMFMC 2003) to the Fishery Management Plan for Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (Reef Fish FMP) established a rebuilding plan for greater amberjack based on a stock assessment conducted in 2000 (Turner et al. 2000). That assessment determined that the greater amberjack stock was overfished and undergoing overfishing as of 1998. Management measures to reduce the recreational bag limit from three to one fish were implemented in January 1997 and the commercial season closure from March through May were implemented in January 1998; however, these closures were not incorporated into the 2000 assessment. The projected effects of these management measures were expected to eliminate overfishing; therefore, no new management measures to further restrict effort were implemented.

In 2006, a Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) updated stock assessment was completed that determined the greater amberjack stock was not recovering at the rate previously projected. The stock continued to be overfished and experiencing overfishing (SEDAR 9 2006). The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) developed and implemented Amendment 30A in 2008 in response to the stock assessment results and the requirement to end overfishing and rebuild the stock by 2012 (GMFMC 2008). The minimum reduction required to rebuild the stock by 2012 was 40% of current fishing mortality. The total allowable catch (TAC) implemented in Amendment 30A was 1,871,000 pounds (lbs) whole weight for 2008 through 2010 (GMFMC 2008). Amendment 30A also established quotas for the recreational and commercial sectors equal to 1,368,000 and 503,000 lbs, respectively. Amendment 30A also required sector-specific accountability measures (AMs) such that if either sector exceeded its allocated portion of the TAC, the Regional Administrator will close that sector for the remainder of the year. Additionally, if a sector's landings exceed that sector's share of the TAC, the Regional Administrator will reduce the fishing season by the amount of time necessary to account for the overage in the following fishing year. A 2010 update stock assessment also determined that the stock remained overfished and was continuing to experience overfishing. In December 2012, Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012) reduced the stock's annual catch limit (ACL), (previously called the TAC), to 1,780,000 lbs in an effort to end overfishing and rebuild the stock. The commercial ACL was set at 481,000 lbs, and a recreational ACL was set at 1,299,000 lbs, based on the interim sector allocation established in Amendment 30A (GMFMC 2008). Annual catch targets (ACTs) (equivalent to quotas) were established at 409,000 lbs for the commercial sector and 1,130,000 lbs for the recreational sector.

A greater amberjack stock assessment (SEDAR 33) was completed and reviewed by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) at their June 2014 meeting. The SSC accepted the greater amberjack stock assessment as the best scientific information available. The SSC concluded that greater amberjack was overfished and undergoing overfishing. The National Standard 1 guidelines state that when a stock has exceeded its maximum rebuilding time and is not yet rebuilt, the yield should be set at the yield corresponding to  $F_{REBUILD}$  (i.e., fishing mortality estimated to rebuild the stock within a stated timeline) or to 75% of maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT), whichever is less. The greater amberjack target rebuild date


established in Amendment 30A (GMFMC 2008) expired at the end of 2012 without the stock being rebuilt and therefore, the yield needs to remain at the established  $F_{REBUILD}$  or be set at 75% of MFMT. Based on this information, the SSC used the acceptable biological catch (ABC) control rule to establish the overfishing limit (OFL) and ABC for a time period of four years beginning in 2015 equivalent to 75% of MFMT based on the results of the most recent stock assessment. The OFL for 2015 is 2,660,000 lbs; 3,210,000 lbs for 2016; 3,420,000 lbs for 2017; and 3,510,000 lbs for 2018. This document includes a range of alternatives for adjusting the stock ACL, as well as recreational and commercial management measures that assist the AMs in restricting harvest and thus, end overfishing and rebuild the stock.

### **Landings Data**

**Table 1.1.1.** Commercial and recreational landings of greater amberjack (pounds whole weight) from 2002 to 2013.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Headboat</b>	<b>Charter</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Recreational Total</b>	<b>Commercial</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>2002</b>	160,636	1,114,754	857,969	2,133,359	703,303	2,836,662
<b>2003</b>	199,347	1,072,018	1,630,455	2,901,820	857,125	3,758,945
<b>2004</b>	108,769	1,068,819	1,214,641	2,392,230	871,016	3,263,246
<b>2005</b>	61,281	365,893	1,089,984	1,517,158	662,285	2,179,443
<b>2006</b>	79,892	1,030,943	589,348	1,700,183	566,384	2,266,567
<b>2007</b>	59,436	516,253	291,797	867,485	589,235	1,456,720
<b>2008</b>	54,544	478,614	785,504	1,318,662	439,176	1,757,838
<b>2009</b>	103,191	653,160	723,955	1,480,306	601,446	2,081,752
<b>2010</b>	53,203	460,740	711,279	1,225,222	534,095	1,759,317
<b>2011</b>	62,835	583,813	303,351	949,999	508,489	1,458,488
<b>2012</b>	99,680	546,086	592,952	1,238,719	307,921	1,546,640
<b>2013</b>	73,246	604,626	938,757	1,616,629	457,821	2,074,450

Source: Southeast Fisheries Science Center recreational (8/5/2014) and commercial (7/10/2014) ACL datasets. Recreational landings exclude Monroe County, Florida.



**Figure 1.1.2.** Recreational, commercial, and total landings in pounds whole weight of greater amberjack from 2002 through 2013. Recreational landings were estimated (AB1) from the Marine Recreational Information Program, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and Southeast Region Headboat Surveys. Source: SEFSC recreational (8/5/2014) and commercial (7/10/2014) ACL datasets.

**Table 1.1.2.** Summary of recent annual commercial landings relative to management targets (pounds whole weight).

Year	Commercial ACT	Commercial ACL	Stock OFL	Commercial Harvest	Harvest - ACL	Closure date
2008		503,000	MFMT	439,176	-63,824	
2009		503,000	MFMT	601,446	98,446	11/7/2009
2010		503,000 (373,072)	MFMT	534,095	161,023	10/28/2010
2011		503,000 (342,091)	MFMT	508,489	166,398	6/18/2011
2012	503,000 (237,438)	503,000 (237,438)	2,380,000	307,921	70,483	3/1/2012
2013	338,157	481,000 (410,157)	2,380,000	457,821	47,654	7/1/2013
2014	409,000	481,000	2,380,000			8/25/2014

Note: The AMs implemented in Amendment 30A (GMFMC 2008) required that the annual commercial harvest exceeding the commercial ACL be deducted from the commercial ACL in the subsequent calendar year. In these cases, the adjusted commercial ACL values are indicated in parentheses. Also, these overage adjustments are made on preliminary landings as final landings are not completed by the beginning of the subsequent calendar year. This may result in minor deviations from the final overage (if any) and the overage deduction.

**Table 1.1.3.** Summary of recent annual recreational landings relative to management targets (pounds whole weight).

Year	Recreational ACT	Recreational ACL	Stock ACL	Stock OFL	Recreational Harvest	Harvest-ACL	Closure date
2008		1,368,000	1,871,000	MFMT	1,318,662	-49,338	
2009		1,368,000	1,871,000	MFMT	1,480,306	112,306	10/24/09
2010		1,368,000 (1,243,184)	1,871,000	MFMT	1,225,222	-17,962	
2011	1,368,000	1,368,000 (1,315,224)	1,871,000	MFMT	949,999	-365,225	
2012	1,299,000	1,368,000	1,780,000	2,380,000	1,238,719	-129,281	
2013	1,299,000	1,299,000	1,780,000	2,380,000	1,616,629	317,629	
2014	888,839	1,299,000 (1,063,538)	1,780,000	2,380,000			8/25/14

Note: The AMs implemented in Amendment 30A (GMFMC 2008) required that the annual recreational harvest exceeding the recreational ACL be deducted from the recreational ACL in the subsequent calendar year. In these cases, the adjusted recreational ACL values are indicated in parentheses. Also, these overage adjustments are made on preliminary landings as final landings are not available at the beginning of the subsequent fishing year. This may result in minor deviations from the final overage (if any) and the overage deduction.

## 1.2 Purpose and Need

The purpose of this amendment is to modify the ACL and the ACT, incorporate updated stock status information from the 2014 stock assessment, modify management measures for the recreational size limit and seasons and commercial trip limit to end the overfishing and rebuild the greater amberjack stock in the Gulf of Mexico. The 2014 stock assessment revealed that greater amberjack continues to be overfished and undergoing overfishing.

The need for this amendment is that the ABC of 1,780,000 lbs established in Amendment 35 exceeds the 1,720,000lb ABC recommendation for 2015 (GMFMC 2012). In addition, section 600.310(g)(3) of the National Standard 1 guidelines states that the system of ACLs and AMs should be re-evaluated, and modified if necessary, if catch exceeds the ACL for a given stock or stock complex more than once in the last four years.

## 1.3 History of Management

The Reef Fish FMP [with its associated environmental impact statement (EIS)] was implemented in November 1984. The original list of species included in the management unit consisted of snappers, groupers, and sea basses. Gray triggerfish and *Seriola* species, including greater amberjack, were in a second list of species included in the fishery, but not in the management unit. The species in this list were not considered to be target species because they were generally taken incidentally to the directed fishery for species in the management unit. Their inclusion in the Reef Fish FMP was for purposes of data collection, and their take was not regulated.

**Amendment 1** [with its associated environmental assessment (EA), regulatory impact review (RIR), and initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA)] to the Reef Fish FMP, implemented in 1990, added greater amberjack and lesser amberjack to the list of species in the management unit. It set a greater amberjack recreational minimum size limit of 28 inches fork length (FL), a three-fish recreational bag limit, and a commercial minimum size limit of 36 inches FL. This amendment's objective was to stabilize the long-term population levels of all reef fish species by establishing a survival rate of biomass into the stock of spawning age to achieve at least 20% spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSBR), relative to the SSBR that would occur with no fishing. A framework procedure for specification of TAC was created to allow for annual management changes. This amendment also established a commercial vessel reef fish permit as a requirement for harvest in excess of the bag limit and for the sale of reef fish.

**Amendment 4** (with its associated EA and RIR), implemented in May 1992, added the remaining *Seriola* species (banded rudderfish and almaco jack) to the management unit, and established a moratorium on the issuance of new commercial reef fish vessel permits for a maximum period of three years.

**Amendment 5** (with its associated supplemental EIS, RIR, and IRFA), implemented in February 1994, required that all finfish except for oceanic migratory species be landed with head and fins attached, and closed the region of Riley's Hump (near Dry Tortugas, Florida) to all fishing during May and June to protect mutton snapper spawning aggregations.

**Amendment 12** (with its associated EA and RIR), submitted in December 1995 and implemented in January 1997, reduced the greater amberjack bag limit from three fish to one fish per person, and created an aggregate bag limit of 20 reef fish for all reef fish species not having a bag limit (including lesser amberjack, banded rudderfish, almaco jack and gray triggerfish). NMFS disapproved proposed provisions to include lesser amberjack and banded rudderfish along with greater amberjack in an aggregate one-fish bag limit and to establish a 28-inch FL minimum size limit for those species.

**Amendment 15** (with its associated EA, RIR, and IRFA), implemented in January 1998, closed the commercial sector for greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico during the months of March, April, and May.

**Regulatory Amendment** with its associated EA, RIR, and IRFA was implemented in August 1999 and closed two areas (i.e., created two marine reserves), 115 and 104 square nautical miles respectively, year-round to all fishing under the jurisdiction of the Council with a four-year sunset clause.

**Generic Sustainable Fisheries Act Amendment** (with its associated EA, RIR, and IRFA), partially approved and implemented in November 1999, set the MFMT for greater amberjack at the fishing mortality necessary to achieve 30% of the unfished spawning potential  $F_{30\% SPR}$ . Estimates of maximum sustainable yield (MSY), minimum stock size threshold (MSST), and optimum yield (OY) were disapproved because they were based on SPR proxies rather than biomass-based estimates.

**Amendment 16B** (with its associated EA, RIR, and IRFA), implemented in November 1999, set a slot limit of 14 to 22 inches FL for banded rudderfish and lesser amberjack for both the commercial and recreational fisheries, and an aggregate recreational bag limit of five fish for banded rudderfish and lesser amberjack.

**Secretarial Amendment 2** (with associated EIS, RIR and IRFA), implemented in July, 2003 for greater amberjack, specified MSY as the yield associated with  $F_{30\% SPR}$  (proxy for  $F_{MSY}$ ) when the stock is at equilibrium, OY as the yield associated with an  $F_{40\% SPR}$  when the stock is at equilibrium, MFMT equal to  $F_{30\% SPR}$ , and MSST equal to  $(1-M)*B_{MSY}$  (where  $M$  = natural mortality) or 75% of  $B_{MSY}$ . It also set a rebuilding plan limiting the harvest to 2,900,000 lbs for 2003-2005, 5,200,000 lbs for 2006-2008, 7,000,000 lbs for 2009-2011, and for 7,900,000 lbs for 2012. This was expected to rebuild the stock in seven years. Regulations implemented in 1997 and 1998 (Amendments 12 and 15 to the Reef Fish FMP) were deemed sufficient to comply with the rebuilding plan so no new regulations were implemented.

**Amendment 30A** (with associated EIS, RIR, and IRFA), implemented August 2008, was developed to stop overfishing of gray triggerfish and greater amberjack. The amendment established ACLs and AMs for greater amberjack and gray triggerfish. For greater amberjack, the rebuilding plan was modified, increasing the recreational minimum size limit to 30 inches FL, implementing a zero bag limit for captain and crew of for-hire vessels, and setting commercial and recreational quotas.

**Regulatory Amendment** with associated EA, RIR, and IRFA implemented in June 2011, specified the greater amberjack recreational closed season from June 1 – July 31. The intended effect of this final rule was to mitigate the social and economic impacts associated with implementing in-season closures.

**Amendment 35** (with associated EA, RIR, and IRFA), implemented in 2012, in response to a 2010 update stock assessment, established a new ACL equal to the ABC at 1,780,000 lbs, which was less than the current annual catch limit of 1,830,000 lbs. Reducing the stock ACL by 18% from no action was expected to end overfishing. The rule also established a commercial trip limit of 2,000 lbs throughout the fishing year. The council also considered bag limits and closed season management measures for the recreational fishing sector but did not alter any recreational management measures.

## CHAPTER 2. MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

### 2.1 Action 1 - Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Annual Catch Limits and Annual Catch Targets

Note: Commercially harvested greater amberjack are typically landed gutted rather than whole. However, the management alternatives in this action are stated in pounds (lbs) whole weight (ww) consistent with current federal regulations and sector allocations. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) published a reminder July 29, 2014 (FB14-55) clarifying that one pound gutted weight is equivalent to 1.04 lbs ww using the standard conversion.

**Alternative 1:** Maintain the current acceptable biological catch (ABC), annual catch limit (ACL), and annual catch target (ACT; quota). Values are in pounds whole weight (ww).

Year	ABC/Stock ACL	Recreational ACL	Recreational ACT	Commercial ACL	Commercial ACT
2014	1,780,000	1,299,000	1,130,000	481,000	409,000

**Alternative 2:** Use the ABC schedule recommended by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) from 2015 to 2018.

**Option a:** Apply ACL/ACT Control Rule:

Commercial Buffer = 15%  
Recreational Buffer = 13%

Year	ABC/Stock ACL	Recreational		Commercial	
		ACL	ACT	ACL	ACT
2015	1,720,000	1,255,600	1,092,372	464,400	394,740
2016	2,230,000	1,627,900	1,416,273	602,100	511,785
2017	2,490,000	1,817,700	1,581,399	672,300	571,455
2018	2,620,000	1,912,600	1,663,962	707,400	601,290

**Option b:** Apply a 20% buffer to set the ACL and ACT for 2015-2018.

Year	ABC/Stock ACL	Recreational		Commercial	
		ACL	ACT	ACL	ACT
2015	1,720,000	1,255,600	1,004,480	464,400	371,520
2016	2,230,000	1,627,900	1,302,320	602,100	481,680
2017	2,490,000	1,817,700	1,454,160	672,300	537,840
2018	2,620,000	1,912,600	1,530,080	707,400	565,920

**Preferred Alternative 3:** Set a constant ABC at the level recommended the SSC for 2015.

**Preferred Option a:** Apply ACL/ACT Control Rule:

Commercial Buffer = 15%  
Recreational Buffer = 13%

Year	Recreational			Commercial	
	ABC/Stock ACL	ACL	ACT	ACL	ACT
2015 +	1,720,000	1,255,600	1,092,372	464,400	394,740

**Option b:** Use a 20% buffer to set the ACL and ACT for 2015-2018

Year	Recreational			Commercial	
	ABC/Stock ACL	ACL	ACT	ACL	ACT
2015 +	1,720,000	1,255,600	1,004,480	464,400	371,520

**Alternative 4:** Set the stock ACL at zero (i.e., no allowable harvest).

**Discussion:** The 2014 Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) workshops (SEDAR 33, 2014) determined that the greater amberjack stock remains overfished and is experiencing overfishing (as of 2012, terminal year of data in the assessment). The status determination criteria used to make these determinations were established in Secretarial Amendment 2 (GMFMC 2003) and are defined as follows: maximum sustainable yield (MSY) is the yield associated with  $F_{30\% SPR}$  (proxy for MSY) when the stock is at equilibrium; optimum yield is the yield associated with an  $F_{40\% SPR}$  when the stock is at equilibrium; maximum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT) is equal to  $F_{30\% SPR}$ ; and minimum stock size threshold is equal to  $(1-M)*B_{MSY}$ , or 75% of biomass at maximum sustainable yield ( $B_{MSY}$ ). Natural mortality (M) equals 0.25 for greater amberjack.

At the August 2014 SSC meeting, the SSC discussed the harvest projections from SEDAR 33 (2014) and the ABC schedule recommended at the previous SSC meeting in June 2014. The additional discussion occurred because 1) the stock remains overfished and continues to experience overfishing, 2) the 10-year rebuilding plan was not met, and 3) the stock biomass has been relatively stable (at overfished levels) for a long period while experiencing harvest levels less than what is currently projected to rebuild the stock in upcoming years. The SSC discussed that historical stock assessment model projections were quite uncertain, and retrospectively, were overly optimistic about the productivity of the stock. An SSC member noted that the current stock assessment differed in terms of modeling environment and approach from previous assessments and the current modeling environment allowed a length-structured assessment with uncertainty in both lengths and landings. These are substantial improvements over previous stock assessments and should add reliability to the results and projections relative to previous assessments of greater amberjack.

Action 1 includes alternatives to modify the ABC, ACL, and ACT for greater amberjack based on the SEDAR 33 (2014) and subsequent Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) review including recommendations for the ABC. Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012) established a stock ABC of 1,780,000 lbs, which exceeds the current ABC recommendation of 1,720,000 lbs for 2015. The ABC established in Amendment 35 was set using Tier 3b of the ABC control rule, where the ABC was set at the mean of recent landings. The SSC adopted this procedure as the projections from the stock assessment were unstable and highly uncertain (SEDAR 9 update 2010).

The recommendations made by the SSC after reviewing SEDAR 33 (2014) will replace the previous ABC and overfishing limit (OFL) recommendations (GMFMC 2012). A ten-year rebuilding plan ended in 2012 without successfully rebuilding the greater amberjack stock. The SSC used the ABC control rule to establish the OFL and ABC for a time period of four years beginning in 2015 equivalent to 75% of MFMT. This is consistent with the National Standard 1 guidelines.

An additional goal of this framework action is to re-evaluate the systems of ACLs and AMs as both the recreational and commercial sectors have exceeded their ACLs and ACTs (quotas) in the last four years. The National Standard (NS) 1 guidelines section 600.310 (g)(3) states “If catch exceeds the ACL for a given stock or stock complex more than once in the last four years, the system of ACLs and accountability measures (AMs) should be re-evaluated, and modified if necessary, to improve its performance and effectiveness.” The management measures in this framework are a means to assist the AMs in restricting harvest and thus, end overfishing and rebuild the stock

**Alternative 1** (no action) would retain the current ABC, equivalent to the stock ACL. Based on the greater amberjack SEDAR 33 (2014) and the SSC’s recommendations for the ABC, the ACL exceeds the ABC for 2015 by 60,000 lbs. Therefore, this alternative is inconsistent with the NS 1 guidelines. However, the current ABC is less than the SSC’s recommendation for 2016 through 2018 and would be expected to rebuild the stock (i.e., spawning stock biomass (SSB) to SPR 30%) by 2019.

**Alternative 2** would set the stock ACL equal to the ABC recommended by the SSC from 2015 through 2018 and is projected rebuild the stock (i.e., SSB to SPR 30%) by 2020. Based on the allocation (73% recreational and 27% commercial), the sector ACLs for 2015 would be 1,255,600 lbs for the recreational sector and 464,400 lbs for the commercial sector. **Alternative 2** would also establish a new stock ACL that is 60,000 lbs less than the current stock ACL in 2015, followed by increases each year from 2016 through 2018.

Greater amberjack are currently managed toward harvesting the ACT (i.e., quota). This strategy provides a management buffer between the ACT and ACL, ultimately reducing the likelihood of exceeding the ACL and triggering AMs. The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) established an ACL/ACT control rule in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment (GMFMC 2011). The Council developed the ACL/ACT control rule so it could objectively and efficiently assign catch limits and targets that take into account management uncertainty. The rule uses different levels of information about catch levels, sector overages, stock management practices, and data quality to assign levels of reduction for either sector ACLs or ACTs.

**Alternative 2** includes two options. **Option a** would apply the ACL/ACT control rule that results in a buffer of 15% for the commercial sector (i.e., management target), and the recreational ACT would result from applying a 13% buffer to the sector’s ACL, to accommodate uncertainty in the effectiveness of the management strategy to constrain catch. **Option a** is projected to rebuild the stock by 2020. **Option b** would not use the ACL/ACT control rule and instead apply a 20% buffer, reducing the ACL by 20% to establish the ACT, or management

target. The rationale for **Option b** is that recreational and commercial harvest has previously exceeded the sector ACL and this would increase both the buffer and the likelihood of rebuilding the stock to target biomass levels by 2020.

Both **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3** include **Preferred Option a** and **Option b**, and propose the same ACLs and ACTs for the year 2015. However, **Preferred Alternative 3** does not allow for increases in the ACL and ACT in subsequent years (2016 - 2018) as compared to **Alternative 2**. **Preferred Alternative 3** is projected to rebuild the stock (i.e., SSB to 30% SPR by 2019). **Preferred Alternative 3, Preferred Option a** would apply the ACL/ACT control rule corresponding to a 15% commercial buffer and a 13% recreational buffer for each year from 2015 to 2018 inclusive. **Preferred Alternative 3, Option b** would apply a constant 20% buffer between the ACL and ACT from 2015 through 2018.

**Alternative 4** would set the stock ACL and stock ACT at zero and is a reasonable alternative given that this stock is overfished and undergoing overfishing despite previous management efforts to rebuild the stock within the ten year rebuilding plan. **Alternative 4** is projected to rebuild the stock by 2017. However, this alternative will have the greatest short-term, negative socioeconomic impacts.

Both **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3** (including **Options**) would retain the same ABC. Under both alternatives, **Option a** would maintain an ACT (commercial sector buffer =15% and the recreational buffer =13%) established using the ACL/ACT control rule. This would retain an ACT value as the “target” yet AMs would not be triggered unless the ACL was exceeded. Under both alternatives, **Option b** would increase the buffer for setting the ACT (5% and 7% for the commercial and recreational sectors, respectively) compared with **Option a**. Under either alternative, **Option b** would reduce the likelihood of exceeding the ACL and aid in preventing overages that have occurred frequently in the management of this species. However, if the buffer is too large, it could prevent the fishery from landing the allowable catch.

## 2.2 Action 2 - Recreational Management Measures

### Action 2.1: Modify the Recreational Minimum Size Limit for Greater Amberjack

**Alternative 1:** No Action – do not modify the current recreational minimum size limit of 30 inches fork length (FL).

**Alternative 2:** Modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 32 inches FL.

**Preferred Alternative 3:** Modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 34 inches FL.

**Alternative 4:** Modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 36 inches FL.

## **Discussion:**

Action 2 includes alternatives to increase the recreational minimum size limit for greater amberjack. **Alternative 1** would maintain the current 30-inch FL recreational minimum size limit. Based on recreational landings in 2012-2013, the most frequently landed size of greater amberjack was 34 inches FL (Figure 2.2.1). A 30-inch FL greater amberjack is approximately two years old and likely has not reached sexual maturity (Figure 2.2.2). At the current 30-inch FL minimum size limit, 11% (95% confidence interval (0 - 23%)) of the females in the population have achieved reproductive maturity (Table 2.2.1).


Other alternatives consider larger size limits, with increasing likelihood of sexual maturity. For instance, **Alternative 2** would modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 32 inches FL. At 32 inches FL, 45% of females (95% confidence interval (23 - 66%)) are reproductively mature. **Preferred Alternative 3** would modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 34 inches FL. At 34 inches FL, 85% of females (95% confidence interval (69 - 100%)) are reproductively mature. **Alternative 4** would modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 36 inches FL. At 36 inches FL, 97% of females (95% confidence interval (92 - 100%)) are reproductively mature. For **Preferred Alternative 3** or **Alternative 4**, greater than 50% of female greater amberjack are estimated to be reproductively mature and **Alternative 4** would be consistent with the commercial sector's minimum size limit.

As minimum size limits increase from 30 inches FL, dead discards are estimated to increase and subsequent estimates of changes in harvest and dead discards for various minimum size limits have been calculated. Discard mortality is estimated at 20% and is used to estimate increases in total dead discards with various minimum size limits consistent with SEDAR 33 (2014) and SEDAR 9 Update (2010).


Spawning potential ratio (Figure 2.2.3) and yield-per-recruit (YPR) (Figure 2.2.4) were calculated for a range of fishing mortality rates for three different minimum size limits following SERO-LAPP-2011-04. The calculations incorporated discard selectivity and discard mortality for sub-legal fish and harvest selectivity within 2 inches of the minimum size limit. Spawning Potential Ratio (SPR) and YPR calculations were updated with SEDAR 33 (2014) parameter estimates of length-weight conversion, von Bertalanffy growth model, length at maturity model, natural mortality, fishing mortality, and discard mortality information.

Spawning potential ratio addresses the spawning potential of the stock relative to the stock with no fishing mortality. The largest minimum size limit considered (**Alternative 4**; 36 inches FL) resulted in the largest spawning potential for the stock. YPR addresses the fishing mortality rate that produces the maximum yield of the fishery. The smallest minimum size considered (**Alternative 1**; 30 inches FL) resulted in the largest yield of the fishery. Thus, the SPR and YPR results reveal a trade-off between SPR and YPR. If the management goal is to achieve a higher SPR, then increasing the minimum size would be beneficial; however, this results in less YPR. If the management goal is to maximize yield then the current minimum size limit of 30 inches FL appears appropriate.

The SPR and YPR analysis presented herein only takes into account growth and mortality. Recruitment is assumed to be constant which is likely unrealistic because recruitment varies over time based on changing stock size and environmental conditions. Thus, there is uncertainty associated with these results. Also, this analysis does not address the issue of determining a fishing mortality rate that will produce a maximum yield that is likely to be sustainable.




**Figure 2.2.1.** Size frequency distribution of recreational greater amberjack landings in 2012-2013 in the Gulf of Mexico. The current minimum size limit is 30 inches FL. Note: Landings in blue = Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP), red = Southeast Headboat Survey, and green = Texas Parks and Wildlife Division. Source: SERO 2014.




**Figure 2.2.2.** Proportion of mature females by length for greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico. Solid line represents the logistic regression model, blue shaded region represents 95% confidence interval. Filled black circles are individual samples that were noted as mature or immature. Source: D. Murie, personal communication and SERO 2014.

**Table 2.2.1.** Proportion of mature females at selected lengths for greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico. At each selected length, the proportion of mature females is estimated using logistic regression. The 95% lower (LCL) and upper (UCL) confidence limits are also provided.

Proportion of mature females			
Fork length (FL, in inches)	Proportion mature	LCL	UCL
30	0.11	0.00	0.23
32	0.45	0.23	0.66
34	0.85	0.69	1.00
36	0.97	0.92	1.00



**Figure 2.2.3.** Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack spawning potential ratio plotted against fishing mortality rates for three different minimum size limits. The black bar represents the current fishing mortality rate ( $F_{\text{current}} = 0.256$ ) and the dashed line represents the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold ( $\text{MFMT} = 0.222$ ) as stated in SEDAR 33 (2014).



**Figure 2.2.4.** Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack yield-per-recruit plotted against fishing mortality rates for three different minimum size limits. The black bar represents the current fishing mortality rate ( $F_{\text{current}} = 0.256$ ) and the dashed line represents the Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold (MFMT = 0.222) as stated in SEDAR 33 (2014).

## Action 2.2: Modify the Recreational Closed Seasons for Greater Amberjack

**Preferred Alternative 1:** No Action – do not modify the current June 1 - July 31 recreational closed season.

**Alternative 2:** Eliminate the closed season and open January 1 until the ACT is harvested.

**Alternative 3:** Modify the recreational seasonal closure to March 1 - May 31.

**Alternative 4:** Modify the recreational seasonal closures to January 1 – May 31 and November 1 – December 31.

### **Discussion:**

Minimum size limits are one management measures that can be used to achieve the management goal of 30% SPR. Another measure the Council is considering to modify is the recreational closed season. The primary reason for a fixed recreational closed season is to eliminate in-season quota closures in the fall, which can be very disruptive to the recreational sector.

**Preferred Alternative 1** would maintain the current fixed closed season June 1-July 31. The original intent of this fixed recreational closed season was to eliminate in-season quota closures and allow one highly targeted species to be open when the other was closed (red snapper and greater amberjack). Of course, this has changed recently as the red snapper recreational season has contracted to prevent exceeding the recreational sector ACL. In addition, by establishing a fixed closed season when the harvest is the greatest, the fishery is more likely to stay open through the remainder of the calendar year.

**Alternative 2** would eliminate the fixed closed season (June 1-July 31) and the fishing season for greater amberjack would open January 1 until the ACT is projected to be met. This was the structure of the recreational fishing season until the implementation of the 2010 Regulatory Amendment (GMFMC 2010b), which established the current fixed closed season.

**Alternative 3** would eliminate the fixed closed season (June 1-July 31) and establish a recreational fixed closed season from March 1-May 31. This alternative would be consistent with the commercial fixed closed season and would also protect greater amberjack during peak spawning.

**Alternative 4** would eliminate the fixed closed season (June 1-July 31) and establish recreational fixed closed seasons from January 1-May 31 and from November 1-December 31 providing protection for spawning greater amberjack and allowing recreational fishing effort to occur throughout the summer (June-July) into early fall (September-October).

**Action 2.1** and **Action 2.2** consider management alternatives to 1) achieve the ACT selected in Action 1 and; 2) consider changes in minimum size limits and or closed seasons to maximize benefits from the greater amberjack stock while ending overfishing and allowing for rebuilding of the stock. The management alternatives are a means to assist the AMs in restricting harvest and thus, end overfishing and rebuild the stock. A recreational decision tool was developed to evaluate combinations of size limits and closed seasons on the total removals of the stock (catch + dead discards) as well as the number of days required to harvest the ACT (catch, not including dead discards). This allows evaluation of tradeoffs in management alternatives to maximize benefits (e.g., season length) and minimize negative attributes (e.g., dead discards). The estimated season length for combinations of minimum size limits (Action 2.1, Alternatives 1 -4) and recreational closed seasons (**Action 2.2, Alternatives 1 -4**) is presented in Table 2.2.1. These estimates are restricted to what would have happened in calendar year 2015 as some alternatives include constant ACT values and uncertainty increases with each successive year of the projection. As such, the number of days presented in Table 2.2.1 represents the best estimate and are considered useful in a comparative sense. The combinations yielding the longest season length include a 36-inch FL minimum size limit and a closed season during June and July when harvest rates are typically greatest. The split season closure (**Alternative 4**) is predicted to yield the shortest fishing season of all the alternatives considered, as the closed seasons occur in relatively low-effort periods, thus requiring longer closed seasons to achieve the same level of harvest reductions.

**Table 2.2.1.** Recreational sector season length in days under selected closed seasons (Action 2.2), minimum size limits (Action 2.1), and ACT options (Action 1).

Closed Seasons	Size Limit	ACT Alt 1	ACT Alt 2		ACT Alt 3	
		13% buffer	13% buffer	20% buffer	13% buffer	20% buffer
June 1 - July 31	30	182	179	172	179	172
January 1 until ACT harvested	30	190	187	181	187	181
March 1 to May 31	30	145	142	135	142	135
January 1 – May 31 and November 1 – December 31	30	97	92	85	92	85
June 1 - July 31	32	196	191	180	191	180
January 1 until ACT harvested	32	199	195	188	195	188
March 1 to May 31	32	152	149	142	149	142
January 1 – May 31 and November 1 – December 31	32	108	102	91	102	91
June 1 - July 31	34	215	209	196	209	196
January 1 until ACT harvested	34	211	208	200	208	200
March 1 to May 31	34	168	162	150	162	150
January 1 – May 31 and November 1 – December 31	34	123	118	104	118	104
June 1 - July 31	36	258	237	222	237	222
January 1 until ACT harvested	36	227	224	215	224	215
March 1 to May 31	36	192	185	170	185	170
January 1 – May 31 and November 1 – December 31	36	147	140	125	140	125

## 2.3 Action 3 - Commercial Management Measures

**Alternative 1:** No Action – Maintain the 1,923-lb gutted weight trip limit (2,000-lb whole weight trip limit) for greater amberjack. Note: The current regulation is specified in pounds (lbs) whole weight.

**Preferred Alternative 2:** Establish a 1,500-lb gutted weight trip limit (1,560-lb whole weight trip limit) for greater amberjack.

**Alternative 3:** Establish a 1,000-lb gutted weight trip limit (1,040-lb whole weight trip limit) for greater amberjack.

**Alternative 4:** Establish a 750-lb gutted weight trip limit (780-lb whole weight trip limit) for greater amberjack.

**Alternative 5:** Establish a 500-lb gutted weight trip limit (520-lb whole weight trip limit) for greater amberjack.

### **Discussion:**

Commercially harvested greater amberjack are typically landed gutted rather than whole. As such, the management alternatives are stated in gutted weight (gw) with equivalent whole weight (ww) conversions noted in parentheses. However, the federal regulations are currently provided in whole weight. NMFS published a reminder July 29, 2014 (FB14-55) clarifying that 2,000 lbs ww is equivalent to 1,923 lbs gw using the standard conversion.

Action 3 includes alternatives to reduce commercial trip limits for greater amberjack. A 1,923-lb gw (2,000-lb ww) commercial trip limit was established in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012) in an effort to reduce harvest rates and prevent ACL overages. Greater amberjack are currently managed toward harvesting the ACT. This strategy provides a management buffer between the ACT and ACL, ultimately reducing the likelihood of exceeding the ACL and triggering AMs. Prior to implementation of the commercial trip limit, the commercial ACL was exceeded each year from 2009 to 2012. Although the trip limit moderately reduced the average poundage landed per trip, the commercial ACT and ACL were also exceeded in 2013. If the commercial ACT and ACL are reduced from status quo to meet the objectives of the eliminate overfishing (i.e., Action 1), an additional reduction to the commercial trip limit could reduce the likelihood of exceeding the ACL. **Alternative 1** would retain the 1,923-lb gw (2,000-lb ww) commercial trip limit. **Preferred Alternative 2**, and **Alternatives 3-5** would reduce the commercial greater amberjack trip limit to 1,500-lb gw (**Preferred Alternative 2**); 1,000-lb gw (**Alternative 3**), 750 lbs gw (**Alternative 4**), and 500-lb gw (**Alternative 5**), respectively. The reduced trip limits are expected to reduce the rate of harvest and the likelihood of exceeding the ACT and extend the season length. This could be an effective management measure to achieve harvest targets and prevent triggering of AMs (i.e., exceeding the ACL).

To estimate season lengths necessary to harvest the commercial ACT, a decision tool was developed to compare **Alternatives 1-5**. Estimates are restricted to what would have happened during fishing year 2015 as projection uncertainty increases with each subsequent year estimated. These season lengths are reported as a range since they are dependent upon the ACT value selected in Action 1. **Alternative 1** (1,923-lb gw trip limit) would provide the shortest season among the alternatives, such that the season is projected to range from 75 to 82 days, assuming a January 1, 2015 opening date (Table 2.3.2). **Preferred Alternative 2** would slow the overall harvest rate of the fleet by restraining trip harvest to 1,500 lbs gw and the projected season length ranges from 83 to 91 days. **Alternative 3** would enact a 1,000-lb gw trip limit with a projected season length ranging from 110 to 123 days. **Alternative 4** (750-lb gw trip limit) would require 140 to 157 days to harvest the ACT. **Alternative 5** (500-lb trip limit) is the smallest trip limit under consideration and would require 207 to 233 days to harvest the ACT. In all cases, **Alternative 5** would have the longest season length at the expense of the smallest allowable harvest per trip. The NMFS Commercial Decision Tool has the option to set different trip limit values for each month and, therefore, can be used to produce season length and economic effects estimates for a mid-season implementation of the new commercial trip limit (SERO, 2015). The ACT is projected, however, to be harvested prior to July under all ACL alternatives with the current trip limit in place, so if a trip limit reduction is implemented on July 1, 2015, it is not expected to affect the season length until the following fishing year.

**Table 2.3.1.** Total greater amberjack commercial landings (2008 - 2013). The commercial ACL was exceeded each year from 2009 to 2013. A 2,000-lb ww trip limit was implemented in December 2012, (fully implemented in 2013). Note, the ACL was adjusted for prior year overages in some years as explained in Table 1.3.1.

Year	Total Landings (ww)	ACL (ww)	Closure Date
2008	439,176	503,000	
2009	601,446	503,000	11/7/2009
2010	534,095	373,072	10/28/2010
2011	508,489	342,091	6/18/2011
2012	307,921	314,734	3/1/2012
2013	457,821	410,157	7/1/2013

**Table 2.3.2.** Estimated commercial season length (i.e., days open) under five management alternatives. The table represents the number of fishing necessary to harvest the ACT as specified in Action 1. The color scale ranges from yellow (i.e., fewest days) to green (i.e., most days).


Action 3 Alternatives	Action 1 Alternatives					
	Trip Limit (lbs gw)	Alternative 1	Alternative 2		Preferred Alternative 3	
			15% buffer	20% buffer	15% buffer	20% buffer
Alt. 1	1923* (status quo)	82	79	75	79	75
Preferred Alt. 2	1500	91	87	83	87	83
Alt.3	1000	123	118	110	118	110
Alt. 4	750	157	151	140	151	140
Alt. 5	500	233	223	207	223	207

\*2000-lb ww

## CHAPTER 3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

### 3.1 Description of the Physical Environment

The Gulf of Mexico has a total area of approximately 600,000 square miles (1.5 million km<sup>2</sup>), including state waters (Gore 1992). It is a semi-enclosed, oceanic basin connected to the Atlantic Ocean by the Straits of Florida and to the Caribbean Sea by the Yucatan Channel (Figure 3.1.1). Oceanographic conditions are affected by the Loop Current, discharge of freshwater into the northern Gulf of Mexico, and a semi-permanent, anti-cyclonic gyre in the western Gulf of Mexico. The Gulf of Mexico includes both temperate and tropical waters (McEachran and Fechhelm 2005). Mean annual sea surface temperatures ranged from 73 through 83° F (23-28° C) including bays and bayous (Figure 3.1.1) between 1982 and 2009, according to satellite-derived measurements (NODC 2012: <http://accession.nodc.noaa.gov/0072888>). In general, mean sea surface temperature increases from north to south with large seasonal variations in shallow waters.



**Figure 3.1.1.** Mean annual sea surface temperature derived from the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer Pathfinder Version 5 sea surface temperature data set (<http://pathfinder.nodc.noaa.gov>).

The physical environment for Gulf of Mexico of Mexico reef fish is detailed in the Generic Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) Amendment (GMFMC 2004a) and the Generic Annual Catch Limit

(ACL)/Accountability Measure (AM) Amendment (GMFMC 2011), which are hereby incorporated by reference.

### **Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC)**

Generic Amendment 3 (GMFMC 2005) for addressing EFH, HAPC, and adverse effects of fishing in the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Resources, Red Drum, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics is hereby incorporated by reference.

### **Environmental Sites of Special Interest Relevant to Reef Fish, Red Drum, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and Red Drum. (Figure 3.1.2)**

Longline/Buoy Gear Area Closure – Permanent closure to use of these gears for reef fish harvest inshore of 118 feet (36.6 meters) off the Florida shelf and inshore of 293 feet (91.4 meters) for the remainder of the Gulf of Mexico, and encompasses 72,300 square nautical miles (nm<sup>2</sup>) or 133,344 km<sup>2</sup> (GMFMC 1989). Bottom longline gear is prohibited inshore of 35 fathoms (54.3 meters) during the months of June through August in the eastern Gulf of Mexico (GMFMC 2009), but is not depicted in Figure 3.2.1.

Madison-Swanson and Steamboat Lumps Marine Reserves - No-take marine reserves (total area is 219 nm<sup>2</sup> or 405 km<sup>2</sup>) sited based on gag spawning aggregation areas where all fishing is prohibited except surface trolling from May through October (GMFMC 1999; 2003).

The Edges Marine Reserve – All fishing is prohibited in this area (390 nm<sup>2</sup> or 1,338 km<sup>2</sup>) from January through April and possession of any fish species is prohibited, except for such possession aboard a vessel in transit with fishing gear stowed as specified. The provisions of this do not apply to highly migratory species (GMFMC 2008).


Tortugas North and South Marine Reserves – No-take marine reserves (185 nm<sup>2</sup>) cooperatively implemented by the state of Florida, National Ocean Service, the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council), and the National Park Service in Generic Amendment 2 Establishing the Tortugas Marine Reserves (GMFMC 2001).

Reef and bank areas designated as Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs) in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico include – East and West Flower Garden Banks, Stetson Bank, Sonnier Bank, MacNeil Bank, 29 Fathom, Rankin Bright Bank, Geyer Bank, McGrail Bank, Bouma Bank, Rezak Sidner Bank, Alderice Bank, and Jakkula Bank – pristine coral areas protected by preventing the use of some fishing gear that interacts with the bottom and prohibited use of anchors (totaling 263.2 nm<sup>2</sup> or 487.4 km<sup>2</sup>). Subsequently, three of these areas were established as marine sanctuaries (i.e., East and West Flower Garden Banks and Stetson Bank). Bottom anchoring and the use of trawling gear, bottom longlines, buoy gear, and all traps/pots on coral reefs are prohibited in the East and West Flower Garden Banks, McGrail Bank, and on significant coral resources on Stetson Bank (GMFMC 2005).

Florida Middle Grounds HAPC - Pristine soft coral area (348 nm<sup>2</sup> or 644.5 km<sup>2</sup>) that is protected by prohibiting the following gear types: bottom longlines, trawls, dredges, pots and traps (GMFMC and SAFMC 1982).

Pulley Ridge HAPC - A portion of the HAPC (2,300 nm<sup>2</sup> or 4,259 km<sup>2</sup>) where deepwater hermatypic coral reefs are found is closed to anchoring and the use of trawling gear, bottom longlines, buoy gear, and all traps/pots (GMFMC 2005).

Alabama Special Management Zone – For vessels operating as a charter vessel or headboat, a vessel that does not have a commercial permit for Gulf of Mexico reef fish, or a vessel with such a permit fishing for Gulf of Mexico reef fish, fishing is limited to hook-and-line gear with no more than three hooks. Nonconforming gear is restricted to recreational bag limits, or for reef fish without a bag limit, to 5% by weight of all fish aboard.



**Figure 3.1.2.** Map of most fishery management closed areas in the Gulf of Mexico.

### Deepwater Horizon MC252

The Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill in 2010 affected at least one-third of the Gulf of Mexico area from western Louisiana east to the Florida Panhandle and south to the Campeche Bank in Mexico. The impacts of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill on the physical environment are expected to be significant and may be long-term. Oil was dispersed on the surface, and because of the heavy use of dispersants (both at the surface and at the wellhead), oil was also documented as being suspended within the water column, some even deeper than the location of the broken well head. Floating and suspended oil washed onto shore in several areas of the Gulf of Mexico as were non-floating tar balls. Whereas suspended and floating oil degrades over time, tar balls are persistent in the environment and can be transported hundreds of miles.

Surface or submerged oil during the Deepwater Horizon MC252 event could have restricted the normal processes of atmospheric oxygen mixing into and replenishing oxygen concentrations in the water column, thus affecting the long-standing hypoxic zone located west of the Mississippi River on the Louisiana continental shelf. In addition, microbes in the water that break down oil and dispersant also consume oxygen, which could lead to further oxygen depletion. Zooplankton that feed on algae could also be negatively impacted, thus allowing more of the hypoxia-fueling algae to grow.

## 3.2 Description of the Biological/Ecological Environment

### Greater Amberjack Life History and Biology

Recent studies conducted in the south Atlantic have consistently estimated that greater amberjack peak spawning occurs in April and May (Sedberry et al. 2006; Harris et al. 2007); whereas, studies conducted in the Gulf of Mexico have consistently estimated that peak spawning occurs a month earlier during March and April (Wells and Rooker 2002; Murie and Parkyn 2008).

Early studies on greater amberjack conducted in south Florida indicated that maximum gonad development occurred in the spring months (Burch 1979). Wells and Rooker (2002) conducted studies in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico on larval and juvenile fish associated with floating *Sargassum* spp. Based on the size and season larvae and juvenile greater amberjack were captured, they suggested peak spawning season occurred in March and April. Murie and Parkyn (2008) completed a study on reproductive biology of greater amberjack throughout the Gulf of Mexico using fishery-dependent as well as fishery-independent data from 1989 - 2008. They also found that peak spawning occurred during March and April, and by May, they documented low gonad weights indicating spawning was ending.

Sedberry et al. (2006) documented greater amberjack spawning in the south Atlantic on both the middle and outer shelf as well as on upper-slope reefs from 49 - 709 ft (15 - 216 m) depth, but spawning females were found at deeper depths from 148 - 400 ft (45 - 122 m). They collected spawning females from January to June, and estimated peak spawning occurred in April and May. Harris et al. (2007) completed a fishery-dependent and fishery-independent study on greater amberjack reproductive biology in the southeastern U.S. Atlantic from 2000 - 2004. Greater amberjack in spawning condition were captured from North Carolina to the Florida Keys; however, spawning was concentrated in areas off south Florida and the Florida Keys.

Harris et al. (2007) documented evidence of spawning from January - June with peak spawning during April and May. Female greater amberjack were significantly larger than males (Harris 2004; Harris et al. 2007). For males, the size at which 50% of individuals were mature was 25 inches fork length (FL) and for females was 29 inches FL. They estimated a spawning season of approximately 73 days off south Florida, with a spawning period of 5 days, and that an individual female could spawn as frequently as 14 times during the season. Female fecundity increased with size, but was essentially constant throughout the spawning season. Greater amberjack are extremely fecund, releasing 18 to 59 million eggs per female in a single spawning season (Harris et al. 2007).

Murie and Parkyn (2008) Gulf of Mexico documented that, for Gulf of Mexico females, 50% of individuals were mature at 35 inches FL (900 mm FL), larger than what Harris et al. (2007) documented off south Florida (Burch 1979).

Harris et al. (2007) suggested that there are known spawning aggregations of greater amberjack targeted by fishers in the south Atlantic, however, no direct evidence of this was presented. Observations by SCUBA divers in Belize documented greater amberjack in pair courtship when they were in a school of approximately 120 fish (Graham and Castellanos 2005). However, no aggregation or indication of spawning aggregations was discussed by the Murie and Parkyn (2008) Gulf of Mexico study or in any other earlier Gulf of Mexico studies.

After spawning, eggs and larvae of greater amberjack are pelagic. Smaller juvenile greater amberjack less than 1 inch standard length (SL) (20 mm SL) were found associated with pelagic *Sargassum* spp. mats (Bortone et al. 1977; Wells and Rooker 2004). Juveniles then shift to demersal habitats (5 - 6 months), where they congregate around reefs, rocky outcrops, and wrecks (GMFMC 2004a). Greater amberjack are only seasonally abundant in certain parts of their range, thus they likely utilize a variety of habitats and/or areas each year throughout their range. Greater amberjack have been documented on artificial structures as well as natural reefs (Ingram and Patterson 2001). Greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico have been reported to live as long as 15 years and commonly reach sizes greater than 40 inches FL (1,016 mm FL) (Manooch and Potts 1997).

### **Status of the Greater Amberjack Stock**

See Section 1.1 under the Introduction.

### **General Information on Reef Fish Species**

The National Ocean Service (NOS) collaborated with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council to develop distributions of reef fish (and other species) in the Gulf of Mexico (SEA 1998). The NOS staff obtained fishery-independent data sets for the Gulf of Mexico, including the Southeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program (SEAMAP), and state trawl surveys. Data from the Estuarine Living Marine Resources (ELMR) Program contain information on the relative abundance of specific species (highly abundant, abundant, common, rare, not found, and no data) for a series of estuaries, by five life stages (adult, spawning, egg, larvae, and juvenile) and month for five

seasonal salinity zones (0-0.5, 0.5-5, 5-15, 15-25, and > 25 parts per thousand). The NOS staff analyzed these data to determine relative abundance of the mapped species by estuary, salinity zone, and month. For some species not in the ELMR database, distribution was classified as only observed or not observed for adult, juvenile, and spawning stages.

In general, reef fish are widely distributed in the Gulf of Mexico, occupying both pelagic and benthic habitats during their life cycle. Habitat types and life history stages are summarized in Table 3.2.1 and can be found in more detail in GMFMC (2004a). In general, both eggs and larval stages are planktonic. Larvae feed on zooplankton and phytoplankton. Exceptions to these generalizations include gray triggerfish that lay their eggs in depressions in the sandy bottom, and gray snapper where larvae are found around submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV). Juvenile and adult reef fish are typically demersal, and are usually associated with bottom topographies on the continental shelf less than 328 ft (100 m) which have high relief, i.e., coral reefs, artificial reefs, rocky hard-bottom substrates, ledges and caves, sloping soft-bottom areas, and limestone outcroppings. However, several species are found over sand and soft-bottom substrates. Juvenile red snapper are common on mud bottoms in the northern Gulf of Mexico, particularly off Texas through Alabama. Also, some juvenile snappers (e.g. mutton, gray, red, lane, and yellowtail snappers) and groupers (e.g. goliath, red, gag, and yellowfin groupers) have been documented in inshore seagrass beds, mangrove estuaries, lagoons, and larger bay systems (GMFMC 1981). More detail on hard bottom substrate and coral can be found in the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for Corals and Coral Reefs (GMFMC and SAFMC 1982).

Population and ecosystem effects resulting from changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and invertebrates are difficult to predict. Fishermen can specifically target greater amberjack while they are schooling. Snappers, groupers, and other reef fishes are commonly caught in association with greater amberjack. Those most commonly caught associated species include: almaco jack, vermilion, and several species of deep-water groupers. None of these species are currently undergoing overfishing or being overfished (NMFS 2014 Summary of Stock Status for FSSI). Regulatory discards significantly contribute to fishing mortality in all of these reef fish species, especially deep-water groupers. Further information regarding bycatch can be found in Appendix D.

**Table 3.2.1.** Summary of habitat use by life history stage for species in the FMP for Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico. This table was adapted from Table 3.2.7 in the final draft of the Council’s Generic EFH Amendment (GMFMC 2004a) and consolidated in this amendment.

<b>Common name</b>	<b>Eggs</b>	<b>Larvae</b>	<b>Early Juveniles</b>	<b>Late juveniles</b>	<b>Adults</b>	<b>Spawning adults</b>
Red snapper	Pelagic	Pelagic	Hard bottoms, Sand/ shell bottoms, Soft bottoms	Hard bottoms, Sand/ shell bottoms, Soft bottoms	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Sand/ shell bottoms
Queen snapper	Pelagic	Pelagic	Unknown	Unknown	Hard bottoms	
Mutton snapper	Reefs	Reefs	Mangroves, Reefs, SAV, Emergent marshes	Mangroves, Reefs, SAV, Emergent marshes	Reefs, SAV	Shoals/ Banks, Shelf edge/slope
Blackfin snapper	Pelagic		Hard bottoms	Hard bottoms	Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope	Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope
Cubera snapper	Pelagic		Mangroves, Emergent marshes, SAV	Mangroves, Emergent marshes, SAV	Mangroves, Reefs	Reefs
Gray snapper	Pelagic, Reefs	Pelagic, Reefs	Mangroves, Emergent marshes, Seagrasses	Mangroves, Emergent marshes, SAV	Emergent marshes, Hard bottoms, Reefs, Sand/ shell bottoms, Soft bottoms	
Lane snapper	Pelagic		Mangroves, Reefs, Sand/ shell bottoms, SAV, Soft bottoms	Mangroves, Reefs, Sand/ shell bottoms, SAV, Soft bottoms	Reefs, Sand/ shell bottoms, Shoals/ Banks	Shelf edge/slope
Silk snapper	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Shelf edge	
Yellowtail snapper	Pelagic		Mangroves, SAV, Soft bottoms	Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs, Shoals/ Banks	
Wenchman	Pelagic	Pelagic			Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope	Shelf edge/slope

Common name	Eggs	Larvae	Early Juveniles	Late juveniles	Adults	Spawning adults
Vermilion snapper	Pelagic		Hard bottoms, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs	
Gray triggerfish	Reefs	Drift algae, <i>Sargassum</i>	Drift algae, <i>Sargassum</i>	Drift algae, Reefs, <i>Sargassum</i>	Reefs, Sand/ shell bottoms	Reefs, Sand/ shell bottoms
Greater amberjack	Pelagic	Pelagic	Drift algae	Drift algae	Pelagic, Reefs	Pelagic
Lesser amberjack			Drift algae	Drift algae	Hard bottoms	Hard bottoms
Almaco jack	Pelagic		Drift algae	Drift algae	Pelagic	Pelagic
Banded rudderfish		Pelagic	Drift algae	Drift algae	Pelagic	Pelagic
Hogfish			SAV	SAV	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Reefs
Blueline tilefish	Pelagic	Pelagic			Hard bottoms, Sand/ shell bottoms, Shelf edge/slope, Soft bottoms	
Tilefish (golden)	Pelagic, Shelf edge/ slope	Pelagic	Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope, Soft bottoms	Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope, Soft bottoms	Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope, Soft bottoms	
Goldface tilefish	Unknown					
Speckled hind	Pelagic	Pelagic			Hard bottoms, Reefs	Shelf edge/slope
Yellowedge grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic		Hard bottoms	Hard bottoms	
Goliath grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic	Mangroves, Reefs, SAV	Hard bottoms, Mangroves, Reefs, SAV	Hard bottoms, Shoals/ Banks, Reefs	Reefs, Hard bottoms

<b>Common name</b>	<b>Eggs</b>	<b>Larvae</b>	<b>Early Juveniles</b>	<b>Late juveniles</b>	<b>Adults</b>	<b>Spawning adults</b>
Red grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic	Hard bottoms, Reefs, SAV	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs	
Warsaw grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic		Reefs	Hard bottoms, Shelf edge/slope	
Snowy grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic	Reefs	Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs, Shelf edge/slope	
Black grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic	SAV	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Mangroves, Reefs	
Yellowmouth grouper	Pelagic	Pelagic	Mangroves	Mangroves, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs	
Gag	Pelagic	Pelagic	SAV	Hard bottoms, Reefs, SAV	Hard bottoms, Reefs	
Scamp	Pelagic	Pelagic	Hard bottoms, Mangroves, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Mangroves, Reefs	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Reefs, Shelf edge/slope
Yellowfin grouper			SAV	Hard bottoms, SAV	Hard bottoms, Reefs	Hard bottoms

## Status of Reef Fish Stocks

The Fishery Management Plan for Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (Reef Fish FMP) currently encompasses 31 species (Table 3.2.2). Eleven other species were removed from the Reef Fish FMP in 2012 by the Council in their Generic ACL/AM Amendment. Stock assessments and stock assessment reviews may be found on the Council ([www.gulfcouncil.org](http://www.gulfcouncil.org)) and SEDAR (<http://sedarweb.org/>) and have been conducted for 13 species:

- red snapper (SEDAR 7 2005; SEDAR 7 Update 2009; SEDAR 31 2013; Update 2014)
- vermilion snapper (Porch and Cass-Calay 2001; SEDAR 9 2006a; SEDAR 9 Update 2011b; SEDAR Update 2014)
- yellowtail snapper (Muller et al. 2003; SEDAR 3 2003)
- mutton snapper (SEDAR 15A 2008; SEDAR 15A Update 2014)
- gray triggerfish (Valle et al. 2001; SEDAR 9 2006b; SEDAR 9 Update 2011c and 2014)
- greater amberjack (Turner et al. 2000; SEDAR 9 2006c; SEDAR 9 Update 2010, SEDAR 33 2014)
- hogfish (Ault et al. 2003; SEDAR 6 2004a, SEDAR 37 2014)
- red grouper (NMFS 2002; SEDAR 12 2007; SEDAR 12 Update 2009)
- gag grouper (Turner et al. 2001; SEDAR 10 2006; SEDAR 10 Update 2009, SEDAR 33 2014)
- black grouper (SEDAR 19 2010)
- yellowedge grouper (Cass-Calay and Bahnick 2002; SEDAR 22 2011a)
- tilefish (golden) (SEDAR 22 2011b)
- goliath grouper (Porch et al. 2003; SEDAR 6 2004b; SEDAR 23 2011)

Utilizing the most current stock assessment information, the Gulf of Mexico of Mexico fourth quarter report of the 2014 Status of U.S. Fisheries classifies the 13 species as follows:

[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/fisheries\\_eco/status\\_of\\_fisheries/archive/2014/2014\\_status\\_of\\_stocks\\_final\\_web.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/fisheries_eco/status_of_fisheries/archive/2014/2014_status_of_stocks_final_web.pdf)

### Overfished and Experiencing Overfishing:

- greater amberjack
- gray triggerfish

### Overfished

- red snapper

### Not Overfished or Experiencing Overfishing:

- yellowtail snapper
- yellowedge grouper
- vermilion snapper
- black grouper
- red grouper
- gag grouper
- mutton snapper
- hogfish

Unknown:

- goliath grouper – benchmarks do not reflect appropriate stock dynamics
- snowy grouper
- speckled hind
- warsaw grouper
- yellowfin grouper
- scamp
- yellowmouth grouper
- cubera snapper
- gray snapper
- lane snapper
- queen snapper
- blackfin snapper
- silk snapper
- wenchman
- jacks complex (lesser amberjack, banded rudderfish)
- tilefish (golden) – insufficient data

**Table 3.2.2.** Species of the Reef Fish FMP grouped by family.

\*\*Note: Goliath grouper is a protected grouper.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Stock Status
<b>Family Balistidae – Triggerfishes</b>		
gray triggerfish	<i>Balistes capriscus</i>	Overfished, overfishing
<b>Family Carangidae – Jacks</b>		
greater amberjack	<i>Seriola dumerili</i>	Overfished, overfishing
lesser amberjack	<i>Seriola fasciata</i>	Unknown
almaco jack	<i>Seriola rivoliana</i>	Unknown
banded rudderfish	<i>Seriola zonata</i>	Unknown
<b>Family Labridae – Wrasses</b>		
*Hogfish	<i>Lachnolaimus maximus</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
<b>Family Malacanthidae – Tilefishes</b>		
Tilefish (golden)	<i>Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps</i>	Unknown
blueline tilefish	<i>Caulolatilus microps</i>	Unknown
goldface tilefish	<i>Caulolatilus chrysops</i>	Unknown
<b>Family Serranidae – Groupers</b>		
Gag	<i>Mycteroperca microlepis</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
red grouper	<i>Epinephelus morio</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
Scamp	<i>Mycteroperca phenax</i>	Unknown
black grouper	<i>Mycteroperca bonaci</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
yellowedge grouper	<i>Epinephelus flavolimbatus</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
snowy grouper	<i>Epinephelus niveatus</i>	Unknown
speckled hind	<i>Epinephelus drummondhayi</i>	Unknown
yellowmouth grouper	<i>Mycteroperca interstitialis</i>	Unknown
yellowfin grouper	<i>Mycteroperca venenosa</i>	Unknown
warsaw grouper	<i>Epinephelus nigritus</i>	Unknown
**goliath grouper	<i>Epinephelus itajara</i>	Unknown, not overfishing
<b>Family Lutjanidae – Snappers</b>		
queen snapper	<i>Etelis oculatus</i>	Unknown
mutton snapper	<i>Lutjanus analis</i>	Unknown
blackfin snapper	<i>Lutjanus buccanella</i>	Unknown
red snapper	<i>Lutjanus campechanus</i>	Overfished, no overfishing
cubera snapper	<i>Lutjanus cyanopterus</i>	Unknown
gray snapper	<i>Lutjanus griseus</i>	Unknown
lane snapper	<i>Lutjanus synagris</i>	Unknown
silk snapper	<i>Lutjanus vivanus</i>	Unknown
yellowtail snapper	<i>Ocyurus chrysurus</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
vermilion snapper	<i>Rhomboplites aurorubens</i>	Not overfished, no overfishing
Wenchman	<i>Pristipomoides aquilonaris</i>	Unknown

\* Hogfish genetic clusters are identified as (1) Western Florida (not including hogfish west of the Florida panhandle), (2) Florida Keys/Eastern Florida, and (3) Georgia through North Carolina. The Western Florida and Florida Keys/Eastern Florida genetic populations converge south of Naples, Florida. Therefore, a portion of the Florida Keys/Eastern Florida population occurs within the Gulf of Mexico Council’s area of jurisdiction, but the majority of the population

occurs within the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction. These genetic populations have not been previously specified as distinct management stocks under South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Council FMPs. Recent findings indicate the Florida Keys/Eastern Florida is overfished and undergoing overfishing.

## **Protected Species**

There are 28 different species of marine mammals that can or are known to occur in the Gulf of Mexico. All 28 species are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and six are also listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (i.e., sperm, sei, fin, blue, humpback and North Atlantic right whales). Other species protected under the ESA occurring in the Gulf of Mexico include five sea turtle species (Kemp's Ridley, loggerhead, green, leatherback, and hawksbill); two fish species (Gulf of Mexico sturgeon and smalltooth sawfish), and two coral species (elkhorn coral and staghorn coral). Information on the distribution, biology, and abundance of these protected species in the Gulf of Mexico is included in Generic EFH Amendment (GMFMC 2004a) and the February 2005, October 2009, and September 2011 ESA biological opinions on the reef fish fishery (NMFS 2005; NMFS 2009; NMFS 2011). Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports and additional information are also available on the NMFS Office of Protected Species website: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/>.

The MMPA 2015 List of Fisheries (79 FR 14418) considers vertical line gear and longline gear as Category III gears. These gears are the dominant gear used in the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery - vertical line (90%) and longline (5.4%) gear. This classification indicates the annual mortality and serious injury of a marine mammal stock resulting from any fishery is less than or equal to 1% of the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortalities, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock while allowing that stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population. Dolphins are the only species documented as interacting with these fisheries. Bottlenose dolphins prey upon on the bait, catch, and/or released discards of fish from the reef fish fishery. They are also a common predator around reef fish vessels, feeding on the discards.

All five species of sea turtles are adversely affected by the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery. Incidental captures are relatively infrequent, but occur in all commercial and recreational hook-and-line components of the reef fishery. Loggerhead sea turtles are by far the most frequently incidentally caught sea turtles. Captured sea turtles can be released alive or can be found dead upon retrieval of the gear as a result of forced submergence. Sea turtles released alive may later succumb to injuries sustained at the time of capture or from exacerbated trauma from fishing hooks or lines that were ingested, entangling, or otherwise still attached when they were released. Sea turtle release gear and handling protocols are required in the commercial and for- hire reef fish fisheries to minimize post-release mortality.

Smalltooth sawfish also interact with the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery, but to a much lesser extent. Smalltooth sawfish primarily occur in the Gulf of Mexico off peninsular Florida. Incidental captures in the commercial and recreational hook-and-line components of the reef fish fishery are rare events, with only eight smalltooth sawfish estimated to be incidentally caught

every three years, and none are expected to result in mortality (NMFS 2011). Fishermen in this fishery are required to follow smalltooth sawfish safe handling guidelines. The long, toothed rostrum of the smalltooth sawfish causes this species to be particularly vulnerable to entanglement in fishing gear.

NMFS has conducted specific analyses (Section 7 consultations) to evaluate potential effects from the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery on species and critical habitats protected under the ESA. On September 30, 2011, the Protected Resources Division released a biological opinion (Opinion), which concluded that the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles (loggerhead, Kemp's ridley, green, hawksbill, and leatherback) or smalltooth sawfish (NMFS 2011a). The Opinion also concluded that other ESA-listed species are not likely to be adversely affected by the Reef Fish FMP. An incidental take statement was issued specifying the amount and extent of anticipated take, along with reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions deemed necessary and appropriate to minimize the impact of these takes. The Council addressed further measures to reduce take in the reef fish fishery's longline component in Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009).

Subsequent to the completion of the biological opinion, NMFS published final rules listing 20 new coral species (September 10, 2014), and designating critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population segment of loggerhead sea turtles (July 10, 2014). NMFS addressed these changes in a series of consultation memoranda. In a consultation memorandum dated October 7, 2014, NMFS assessed the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery's potential impact on the newly-listed coral species occurring in the Gulf of Mexico (3 species of *Orbicella* and *Mycetophyllia ferox*) and concluded the fishery is not likely to adversely affect any of the protected coral species. Similarly, in a consultation memorandum dated September 16, 2014, NMFS assessed the continued authorization of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico fisheries' potential impacts on loggerhead critical habitat and concluded the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is not likely to adversely affect the newly designated critical habitat.

### **3.3 Description of the Economic Environment**

A description of the greater amberjack stock is provided in Section 1.1. Additional details on the fishery for greater amberjack are provided in Amendment 30A to the Reef Fish FMP (GMFMC 2008) and Regulatory Framework Action to the Reef Fish FMP (Greater Amberjack Recreational Fishing Closure) (GMFMC 2011), and are incorporated herein by reference. The following section contains updated information on the economic environment of the greater amberjack fishery.

#### **3.3.1 Economic Description of the Commercial Sector**

The major source of data summarized in this description is the Federal Logbook System (FLS), supplemented by average prices calculated from the NMFS Accumulated Landings System (ALS) and price indices taken from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Inflation adjusted revenues and prices are reported in 2013 dollars. Landings are expressed in gutted weight (gw) to match

the method for collecting ex-vessel price information. The gutted to whole weight (ww) conversion rate is  $ww = gw \times 1.04$ .

### Landings, Value, and Effort

The number of vessels that landed greater amberjack each year decreased rapidly from 2009 through 2012 and increased modestly in 2013 (Table 3.3.1). The number of trips on which greater amberjack was landed, as well as landings of greater amberjack and landings of other species jointly caught with greater amberjack, exhibited similar trends during this time period. The number of non-greater amberjack trips taken by vessels that landed at least one pound of greater amberjack during the year, as well as landings on those trips, fluctuated from 2009 through 2013. On average (2009 through 2013), vessels that landed greater amberjack took 4.6 times as many non-greater amberjack trips as greater amberjack trips. Greater amberjack landings for those vessels accounted for only 4.7% of all species landings from all trips.

**Table 3.3.1.** Number of vessels, number of trips and landings (pounds [lbs] gutted weight [gw]) by year.

Year	Number of vessels that caught GOM greater amberjack (> 0 lbs)	Number of trips that caught GOM greater amberjack	GOM greater amberjack landings (lbs gw)	Other species' landings jointly caught with GOM greater amberjack (lbs gw)	Number of GOM trips that only caught other species	Other species' landings on GOM trips without greater amberjack (lbs gw)
2009	320	1,148	477,778	3,064,904	3,909	7,975,844
2010	222	634	472,090	1,617,077	2,379	5,484,925
2011	191	524	445,027	1,155,942	3,030	6,686,227
2012	142	314	270,223	692,299	2,458	5,698,505
2013	179	489	346,442	1,146,752	2,593	6,984,252
Average	211	622	402,312	1,535,395	2,874	6,565,951

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook.

Ex-vessel revenues by year for greater amberjack and non-greater amberjack species are presented in Table 3.3.2. On average (2009 through 2013), greater amberjack revenues accounted for about 1.9% of total revenues earned by vessels that landed at least one pound of greater amberjack. On trips in which greater amberjack was harvested (2009 through 2013), species other than greater amberjack accounted for the majority of revenues on average. Total dockside revenue for vessels that landed greater amberjack fluctuated from 2009 through 2013 but did not change that much overall, whereas average total dockside revenue per vessel increased steadily.

**Table 3.3.2.** Number of vessels and ex-vessel revenues by year (2013 dollars)\*.

Year	Number of vessels that caught GOM greater amberjack (> 0 lbs)	Dockside revenue from GOM greater amberjack only	Dockside revenue from 'other species' jointly caught with GOM greater amberjack only	Dockside revenue from 'other species' caught on GOM trips without greater amberjack	Total dockside revenue	Average total dockside revenue per vessel
2009	320	\$599,315	\$8,680,032	\$22,974,684	\$32,254,031	\$100,794
2010	222	\$545,065	\$5,121,735	\$17,469,806	\$23,136,606	\$104,219
2011	191	\$559,961	\$3,599,690	\$20,876,537	\$25,036,187	\$131,080
2012	142	\$337,302	\$2,141,370	\$18,128,951	\$20,607,623	\$145,124
2013	179	\$510,558	\$4,128,833	\$25,410,189	\$30,049,580	\$167,875
Average	211	\$510,440	\$4,734,332	\$20,972,033	\$26,216,806	\$129,818

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook for landings and NMFS Accumulated Landings System for prices.

\*Revenues converted to 2013 dollars using the 2013 annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all US urban consumers provided by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics (BLS).

Given that the only commercial management measure being considered in this framework action is a trip limit, it's useful to analyze the amount of recent effort and the number of vessels that would have been non-compliant had each proposed trip limit option been in place historically. This provides empirical estimates of the proportion of total effort and vessels likely to be affected by the commercial trip limits if the revised trip limit is implemented. Table 3.3.3 presents the average number of trips with landings in excess of each trip limit option and average number of vessels that took such trips (2009-2013)<sup>1</sup>. About 13% of greater amberjack trips on average had landings in excess of the 1,500-lb gw trip limit. Twenty-seven percent of those trips had greater amberjack landings in excess of the 500-lb gw trip limit option from 2009 through 2013. Fourteen percent of greater amberjack vessels reported landings in excess of the 1,500-lb gw trip limit option and 30% of greater amberjack vessels reported landings in excess of the 500-lb gw trip limit on average (2009-2013). Lower trip limits may reduce profits and the severity of such impacts will be based on the overall dependence a vessel has on greater amberjack and the vessel's ability to substitute other species revenue. On average (2009-2013), there were three or fewer vessels that both derived the majority of their revenues from greater amberjack and took a trip with landings in excess of each trip limit option. It seems likely that these vessels would be the most severely impacted by a reduction in trip limits, though it is not possible to quantify the magnitude of such impacts given the uncertainty of future revenues, costs and behavioral responses of the fishermen. If trip limits successfully extend the greater amberjack season, some vessels, especially those that do not experience large reductions in their trip-level landings, may

<sup>1</sup> The status quo 2,000-lb (ww) trip limit implemented in 2013 is excluded from this table since averaging across years with non-consistent trip limits could be misleading and since it does not provide additional information in terms of potential displaced effort. About 11% of GAJ vessels, however, did report trip-level landings in excess of the 2000-lb (ww) trip limit in 2013. These trips accounted for 8% of all GAJ trips taken in 2013. Anecdotal evidence suggests many fishermen misinterpreted the trip limit as being in gutted weight rather than whole weight. The data supports this as well, showing a large drop in non-compliant vessels and trips when gutted weight is substituted for whole weight (19 vessels to 8 vessels and 38 trips to 10 trips respectively). NMFS released a bulletin on July 29, 2014 that reminded commercial reef fish fishermen that the trip limit is in whole weight and provided the gutted weight conversion.

benefit from the opportunity to take additional trips. Other vessels may experience a decline in trip-level revenues to the point where it is no longer profitable to fish for greater amberjack.

**Table 3.3.3.** Number of trips with greater amberjack (GAJ) landings in excess of each trip limit option and number of vessels that took such trips (2009-2013 Average).

	Trip Limit (lbs, gw)			
	500	750	1,000	1,500
<b>Number of trips with GAJ landings in excess of each trip limit option (percent of total GAJ trips)</b>	171 (27%)	132 (21%)	112 (18%)	84 (13%)
<b>Number of vessels that took a trip with GAJ landings in excess of each trip limit option (percent of total GAJ vessels)</b>	64 (30%)	48 (23%)	40 (19%)	30 (14%)

Source: NMFS SEFSC Coastal Fisheries Logbook.

## Imports

Imports of seafood products compete in the domestic seafood market and have, in fact, dominated many segments of the seafood market. Imports aid in determining the price for domestic seafood products and tend to set the price in the market segments in which they dominate. Seafood imports have downstream effects on the local fish market. At the harvest level for reef fish in general and greater amberjack in particular, imports affect the returns to fishermen through the ex-vessel prices they receive for their landings. As substitutes to domestic production of reef fish, including greater amberjack, imports tend to cushion the adverse economic effects on consumers resulting from a reduction in domestic landings. The following describes the imports of fish products which directly compete with domestic harvest of reef fish, including greater amberjack.

Imports<sup>2</sup> of fresh snapper ranged from 21.5 million lbs product weight (pw) in 2009 to 23.2 million pounds pw in 2013 with minor fluctuations in between. Total revenue from fresh snapper imports increased steadily from \$53.6 million (2013 dollars<sup>3</sup>) in 2009 to a five-year high of \$67.9 million in 2013. Imports of fresh snappers primarily originated in Mexico, Central America, or South America, and entered the U.S. through the port of Miami. Imports of fresh snapper were highest on average (2009 through 2013) during the months March through May.

Imports of frozen snapper were substantially less than imports of fresh snapper from 2009 through 2013. The annual value of frozen snapper imports ranged from \$17.2 million (2013 dollars) to \$26.7 million during the time period, with a peak in 2011. Imports of frozen snapper primarily originated in South America (especially Brazil), Indonesia, and Mexico. The majority of frozen snapper imports entered the U.S. through the ports of Miami and New York. Imports

<sup>2</sup> NOAA Fisheries Service purchases fisheries trade data from the Foreign Trade Division of the U.S. Census Bureau. Data are available for download at <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/trade/index.html>.

<sup>3</sup> Converted to 2013 dollars using the 2013 annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all US urban consumers provided by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics (BLS).

of frozen snappers tended to be lowest during March, April and May when fresh snapper imports were the highest.

Imports of fresh grouper ranged from 8.3 million lbs pw worth \$23.7 million (2013 dollars) in 2009 to 10 million lbs pw worth \$36.2 million in 2013 with minor fluctuations in between. The bulk of fresh grouper imports originated in Mexico and entered the U.S. through Miami. From 2009 through 2013 fresh grouper imports were lowest on average during the month of March and higher the rest of the year, with a peak in July.

Imports of frozen grouper were minimal and stable from 2009 through 2013, ranging from 1 million lbs pw worth \$2.1 million (2013 dollars) to 2 million lbs pw worth \$3.5 million. Frozen grouper imports generally originated in Mexico and to a lesser extent, Asia and entered the U.S. through Miami and Tampa. There was an inverse relationship in monthly landings between frozen and fresh groupers, with average imports being the highest in March for frozen grouper and lower during other months.

## **Business Activity**

The commercial harvest and subsequent sales and consumption of fish generates business activity as fishermen expend funds to harvest the fish and consumers spend money on goods and services, such as greater amberjack purchased at a local fish market and served during restaurant visits. These expenditures spur additional business activity in the region(s) where the harvest and purchases are made, such as jobs in local fish markets, grocers, restaurants, and fishing supply establishments. In the absence of the availability of a given species for purchase, consumers would spend their money on substitute goods and services. As a result, the analysis presented below represents a distributional analysis only; that is, it only shows how economic effects may be distributed through regional markets and should not be interpreted to represent the impacts if these species are not available for harvest or purchase.

Estimates of the U.S. average annual business activity associated with the commercial harvest of greater amberjack, and all species harvested by the vessels that harvested these greater amberjack, were derived using the model developed for and applied in NMFS (2011) and are provided in Table 3.3.4. This business activity is characterized as full-time equivalent jobs, income impacts (wages, salaries, and self-employed income), and output (sales) impacts (gross business sales). Income impacts should not be added to output (sales) impacts because this would result in double counting. It should be noted that the results provided should be interpreted with caution and demonstrate the limitations of these types of assessments. These results are based on average relationships developed through the analysis of many fishing operations that harvest many different species. Separate models to address individual species are not available. For example, the results provided here apply to a general reef fish category rather than just greater amberjack, and a harvester job is “generated” for approximately every \$44,000 in ex-vessel revenue. These results contrast with the information provided in Section 3.3.1. which shows an average of 211 harvesters (vessels) with recorded landings of greater amberjack.

**Table 3.3.4.** Average annual business activity (2009 through 2013) associated with the commercial harvest of greater amberjack and the harvest of all species by vessels that landed greater amberjack. All monetary estimates are in 2013 dollars.

Species	Average Ex-vessel Value (\$ thousands)	Total Jobs	Harvester Jobs	Output (Sales) Impacts (\$ thousands)	Income Impacts (\$ thousands)
Greater amberjack	\$510	89	12	\$6,721	\$2,864
All species on all trips made by vessels that landed greater than one pound of greater amberjack in a year.	\$26,217	4,566	596	\$345,184	\$147,114

### 3.3.2 Economic Description of the Recreational Sector

The Gulf of Mexico recreational sector is comprised of the private and for-hire modes. The private mode includes anglers fishing from shore (all land-based structures) and private/rental boats. The for-hire mode is composed of charter boats and headboats (also called party boats). Charter boats generally carry fewer passengers and charge a fee on an entire vessel basis, whereas headboats carry more passengers and payment is per person. The type of service, from a vessel- or passenger-size perspective, affects the flexibility to search different fishing locations during the course of a trip and target different species since larger concentrations of fish are required to satisfy larger groups of anglers.

#### Landings

The recreational sector has been allocated 73% of the greater amberjack stock ACL each year since the implementation of Amendment 30A in August 2008 (GMFMC 2008). Recreational harvests of greater amberjack declined from 2009 through 2011 and increased from 2011 to a five-year high in 2013 (Table 3.3.5).

**Table 3.3.5.** Recreational landings (lbs whole weight (ww)) and percent distribution of greater amberjack and reef fish, 2009 - 2013.

	Greater Amberjack	Reef Fish	Percent of Reef Fish*
<b>2009</b>	1,480,306	12,866,823	11.5%
<b>2010</b>	1,225,222	8,472,155	14.5%
<b>2011</b>	949,999	9,938,318	9.6%
<b>2012</b>	1,238,719	13,099,518	9.5%
<b>2013</b>	1,616,629	20,379,130	7.9%
<b>Average</b>	1,302,175	12,951,189	10.1%

Source: SEFSC MRIP ACL datasets (Aug 2014).

\* Species managed under the Reef Fish FMP; see <http://www.gulfcouncil.org/>.

From 2009 through 2013, recreational landings of greater amberjack in west Florida were consistently higher than landings in any other state, accounting for over 75% of total Gulf of Mexico-wide landings on average (Table 3.3.6). Yearly landings fluctuated for all states.

**Table 3.3.6.** Recreational landings (lbs ww) and percent distribution of greater amberjack across all modes, by state, 2009 - 2013.

	AL	AL/FLW*	FLW	LA	LA/MS**	MS	TX
	<b>Landings (lbs ww)</b>						
<b>2009</b>	43,661	57,566	950,852	359,595	27,246	20,344	21,043
<b>2010</b>	85,833	33,860	1,002,601	78,238	2,485	0	22,205
<b>2011</b>	64,394	39,201	810,525	9,253	7,986	0	18,640
<b>2012</b>	58,005	66,054	924,292	151,875	10,390	0	28,103
<b>2013</b>	216,865	0	1,172,107	178,308	7,262	12,358	29,729
<b>Avg</b>	93,752	39,336	972,075	155,454	11,074	6,540	23,944
	<b>Percent Distributions</b>						
<b>2009</b>	2.9%	3.9%	64.2%	24.3%	1.8%	1.4%	1.4%
<b>2010</b>	7.0%	2.8%	81.8%	6.4%	0.2%	0.0%	1.8%
<b>2011</b>	6.8%	4.1%	85.3%	1.0%	0.8%	0.0%	2.0%
<b>2012</b>	4.7%	5.3%	74.6%	12.3%	0.8%	0.0%	2.3%
<b>2013</b>	13.4%	0.0%	72.5%	11.0%	0.4%	0.8%	1.8%
<b>Avg</b>	7.0%	3.2%	75.7%	11.0%	0.8%	0.4%	1.9%

Source: SEFSC MRIP ACL datasets (Aug 2014).

\* Headboat landings are estimated jointly for west Florida and Alabama through 2012.

\*\* Headboat landings data from Louisiana and Mississippi are combined for confidentiality purposes.

The majority of recreational greater amberjack landings (93.9%) from 2009 through 2013 were reported by the private and charter vessel modes (Table 3.3.7). During this time period, average landings were about 15% higher for private vessels than charter vessels. Charter landings were, however, almost double those of the private mode in 2011. Headboat landings were consistently much lower than both charter and private modes, accounting for only 6.1% on average (2009 through 2013). There were no landings reported from shore for greater amberjack.

**Table 3.3.7.** Recreational landings (lbs ww) and percent distribution of greater amberjack across all states, by mode, 2009 - 2013.

	Landings (lbs ww)				Percent Distribution			
	Charter boat	Headboat	Private	Shore	Charter boat	Headboat	Private	Shore
<b>2009</b>	653,160	103,191	723,955	0	44.1%	7.0%	48.9%	0.0%
<b>2010</b>	460,740	53,203	711,279	0	37.6%	4.3%	58.1%	0.0%
<b>2011</b>	583,813	62,835	303,351	0	61.5%	6.6%	31.9%	0.0%
<b>2012</b>	546,086	99,680	592,952	0	44.1%	8.0%	47.9%	0.0%
<b>2013</b>	604,626	73,246	938,757	0	37.4%	4.5%	58.1%	0.0%
<b>Avg</b>	569,685	78,431	654,059	0	44.9%	6.1%	49.0%	0.0%

Source: SEFSC MRIP ACL datasets (Aug 2014).

As seen in Table 3.3.8, over the period 2009-2013, greater amberjack recreational landings generally started low at the beginning of each year, peaked in May through August, then tapered back down till the end of the year. Prior to the implementation of the June through July seasonal closure beginning in 2011, the majority of landings occurred during May through August. Following the implementation of the seasonal closure in 2011, the distribution of monthly landings changed somewhat, with a higher average percentage of annual landings occurring in March, April, September, and October.

**Table 3.3.8.** Recreational landings (lbs ww) and percent distribution of greater amberjack, by month, 2009-2013.

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun*	Jul*	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Landings (lbs ww)</b>												
<b>2009</b>	95,126	85,920	40,854	39,536	339,464	328,513	230,162	230,162	44,466	45,948	77	79
<b>2010</b>	36,884	33,314	139,968	135,452	268,592	259,928	44,175	44,175	96,715	99,938	32,123	33,194
<b>2011</b>	32,421	29,283	52,927	51,220	196,240	-	-	247,109	144,619	149,440	22,987	23,753
<b>2012</b>	63,811	59,694	197,159	190,799	236,256	-	-	165,023	97,960	101,225	62,356	64,435
<b>2013</b>	15,284	13,805	199,921	193,472	293,793	-	-	404,001	225,802	233,328	18,306	18,916
<b>Avg</b>	48,705	44,403	126,166	122,096	266,869	NA**	NA**	218,094	121,912	125,976	27,170	28,075
<b>Percent Distribution</b>												
<b>2009</b>	6.4%	5.8%	2.8%	2.7%	22.9%	22.2%	15.5%	15.5%	3.0%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>2010</b>	3.0%	2.7%	11.4%	11.1%	21.9%	21.2%	3.6%	3.6%	7.9%	8.2%	2.6%	2.7%
<b>2011</b>	3.4%	3.1%	5.6%	5.4%	20.7%	-	-	26.0%	15.2%	15.7%	2.4%	2.5%
<b>2012</b>	5.2%	4.8%	15.9%	15.4%	19.1%	-	-	13.3%	7.9%	8.2%	5.0%	5.2%
<b>2013</b>	0.9%	0.9%	12.4%	12.0%	18.2%	-	-	25.0%	14.0%	14.4%	1.1%	1.2%
<b>Avg</b>	3.8%	3.5%	9.6%	9.3%	20.6%	NA**	NA**	16.7%	9.6%	9.9%	2.2%	2.3%

Source: SEFSC MRIP ACL datasets (Aug 2014).

Note: Landings in each wave are assumed uniformly distributed across open months.

\*A June 1<sup>st</sup> through July 31 closure was implemented in 2011.

\*\* Averages for June and July are not applicable due to the closures. The average percent distribution row will not sum to 100% as a result.

### Angler Effort

Recreational effort derived from the MRIP database can be characterized in terms of the number of trips as follows:

- Target effort - The number of individual angler trips, regardless of duration, where the intercepted angler indicated that the species or a species in the species group was targeted as either the first or the second primary target for the trip. The species did not have to be caught.
- Catch effort - The number of individual angler trips, regardless of duration and target intent, where the individual species or a species in the species group was caught. The fish did not have to be kept.
- Total recreational trips - The total estimated number of recreational trips in the Gulf of Mexico, regardless of target intent or catch success.

A target trip may be considered an angler's revealed preference for a certain species, and thus may carry more relevant information when assessing the economic effects of regulations on the subject species than the other two measures of recreational effort. Given the subject nature of this amendment, the following discussion focuses on target trips for greater amberjack.

On average, greater amberjack target trips<sup>4</sup> accounted for 3.3% of target reef fish trips and target reef fish trips accounted for 5.6% of total angler trips for the years 2009 through 2013 in the Gulf of Mexico (Table 3.3.9). This excludes headboat trips and trips from Texas, for which target data is unavailable. Both greater amberjack and reef fish target trips were at five-year highs in 2013 following a period of reduced effort starting in 2010. The reduction in effort in 2010 could be due in part to the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill and associated closures (see Section 3.2.1). There is a subtle downward trend from 2009 through 2013 in the percent of reef fish target trips made up of greater amberjack target trips.

**Table 3.3.9.** Target trips for greater amberjack and reef fish, 2009 -2013.

	Greater Amberjack Target Trips*		Reef Fish Target Trips*	
	Trips	Percent <sup>1</sup>	Trips	Percent <sup>2</sup>
<b>2009</b>	48,972	3.6%	1,351,092	6.0%
<b>2010</b>	31,195	3.4%	906,060	4.4%
<b>2011</b>	36,208	3.8%	958,092	4.3%
<b>2012</b>	35,222	3.2%	1,112,276	4.9%
<b>2013</b>	50,719	2.5%	2,053,975	8.2%
<b>Average</b>	40,463	3.3%	1,276,299	5.6%

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

\* Target data for headboats and the state of Texas are unavailable and are not included.

<sup>1</sup>Percent of reef fish target trips. <sup>2</sup>Percent of total angler trips.

On average, the highest number of estimated greater amberjack target trips for the Gulf of Mexico occurred in Florida (81.3%), followed by Alabama (10.7%) and Louisiana (7.7%) (Table 3.3.10). Mississippi recorded greater amberjack target effort in 2009, but not in subsequent years. The number of target trips in Florida decreased substantially in 2010, increased gradually from 2010 through 2012 and then rose quickly in 2013 to a five-year high. Target effort in Alabama fluctuated with a peak in 2011. The number of target trips in Louisiana dropped drastically in 2010 and 2011, then increased heavily in 2012 and 2013, but did not return to 2009 levels. As discussed earlier, it may be likely that the severe declines in target effort in Louisiana during 2010 and 2011 were due in part to the 2010 Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill. The potential impact of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill is not, however, apparent for Alabama, which experienced increases in the number of estimated target trips in 2010 and 2011.

<sup>4</sup> Monroe County, FL is excluded from all target effort metrics to be consistent with greater amberjack landings post-stratification. This potentially underestimates total reef fish target effort in the Gulf, since not all species in the reef fish complex require post-stratification.

**Table 3.3.10.** Greater amberjack target trips and percent distribution across all modes by state, 2009 - 2013.

	Greater Amberjack Target Trips*				Percent Distribution			
	AL	FLW	LA	MS	AL	FLW	LA	MS
<b>2009</b>	1,838	38,053	8,437	644	3.8%	77.7%	17.2%	1.3%
<b>2010</b>	3,758	26,466	970	-	12.0%	84.8%	3.1%	0.0%
<b>2011</b>	7,874	28,148	186	-	21.7%	77.7%	0.5%	0.0%
<b>2012</b>	2,341	30,229	2,652	-	6.6%	85.8%	7.5%	0.0%
<b>2013</b>	4,748	40,820	5,152	-	9.4%	80.5%	10.2%	0.0%
<b>Average</b>	4,112	32,743	3,479	129	10.7%	81.3%	7.7%	0.3%

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

\* Target data for headboats and the state of Texas are unavailable and are not included.

On average, approximately 75% of the estimated target trips for greater amberjack were recorded by anglers in private boats and the rest, by charter vessels (Table 3.3.11). No greater amberjack target trips were recorded by the shore-mode anglers. The number of private angler target trips decreased annually to a five-year low in 2011, then increased annually through 2013, almost returning to 2009 levels. The estimated number of target trips for charter anglers fluctuated with a peak in 2011.

**Table 3.3.11.** Greater amberjack target trips and percent distribution across all states, 2009 - 2013.

	Greater Amberjack Target Trips*			Percent Distribution		
	Shore	Charter	Private	Shore	Charter	Private
<b>2009</b>	0	8,294	40,679	0.0%	16.9%	83.1%
<b>2010</b>	0	5,534	25,661	0.0%	17.7%	82.3%
<b>2011</b>	0	15,165	21,043	0.0%	41.9%	58.1%
<b>2012</b>	0	9,427	25,795	0.0%	26.8%	73.2%
<b>2013</b>	0	11,168	39,551	0.0%	22.0%	78.0%
<b>Average</b>	0	9,918	30,546	0.0%	25.1%	74.9%

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

\* Target data for headboats and the state of Texas are unavailable and are not included.

On average, target effort for greater amberjack was concentrated most heavily in the months March through May and August through September (Table 3.3.12). Target effort was low or zero in June and July following the implementation of the seasonal closure in 2011. The monthly distribution of target effort generally coincided with the monthly distribution of landings.

**Table 3.3.12.** Greater amberjack target trips and percent distribution across all modes and states, by month, 2009 - 2013.

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Greater Amberjack Target Trips*</b>												
2009	772	7,062	809	7,275	4,584	19,461	4,819	2,165	1445	0	580	0
2010	0	1810	5,437	150	9,974	342	2,007	888	3,214	3,653	3,721	0
2011	0	0	1,737	2,785	5,501	0	0	14,653	7447	1409	0	2,675
2012	1,851	262	5,107	9,337	3,032	441	0	8,205	1,862	1,103	1309	2712
2013	50	3,363	13,497	0	11,986	0	1,348	9,263	6,683	1,478	1,241	1,811
Avg	535	2,499	5,317	3,909	7,015	4,049	1,635	7,035	4,130	1,529	1,370	1,440
<b>Percent Distribution</b>												
2009	1.6%	14.4%	1.7%	14.9%	9.4%	39.7%	9.8%	4.4%	3.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%
2010	0.0%	5.8%	17.4%	0.5%	32.0%	1.1%	6.4%	2.8%	10.3%	11.7%	11.9%	0.0%
2011	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	7.7%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	40.5%	20.6%	3.9%	0.0%	7.4%
2012	5.3%	0.7%	14.5%	26.5%	8.6%	1.3%	0.0%	23.3%	5.3%	3.1%	3.7%	7.7%
2013	0.1%	6.6%	26.6%	0.0%	23.6%	0.0%	2.7%	18.3%	13.2%	2.9%	2.4%	3.6%
Avg	1.4%	5.5%	13.0%	9.9%	17.8%	8.4%	3.8%	17.9%	10.5%	4.3%	3.9%	3.7%

Source: MRIP database, NMFS, SERO.

\* Target data for headboats and the state of Texas are unavailable and are not included.

Note: There are some target trips shown during the June through July closure implemented in 2011. This is likely due to a small number of intercepted angler trips with high sample weights that either targeted greater amberjack for catch and release purposes or mistakenly reported greater amberjack as one of their primary targets.

Similar analysis of recreational effort is not possible for the headboat mode because headboat data are not collected at the angler level. Estimates of effort by the headboat mode are provided in terms of angler days, or the number of standardized 12-hour fishing days that account for the different half-, three-quarter-, and full-day fishing trips by headboats. The stationary “fishing for demersal species” nature of headboat fishing, as opposed to trolling, suggests that most, if not all, headboat trips and, hence, angler days, are demersal or reef fish trips by intent. In a study of the for-hire fishing industry in the Gulf of Mexico, Sutton et al. (1999) found that the mean percentage of time spent targeting greater amberjack for the entire year for all party boat (headboat) operators in the Gulf of Mexico was 5.10%<sup>5</sup>.

The distribution of headboat effort (angler days) by geographic area is presented in Table 3.3.13. For purposes of data collection, the headboat data collection program divides the Gulf of Mexico into several areas. In Table 3.3.2.9, FLW refers to areas in Florida from the Dry Tortugas through the Florida Middle Grounds, FL-AL covers northwest Florida and Alabama, MS refers to the entire coastline of Mississippi, LA refers to the entire coastline of Louisiana, and TX includes areas in Texas from Sabine Pass-Freeport south to Port Isabel. On average, the area from the Dry Tortugas through the Florida Middle Grounds accounted for 40.2% of total

<sup>5</sup> No newer studies have been identified which discuss greater amberjack targeting behavior of headboats in the Gulf.

headboat angler days in the Gulf of Mexico, followed by northwest Florida through Alabama (33.2%), Texas (25.2%), Louisiana (<1%) and Mississippi (<1%). Western Florida, Northwest Florida through Alabama, and Texas all experienced declines in angler days in 2010, but then saw steady increases to five-year highs in 2013. In Louisiana, the number of headboat angler days dropped precipitously in 2010, increased in 2011, but then decreased again in 2012 and 2013. In Mississippi, the number of angler days increased substantially in 2011 and then remained mostly stable through 2013.

**Table 3.3.13.** Headboat angler days and percent distribution, by state, 2009 - 2013.

	Angler Days					Percent Distribution				
	FLW	FL-AL*	LA	TX	MS**	FLW	FL-AL	LA	TX	MS
<b>2009</b>	76,815	65,623	3268	50,737	-	39.1%	33.4%	1.7%	25.8%	-
<b>2010</b>	70,424	40,594	217	47,154	498	44.3%	25.5%	0.1%	29.7%	0.3%
<b>2011</b>	79,722	77,303	1,886	47,284	1,771	38.3%	37.2%	0.9%	22.7%	0.9%
<b>2012</b>	84,205	77,770	1,839	51,776	1,841	38.7%	35.8%	0.8%	23.8%	0.8%
<b>2013</b>	94,752	80,048	1,579	55,749	1,827	40.5%	34.2%	0.7%	23.8%	0.8%
<b>Average</b>	81,184	68,268	1,758	50,540	1,484	40.2%	33.2%	0.8%	25.2%	0.7%

Source: NMFS Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS).

\*For 2013, SRHS data was reported separately for NW Florida and Alabama, but has been combined here for consistency with previous years.

\*\* No headboats in Mississippi were included in the SRHS in 2009.

Headboat effort in terms of angler days for the entire Gulf of Mexico was concentrated most heavily during the summer months of June through August on average (2009 through 2013) (Table 3.3.14). The monthly trend in angler days was very similar across years, building gradually from January through May, rising sharply to a peak in June and July, dropping rapidly through September, increasing slightly in October, then tapering through December.

**Table 3.3.14.** Headboat angler days and percent distribution, by month, 2009 - 2013.

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
<b>Headboat Angler Days</b>												
<b>2009</b>	7,611	8,525	14,444	15,513	17,089	36,749	38,955	25,060	9,201	9,745	6,889	6,662
<b>2010</b>	4,962	5,709	13,186	18,077	14,029	26,495	22,616	14,378	8,759	16,328	9,488	4,860
<b>2011</b>	5,242	9,174	16,378	17,626	16,148	39,775	42,089	22,513	10,766	12,609	8,514	7,132
<b>2012</b>	7,924	9,364	18,326	16,404	17,708	39,662	46,468	21,440	12,629	13,281	7,135	7,090
<b>2013</b>	8,630	9,576	16,759	16,426	17,150	47,791	38,304	27,610	12,697	21,256	8,654	9,102
<b>Avg</b>	6,874	8,470	15,819	16,809	16,425	38,094	37,686	22,200	10,810	14,644	8,136	6,969
<b>Percent Distribution</b>												
<b>2009</b>	3.9%	4.3%	7.4%	7.9%	8.7%	18.7%	19.8%	12.8%	4.7%	5.0%	3.5%	3.4%
<b>2010</b>	3.1%	3.6%	8.3%	11.4%	8.8%	16.7%	14.2%	9.0%	5.5%	10.3%	6.0%	3.1%
<b>2011</b>	2.5%	4.4%	7.9%	8.5%	7.8%	19.1%	20.2%	10.8%	5.2%	6.1%	4.1%	3.4%
<b>2012</b>	3.6%	4.3%	8.4%	7.5%	8.1%	18.2%	21.4%	9.9%	5.8%	6.1%	3.3%	3.3%
<b>2013</b>	3.7%	4.1%	7.2%	7.0%	7.3%	20.4%	16.4%	11.8%	5.4%	9.1%	3.7%	3.9%
<b>Avg</b>	3.4%	4.1%	7.8%	8.5%	8.2%	18.6%	18.4%	10.9%	5.3%	7.3%	4.1%	3.4%

Source: NMFS Southeast Region Headboat Survey (SRHS).

## Permits

For-hire vessels are required to have a Charter/Headboat for Reef Fish permit (for-hire permit) to fish for or possess reef fish species in the Gulf of Mexico EEZ (a similar, but separate, permit is required for coastal migratory pelagic species). This sector is currently under a permit limitation program since June, 2006. On September 22, 2014, there were 1,195 valid (non-expired) or renewable<sup>6</sup> Gulf of Mexico for-hire permits.

For 2009 through 2013, an average of 1,364 for-hire vessels were permitted to harvest reef fish in the Gulf of Mexico (Table 3.3.2.11). Florida, with an average of 819 permitted vessels, was the foremost homeport state of for-hire vessels, followed by Texas (222), Alabama (147), Louisiana (111), and Mississippi (48). An average of 17 vessels had homeports in states outside the Gulf of Mexico.

The total number of Gulf of Mexico reef fish for-hire permits steadily declined from 2009 through 2013 (Table 3.3.15). Florida was the driving force behind this trend, though there were similar trends in Mississippi, Texas, and all non-Gulf of Mexico states combined. Alabama and Louisiana saw modest increases in the number of for-hire permitted vessels during the time period.

<sup>6</sup> A renewable permit is an expired permit that may not be actively fished, but is renewable for up to one year after expiration.

**Table 3.3.15.** Number of vessels with a Gulf of Mexico for-hire permit by homeport state, 2009-2013.

	FL	AL	MS	LA	TX	OTHERS	TOTAL
<b>2009</b>	871	143	50	103	232	18	1,417
<b>2010</b>	840	142	50	103	229	21	1,385
<b>2011</b>	810	143	48	116	219	17	1,353
<b>2012</b>	792	151	46	116	214	17	1,336
<b>2013</b>	783	155	45	115	215	14	1,327
<b>Average</b>	819	147	48	111	222	17	1364

Source: Southeast Permits Database, NOAA Fisheries, SERO.

Based on permits data alone, it is not possible to distinguish headboats from charter boats, but the 2013 headboat survey program included 70 headboats in the Gulf of Mexico. The majority of headboats were located in Florida (37), followed by Texas (16), Alabama (9), Mississippi (5), and Louisiana (3) (K. Brennen, NMFS SEFSC, pers. comm.)<sup>7</sup>.

There are no specific federal permitting requirements for recreational anglers to fish for or harvest reef fish, including greater amberjack. Instead, anglers are required to possess either a state recreational fishing permit that authorizes saltwater fishing in general, or be registered in the federal National Saltwater Angler Registry system, subject to appropriate exemptions. As a result, it is not possible to identify with available data how many individual anglers would be expected to be affected by this proposed amendment.

### Economic Value

Participation, effort, and harvest are indicators of the value of saltwater recreational fishing. However, a more specific indicator of value is the satisfaction that anglers experience over and above their costs of fishing. The monetary value of this satisfaction is referred to as consumer surplus (CS). The value or benefit derived from the recreational experience is dependent on several quality determinants, which include fish size, catch success rate, and the number of fish kept. These variables help determine the value of a fishing trip and influence total demand for recreational fishing trips. Haab et al. (2012) estimated the CS (willingness to pay (WTP) per fish) for snapper in the Southeastern U.S. using four separate econometric modeling techniques. The finite mixture model, which takes into account variation in the preferences of fishermen, had the best prediction rates of the four models and as such was selected for this analysis<sup>8</sup>. The WTP

<sup>7</sup> Sixty-seven vessels were registered in the SHRS as of April 8, 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Haab et al. (2012) did not explicitly account for endogenous stratification and avidity bias in the MRFSS data which could potentially inflate the estimates. The WTP estimates from the four models used in their study ranged from \$9-\$25 (2000 dollars) and the one that was selected for use here was at the bottom of the range, so the bias may not be that big of an issue. In addition, given its popularity as a sport fish, greater amberjack may be more valuable to anglers than many of the other snapper species included in the model.

per snapper estimated by this model is \$12.18 (2013 dollars)<sup>9</sup>. Although this estimate is not specific to greater amberjack, their study did include the amberjack genus as part of the snapper group. This value may seem low and may be strongly influenced by the pooling effect inherent to the model in which it was estimated. For comparison purposes, the estimated value of the consumer surplus for catching and keeping a second grouper on an angler trip is approximately \$102 (values updated to 2013 dollars), and decreases thereafter (approximately \$68 for a third grouper, \$50 for a fourth grouper, and \$39 for a fifth grouper) (Carter and Liese 2012). Values by specific grouper species are not available.

The foregoing estimates of economic value should not be confused with economic impacts associated with recreational fishing expenditures. Although expenditures for a specific good or service may represent a proxy or lower bound of value (a person would not logically pay more for something than it was worth to them), they do not represent the net value (benefits minus cost), nor the change in value associated with a change in the fishing experience.

While anglers receive economic value as measured by the CS associated with fishing, for-hire businesses receive value from the services they provide. Producer surplus (PS) is the measure of the economic value these operations receive. The PS is the difference between the revenue a business receives for a good or service, such as a charter or headboat trip, and the cost the business incurs to provide that good or service. Estimates of the PS associated with for-hire trips are not available. However, proxy values in the form of net operating revenues (NOR)<sup>10</sup> were generated for the charter and headboat operations. The estimated NOR values are \$158.06 (2013 dollars) per charter angler trip and \$51.96 (2013 dollars) per headboat angler trip (D. Carter and C. Liese, NMFS SEFSC, pers. comm.)<sup>11</sup>.

## **Business Activity**

The desire for recreational fishing generates economic activity as consumers spend their income on various goods and services needed for recreational fishing. This spurs economic activity in the region where recreational fishing occurs. It should be clearly noted that, in the absence of the opportunity to fish, the income would presumably be spent on other goods and services and these expenditures would similarly generate economic activity in the region where the expenditure occurs. As such, the analysis below represents a distributional analysis only.

Estimates of the business activity (economic impacts) associated with recreational angling for greater amberjack were derived using average impact coefficients for recreational angling for all species, as derived from an add-on survey to the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistical Survey (MRFSS) to collect economic expenditure information, as described and utilized in NMFS

---

<sup>9</sup> Converted to 2013 dollars using the 2013 annual Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all US urban consumers provided by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics (BLS).

<sup>10</sup> Net operating revenues are trip revenues minus trip-based variable costs and do not include fixed costs. These represent the total returns used to pay all labor wages, returns to capital, and owner profits.

<sup>11</sup> Estimates were converted to 2013 dollars using the 2013 June CPI for all US urban consumers provided by the BLS.

(2011). Estimates of the average expenditures by recreational anglers are also provided in NMFS (2011) and are incorporated herein by reference.

Recreational fishing generates business activity (economic impacts). Business activity for the recreational sector is characterized in the form of full-time equivalent jobs, output (sales) impacts (gross business sales), and value-added impacts (difference between the value of goods and the cost of materials or supplies). Estimates of the average greater amberjack target effort (2009-2013) and associated business activity (2013 dollars) are provided in Table 3.3.16. The average impact coefficients, or multipliers, used in the model are invariant to the “type” of effort and can therefore be directly used to measure the impact of other effort measures such as greater amberjack catch trips. To calculate the multipliers from Table 3.3.2.12, simply divide the desired impact measure (output impact, value-added impact, or jobs) associated with a given state and mode by the number of target trips for that state and mode.

The estimates provided in Table 3.3.2.12 only apply at the state level. These numbers should not be added across the region. Addition of the state-level estimates to produce a regional (or national) total could either under- or over-estimate the actual amount of total business activity because of the complex relationship between different jurisdictions and the expenditure/impact multipliers. Neither regional nor national estimates are available at this time.

Florida clearly received the greatest level of economic impact from greater amberjack in comparison to the other Gulf of Mexico states, which is not surprising given the majority of greater amberjack target trips are estimated to be taken by Florida anglers (Table 3.3.2.12). Although not shown in Table 3.3.16, Florida also had the highest multipliers for all impact measures associated with the charter mode. Louisiana had the highest multipliers for output impact and value-added impact for the private angler mode and was tied with Alabama for the highest jobs impact multiplier for the private angler mode.

Estimates of the business activity associated with headboat effort are not available. Headboat vessels are not covered in the MRFSS/MRIP, so, in addition to the absence of estimates of target effort, estimation of the appropriate business activity coefficients for headboat effort has not been conducted.

**Table 3.3.16.** Summary of greater amberjack target trips (2009-2013 average) and associated business activity (2013 dollars). Output and value added impacts are not additive.

	Alabama	West Florida	Louisiana	Mississippi	Texas
<b>Shore Mode</b>					
Target Trips	0	0	0	0	*
Output Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	*
Value Added Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	*
Jobs	0	0	0	0	*
<b>Private/Rental Mode</b>					
Target Trips	3,098	24,401	2,918	129	*
Output Impact	\$167,403	\$1,319,539	\$220,547	\$4,533	*
Value Added Impact	\$90,593	\$747,195	\$105,982	\$2,306	*
Jobs	2	11	2	0	*
<b>Charter Mode</b>					
Target Trips	1,014	8,342	561	0	*
Output Impact	\$648,122	\$6,117,419	\$271,425	\$0	*
Value Added Impact	\$443,540	\$4,089,823	\$186,638	\$0	*
Jobs	6	54	2	0	*
<b>All Modes</b>					
Target Trips	4,112	32,743	3,479	129	*
Output Impact	\$815,525	\$7,436,958	\$491,972	\$4,533	*
Value Added Impact	\$534,133	\$4,837,018	\$292,619	\$2,306	*
Jobs	8	65	4	0	*

\*Because target information is unavailable, associated business activity cannot be calculated.

Source: effort data from MRIP, economic impact results calculated by NMFS SERO using the model developed for NMFS (2011).

### 3.4 Description of the Social Environment

A description of the social environment including analysis of communities engaged in reef fish fishing, was provided in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012) and is incorporated here by reference. This section provides a summary of that information and is updated where possible.

Greater amberjack is fished throughout the Gulf of Mexico although landings are greatest in Florida. The majority of greater amberjack is landed by the recreational sector (72.4% from 2002 – 2013 with a range of 59.6% to 80.1%) and 27.6% is landed by the commercial sector (range of 19.9% to 40.4% from 2002 - 2013, Table 1.1.1). For the purpose of setting quotas, the Council selected an interim allocation at 73% recreational: 27% commercial in Amendment 30A (GMFMC 2008). The low commercial value and one fish recreational bag limit likely restricts

greater amberjack from being a directed fishery. Rather than directed fishing trips, greater amberjack is an important component to a multi-species fishery for both commercial and recreational fishermen. Because of this multi-species fishing practice, it is difficult to discuss greater amberjack fishing separate from its broader context within commercial and recreational fishing for reef fish.


### 3.4.1 Fishing Communities

#### Recreational Fishing Communities

The available information concerning targeted trips within the recreational sector (private and for-hire vessels) shows that only a small proportion of recreational trips target greater amberjack. Excluding headboats and Texas, for which target data are not available, on average, 3.3% of all reef fish trips target greater amberjack, and on average, 5.6% of all private angler trips target reef fish, generally (Table 3.3.9). The low proportion of trips directed at catching greater amberjack is due in part to the one fish bag limit and 30 inch fork length minimum size limit. Because of their large size, greater amberjack is often a trip's trophy catch, making it an important part to a multi-species fishing trip. Greater amberjack is also an important component in recreational tournaments.

By state, the majority of greater amberjack caught by recreational anglers is landed in Florida, followed by Louisiana, Alabama, Texas, and Mississippi (Table 3.3.6). By mode, anglers fishing from private vessels represent on average 49% of the recreational landings, followed closely by charter boats (44.9%); headboats represent on average 6.1% of the recreational landings (Table 3.3.7). Landings for the recreational sector are not available by species at the community level; therefore, it is difficult to identify communities as dependent on recreational fishing for greater amberjack.

Because limited data are available concerning how recreational fishing communities are engaged and reliant on specific species, a set of indices were created using secondary data from permit and infrastructure information for the southeast recreational fishing sector at the community level (Jepson and Colburn 2013; Jacob et al. 2013). Using a principal component and single solution factor analysis, each community receives a factor score for each index to compare to other communities. With a selected group of communities that may have greater amberjack fishing activity, factor scores of both engagement and reliance were plotted onto bar graphs. Factor scores are denoted by colored bars and are standardized, therefore the mean is zero. Two thresholds of one and  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation above the mean are plotted onto the graphs to help determine a threshold for significance. Figure 3.4.1 identifies the recreational communities that are engaged and reliant upon fishing in general. Using thresholds of fishing dependence of  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation and one standard deviation, Figure 3.4.1 suggests that several communities are substantially engaged in recreational fishing. Because the analysis used discrete geo-political boundaries, Panama City and Panama City Beach had separate values for the associated variables. Calculated independently, each still ranked high enough to appear in the top 16 list suggesting a greater importance for recreational fishing in that area.



**Figure 3.4.1.** Top 16 recreational fishing communities' engagement and reliance. Source: SERO Social indicators database (2012).


### Commercial Fishing Communities

Most commercially landed greater amberjack is caught using vertical line alongside other target species, as opposed to being the primary target species. This is partly due to its relatively low economic value (approximately \$1/pound) and large minimum size limit (36 inch fork length). A small percentage of commercial vessels direct trips toward greater amberjack and may land thousands of pounds in a single trip. Other commercial vessels may direct effort toward greater amberjack during part of a multi-day trip.

The communities in which the majority of commercial greater amberjack landings are made has remained relatively unchanged since the implementation of Reef Fish Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012), with the exception of a decline in landings in Texas. Average landings from 2001-2010 showed landings concentrated in fewer communities in the Houston-Galveston area of Texas, Louisiana, and the Florida Panhandle, and numerous separate communities concentrated together, each with smaller amounts of landings along the west central coast of Florida. This suggests a different social organization of commercial fishing infrastructure between Florida and Texas (GMFMC 2008).

Figure 3.4.2 shows the communities with the most landings of greater amberjack in 2012 in the Gulf of Mexico. These data are reported by dealers, the address for which may not correspond to the actual landing site or vessel homeport. Although place is one way of defining a community,

a community is not defined by discrete geo-political boundaries alone. Social relationships, information exchanges, and economic interactions reflect shared interests that overlap place-based boundaries.




**Figure 3.4.2.** Proportion of greater amberjack commercial landings (value and pounds) for 15 Gulf of Mexico communities out of total pounds and landings of greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico (2012). Source: Accumulated landings system (ALS) dealer reports.

### Importance of Greater Amberjack to Communities

Figure 3.4.1 identifies the top Gulf of Mexico communities engaged and reliant on recreational fishing generally (i.e., not specific to greater amberjack). Figure 3.4.2 identifies the Gulf of Mexico communities with the greatest amount of commercial greater amberjack landings. While these communities had the most greater amberjack landed by pounds, this does not necessarily reflect the importance of greater amberjack in relation to other landed species in those communities. No data are available for the proportion of recreational landings of greater amberjack by community, but these data are available for the commercial sector. Commercial landings include many species that may not be caught by the recreational sector such as shrimp and tilefish, while recreational landings would include other species such as red drum and spotted sea trout. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that the proportion of commercial greater amberjack landings among other species in a community would be similar to its proportion among recreational landings within the same community. These data should also be considered in terms of the difference between the commercial and recreational sectors' interim allocation of the quota.

Comparing the communities of recreational importance and those with greater amounts of greater amberjack commercial landings, Destin and Panama City, Florida rank high for both. Collectively, these communities represented approximately 28% of the commercial greater amberjack landings in the Gulf of Mexico in 2009 (GMFMC 2008). But within each community, greater amberjack represents a very small proportion of total commercial landings (Figure 3.4.3).



**Figure 3.4.3.** Proportion (local quotient, lq) of commercial landings and value for top 15 species in 2012 out of total landings and value for all commercial species landed in Destin, FL. Source: ALS dealer reports 2012.

In 2009, Destin ranked fifth for commercial greater amberjack landings with 12% of the total value and 10% of the total pounds Gulf of Mexico-wide. Yet among all commercially landed species in Destin that year, greater amberjack represented less than 5% of all commercial landings. King and cero mackerels (37%), vermilion snapper (22%), and red snapper (9%) represented the top three commercial species by weight landed in Destin in 2009. In 2012, Destin ranked first Gulf of Mexico-wide for commercial greater amberjack landings, yet greater amberjack represented approximately 1% of the total weight and value among all commercial landings. The top three species landed in Destin remained unchanged since 2009, although their proportion by weight and value compared to all other landed species has increased (Figure 3.4.3).

Individually, Panama City and Panama City Beach each ranked among the top 10 recreational fishing communities based on the fishing involvement analysis provided above suggesting a higher level of involvement across geo-political boundaries. Panama City ranked third in 2009 for highest landings Gulf of Mexico-wide, and fifth in 2012. Following a similar pattern for

greater amberjack, it makes up a very small proportion of total commercial landings in the community; less than 5% in 2009 (GMFMC 2012), and 1% in 2012. Vermilion snapper, yellowfin tuna, and red snapper represent the top three commercial species by weight landed in Panama City (ALS 2012). Gulf of Mexico-wide, Houma ranked second in terms of commercial greater amberjack landings in 2012, with a large increase in its proportion of landings since 2009, when Houma ranked eighth with 3.5% of the total weight and value. Within Houma, greater amberjack represents about 1% of all commercial landings, which are dominated by oysters, with 65% of total value.

For both sectors it is difficult to speak of community reliance on greater amberjack; rather, greater amberjack is an important component to commercial reef fish fishing. Although the communities described ranked among the top communities for commercial landings of greater amberjack throughout the Gulf of Mexico, greater amberjack represents a small proportion of total landings within each community. Nevertheless, although landings are proportionally low compared with other species in each community, greater amberjack consistently ranks within the top 15 species in commercial communities.<sup>12</sup> This supports its status as an important component in the reef fish complex, rather than a primary target species. Rather than engaging in directed trips, greater amberjack is generally targeted during trips along with other species. It is an important trophy and meat fish, prized for both its size and fighting behavior, making for a thrilling fishing experience.

Landings at the community level are not available for the recreational sector, thus a comparable analysis is not possible. Recreational landings information is needed at the community level to evaluate these communities' engagement and reliance with greater amberjack compared with other landed species.

### **3.4.2 Environmental Justice Considerations**


The proposed actions could be expected to affect fishermen and associated industries in numerous communities along the Gulf of Mexico coast. Persons employed in greater amberjack fishing and associated businesses and communities along the Gulf of Mexico coast would be expected to be affected by this proposed action. However, information on the race and income status for groups at the different participation levels (vessel owners, crew, dealers, processors, employees, employees of associated support industries, etc.) is not available. Although information is available concerning communities overall status with regard to minorities and poverty (e.g., census data), such information is not available specific to fishermen and those involved in the industries and activities, themselves. To help assess whether any environmental justice concerns arise from the actions in this framework, a suite of indices were created to examine the social vulnerability of coastal communities. The three indices are poverty, population composition, and personal disruptions. The variables included in each of these indices have been identified through the literature as being important components that contribute to a community's vulnerability. Indicators such as increased poverty rates for different groups, more single female-headed households and households with children under the age of five, disruptions such as higher separation rates, higher crime rates, and unemployment all are signs of

---

<sup>12</sup> Except for Apalachicola, Florida, which ranks among the communities with the most landings, but within the community, it represents less than 1% of landings by weight and value.


populations experiencing vulnerabilities. Again, for those communities that exceed the threshold it would be expected that they would exhibit vulnerabilities to sudden changes or social disruption that might accrue from regulatory change.

As depicted in Figure 3.4.4, several commercial fishing communities of exceed the threshold of  $\frac{1}{2}$  standard deviation above the mean for at least one of the social vulnerability indices: Bayou La Batre, Alabama; Apalachicola, Panama City, and Ruskin, Florida; Golden Meadow, Grand Isle, and Houma, Louisiana. It would be expected that these communities may exhibit vulnerabilities to social or economic disruption because of regulatory change, including those proposed in this framework action. Those communities that exhibit several index scores exceeding the threshold would be the most vulnerable. These include Bayou La Batre, Alabama; Apalachicola and Ruskin, Florida; and Golden Meadow, Louisiana. Social effects resulting from action taken in this plan amendment are likely to be greatest in these communities.



**Figure 3.4.4.** Social vulnerability indices for selected greater amberjack commercial fishing communities. Source: Southeast Regional Office, Social indicators database (2012).

Figure 3.4.5 provides the social vulnerability of recreationally engaged communities in terms of the same three indices: poverty, population composition, and personal disruptions. Again, for those communities that exceed the thresholds it would be expected that they would exhibit vulnerabilities to sudden changes or social disruption that might result from regulatory change. Three communities exceed the threshold of one standard deviation above the mean for two of the indices (Freeport, Texas; Apalachicola and Carrabelle, Florida), and would be the communities most likely to exhibit vulnerabilities to social or economic disruption due to regulatory change.



**Figure 3.4.5.** Social vulnerability indices for recreational fishing communities. Source: Southeast Regional Office, Social indicators database (2012).

People in these communities may be affected by fishing regulations in two ways: participation and employment. Although these communities may have the greatest potential for EJ concerns, no data are available on the race and income status for those involved in the local fishing industry (employment), or for their dependence on greater amberjack specifically (participation). The fishery is primarily recreational (73%) and requires boat access. Greater amberjack does not represent a substantial proportion of landings in the primary fishing communities, thus no EJ concerns are expected to arise in these communities as a result of the actions in this amendment. There are no known claims for customary usage or subsistence consumption of greater amberjack by any Gulf of Mexico population including tribes or indigenous groups. Although no EJ issues have been identified, the absence of potential EJ concerns cannot be assumed.

The proposed actions would decrease the amount of greater amberjack available for harvest by both the commercial and recreational sectors, and would adopt additional restrictions on both sectors to constrain the harvest of greater amberjack. The effects resulting from these actions are addressed in the sections discussing social effects in Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

## 3.5 Description of the Administrative Environment

### 3.5.1 Federal Fishery Management

Federal fishery management is conducted under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), originally enacted in 1976 as the Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The Magnuson-Stevens Act claims sovereign rights and exclusive fishery management authority over most fishery resources within the exclusive economic zone (EEZ). The EEZ is defined as an area extending 200 nautical miles from the seaward boundary of each of the coastal states. The Magnuson-Stevens Act also claims authority over U.S. anadromous species and continental shelf resources that occur beyond the EEZ.

Responsibility for federal fishery management decision-making is divided between the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) and eight regional fishery management councils that represent the expertise and interests of constituent states. Regional councils are responsible for preparing, monitoring, and revising management plans for fisheries needing management within their jurisdiction. The Secretary is responsible for promulgating regulations to implement proposed plans and amendments after ensuring management measures are consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and with other applicable laws summarized in Section 10. In most cases, the Secretary has delegated this authority to NMFS.

The Council is responsible for fishery resources in federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico. These waters extend to 200 nautical miles offshore from the nine-miles seaward boundary of the states of Florida and Texas, and the three-miles seaward boundary of the states of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The length of the Gulf of Mexico coastline is approximately 1,631 miles. Florida has the longest coastline of 770 miles along its Gulf of Mexico coast, followed by Louisiana (397 miles), Texas (361 miles), Alabama (53 miles), and Mississippi (44 miles).

The Council consists of seventeen voting members: 11 public members appointed by the Secretary; one each from the fishery agencies of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida; and one from NMFS. The public is also involved in the fishery management process through participation on advisory panels and through publically open Council meetings, with some exceptions for discussing internal administrative matters. The regulatory process is also in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act, in the form of “notice and comment” rulemaking, which provides extensive opportunity for public scrutiny and comment, and requires consideration of and response to those comments.

Regulations contained within FMPs are enforced through actions of the NOAA’s Office of Law Enforcement, the U.S. Coast Guard, and various state authorities. To better coordinate enforcement activities, federal and state enforcement agencies have developed cooperative agreements to enforce the Magnuson-Stevens Act. These activities are being coordinated by the Council’s Law Enforcement Advisory Panel and the Gulf of Mexico States Marine Fisheries Commission’s Law Enforcement Committee have developed a two year “Gulf of Mexico Cooperative Law Enforcement Strategic Plan – 2011 - 2012.”

### 3.5.2 State Fishery Management

The purpose of state representation at the Council level is to ensure state participation in federal fishery management decision-making and to promote the development of compatible regulations in state and federal waters. The state governments of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida have the authority to manage their respective state fisheries. Each of the five Gulf of Mexico states exercises legislative and regulatory authority over their states' natural resources through discrete administrative units. Although each agency is the primary administrative body with respect to the states' natural resources, all states cooperate with numerous state and federal regulatory agencies when managing marine resources. A more detailed description of each state's primary regulatory agency for marine resources is provided in Amendment 22 (GMFMC 2004b).

## CHAPTER 4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

### 4.1 Action 1 - Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Annual Catch Limits and Annual Catch Targets

#### Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

Impacts of these alternatives on the physical environment depend on the resulting reduction in the level of fishing effort by the commercial and recreational sectors. The commercial sector is currently allocated 27% of the stock annual catch limit (ACL) and the recreational sector is currently allocated 73% of the stock ACL. Using greater amberjack landings history from 2001 - 2010, commercial longlines landed 10% of the greater amberjack and vertical lines (i.e., electric reel, bandit rig, hook and line, and trolling) landed 68% of the greater amberjack, while 22% of the landings were from unclassified gear types and dive gears (SEFSC Commercial ACL Data Set July 2014). Landings by trolling and diving with a spear were low and infrequent compared to hand and electric vertical lines in the commercial sector. The recreational sector (headboat, charter, and private modes) primarily uses hand lines and sometimes electric reels to fish for reef fish, including greater amberjack. Recreational fishers also harvest greater amberjack with spear and powerhead gear. When recreational fishers are targeting greater amberjack they often use large live baits and the attached weights and hooks may or may not touch the bottom depending on the structure type and fisher experience level.

#### *Longlines*

Longline gear is deployed over hard bottom habitats using weights to keep the gear in direct contact with the bottom. The potential for this gear to adversely impact the bottom depends on the type of habitat it is set on, the presence or absence of currents and the behavior of fish after being hooked. In addition, this gear upon retrieval can abrade, snag, and dislodge smaller rocks, corals, and sessile invertebrates (Hamilton 2000; Barnette 2001). Direct underwater observations of longline gear in the Pacific halibut fishery by High (1998) noted that the gear could sweep across the bottom. A study that directly observed deployed longline gear (Atlantic tilefish fishery) found there was no evidence that the gear shifted significantly, even when set in currents. Lack of gear shifting even in strong currents was attributed to setting anchors at either end of the longline to prevent movement (Hanmei et al. 1982). Based on the direct observations, it is logical to assume that bottom longline gear would have a minor impact on sandy or muddy habitat areas. However, due to the vertical relief that hardbottom and coral reef habitats provide, it would be expected that bottom longline gear may become entangled, resulting in potential negative impacts to habitat (Barnette 2001).

#### *Vertical lines*

Concentrations of many managed reef fish species are higher on hard bottom areas than on sand or mud bottoms, thus vertical line gear fishing generally occurs over hard bottom areas (GMFMC 2004a). Vertical lines include multi-hook lines known as bandit gear, handlines, and rod-and-reels. Vertical-line gear is less likely to contact the bottom than longlines, but still has

the potential to snag and entangle bottom structures and cause attached organism such as soft corals and sponges to tear off or be abraded (Barnette 2001). In using bandit gear, a weighted line is lowered to the bottom, and then the lead is raised slightly off the bottom (Siebenaler and Brady 1952). The gear is in direct contact with the bottom for only a short period of time. Barnette (2001) suggests that physical impacts may include entanglement and minor degradation of benthic species from line abrasion and the use of weights (sinkers).

Anchor damage is also associated with vertical-line fishing vessels, particularly by the recreational sector where fishermen may repeatedly visit well marked or known fishing locations. Hamilton (2000) points out that “favorite” fishing areas such as reefs are targeted and revisited multiple times, particularly with the advent of global positioning technology. The cumulative effects of repeated anchoring could damage the hard bottom areas where fishing for greater amberjack and other reef fish occurs. The for-hire sector and commercial sector that uses vertical line gear are typically known to anchor more frequently over the reef sites.

### *Spear and Powerhead*

Spearguns are used by both the recreational and commercial sector to harvest greater amberjack, but represent a relatively minor component of both. Barnette (2001) summarizes a previous study that concluded spearfishing on reef habitat may result in some coral breakage. In addition, there could be some impacts from divers touching coral with hands or from re-suspension of sediment by fins (Barnette 2001).

**Alternative 1** maintains the current quota and would not be expected to alter the execution of the fishery substantially and therefore would not be expected to have any substantial change or effects to the physical environment or essential fish habitat (EFH). All alternatives reduce directed harvest as compared to the Alternative 1 and would be beneficial to the physical environment. And therefore, we expect these effects not to be significant. **Alternative 2** would reduce the ACL by 3% in 2015 but increase by 25% in 2016, 40% in 2017, and 47% in 2018 relative to **Alternative 1**. **Alternative 2** would not be expected to have any substantial changes or effects to the physical environment or EFH. **Preferred Alternative 3** would reduce the ACL by 3% (2015 - 2018) relative to **Alternative 1** and is not expected to have any substantial change or effects the physical environment or EFH. **Alternative 4** would restrict all harvest representing the greatest change (magnitude) from status quo.

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment**

Management actions that directly impact the biological and ecological environment include fishing mortality and the resulting population size, life history characteristics, and the role of the species within its habitat. Removal of fish from the population through fishing reduces the overall population size and reproductive potential. All alternatives reduce directed harvest as compared to the Alternative 1 and would be beneficial to the biological environment. And therefore, we expect these effects not to be significant. **Preferred Alternative 3** is expected to provide positive benefits to the biological environment compared to **Alternative 1** (no action) and **Alternative 2**, because it sets a constant acceptable biological catch (ABC), ACL and annual

catch target (ACT) beginning in 2015 that is less than current levels. **Preferred Alternative 3, Option b**, is expected to provide greater positive benefits to the biological environment compared to **Preferred Option a**, due to the 20% reduction in the stock ACT compared to a 15% commercial buffer and 13% recreational buffer in **Preferred Option a**. **Alternative 4** does not allow any harvest of greater amberjack and would not be expected to alter the execution of the fishery for vessels that target greater amberjack due to the expectation that these vessels would continue to fish for reef fish species.

The **Action 1** alternatives have projections to end overfishing and rebuild the stock that were presented at the January 2015 Gulf of Mexico of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) meeting (Cummings, 2015, SEFSC). **Alternative 1** is expected to end overfishing and rebuild the stock by 2019, **Alternative 2** by 2020, **Preferred Alternative 3** by 2019, and **Alternative 4** is expected to end overfishing and rebuild the stock by 2017.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

Modifications to greater amberjack stock ACLs and associated sector specific ACLs and ACTs (commercial and recreational) considered in this framework action would be expected to result in short and longer term effects on the economic environment. In general, although smaller ACLs and associated ACTs are expected to result in diminished economic benefits in the short run, they would be expected to result in faster rebuilding of the greater amberjack stock, thereby resulting in greater economic benefits in the longer term. Conversely, larger ACLs and associated ACTs would be expected to result in increased economic benefits in the short run but could result in smaller long-term economic benefits due to slower rebuilding of the stock. Estimates of expected effects on the economic environment provided in this section are based on sector-specific decision tools developed by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (SERO, 2015). The assumptions, data and methods used to derive these estimates are detailed in SERO (2015). For the commercial and recreational sectors, it is not noted that, due to data and model limitations, the decision tools only provide estimated effects on the economic environment for 2015. For subsequent years, a qualitative discussion of the economic effects expected to result from the management alternatives is provided.

**Alternative 1**, which would maintain the current greater amberjack stock ACL and associated commercial and recreational ACLs and ACTs. **Alternative 1** (no action) is not expected to affect recreational or commercial fishing for greater amberjack and would therefore not be expected to result in effects to the economic environment.

**Alternative 2** would base the greater amberjack stock ACL on the schedule recommended by the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) for the 2015-2018 time interval. Relative to the no action alternative (**Alternative 1**), **Alternative 2** would reduce the stock ACL by 60,000 pounds (lbs) in 2015, but gradually increase the stock ACL in subsequent years. Between 2015 and 2018, the greater amberjack stock ACL would increase from 1, 72,000 lbs to 2,620,000 lbs. To set the commercial and recreational ACTs, **Alternative 2-Option a** would apply a 15% buffer to the commercial ACL and a 13% buffer to the recreational ACL, respectively. **Alternative 2-Option b** would set the commercial and recreational ACTs by applying a 20% buffer to the respective ACLs.

The 2015 commercial greater amberjack season is estimated at 79 days and 75 days for **Alternative 2-Option a** and **Alternative 2-Option b**, respectively (Table 2.3.2). For **Alternative 2-Option a** and **Alternative 2-Option b**, expected economic losses, as proxied by decreases in ex-vessel value relative to status quo, are estimated at approximately \$26,174 and \$61,073 (in 2013 dollars), respectively. Economic effects expected to result from **Alternative 2** beyond 2015 cannot be quantified due to data and model limitations. However, based on planned increases in stock ACLs and associated commercial ACLs and ACTs, it is expected that economic benefits from ACL increases between 2016 and 2018 would more than offset economic losses estimated for 2015. Therefore, net economic effects under **Alternative 2** are expected to be positive. Furthermore, based on a longer estimated season in 2015 and smaller estimated economic loss, it is expected that **Alternative 2-Option a** would yield greater net economic benefits than **Alternative 2-Option b**. Beyond 2015, it is expected that **Alternative 2-Option a** would continue to yield greater economic benefits to the commercial sector than **Alternative 2-Option b**, because it sets a less restrictive ACT.

The 2015 recreational greater amberjack season is estimated at 179 days and 172 days for **Alternative 2-Option a** and **Alternative 2-Option b**, respectively (Table 2.2.2). For **Alternative 2-Option a** and **Alternative 2-Option b**, losses in consumer surplus to anglers are estimated at approximately \$19,679 and \$65,597 (in 2013 dollars), respectively. Assuming that a shorter recreational greater amberjack season occurs because of decreases in the recreational greater amberjack ACL and ACT, some charter trips targeting greater amberjack will be eliminated; thus charter for-hire operators would be adversely impacted. Negative economic effects would stem from losses in producer surplus to charter and headboat for-hire operators. Only the economic effects to charter vessels, however, could be estimated with available data because of the absence of species target information for headboat anglers. For **Alternative 2-Option a** and **Alternative 2-Option b**, losses in producer surplus (approximated by net operating revenues) are estimated at \$47,552 and \$158,507 (in 2013 dollars), respectively. Therefore, total losses in economic value to the recreational sector expected to result in 2015 from **Alternative 2-Option a** and **Alternative 2-Option b** would range for \$19,679 to \$67,231 and from \$65,597 to 224,104 (in 2013 dollars), respectively. Economic effects expected to result from **Alternative 2** beyond 2015 cannot be quantified due to data and model limitations. However, based on proposed increases in recreational ACLs and ACTs, and resultant additional recreational fishing days, it is expected that increases in economic value expected to result from ACL increases between 2016 and 2018 would outweigh economic losses estimated for 2015. Therefore, net economic effects under **Alternative 2** are expected to be positive relative to **Alternative 1** (status quo). Furthermore, based on a longer estimated recreational season in 2015 and smaller estimated economic loss, it is expected that **Alternative 2-Option a** would yield greater net economic benefits than **Alternative 2-Option b**. Beyond 2015, it is expected that **Alternative 2-Option a** would continue to yield greater economic benefits to the commercial sector than **Alternative 2-Option b**, because it sets a less restrictive ACT.

**Preferred Alternative 3** would set a constant greater amberjack stock ACL and associated recreational and commercial ACLs and ACTs for 2015 and subsequent years. To determine the commercial and recreational ACTs, **Preferred Alternative 3-Preferred Option a** would apply a 15% buffer to the commercial ACL and a 13% buffer to the recreational ACL, respectively.

**Alternative 3-Option b** would apply a 20% buffer to the commercial and recreational ACLs to determine the commercial and recreational ACTs, respectively. Economic losses to the commercial and recreational sectors expected to result in 2015 from **Alternative 3** would be similar to 2015 losses in ex-vessel revenues to the commercial sector and losses in economic value to the recreational sector estimated under **Alternative 2**. Beyond 2015, although unquantifiable due to data and model limitations, additional losses in ex-vessel value to the commercial sector and in economic value to the recreational sector would be expected to occur due to the decreases in stock and sector specific ACLs, commercial and recreational ACTs, and resultant decreases in commercial and recreational season lengths relative to **Alternative 1** (status quo). Compared to **Preferred Alternative 3-Preferred Option a**, aforementioned decreases are expected to be greater under **Alternative 3-Option b**. Therefore, for the 2015-2018 time interval, **Alternative 3-Option b** would be expected to result in greater economic losses than **Preferred Alternative 3-Preferred Option a**.

**Alternative 4** would set the greater amberjack stock ACL at zero and therefore would not allow any greater amberjack landings from 2015 through 2018. Although unquantifiable for the 2015 through 2018 time interval, **Alternative 4** would be expected to result in losses in ex-vessel revenues to the commercial sector, losses in consumer surplus to anglers and in producer surplus to for-hire operators relative to **Alternative 1**. Among the alternative modifications to the greater amberjack ACLs and ACTs, **Alternative 4**, which would eliminate most economic activities associated with the greater amberjack segment of the reef fish fishery would be the worst from an economics standpoint. The recreational sector may still gain some limited benefits from catch and release activities. The commercial sector would forgo all profits derivable from this segment of the reef fish fishery. The remaining alternatives could be ranked from most to least beneficial as follows: **Alternative 2** then **Alternative 1**, and **Preferred Alternative 3**.

Following the discussion relative to the effects on the economic environment expected to result from modifications to the recreational closed season (Section 4.2.2), the expected combined economic effects of recreational measures proposed in this framework action are discussed. Similarly, a discussion of combined effects of commercial measures considered is provided following the discussion relative to commercial trip limit changes (Section 4.3.3).

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment**

The effects of this action on the social environment would vary relative to how much the harvest limits are changed from the current harvest limits (**Alternative 1**, no action). In general, negative effects would be expected from a decrease in the amount of available fish to harvest, as fishing behavior and resource usage are restricted from existing levels of fishing activity; broad social benefits would be expected from an increase in the amount of allowable harvest, as additional fishing opportunities are provided.

Although additional effects would not be expected from maintaining the status quo ACLs and ACTs (**Alternative 1**), the rebuilding plan goals were not met by the target rebuilding date. Furthermore, the existing stock ACL is greater than that recommended by the SSC after reviewing the 2014 greater amberjack SEDAR 33 assessment, and is thus not allowable.

**Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3** would modify the ABC, ACLs, and ACTs using different approaches to configuring these limits. The method used to determine these harvest limits does not result in social effects; rather, effects would arise from (and be in proportion to) the change in how much greater amberjack fishermen are allowed to land. When the quota (ACT) is met during the year, retention of greater amberjack is prohibited for the remainder of the year. Further, in the event landings exceed the stock ACL, the following season's sector ACLs are reduced for the sector that exceeds its portion of the ACL, by the amount of its sector overage. This accountability measure results in negative effects on fishing participants in the subsequent fishing season. Thus, maximum social benefits would be realized at the point that the total catch comes closest to meeting but not exceeding the ACL (which triggers the overage adjustment).

For the year 2015, the proposed stock ACL is the same for both **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3**, which is 60,000 lbs lower than the stock ACL of **Alternative 1**. By sector, this would reduce the commercial ACL by 16,600 lbs, and the recreational ACL by 43,400 lbs. Under **Alternative 2**, the increasing annual yields following 2015 would allow a greater total harvest during the years 2016-2018 compared with both **Alternative 1** (no action), and **Preferred Alternative 3** (maintain 2015 harvest limits). Although short-term social benefits would be expected from the additional harvest allowed under **Alternative 2**, given that the stock remains overfished, is experiencing overfishing, and did not meet the goals of the rebuilding plan, selecting the more conservative, constant harvest level (**Preferred Alternative 3**) is expected to ensure long-term benefits are realized from a rebuilt stock.

The same **Options a and b** provided under both **Alternative 2** and **Preferred Alternative 3** propose different buffers for setting the ACT (quota). **Options a** would set each sector's ACT as a 15% buffer to the commercial sector's ACL and a 13% buffer to the recreational sector's ACL; these are equivalent to each sector's ACL buffer under **Alternative 1**. When the ACT of each sector is met, the fishing season for that sector will be closed for the duration of the year. Managing towards the ACT (quota) reduces the likelihood that the ACL will be exceeded, which would then reduce the following year's ACL and sector ACTs.

**Options b** would increase the buffer for setting each sector's ACT to 20%, an increase of 7% to the recreational buffer and 5% to the commercial buffer compared to the ACT used in **Alternative 1** and **Options a**. Selecting the larger buffer (**Options b**) would be expected to further reduce the likelihood that the ACL is exceeded compared to the smaller sector-specific buffers (**Options a**), thereby avoiding the potential negative effects from a quota overage adjustment. However, selecting the most conservative harvest target (which when reached would result in a harvest closure for the rest of the year) could prevent fishermen from landing as much of the allowable harvest as possible.

The complete harvest closure of greater amberjack (**Alternative 4**) would result in the greatest negative effects and is the least desirable alternative for the social environment. Although the impacts may be mitigated in the long-term if the stock rebuilds faster, a complete harvest closure greatly exceeds the action required by the National Standard 1 guidelines in the event a stock does not rebuild by its target date. Further, for the majority of fishermen of both sectors, greater amberjack is caught alongside other species, rather than targeted on directed trips. Thus, even

under a complete harvest closure, greater amberjack would continue to be caught incidentally on non-targeted trips, and fishermen would be required to discard those fish, contributing to mortality. Throwing back dead fish is perceived as wasteful and is frustrating for fishermen.

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment**

**Alternative 1** maintains the current commercial and recreational ACLs and ACTs at the 2014 level, or until the next stock assessment is completed and thus is not expected to alter the administrative burden. **Alternatives 2a** and **2b**, would set the commercial and recreational ACLs using the ACL/ACT control rule buffer recommended by the SSC for 2015-2018. **Alternatives 2 and Preferred Alternative -3 (options a-b)**, and would be expected to have similar administrative burden as the no action alternative. **Alternative 4** would set the stock ACL at zero and would be expected to have less administrative burden than other alternatives due to the fact that there would be no in-season harvest monitoring or closure.

## **4.2 Action 2 - Recreational Management Measures**

### **4.2.1 Action 2.1 - Modifications to the Recreational Minimum Size Limit for Greater Amberjack**

#### **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment**

Adjusting the minimum size limit could have indirect effects on the physical environment. Increasing the minimum size limit for greater amberjack could result in recreational fishers staying on a particular reef site for a longer period of time to catch a legal sized greater amberjack, thus potentially increasing gear interactions with the substrate. **Alternative 2, Preferred Alternative 3, and Alternative 4** would increase the size limit to 32, 34, and 36 inches fork length (FL), respectively. **Alternative 1** (no action), which would maintain the current 30 inch size limit is not expected to affect recreational fishing for greater amberjack and would therefore not be expected to result in effects to the physical environment. The changing size limit is not expected to alter the overall execution of the reef fish fishery substantially and therefore would not be expected to have any substantial change or effects to the physical environment.

#### **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment**

There are several management strategies the Council can use to meet the goals necessary to reduce landings to keep harvest levels below the sector ACLs. One recreational measure the Council considered is to increase the recreational minimum size limit (**Action 2.1**). **Action 2.1, Alternative 1** would maintain the 30-inch FL minimum size limit. Based on theoretical analysis comparing yield-per-recruit (YPR) and spawning potential ratio (SPR) it was estimated that increasing the minimum size limit will provide greater spawning potential; whereas, maintaining the 30-inch FL minimum size limit would result in higher yield per recruit. However, this analysis gives no indication of whether or not this yield is sustainable. **Action 2.1** alternatives consider increasing the minimum size limit by as much as 6 inches. The biological

consequences of increasing the minimum size limit by various amounts were evaluated relative to changes in YPR, SPR, and bycatch. The changes in YPR and SPR were summarized in Appendix 12.4.3 of Amendment 35 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico (GMFMC 2012). Reproductive studies by Murie and Parkyn (2008) estimated at the 30 inch FL minimum size limit (**Alternative 1**), less than 11% of the female greater amberjack in the population have reached sexual maturity. **Alternative 2** would modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 32 inches FL. At 32 inches FL 45% of females are reproductively mature. **Preferred Alternative 3** would modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 34 inches FL. At 34 inches FL, 85% of females are reproductively mature. **Alternative 4** would modify the minimum size limit for greater amberjack to 36 inches FL. At 36 inches FL, 97% of females are reproductively mature. **Alternative 4** is expected to provide the greatest biological benefits to the resource, because the majority of female greater amberjack would be reproductively mature before entering the fishery. **Alternative 4** would also be consistent with the commercial sector's minimum size limit. These alternatives are expected to provide greater biological benefits to the resource than **Alternative 1**; however, benefits may diminish if release mortality increases with increases in fish size. As minimum size limits increase from 30 inches FL, dead discards are estimated to increase and subsequent estimates of changes in harvest and dead discards for various minimum size limits could be calculated. Dead discard mortality is estimated at 20% and was used to estimate increases in total dead discards with various minimum size limits consistent with SEDAR 33 (2014) and the SEDAR 9 Update (2010).

The Council and Reef Fish Advisory Panel have stated concerns about bycatch mortality of greater amberjack if the minimum size limit is increased. There were also concerns about whether or not the minimum size limit would sufficiently slow the rate of harvest and increase bycatch. To address these concerns, the decision model (SERO-LAPP 2015-01) was used to evaluate how the rate of harvest and dead discards would change with increases to the minimum size limit. **Alternative 1** is expected to result in the lowest level of dead discards compared to **Alternative 2, Preferred Alternative 3, and Alternative 4**. **Alternative 2** is expected to increase dead discards by 4%, **Preferred Alternative 3** is expected to increase dead discards by 9%, and **Alternative 4** is expected to increase dead discards by 13%.

The YPR and SPR analyses summarized in Figure 2.2.3 and Figure 2.2.4 evaluated minimum size limits ranging from 30 to 36 inches FL. These analyses showed YPR was maximized at 30 inches FL (Figure 2.2.4). Spawning potential was maximized at 36 inches FL and increasing the minimum size limit from 30 to 36 inches increases SPR (**Alternative 4**). The YPR/SPR analysis results revealed a tradeoff between fishery performance yield and spawning potential. Although increasing the minimum size limit appears to provide biological benefits, other management measures (e.g., seasonal closures, constraining harvest to the sector ACL) could also control the rate of fishing mortality in order to achieve higher SPR and YPR. The Council discussed over multiple meetings the biological trade-offs of increasing the minimum size limit on bycatch, YPR, and SPR.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

This action considers increases in the recreational size limit for greater amberjack. **Alternative 2, Preferred Alternative 3, and Alternative 4** would increase the size limit to 32, 34, and 36 inches FL, respectively. **Alternative 1** (no action), which would maintain the current 30-inch minimum size limit is not expected to affect recreational fishing for greater amberjack and would therefore not be expected to result in effects to the economic environment. Effects on the economic environment, measured in changes in economic value to the recreational sector were derived from the recreational decision tool developed by SERO (2015). As discussed in Section 3.3.2, changes in consumer surplus are determined based on a consumer surplus of \$12.18 (2013 dollars) per greater amberjack. Changes in producer surplus were based on net operating revenues of \$158.06 (2013 dollars) per charter angler trip. The changes in economic value, i.e., changes in consumer surplus and producer surplus, would stem from changes in season length resulting from alternative size limits. It is noted that the decision tool used to estimate changes in economic value to the recreational sector does not account for potential changes in the quality of recreational trips due to size limit modifications. Table 4.2.1 provides estimated season length in 2015 and associated changes in consumer surplus, producer surplus and economic value for alternative greater amberjack recreational size limits. For subsequent years, a qualitative discussion of the economic effects expected to result from the management alternatives is provided.

**Table 4.2.1.** Estimated 2015 season length, changes in consumer surplus (CS), producer surplus (PS) and economic value (EV) for alternative greater amberjack recreational size limits. Season length in days; CS, PS and EV in 2013 dollars; size limits in inches.

	Size Limit	Season Length	Changes in		
			CS	PS	EV
Alternative 1	30	182	---	---	---
Alternative 2	32	196	\$2,224.35	\$10,457.77	\$12,682.12
<u>Alternative 3</u>	34	215	\$5,289.48	\$24,650.46	\$29,939.94
Alternative 4	36	258	\$9,498.14	\$93,782.73	\$103,280.87

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

In general, relative to the status quo size limit, a greater size limit would be expected to result in a longer recreational greater amberjack fishing season. **Alternative 4**, which would increase the size limit the most relative to status quo, would be expected to result in the longest greater amberjack recreational fishing season, followed by **Preferred Alternative 3** then **Alternative 2**. This ordinal ranking of the alternatives would be expected to hold when comparing changes in consumer surplus and in producer surplus (assuming that additional charter for-hire trips targeting greater amberjack are created). As expected, greatest changes in consumer surplus and in producer surplus would be expected to result from **Alternative 4**. Although the recreational decision tool cannot estimate season length and changes in consumer surplus, producer surplus and economic value beyond 2015, greater size limits would be expected to continue to result in longer recreational seasons and greater changes in economic value. Therefore, the ordinal ranking of the alternatives would be expected to hold beyond 2015. Following the discussion relative to the effects on the economic environment expected to result from modifications to the

recreational closed season (Section 4.2.2), the expected combined economic effects of recreational measures proposed in this framework action are discussed.

### **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment**

Negative effects may be expected from increasing the recreational minimum size limit if fishermen find it difficult to land a legal size fish, making the fishing experience less satisfying. Although additional effects would not be expected from maintaining the 30-inch FL minimum size limit (**Alternative 1**), at 30 inches, only 11% of female greater amberjack have reached sexual maturity. Thus, avoiding short-term negative effects by retaining **Alternative 1** may result in some negative long-term effects as the stock takes longer to rebuild warranting lower catch limits in the interim.

Negative effects from increasing the minimum size limit would result from the estimated trip-level harvest reduction and an increase in regulatory discards. The effects would correspond in severity with the estimated harvest reduction such that the greater the increase to the minimum size, the greater the estimated harvest reduction. Discarding fish due to regulations can negatively affect the fishing experience especially if the fish appears unable to survive. Increasing the minimum size to 32 inches FL (**Alternative 2**) is estimated to reduce trip-level harvest the least among **Alternatives 2-4**, and would also affect the fewest anglers by allowing the retention of a smaller size fish than under **Preferred Alternative 3** or **Alternative 4**.

Increasing the minimum size to 34 inches FL (**Preferred Alternative 3**) would reduce harvest more than **Alternative 2**, but would allow anglers to retain the most frequently landed size of greater amberjack (Figure 2.2.1). An increase to 36 inches FL (**Alternative 4**) would reduce harvest the most and also affect the most fishing trips. Thus, fishermen would be most affected by an increase in the minimum size limit to 36 inches FL (**Alternative 4**). As noted, these increases in harvest reductions would coincide with increases in dead discards. Throwing back dead fish is perceived as wasteful and is frustrating for fishermen. On the other hand, many recreational fishermen support and often encourage management measures designed to protect the biological needs of a species, including size limits that maximize reproductive potential.

Although negative effects would be expected from increasing the minimum size limit, greater amberjack remain overfished and the stock did not successfully reach the 10-year rebuilding plan goals. Thus, positive effects are expected to accrue in the long term if a larger minimum size helps to rebuild the stock. A greater increase in the minimum size limit would correspond with fewer removals of fish that have not reached reproductive maturity, benefitting the stock by increasing the spawning potential ratio. If the larger minimum size limit aids in rebuilding the stock and the quota is increased, then it would be expected to benefit the fishermen, businesses, and fishing communities that harvest greater amberjack.

Finally, increasing the size limit to 34 inches FL (**Preferred Alternative 3**) or 36 inches FL (**Alternative 4**) would be expected to reduce trip-level harvest rates, but would also result in the longer season (Table 2.2.2), providing more fishing opportunities to anglers throughout the year. It should be noted that an increase to 36 inches FL would make the minimum size limit consistent with that of the commercial sector.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment

The alternatives in Action 2.1 are expected to have minimal impacts to the administrative environment compared to no action. Any change to the regulations would create the additional burden on the administrative environment in the beginning; however, after the regulations are in effect **Alternatives 2, 3, and 4** are not expected to have additional impacts on the administrative environment. **Alternative 1** the status quo would have the least impact on the administrative environment, because the current minimum size limit is 30 inches FL for the recreational sector. **Preferred Alternative 3** and **Alternatives 2 and 4**, are expected to have similar impacts on the administrative environment because they would be modified from no action.

### 4.2.2 Action 2.2 - Modifications to the Recreational Closed Season for Greater Amberjack

The Regulatory Amendment (GMFMC 2011b) implemented in 2011 reviewed the effects of a recreational season closure in further detail, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

It is unknown how many recreational anglers leave the dock intending to target greater amberjack, or how fishing behavior would change based on the various alternatives for closed seasons. The following comparison of alternatives is based on the number of available fishing days under each alternative. This comparison does not take into account fishing during the closed season or effort shifting outside of the closed season. The impacts to the physical environment may be underestimated in this analysis if there is increased effort shifting outside the closed season. Physical impacts to the environment could occur when gear such as weights, hooks, and anchors hit and damage the substrate and surrounding habitat. Recreational fishers typically use rod and reel or spears to harvest greater amberjack; see Chapter 4.1 for a comparison of gear types and impacts to the physical environment. The effects of the four Alternatives considered under Action 2.2 to modify the recreational closed season are dependent upon the ACT that is selected as preferred. **Alternative 4** has proposed closure dates of January 1 - May 31, and a November - December closure. If a closed recreational season for amberjack deters fishermen from making a fishing trip, then **Alternative 4** would likely have the greatest positive impacts on the physical environment because the recreational season is the shortest under this alternative with 91-108 open fishing days, depending upon the ACT selected. **Preferred Alternative 1** would likely result in a 172-182 day fishing season, **Alternative 2** would likely result in a 181-190 day fishing season, and **Alternative 3** would likely result in a 135-145 day fishing season. The following alternatives are listed in order from greatest positive benefits to least expected positive benefits to the physical environment; **Alternative 4, 3, 1, 2**. The comparison of the various closed seasons and their associated ACTs can be found in Table 2.2.2. The alternatives in **Action 2.2** are not expected to alter the overall execution of the reef fish fishery and therefore are not expected to have any substantial change in effects to the physical environment.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment

Action 2.2 would modify the recreational closed season for greater amberjack. As the greater amberjack stock rebuilds **Preferred Alternative 1**, the status quo may not constrain harvest enough to prevent an in-season recreational fishing closure. As the greater amberjack stock rebuilds **Alternatives 2, 3 and 4** may not constrain harvest enough to prevent an in-season recreational fishing closure. Even with the longer closed season of **Alternative 3**, the March – May closure allows for a greater landings of fish by the recreational sector than **Preferred Alternative 1** (June – July closure). The Council determined that restricting landings by the additional amount projected for **Preferred Alternative 1** provides greater biological benefit to rebuilding the stock than by providing a spawning season closure, which has unquantified benefits.

Based on the spawning season for greater amberjack **Alternatives 3 and 4** may provide the greatest benefits to the resource and biological environment (Murie and Parkyn 2008). Both alternatives would close the recreational fishing season during peak spawning (March - May). Closing recreational fishing during the months of March - May would be consistent with the current commercial fixed closed season. However, little information exists to suggest that closing the greater amberjack recreational sector during the spawning period would provide greater biological benefits to the stock compared to closing them during months of peak recreational fishing effort (May - August), which reduces harvest to a greater extent than a March – May closure (**Alternative 3**). Similarly, it is unknown if greater amberjack are more susceptible to fishing mortality during the spawning season. A study by Harris et al. (2007) suggested spawning aggregations of greater amberjack were targeted by fishers in the South Atlantic, but no evidence of this was presented. Diver observations in Belize documented greater amberjack in pair courtship while in schools of 120 fish (Graham and Castellanos 2005). It is unknown if fishers target these schools or aggregations of greater amberjack more heavily during spawning than at other times of the year; therefore, **Alternatives 3 and 4** are expected to provide positive benefits to the resource by protecting greater amberjack during spawning. Closing the season during spawning is expected to provide a higher percentage of reproductively mature individuals to the spawning pool. The alternatives in **Action 2.2** are not expected to alter the overall execution of the reef fish fishery and therefore are not expected to have any substantial change or effects to the biological environment.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment

This action considers alternatives to the current June 1 to July 31 annual greater amberjack recreational closure. **Alternative 2** would eliminate the closed season and open the greater amberjack recreational fishing season January 1 until the ACT is reached. **Alternatives 3 and 4** would modify the closure to March 1-May 31 and to January 1-May 31 and November 1-December 31, respectively. **Preferred Alternative 1** (no action), which would maintain the current June 1 to July 31 annual greater amberjack recreational closure is not expected to affect recreational fishing for greater amberjack and would therefore not be expected to result in effects to the economic environment. Effects on the economic environment, measured in changes in economic value to the recreational sector were derived from the recreational decision tool

developed by SERO (2015). The changes in economic value, (i.e., changes in consumer surplus (CS) and producer surplus (PS)) expected to occur under each of the closed season alternatives would stem from changes in the temporal distribution of harvests and effort, and the total number of greater amberjack estimated to be harvested. It is noted that the decision tool used to estimate changes in economic value to the recreational sector does not account for potential effort shifts during the open months. Table 4.2.2 provides estimated season length in 2015 and associated changes in CS, PS, and economic value for alternative greater amberjack recreational closed seasons. For subsequent years, a qualitative discussion of the economic effects expected to result from the management alternatives is provided.

**Table 4.2.2.** Estimated 2015 season length, changes in consumer surplus (CS), producer surplus (PS) and economic value (EV) for alternative greater amberjack recreational season closures. Season length in days; CS, PS and EV in 2013 dollars.

	Closed Seasons	Season Length	Changes in		
			CS	PS	EV
Alternative 1	6/1-7/31	182	---	---	---
Alternative 2	None	190	-\$3,433.62	\$191,190.91	\$187,757.29
Alternative 3	3/1-5/31	145	\$19,088.62	-\$10,970.76	\$8,117.86
Alternative 4	1/1-5/31 and 11/1-12/31	97	\$20,831.96	\$7,928.47	\$28,760.43

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

Relative to **Preferred Alternative 1** (no action), **Alternative 2**, which would result in the longest recreational season in 2015, would be expected to result in the greatest changes in economic value, i.e., the sum of the changes in consumer surplus and producer surplus.

**Alternative 2** would not set a closed season but would let the season run until the recreational ACT is met. **Alternative 3**, which would establish a March 1 to May 31 closed season would be expected to result in the smallest change in economic value. It is important to note that CS may increase or decrease relative to changes in season length, based on the temporal distribution of harvests, as well as the total amount harvested by the recreational sector. This is because the recreational decision tool developed by SERO (2015) estimates the number of fish harvested using heterogeneous wave-level daily catch rates and mean fish weights. CS, as estimated, is based only on the number of fish and not the size of fish, so the same number of pounds would be more valuable in a month with a low mean fish weight than with a high mean fish weight. Additionally, because the recreational decision tool simulates a quota closure in the day preceding the day on which an estimated overage would occur, the overall harvest is dependent on both the daily catch rate and the aggregate harvest through the estimated closure date. Similarly, PS may increase or decrease relative to changes in season length, based on which days are open or closed to fishing, because the daily rate at which charter for-hire trips occur varies by wave. Although the decision tool does not quantify changes in economic value due to season closures beyond 2015, it is assumed that positive net economic effects would continue to result from all proposed season closures.

**Combined effects of recreational measures (changes in ACL and ACT, in size limit and season closures)**

For 2015, recreational season lengths, changes in economic value to the recreational sector that would be expected to result from the modifications to the recreational greater amberjack ACL and ACT (Action 1), modifications to the minimum recreational size limit (Action 2.1) and changes to the seasonal closures (Action 2.2) are provided in Table 4.2.3 and Table 4.2.4, respectively.

**Table 4.2.3.** Recreational season lengths by recreational ACT and size limit. Season lengths in days; size limits in inches fork length

Closed Seasons	Size Limit	Modifications to ACL and ACT		
		ACT Alt 1	ACT Alt 2	
			13% buffer	20% buffer
June 1 - July 31	30	182	179	172
none	30	190	187	181
March 1 to May 31	30	145	142	135
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	30	97	92	85
June 1 - July 31	32	196	191	180
none	32	199	195	188
March 1 to May 31	32	152	149	142
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	32	108	102	91
June 1 - July 31	34	215	209	196
none	34	211	208	200
March 1 to May 31	34	168	162	150
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	34	123	118	104
June 1 - July 31	36	258	237	222
none	36	227	224	215
March 1 to May 31	36	192	185	170
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	36	147	140	125

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

**Table 4.2.4.** Estimated 2015 changes in economic value for alternative greater amberjack recreational season closures and recreational ACTs. Size limit in inches fork length, economic values in 2013 dollars.

Closed Seasons	Size Limit	Modifications to ACL and ACT		
		ACT Alt 1	ACT Alt 2	
			13% buffer	20% buffer
June 1 - July 31	30	-----	-\$67,231.30	-\$224,104.32
none	30	\$187,757.29	\$120,133.86	-\$15,113.01
March 1 to May 31	30	\$8,117.86	-\$59,113.43	-\$215,986.45
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	30	\$28,760.43	\$6,412.66	-\$150,460.36
June 1 - July 31	32	\$12,682.12	-\$8,755.41	-\$91,280.53
none	32	\$338,109.33	\$249,687.09	\$94,948.16
March 1 to May 31	32	\$100,495.42	\$34,589.09	-\$119,192.33
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	32	\$36,792.10	\$11,067.05	-\$53,776.79
June 1 - July 31	34	\$29,939.94	\$5,135.22	-\$47,551.16
none	34	\$528,823.57	\$464,154.66	\$291,704.23
March 1 to May 31	34	\$113,972.70	\$89,655.91	\$6,174.69
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	34	\$45,323.27	\$24,896.63	-\$31,842.55
June 1 - July 31	36	\$103,280.87	\$29,615.21	-\$25,865.76
none	36	\$782,951.66	\$720,491.19	\$533,109.76
March 1 to May 31	36	\$132,222.84	\$106,331.72	\$51,956.07
January 1 – May 31 and Nov 1 – Dec 31	36	\$66,521.16	\$40,630.04	-\$14,850.92

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

As previously discussed, reductions in recreational ACLs and ACTs would be expected to result in adverse economic effects to the recreational sector. Conversely, larger minimum size limits would be expected to result in longer fishing seasons and increased economic value. Finally, alternative closed season may be expected to result in increased or decreased economic value based on the temporal distribution of harvests and the total amount harvested by the recreational sector. For 2015, the net economic effects expected to result from recreational ACL and ACT changes (Action 1), size limit changes (Action 2.1) and season closure modifications (Action 2.2) would depend of the relative magnitude of the economic effects on the recreational sector of the proposed alternatives. Noting that Action 1- Alternative 1 is not a viable alternative because it would exceed the recommended stock ACL, the combination that would be expected to result in the greatest net economic benefits in 2015 would set a 13% buffer on the recreational ACL (Action 1-Alternatives 2 or 3 – Option a), establish a 36 inch minimum size limit (Action 2.1-Alternative 4), and eliminate the closed season (Action 2.2-Alternative 2). Conversely, the combination that would be expected to result in the greatest loss in economic value to the recreational sector would set a 20% buffer on the recreational ACL (Action 1-Alternatives 2 or

3-Option b), maintain and the current 30-inch minimum recreational size limit (Action 2.1- Alternative 1) and the current June 1-July 31 closed season (Action 2.2- Preferred Alternative 1).

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment**

The fixed closed season for greater amberjack during the months of June and July (**Preferred Alternative 1**) was intended to avoid in-season closures and allow for fishing this large trophy fish when red snapper harvest is closed. Modifications to the recreational closed season for greater amberjack were evaluated and not adopted in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012). The issue is being evaluated again as the rebuilding plan goals were not met, requiring further reductions to harvests.

The June through July closed season (**Preferred Alternative 1**) was originally implemented (GMFMC 2008) to reduce fishing effort for greater amberjack and avoid in-season closures. A fixed closed season allows private recreational fishermen and for-hire operators the ability to schedule fishing trips with more certainty. An in-season closure is disruptive to planning fishing trips because the date of the closure is not known in advance. Impacts would arise from in-season closures if planned fishing trips must be cancelled. Also, at the time the closure was adopted in 2008, the greater amberjack fixed closed season overlapped with the June 1 – August 4 open season for red snapper. This is a benefit for recreational fishermen who prefer to have one of the two trophy fish open throughout the year. The length of the federal red snapper season has since become progressively shorter, such that for most of June and all of July 2014, fishing for both red snapper and greater amberjack was closed in federal waters. With the 2015 increase to the red snapper quota, the recreational red snapper season length in federal waters will be 10 days for anglers fishing from privately owned vessels, and 44 days for anglers fishing from federally permitted for-hire vessels. Therefore, the same social effects will continue for 2015 for anglers fishing from privately owned vessels, but there will be some additional social benefits for anglers fishing from federally permitted for-hire vessels, at least through mid-July.

Eliminating the fixed closed season (**Alternative 2**) would open the recreational sector from January 1 until the ACT is filled. This alternative could negatively affect both for-hire operators, their angler passengers, and private recreational fishermen as the closure date for the sector would be announced with little notice. Without a fixed closed season, the ACT under Action 1's Alternative 2 or 3, Option b (13% buffer) is expected to be met in approximately 187 days. This suggests that the greater amberjack and red snapper seasons would be closed for the year at approximately the same time, and neither trophy species would be open throughout the fall.

**Alternative 3** would modify the recreational season closure for greater amberjack to March 1 through May 31 which coincides with the peak spawning season and the commercial sector's closed season. Closing the season at this time could provide biological benefits to the stock thereby benefiting fishermen in the long term. Among the management tools that constrain effort, anglers generally support closed seasons during spawning times, recognizing the resulting conservation benefits. However, red snapper is also closed at this time meaning that negative effects may accrue to fishermen by prohibiting access to one of the trophy species or the other on a year-round basis. On the other hand, as with the benefits described for **Preferred Alternative**

**1**, a fixed closed season reduces the likelihood of an in-season closure and enables the scheduling of fishing trips.

Furthermore, **Alternative 3** is not expected to reduce effort sufficiently to avoid an in-season closure. Given the preferred alternatives selected in Action 1, the season length would be between 142 and 185 days (162 days under the preferred minimum size limit increase to 34”), meaning the closure proposed in **Alternative 3** will be insufficient to prevent a closing before the end of the year. **Alternative 3** could provide benefits to anglers who prefer to have red snapper and greater amberjack open at the same time. Some anglers may prefer to take fewer fishing trips due to the costs (e.g., fuel) of multiple trips to target species at different times of the year. However, because recreational fishermen often target multiple species at one time, this may not include as much of a benefit unless recreational anglers are interested in targeting greater amberjack and red snapper specifically.

**Alternative 4** would modify the recreational seasonal closure so that the season is open from June 1 - October 31, five months in duration. As with **Preferred Alternative 1** and **Alternative 3**, benefits could be expected for fishermen by establishing a fixed closure that enables the scheduling of fishing trips and avoids the likelihood of an in-season closure. The season would also be open throughout the summer and into early fall when fishing participation (effort) is greatest. As with **Alternatives 2** and **3**, the red snapper recreational season in federal waters would overlap with the greater amberjack season, meaning both trophy species would be open at the same time. This would be expected to provide benefits to those fishermen who prefer to target both species on summer trips, but is not desirable for for-hire operators who have expressed support for having one of the two trophy species open when the other is closed. Given the heterogeneity of angler preferences, there is no consensus concerning the best time for a season closure.

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment**

The alternatives in **Action 2.2** are expected to create nominal differences in the direct and indirect impacts on the administrative environment. **Preferred Alternative 1** would have the least impact on the administrative environment, because the current fixed closed season June 1 - July 31 is already established for the recreational sector (GMFMC 2008). **Alternatives 2, 3, and 4** are expected to have similar impacts on the administrative environment because they would be modified from no action. **Alternative 2** is expected to create the greatest burden on the administrative environment because all fixed closed seasons would be removed. Landings for the recreational sector would need to be closely monitored and enforced when the quota was projected to be reached so that it is not exceeded. Managing the recreational sector without a fixed closed season has resulted in overages in the past. An additional level of public information and broadcasts by radio and press releases may be necessary to inform stakeholders when the fishery is closed, because it could be a different month and day each year based on natural changes in the resource and shifts in effort.

## 4.3 Action 3 - Commercial Management Measures

### Direct and Indirect Effects on the Physical Environment

Direct effects to the physical environment resulting from commercial fishing include physical damage to habitat associated with anchoring, longline snags on the bottom, and hook-and-line abrading the bottom and potentially tearing off attached organisms as discussed in Section 4.1., Sixty-eight percent of the greater amberjack commercial landings from 2004 - 2013 were caught using vertical line gear including bandit gear, electric reels, and trolling (SEFSC Commercial ACL Data Set 2014).

Greater amberjack are primarily caught in the water column above structure. During greater amberjack commercial fishing the hook and line gear is unlikely to contact bottom habitat or cause any damage. However, anchoring over wrecks or other structure to fish for greater amberjack may have a negative effect on those structures and surrounding benthic habitat. Commercial longline vessels captured 10% of the total commercial greater amberjack landed from 2001 - 2010. However, bottom longlines are not used to target greater amberjack and typically catch the fish while setting and retrieving the gear so effort with this gear type should not be affected by a reduction in the sector ACL. Additionally, to use longline gear east of 85° 30' W., an endorsement is required as implemented in Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009). Spearfishing and other unclassified gear, including unclassified diving gear, accounted for an estimated 22% of the commercial harvest from 2004 - 2013. There are several existing habitat areas of particular concern, marine sanctuaries, and marine reserves in the Gulf of Mexico providing additional protection to greater amberjack habitat and help reduce impacts to the physical environment (see Section 3.1). The alternatives in **Action 3** are not expected to alter the execution of the fishery and therefore are not expected to have any substantial change or effects to the physical environment.

**Action 3, Alternative 1**, the no action alternative, would maintain the current 2,000-lbs whole weight (ww) trip limit. **Alternative 1** provides the commercial sector with a 75-82 day fishing season. A range of days are provided as the estimate is dependent upon the preferred alternative selected in **Action 1**. The in-season management measures developed to adhere to the sector ACL would be to close the sector when the ACT or quota has been reached. This closure is not expected to vary the fishing effort and would not have any additional direct or in-direct effects on the physical environment. The commercial sector uses similar gear to catch the different reef fish species including greater amberjack. Thus, fishing effort would be expected to continue even if greater amberjack is closed.

**Preferred Alternative 2** would decrease the commercial trip limit to 1,500 lbs gutted weight (gw) which is projected to provide a commercial fishing season between 83-91 days. **Alternative 3** would decrease the commercial trip limit to 1,000 lbs gw and is projected to provide a commercial fishing season of 110-123 days. **Alternative 4** would decrease the commercial trip limit to 750 lbs gw and is projected to provide a commercial fishing season between 140-157 days. **Alternative 5** would decrease the commercial trip limit to 500 lbs gw, which is projected to provide a commercial fishing season between 207-233 days. A lower commercial trip limit is expected to provide a longer greater amberjack fishing season and is not anticipated to shift any

fishing effort or methods because less than 5% of trips exclusively target greater amberjack (SEFSC Commercial Logbook 2011). Therefore, **Alternatives 2 - 5** would be beneficial but would only have minimal effects on the physical environment relative to **Alternative 1**. Table 2.3.2 analyzes the five trip limit alternatives depending on the ACT selected. The difference among the five alternatives on direct and indirect effects to the physical environment is expected to be minimal.

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Biological/Ecological Environment**

Management actions that directly impact the biological and ecological environment include fishing mortality and the resulting population size, life history characteristics, and the role of the species within its habitat. Removal of fish from the population through fishing reduces the overall population size and reproductive potential. Benefits associated with ending overfishing and rebuilding the stock include: expanding the size- and age-structure, increasing stock abundance and biomass, and reducing mortality. The ACL would be expected to be harvested under all of the trip limit options, so the expected effects on the biological/ecological environment pertain mainly to changes in discards and or the risk of exceeding the ACL.

The expected effects of a trip limit change on the level of greater amberjack discards depend on the magnitude of the change. Marginal changes to the trip limit would not be expected to result in a change in the targeting behavior of fishermen. Under this scenario, discards would be expected to increase, because vessels that continue to target greater amberjack would achieve the trip limit sooner than they would under the status quo. A larger change in the trip limit, conversely, would be expected to alter targeting behavior as compared to the status quo. Under this scenario, vessels that previously would have targeted greater amberjack would likely shift their effort to other species and, as a result, would be expected to encounter greater amberjack at a level that is below the new trip limit, resulting in no new discards. This reduction in greater amberjack trip-level landings would also be expected to result in an extended season, during which time, vessels targeting other reef fish species would now be able to convert greater amberjack discards into landings. This would be expected to result in an overall decrease in the level of greater amberjack discards, which would have a beneficial effect on the biological and ecological environment.

**Alternative 1**, the no action alternative is projected to provide the shortest fishing season, but would continue to result in a high level of discards after the season is closed, due to incidental catch on reef fish trips. **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternatives 3 - 5** would reduce the commercial trip limit relative to **Alternative 1** and the expected effects on the biological and ecological environment would depend on the behavioral response of fishermen, as discussed above. **Preferred Alternative 2** would result in the smallest decrease in the trip limit and, as such, would be expected to result in an increased level of discards, relative to the status quo. **Alternative 5** would result in the largest decrease in the trip limit and would be expected to reduce discards relative to the status quo, because incidental discards which would have been expected to occur under the status quo, after the season is closed, would now be converted into landings. The expected effects of **Alternative 3** and **Alternative 4** are less certain.

If the commercial ACT and ACL are reduced from status quo to meet the objectives of rebuilding the stock, an additional reduction to the commercial trip limit would reduce the likelihood of exceeding the ACL.

The biological/ecological effects on bycatch and non-target species is discussed in the Bycatch Practicability Analysis (Appendix D) of this document.

Therefore, **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternatives 3 - 5** would be expected to have minimal effects on the biological and ecological environment relative to **Alternative 1**. Table 2.3.2 analyzes the five alternatives depending on the ACT selected. The difference among the five alternatives on direct and indirect effects to the biological environment is expected to be minimal.

### **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Economic Environment**

This action considers reductions to the commercial greater amberjack trip limit from the current 1,923 lbs gw. Reductions proposed would set the trip limit to 1,500 lbs gw (**Preferred Alternative 2**), 1,000 lbs gw (**Alternative 3**), 750 lbs gw (**Alternative 4**) or 500 lbs gw (**Alternative 5**). **Alternative 1**, the no action alternative, would not affect the commercial harvests of greater amberjack and would therefore not be expected to result in changes to the economic environment.

A reduction in the greater amberjack commercial trip limit would be expected to decrease the amount of harvest per trip for vessels that normally harvest, or would be expected to harvest, over the proposed trip limit. As a result, these vessels would be expected to experience a reduction in per-trip greater amberjack ex-vessel revenues and associated profits, assuming relatively stable operating costs per trip. To the extent that the a trip limit reduction could postpone quota closures to a later date compared to status quo, some of the revenue losses from a trip limit could be recouped by undertaking more trips later in the year. These additional trips would also incur additional fishing costs so that profit per vessel as well as for the entire harvesting industry may remain the same, decrease, or increase. One favorable factor of a trip limit reduction is the possibility to lengthen the season and avoid concentrating landings over a short period of time which could depress prices. A longer fishing season would also afford those who target or catch greater amberjack on a seasonal basis additional opportunities to fish for the species. However, if the trip limit is too low, it may preclude fishermen from harvesting the entirety of the commercial quota, possibly resulting in net loss in total industry revenue. Given the limitations of the current decision tool, the quantitative analysis presented is limited to changes in ex-vessel revenues for 2015. For subsequent years, a qualitative discussion of the economic effects expected to result from the management alternatives is provided. For 2015, estimated season lengths and associated changes in ex-vessel revenues relative to **Alternative 1** are provided for each alternative trip limit in Table 4.3.1. Changes in ex-vessel revenues were based on monthly average prices between 2009 and 2013.

**Table 4.3.1.** Estimated 2015 commercial greater amberjack season length and changes in ex-vessel value by trip limit. Trip limits in pounds gutted weight; season length in days; dollar values in 2013 dollars

	Trip Limit	Season Length	Changes in Ex-Vessel Value
Alternative 1	1,923	82	
<u>Alternative 2</u>	1,500	91	\$3,599.38
Alternative 3	1,000	123	-\$15,365.12
Alternative 4	750	157	-\$32,731.67
Alternative 5	500	233	-\$39,684.14

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

If it is assumed that under status quo commercial fishermen have devised adequate fishing practices, e.g., catch composition, to optimize their fishing operations, sizeable reductions in trip limits would disrupt their customary practices and could be expected to adversely affect their revenues. However, smaller reductions in trip limits may not significantly affect fishing practices and may not adversely impact revenues. As previously noted, smaller trip limits could also reduce the amount of fish available and therefore have a positive effect on market prices.

**Alternative 5**, which would establish the smallest trip limit, would be expected to result in the greatest adverse economic effect in 2015, followed by **Alternative 4**, then **Alternative 3**. It is estimated that the trip limit reduction that would be implemented under **Preferred Alternative 2** would not be large enough to adversely affect fishing practices and would offer opportunities to prosecute greater amberjack during a larger time period and result in positive economic effects for 2015. Changes in ex-vessel revenues estimated using the decision tool developed by SERO (2015) are expected to range from -\$39,684.11 (**Alternative 5**) to \$3,599 (**Preferred Alternative 2**).

#### **Combined commercial measures (ACL and ACT changes and trip limit reduction)**

For 2015, commercial season lengths and net economic effects on the commercial sector that would be expected to result from the modifications to the commercial greater amberjack ACL and ACT (Action 1) and reductions in trip limit (Action 3) are provided in Tables 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, respectively.

**Table 4.3.2.** Commercial season lengths by commercial ACT and trip limit. Season length in days.

Trip Limit	Modifications to ACL and ACT		
	Alternative 1	Alternatives 2 and 3	
		Option a (15% buffer)	Option b (20% buffer)
Alternative 1	82	79	75
Alternative 2 (1,500 lbs)	91	87	83
Alternative 3 (1,000 lbs)	123	118	110
Alternative 4 (750 lbs)	157	151	140
Alternative 5 (500 lbs)	233	223	207

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

**Table 4.3.3.** 2015 Changes in commercial greater amberjack ex-vessel values by trip limit and by commercial ACTs. Ex-vessel values in 2013 dollars

Trip Limit	Modifications to ACL and ACT		
	Alternative 1	Alternatives 2 and 3	
		Option a (15% buffer)	Option b (20% buffer)
Alternative 1	----	-\$26,174.25	-\$61,073.25
Alternative 2 (1,500 lbs)	\$3,599.38	-\$20,703.19	-\$52,071.39
Alternative 3 (1,000 lbs)	-\$15,365.12	-\$30,831.43	-\$57,007.06
Alternative 4 (750 lbs)	-\$32,731.67	-\$48,799.33	-\$74,922.19
Alternative 5 (500 lbs)	-\$39,684.14	-\$59,739.48	-\$89,210.90

Source: SERO-LAPP 2015-01

As previously discussed, larger trip limit reductions and decreases in ACT would be expected to result in greater adverse economic effects on the commercial sector. Therefore, for 2015, Action 1- Alternatives 2 or 3 (Option b) and Action 3-Alternative 5 would have constituted the combination expected to result in the greatest loss in ex-vessel revenues. Beyond 2015, combinations that include a trip limit reduction and ACL and ACT reductions would be expected to result in continued ex-vessel revenue losses. However, the sign and magnitude of economic effects expected to result from combinations that include a trip limit reduction and increases in commercial ACL and ACT are not known. The combined economic effects would be expected to be positive if the increases in commercial ACL and ACT more than offset the adverse economic effects that would be expected to result from a reduction in trip limit beyond 1,500 lbs gw. Beyond 2015, the establishment of a 1,500 lb trip limit (Action 3-Alternative 3) in conjunction with increases in commercial ACL and ACTs would be expected to result in net

positive economic effects because the trip limit reduction would not be large enough to disrupt fishing practices and prevent the commercial sector from harvesting its quota.

This action would reduce the commercial ACL to 0.464 million pounds (mp) ww and apply a 15% buffer to set the commercial ACT (**Action 1 – Preferred Alternative 3 – Preferred Option a**) and decrease the commercial greater amberjack trip limit to 1,500 lbs gw (**Action 3 – Preferred Alternative 2**). The net economic effect expected to result from the selected suite of preferred commercial management measures is estimated at -\$20,703 for the first year. Although economic effects expected to result in subsequent years from the preferred commercial ACL and ACT reductions and trip limit decrease cannot be estimated due to data limitations, it is expected that comparable economic losses would continue to result from the selected combination of preferred alternatives.

## Direct and Indirect Effects on the Social Environment

Commercial trip limits in the range of 500 lbs to 2,000 lbs ww were evaluated as an alternative to eliminating the fixed closed season (March through May) in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012). The Council selected a 2,000-lb ww trip limit, now **Alternative 1**. With the addition of a 750-lb gw trip limit, the same alternatives<sup>13</sup> are being re-evaluated. The commercial fixed closed season coincides with the peak spawning season of greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico. Although no additional effects would be expected from maintaining the 2,000-lb ww/1,923-lb gw trip limit (**Alternative 1**), the commercial sector has regularly exceeded its quota, which is then reduced further in the following year as a result of the prior overage. Thus, some additional measure is needed to enable some reduction of the commercial harvest to rebuild greater amberjack.

Modifying commercial trip limits would affect commercial fishermen depending on their existing fishing practice. Although not many reef fish fishermen target greater amberjack regularly, those who do would be affected by a further reduction to the trip limit (**Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternatives 3-5**; Table 4.3.4). As discussed in Section 3.4, the majority of commercial fishermen land greater amberjack incidentally, alongside other reef fish as part of a multi-species fishing strategy. The 2,000-lb trip limit adopted in 2012 was projected to most affect 8% of vessels which landed greater amberjack at some time during the year, as a directed fishing strategy became prohibited. The remaining alternatives propose to further reduce the trip limit. The number of vessels that make landings in excess of the threshold proposed by each alternative is shown in Table 4.3.4. For each of **Preferred Alternative 2** and **Alternatives 3-5**, those individuals involved with the vessels making landings above each proposed trip limit would be the ones most affected by the alternative selected. In general, more fishermen and vessels would be affected from the smaller the trip limit that is selected. Thus, **Preferred Alternative 2** would affect the fewest fishermen and vessels among all **Alternatives**. The greatest negative effects would be expected from selecting the smallest trip limit (500 lbs gw; **Alternative 5**).

---

<sup>13</sup> The trip limit alternatives in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012) were in pounds *whole weight*. Those proposed in this framework action are in pounds *gutted weight*. Alternative 1's, 2,000-lb trip limit equates to 1,923 lbs gutted weight.

Table 4.3.4 contains the number of vessels per year that made greater amberjack landings in excess of each of the trip limits proposed by **Alternatives 2-5**. These data reflect the highest landings of each vessel at least once during the year and each vessel likely made numerous trips. The number of vessels with landings greater than each proposed trip limit is a subset of the previous column's maximum landing weight. For example, in 2009, 318 unique vessels landed at least one pound of greater amberjack during the year. Of those 318 vessels, 76 vessels landed more than 500 lbs on a single trip, on at least one trip during the year. The proportion of vessels that made at least a single landing of greater amberjack above the poundage provided for each of the proposed options is shown in Table 4.3.5. The table includes three time frames for comparison: the average number of vessels landing more than each trip limit for 10 years, 5 years, and a single year (2013). Although the number of vessels landing greater amberjack varies each year, the proportion of vessels with landings greater than each trip limit has remained consistent. These data facilitate consideration of the number of vessels that may be impacted by the adoption of each proposed trip limit.

**Table 4.3.4.** Number of vessels by year with greater amberjack landings greater than the proposed trip limits under Preferred Alternative 1 and Alternatives 2-5.

Year	Number of Vessels					
	>0 lbs	Alt. 5 ≥ 500 lbs	Alt. 4 ≥ 750 lbs	Alt. 3 ≥ 1000 lbs	Pref. Alt. 2 ≥ 1500 lbs	Alt. 1 ≥ 2000 lbs
1993	530	106	80	64	44	35
1994	566	134	94	66	45	36
1995	509	117	89	66	44	35
1996	509	134	94	74	46	35
1997	491	115	87	69	49	39
1998	446	97	68	52	28	24
1999	467	96	66	55	41	29
2000	464	101	76	60	44	30
2001	455	110	75	54	38	32
2002	465	100	75	57	38	31
2003	492	125	90	70	51	39
2004	468	108	84	65	46	37
2005	447	100	70	58	41	33
2006	360	86	61	48	34	30
2007	287	73	54	41	33	27
2008	314	79	56	41	24	19
2009	318	76	53	43	34	25
2010	222	59	46	36	27	23
2011	191	56	39	35	25	16
2012	143	47	40	37	28	21
2013	178	83	62	53	37	19

Source: Southeast Fisheries Science Center Commercial Logbook (Nov 2014).

Note: The columns contain the number of unique vessels landing greater amberjack. The first column (>0 lbs) is the total number of vessels landing greater amberjack on at least one trip for the given year. Subsequent columns contain the number of vessels out of the total that landed more greater amberjack than each proposed trip limit on a single trip.

**Table 4.3.5.** Proportion of vessels with landings of greater amberjack that exceed each proposed trip limit option.

	Number of Vessels					
		Alt. 5	Alt. 4	Alt. 3	Pref. Alt. 2	Alt. 1
	>0 lbs	>= 500 lbs	>=750 lbs	>=1000 lbs	>=1500 lbs	>=2000 lbs
2004-2013 (Average)	292.8	76.7	56.5	45.7	32.9	25
	100%	26%	19%	16%	11%	9%
2009-2013 (Average)	210.4	64.2	48	40.8	30.2	20.8
	100%	31%	23%	19%	14%	10%
2013	178	83	62	53	37	19
	100%	47%	35%	30%	21%	11%

Note: Although the number of vessels landing greater amberjack varies by year (see Table 4.3.4), the proportion of vessels with landings that exceed each trip limit option is fairly consistent.

Generally, greater amberjack is caught by vertical line alongside other reef fish species and makes up only a part of most vessels' landings per trip. On average, over the last five years (Table 4.3.5), 14% of vessels would be most impacted by the adoption of a 1,500-lb trip limit (**Preferred Alternative 2**); 19% would be impacted by a 1,000-lb trip limit (**Alternative 3**); 23% by a 750-lb trip limit (**Alternative 4**); and the most, 31% of vessels would have to modify their fishing strategy and behavior to avoid exceeding a 500-lb trip limit (**Alternative 5**).

Some vessels may target greater amberjack in a directed trip and land several thousands of pounds. Others conduct directed trips seasonally and yet others direct effort during part of a multi-day fishing trip, and would exceed 2,000 lbs ww on this day alone. However, it is more common for greater amberjack directed trips to be part of a flexible, multi-species strategy of a subset of vessels rather than a full-time dedicated fishery. It is not likely that any vessel targets greater amberjack full-time. In more recent years, a majority of vessels do not exceed 1,000 lbs on any trip during the year (Table 4.3.5). However, these examples of diversified fishing strategies represent examples of ways fishermen adapt to changing regulations and fishing conditions. Reducing the trip limit will narrow the available fishing options, negatively impacting fishing behavior and practice for some fishermen. Thus, reducing the trip limit is expected to affect a segment of commercial reef fish participants, rather than affecting all participants evenly. Vessels will likely continue to fish but their crew will switch effort in as yet unknown ways.

The smaller the trip limit, the longer the fishing season would be expected to remain open. In this way, there is a trade-off between the amount of greater amberjack that can be landed at one time, and the amount of time available to catch those fish. With a 1,923-lb gw trip limit (**Alternative 1**), the season is expected to remain open for 75-82 days, depending on the buffer selected in Action 1. Smaller trip limits will impact more vessels, but allow the season to remain open longer. With a 1,500-lb gw trip limit, the season would be expected to be open 83-91 days (**Preferred Alternative 2**); a 1,000-lb gw trip limit may provide a season of 110-123 days (**Alternative 3**); a 750-lb trip limit may provide a season of 140-157 days (**Alternative 4**), and

the most restrictive trip limit, 500 lbs gw (**Alternative 5**), would be expected to provide the longest fishing season, from 207-233 days. Thus, **Alternative 5** would be expected to allow the longest fishing season, but restrict vessels to the smallest trip limit.

## **Direct and Indirect Effects on the Administrative Environment**

**Alternative 1** is not expected to impact the administrative environment because it would not change the current management measures. **Preferred Alternative 2** would be expected to have an increasing burden on the administrative environment due to the modification of the commercial trip limit in regard to quota monitoring and the resulting length of the open season. **Alternatives 3, 4 and 5** would be expected to have an increased burden on the administrative environment due to the modification of the commercial trip limit in regard to quota monitoring and the resulting length of the open season. Therefore, **Alternative 1** would have the least adverse effect on the administrative environment.

### **4.4 Cumulative Effects**

The cumulative effects of setting the ACLs and ACTs (quotas) in this regulatory amendment are similar to the greater amberjack rebuilding plan in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012), which is incorporated by reference and is further summarized below. This analysis found the effects on the biophysical and socioeconomic environments are positive in the long-term, because they would ultimately restore/maintain the stock at a level that allows the maximum benefits in yield and commercial and recreational fishing opportunities to be achieved. However, short-term negative impacts on the socioeconomic environment associated with greater amberjack fishing have occurred and are likely to continue due to the need to limit directed harvest and reduce bycatch mortality. These negative impacts can be minimized by selecting measures that would provide the least disruption to the greater amberjack component of the reef fish fishery while maintaining a stock ACL and sector quotas consistent with the adjusted ABC, and while also reducing the potential to exceed the ACL and end overfishing.

The proposed actions are directed towards the management of naturally occurring species in the Gulf of Mexico, so the introduction or spread of non-indigenous species should not occur. Additionally, the action does not propose any activity, such as increased ballast water discharge from foreign vessels, which is associated with the introduction or spread on non-indigenous species.

There is a large and growing body of literature on past, present, and future impacts of global climate change induced by human activities. Some of the likely effects commonly mentioned are sea level rise, increased frequency of severe weather events, and change in air and water temperatures. The Environmental Protection Agency's climate change web page provides basic background information on these and other measured or anticipated effects. In addition, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has numerous reports addressing their assessments of climate change ([http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/publications\\_and\\_data.shtml](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_and_data.shtml)). Global climate changes could have significant effects on Gulf of Mexico fisheries; however, the extent of these effects is not known at this time. Possible impacts include temperature changes in coastal and marine ecosystems that can influence organism metabolism and alter ecological

processes such as productivity and species interactions; changes in precipitation patterns and a rise in sea level which could change the water balance of coastal ecosystems; altering patterns of wind and water circulation in the ocean environment; and influencing the productivity of critical coastal ecosystems such as wetlands, estuaries, and coral reefs (Kennedy et al. 2002). Modeling of climate change in relation to the northern Gulf of Mexico hypoxic zone may exacerbate attempts to reduce the area affected by these events (Justic et al. 2003). It is unclear how climate change would affect reef fishes, and likely would affect species differently. Climate change can affect factors such as migration, range, larval and juvenile survival, prey availability, and susceptibility to predators. In addition, the distribution of native and exotic species may change with increased water temperature, as may the prevalence of disease in keystone animals such as corals and the occurrence and intensity of toxic algae blooms. Climate change may significantly impact Gulf of Mexico reef fish species in the future, but the level of impacts cannot be quantified at this time, nor is the time frame known in which these impacts would occur. Actions from this amendment are not expected to significantly contribute to climate change through the increase or decrease the carbon footprint from fishing.

The effects of the proposed action are, and will continue to be, monitored through collection of landings data by NMFS, stock assessments and stock assessment updates, life history studies, economic and social analyses, and other scientific observations. Landings data for the recreational sector in the Gulf of Mexico are collected through the Marine Recreational Information Program, the Southeast Headboat Survey, and the Texas Marine Recreational Fishing Survey. In addition, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources have instituted programs to collect greater amberjack recreational landings information in their respective states. Commercial data are collected through trip ticket programs, port samplers, and logbook programs, as well as dealer reporting through the individual fishing quota program. Currently, a SEDAR Update assessment for Gulf of Mexico of Mexico greater amberjack is scheduled in 2016.

Two important events include impacts of the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill and climate change. Impacts from the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill are still being examined and peer-reviewed studies are now only just being published. However, the effects of this oil on greater amberjack and other reef fish populations are incomplete and unavailable (see 40 CFR § 1502.22) at this time because studies of the effects of the oil spill are still ongoing. If the oil impacts important habitat for these species or interrupts critical life history stages, the effects could reduce these species' population sizes. The oil itself could have adversely affected adult greater amberjack and other reef fish species. In a recent study, Weisberg et al. (2014) suggested the hydrocarbons associated with Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill did transit onto the Florida shelf and may be associated with the occurrences of reef fish with lesions and other deformities. However, Murawski et al. (2014) reported that the incidence of lesions on bottom dwelling fish had declined between 2011 and 2012 in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

# CHAPTER 5. REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW

## 5.1 Introduction

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) requires a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for all regulatory actions that are of public interest. The RIR does three things: 1) it provides a comprehensive review of the level and incidence of impacts associated with a proposed or final regulatory action; 2) it provides a review of the problems and policy objectives prompting the regulatory proposals and an evaluation of the major alternatives that could be used to solve the problem; and, 3) it ensures that the regulatory agency systematically and comprehensively considers all available alternatives so that the public welfare can be enhanced in the most efficient and cost-effective way. The RIR also serves as the basis for determining whether the regulations are a “significant regulatory action” under the criteria provided in Executive Order (E.O.) 12866. This RIR analyzes the impacts this action would be expected to have on the greater amberjack component of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery.

## 5.2 Problems and Objectives

The problems and objectives addressed by this action are discussed in Section 1.2.

## 5.3 Description of Fisheries

A description of the red snapper component of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is provided in Sections 3.1 and 3.5.

## 5.4 Impacts of Management Measures

### 5.4.1 Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Annual Catch Limits (ACL) and Annual Catch Targets (ACT)

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 4.1. The following discussion summarizes the key points of this analysis.

**Preferred Alternative 3** would set a constant greater amberjack stock ACL and associated recreational and commercial ACLs and ACTs for 2015 and subsequent years. To determine the commercial and recreational ACTs, **Preferred Option a** would apply a 15% buffer to the commercial ACL and a 13% buffer to the recreational ACL, respectively. For the commercial sector, **Preferred Alternative 3-Preferred Option a** would be expected to result in ex-vessel revenue losses estimated at approximately \$26,174 (2013 dollars) in 2015. For the recreational sector, consumer surplus losses expected to result from **Preferred Alternative 3-Preferred Option a** in 2015 are estimated at \$19,679 (in 2013 dollars). Negative economic effects would also result from losses in producer surplus to charter and headboat for-hire operators if some for-hire trips targeting greater amberjack are eliminated due to the shortening of the recreational greater amberjack season. Only the economic effects to charter vessels, however, could be estimated with available data because of the absence of species target information for headboat

anglers. Potential losses in producer surplus to the charter for-hire operators in 2015 are estimated at \$47,552 (in 2013 dollars). Beyond 2015, although unquantifiable due to data and model limitations, comparable losses in ex-vessel value to the commercial sector and in economic value to the recreational sector would be expected to occur due to the decreases in stock and sector specific ACLs, commercial and recreational ACTs, and resultant decreases in commercial and recreational season lengths relative to **Alternative 1** (status quo).

#### 5.4.2.1 Modifications to the Recreational Minimum Size Limit for Greater Amberjack

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 4.2.1. The following discussion summarizes the key points of this analysis.

**Preferred Alternative 3** would increase the size limit to 34 inches FL. Relative to the status quo size limit, a greater size limit would be expected to result in a longer recreational greater amberjack fishing season. For 2015, changes in economic value (consumer and producer surplus<sup>14</sup> combined) expected to result from **Preferred Alternative 3** are estimated at \$29,940 (2013 dollars). Although the changes in economic value in subsequent years cannot be estimated due to data limitations, greater size limits would be expected to continue to result in longer recreational seasons and positive changes in economic value beyond 2015.

#### 5.4.2.2 Modify the Recreational Closed Seasons for Greater Amberjack

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 4.2.2. Because the Council chose the no-action alternative for the action, no regulatory change would occur and no further discussion of the economic effects of this action is provided here.

#### Combined effects of the proposed recreational measures

Reductions in recreational ACLs and ACTs would be expected to result in shorter recreational seasons and adverse economic effects to the recreational sector. However, larger minimum size limits would be expected to result in longer fishing seasons and increased economic value. Therefore, the net economic effects expected to result from the combination of preferred alternatives selected by the Council would depend on the relative magnitude of the economic effects expected to result from ACL and ACT decreases and the economic effects associated with size limit increases. For the recreational sector, because the economic effects due to size limit increases are expected to outweigh the economic effects resulting from ACL and ACT reductions, net economic effects for the recreational sector are expected to be positive and are estimated at approximately \$5,135 (2013 dollars) for 2015. Although economic effects expected to result in subsequent years from the preferred suite of alternatives cannot be estimated due to data limitations, it is expected that comparable positive net economic effects would continue to result from the selected combination of preferred alternatives.

---

<sup>14</sup> Producer surplus estimates are only available for charter for-hire operators.

### 5.4.3 Commercial Management Measures

A detailed analysis of the economic effects expected to result from this action is provided in Section 4.3. The following discussion summarizes the key points of this analysis. It is assumed that commercial fishermen have devised adequate fishing practices, e.g., catch composition, to optimize their fishing operations under the status quo. Therefore, if the greater amberjack trip limit is significantly reduced below their typical level of harvest, it would be expected to disrupt their customary practices and adversely affect their revenues. Small reductions in the trip limit, however, may not significantly affect fishing practices and may not adversely impact revenues. It is estimated that the trip limit reduction that would be implemented under **Preferred Alternative 2** would not be large enough to adversely affect fishing practices and would offer opportunities to prosecute greater amberjack during a longer time period. **Preferred Alternative 2** would, therefore, be expected to result in positive economic effects for 2015. The changes in ex-vessel revenues from greater amberjack expected to result from **Preferred Alternative 2** are estimated at \$3,599 (2013 dollars) in 2015. Although the economic effects expected to result from trip limit reductions in subsequent years cannot be estimated due to data limitations, the economic effects discussed in this section would be expected to continue, subject to changes in angler behavior.

#### **Combined effects of the proposed commercial measures**

The proposed reductions in the commercial ACLs and ACTs would be expected to result in adverse economic effects to the commercial sector due to a reduction in ex-vessel revenues. However, the proposed decrease in the trip limit would be expected to result in positive economic effects, because it would be expected to extend the fishing season, which would be less disruptive of normal commercial fishing practices, and reduce the amount of fish brought to market, which could have a positive effect on prices. The net economic effect expected to result from the selected suite of preferred commercial management measures is estimated at -\$20,703 for 2015. Although economic effects expected to result in subsequent years from the preferred commercial ACL and ACT reductions and trip limit decrease cannot be estimated due to data limitations, it is expected that comparable economic losses would continue to result from the selected combination of preferred alternatives, absent changes in fishing behavior or stock conditions.

### 5.5 Public and Private Costs of Regulations

The preparation, implementation, enforcement, and monitoring of this or any federal action involves the expenditure of public and private resources which can be expressed as costs associated with the regulations. Costs associated with this action include:

Council costs of document preparation, meetings, public hearings, and information dissemination.....	\$50,000
NMFS administrative costs of document preparation, meetings and review .....	\$30,000

TOTAL .....\$80,000

The estimate provided above does not include any law enforcement costs. Any enforcement duties associated with this action would be expected to be covered under routine enforcement costs rather than an expenditure of new funds.

## **5.6 Determination of Significant Regulatory Action**

Pursuant to E.O. 12866, a regulation is considered a “significant regulatory action” if it is likely to result in: 1) an annual effect of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; 2) create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; 3) materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights or obligations of recipients thereof; or 4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities, or the principles set forth in this executive order. Based on the information provided above, this action has been determined to not be economically significant for the purposes of E.O. 12866.

# CHAPTER 6. REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ACT ANALYSIS

## 6.1 Introduction

The purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) is to establish a principle of regulatory issuance that agencies shall endeavor, consistent with the objectives of the rule and of applicable statutes, to fit regulatory and informational requirements to the scale of businesses, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation. To achieve this principle, agencies are required to solicit and consider flexible regulatory proposals and to explain the rationale for their actions to assure such proposals are given serious consideration. The RFA does not contain any decision criteria; instead the purpose of the RFA is to inform the agency, as well as the public, of the expected economic impacts of various alternatives contained in the fishery management plan (FMP) or amendment (including framework management measures and other regulatory actions) and to ensure the agency considers alternatives that minimize the expected impacts while meeting the goals and objectives of the FMP and applicable statutes.

The RFA requires agencies to conduct a Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis (RFAA) for each proposed rule. The RFAA is designed to assess the impacts various regulatory alternatives would have on small entities, including small businesses, and to determine ways to minimize those impacts. An RFAA is conducted to primarily determine whether the proposed action would have a “significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.” The RFAA provides: 1) A description of the reasons why action by the agency is being considered; 2) a succinct statement of the objectives of, and legal basis for, the proposed rule; 3) a description and, where feasible, an estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed rule will apply; 4) a description of the projected reporting, record-keeping, and other compliance requirements of the proposed rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirements of the report or record; 5) an identification, to the extent practicable, of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap, or conflict with the proposed rule; 6) a description and estimate of the expected economic impacts on small entities; and 7) an explanation of the criteria used to evaluate whether the rule would impose “significant economic impacts”.

## 6.2 Statement of the need for, objective of, and legal basis for the proposed action

The need for and objective of this proposed action are provided in Chapter 1. In summary, the current acceptable biological catch (ABC) for Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack does not incorporate updated stock assessment information and exceeds the recommended ABC for 2015 (GFMC 2012). In addition, greater amberjack harvest has exceeded the annual catch limit (ACL) twice in the past four years which necessitates a re-evaluation of and potential modification to the sector (commercial and recreational) ACLs and accountability measures (AMs). The objective of this proposed action is to modify the greater amberjack sector ACLs and annual catch targets (ACTs) and modify the management measures for the recreational size

limit, recreational season and commercial trip limit in order to end overfishing and rebuild the stock. The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act provides the statutory basis for this proposed action.

### **6.3 Description and estimate of the number of small entities to which the proposed action would apply**

This proposed action would apply to all commercial vessels which harvest greater amberjack under the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish FMP. Changes to recreational ACLs, ACTs, minimum size limits and/or closed seasons would not directly apply to or regulate for-hire businesses. Any impact to the profitability or competitiveness of for-hire fishing businesses would be the result of changes in for-hire angler demand and would therefore be indirect in nature. The RFA does not consider recreational anglers, who would be directly affected by this proposed action, to be small entities, so they are outside the scope of this analysis and only the effects on commercial vessels will be analyzed.

As of March 25, 2015, there were 863 valid or renewable Gulf of Mexico reef fish permits. Each of these commercial permits is associated with an individual vessel. On average (2009 through 2013), 211 vessels landed greater amberjack each year. Their average annual vessel-level revenue for 2009 through 2013 was \$130,000 (2013 dollars).

No other small entities that would be directly affected by this proposed action have been identified.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) has established size criteria for all major industry sectors in the U.S., including commercial finfish harvesters (NAICS code 114111). A business primarily involved in finfish harvesting is classified as a small business if it is independently owned and operated, is not dominant in its field of operation (including its affiliates), and has combined annual receipts not in excess of \$20.5 million for all its affiliated operations worldwide. All of the vessels directly regulated by this action are believed to be small entities based on the SBA size criteria.

### **6.4 Description of the projected reporting, record-keeping and other compliance requirements of the proposed action, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for the preparation of the report or records**

This proposed action would not establish any new reporting, record-keeping, or other compliance requirements.

## **6.5 Identification of all relevant federal rules, which may duplicate, overlap or conflict with the proposed action**

No duplicative, overlapping, or conflicting federal rules have been identified.

## **6.6 Significance of economic impacts on a substantial number of small entities**

### **Substantial number criterion**

This proposed action would be expected to directly affect all federally permitted commercial vessels that harvest greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery. All of these entities have been determined, for the purpose of this analysis, to be small entities. Therefore, this proposed action would affect a substantial number of small entities.

### **Significant economic impacts**

The outcome of “significant economic impact” can be ascertained by examining two factors: disproportionality and profitability.

Disproportionality: Do the regulations place a substantial number of small entities at a significant competitive disadvantage to large entities?

All entities expected to be affected by this action are believed to be small entities and, thus, the issue of disproportionality does not arise.

Profitability: Do the regulations significantly reduce profits for a substantial number of small entities?

A detailed discussion of the economic effects associated with each alternative considered is provided in Chapter 4. The following information summarizes the expected effects of this proposed action.

This proposed action would reduce the current commercial ACT by 14,260 lbs whole weight (ww) or 3.5%. In addition, this proposed action would lower the commercial greater amberjack trip limit from 1,923 lbs gutted weight (gw)<sup>15</sup> to 1,500 lbs gw. On its own, the reduction in the ACT would be expected to result in a shorter season and fewer trips that harvest greater amberjack. Conversely, the lower trip limit would be expected to increase the season length and the overall number of trips necessary to harvest the ACT. Analyzed together, the expected recurring annual reduction in ex-vessel revenue from this proposed action, keeping all else constant, is estimated to be \$20,703 (2013 dollars). In addition, the season length is predicted to be five days longer than under the status quo. Assuming the reduction in greater amberjack revenues is distributed evenly across the average number of vessels that harvest greater

---

<sup>15</sup> 2,000 lbs ww.

amberjack per year (211 vessels), the annual per-vessel loss would be \$98 (2013 dollars), or less than one percent of the average annual revenue from all species earned by these vessels. Because this estimate is based on average performance, some vessels may be affected more or less than others, depending on their overall catch composition, landing capacity, and fishing behavior.

Thirty vessels, on average per year (2009 through 2013), were identified that landed greater amberjack in excess of 1,500 lbs gw on a single trip (14% of the average number of vessels that harvested greater amberjack each year). In 2013, the total weight of greater amberjack harvested above 1,500 lbs gw per trip accounted for approximately 10% of total greater amberjack landings<sup>16</sup>. Thus, the proposed reduction in the trip limit, assuming effort remains constant, would be expected to reduce total greater amberjack harvests by approximately 39,000 lbs ww and \$46,800 (2013 dollars) in total ex-vessel revenue annually. Averaged across the 30 vessels per year with trip harvests above 1,500 lb gw, this reduction would equal approximately \$1,560 (2013 dollars) per vessel, or approximately one percent of their average annual revenue. These losses would be reduced if the increased harvest of other species can be substituted for lower greater amberjack landings or if new trips harvesting greater amberjack occur. In an extreme case, some vessels may not be able to fish for greater amberjack at all if a reduction in the trip limit makes those types of trips unprofitable. It is not possible to quantify the likelihood of such cancellations or associated effects with available data. It is assumed that any reduction in landings by these vessels would be absorbed by other vessels on trips with lower greater amberjack yields.

## **6.7 Description of the significant alternatives to the proposed action and discussion of how the alternatives attempt to minimize economic impacts on small entities**

Four alternatives were considered for the action to modify the commercial ACL and ACT for Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack. The first alternative, the no action alternative, would not be expected to have any direct economic effects. This alternative was not selected, however, because the ACL would exceed the ABC calculated by the most recent greater amberjack assessment and recommended by the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and would, therefore, be inconsistent with the National Standard 1 guidelines. The second alternative would use the ABC schedule recommended by the SSC to set the stock ACL for 2015 through 2018. This alternative included two sub-options. The first sub-option would use the Council's ACL/ACT Control Rule in the Generic ACL/AM Amendment (GMFMC 2011), which would set the commercial ACT at 15% of the commercial ACL for greater amberjack. The second sub-option would not use the ACL/ACT Control Rule and instead would apply a 20% buffer, reducing the ACL by 20% to establish the ACT. This alternative would increase the stock ACL each year from 2015 through 2018, which would be expected to result in greater economic benefits than the proposed action. This alternative was not selected as preferred, however, due to the following concerns: 1) the stock remains overfished and is undergoing overfishing, 2) the 10-

---

<sup>16</sup> 2013 is the most recent year in which the current 1,923-lb gw trip limit was in place and for which data is available for the full year. The percentages of pounds landed over and above 1,500 lbs gw are much higher prior to the implementation of the current trip limit.

year rebuilding plan was not met, and 3) the stock biomass has been relatively stable (at overfished levels) for a long period while experiencing harvest levels below what is currently projected to rebuild the stock in upcoming years. The third alternative is the preferred alternative, which would set a constant stock ACL equal to the 2015 ABC value recommended by the SSC. The same two sub-options for setting the ACT that were considered for the second alternative were also considered for the third alternative. The first sub-option, applying a 15% buffer to set the ACT, was selected as preferred. The fourth alternative would set the stock ACL and stock ACT at zero. The fourth alternative would have ceased all directed harvest of greater amberjack and resulted in greater economic losses than the proposed action.

Five alternatives were considered for the action to modify the greater amberjack commercial trip limit. The first alternative, the no action alternative, would maintain the current 1,923-lb gw trip limit and would not be expected to have any direct economic effects. The second alternative is the preferred alternative, which would establish a 1,500-lb gw trip limit for greater amberjack. The third, fourth, and fifth alternatives would have established 1,000-lb gw, 750-lb gw, and 500-lb gw trip limits, respectively. Although these alternatives would be expected to extend the season, they would have increased the likelihood that trips no longer remained profitable and decreased the likelihood that the full ACT would be harvested. As such, these alternatives would be expected to result in greater economic losses to affected small entities than the proposed action.

## CHAPTER 7. LIST OF PREPARERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Expertise</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Agency</b>
John Froeschke	Fishery Biologist	Co-Team Lead – Amendment development, introduction	GMFMC
Rich Malinowski	Biologist	Co-Team Lead – Amendment development, effects analysis, and cumulative effects	SERO
David Records	Economist	Economic environment and Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis	SERO
Ava Lasseter	Anthropologist	Social analyses and Reviewer	GMFMC
Mara Levy	Attorney	Legal compliance and Reviewer	NOAA GC
Scott Sandorf	Technical Writer Editor	Regulatory writer	SERO
Noah Silverman	Natural Resource Management Specialist	NEPA compliance	SERO
Nick Farmer	Biologist	Data analysis	SERO
Michael Larkin	Biologist	Data analysis	SERO
Stephen Holliman	Economist	Reviewer	SERO
Assane Diagne	Economist	Economic effects analysis and Regulatory Impact Review	GMFMC
Juan Agar	Economist	Reviewer	SEFSC
Nancie Cummings	Fishery Assessment Biologist	Reviewer	SEFSC

## **CHAPTER 8. LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS CONSULTED**

The following have or will be consulted.

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council

National Marine Fisheries Service

- Southeast Fisheries Science Center
- Southeast Regional Office
  - Protected Resources
  - Habitat Conservation
  - Sustainable Fisheries

NOAA General Counsel

U.S. Coast Guard

## CHAPTER 9. REFERENCES

- Ault, J. S., S. G. Smith, G. A. Diaz, and E. Franklin. 2003. Florida hogfish fishery stock assessment. University of Miami, Rosenstiel School of Marine Science. Contract No. 7701 617573 for Florida Marine Research Institute, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- Barnette, M. C. 2001. A review of the fishing gear utilized within the Southeast Region and their potential impacts on essential fish habitat. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-449. National Marine Fisheries Service, 263 13th Avenue, South St. Petersburg, Florida 33701
- Beasley, M. 1993. Age and growth of greater amberjack, *Seriola dumerili*, from the northern Gulf of Mexico. Master's Thesis. Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Bortone, S. A., P. A. Hastings, and S.B. Collard. 1977. The Pelagic-*Sargassium* ichthyofauna of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. Northeast Gulf of Mexico Science: 60-67.
- Burch, R. K. 1979. The greater amberjack, *Seriola dumerili*: its biology and fishery off Southeastern Florida. Master's Thesis. University of Miami, Miami.
- Carter, D.W. and C. Liese. 2012. The Economic Value of Catching and Keeping or Releasing Saltwater Sport Fish in the Southeast USA. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 32:4, 613-625. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02755947.2012.675943>
- Cass-Calay, S. L., and M. Bahnick. 2002. Status of the yellowedge grouper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico. Contribution SFD 02/03 – 172. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.
- Clapp, R. B., R. C. Banks, D. Morgan-Jacobs, and W. A. Hoffman. 1982. Marine birds of the southeastern United States and Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Dept. of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington D.C. FWS/OBS-82/01. 3 vols
- Cummings, N., 2015. Additional Stock Projections for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.
- Gore, R. H. 1992. The Gulf of Mexico: A treasury of resources in the American Mediterranean. Pineapple Press. Sarasota, Florida.
- Graham, R. T., and D. W. Castellanos. 2005. Courtship and spawning behaviors of carangid species in Belize. Fishery Bulletin 103:426-432.
- GMFMC and SAFMC. 1982. Fishery management plan final environmental impact statement for coral and coral reefs. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida and South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Charleston, South Carolina.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Coral%20FMP.pdf>

- GMFMC. 1981. Environmental impact statement and fishery management plan for the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico and environmental impact statement. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/RF%20FMP%20and%20EIS%201981-08.pdf>
- GMFMC. 1989. Amendment 1 to the reef fish fishery management plan. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 356 p.
- GMFMC. 1999a. Generic sustainable fisheries act amendment to the following FMPs: Gulf of Mexico coral and coral reef resources, coastal migratory pelagics, red drum, reef fish, shrimp, spiny lobster, stone crab. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida. 155 p. + tables + append.
- GMFMC. 2001. Generic amendment addressing the establishment of the Tortugas Marine Reserves in the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico: Coastal Migratory Pelagics; Coral and Coral Reefs; Red Drum; Reef Fish; Shrimp; Spiny Lobster; Stone Crab. Includes an IRFA, RIR, and a FSEIS.
- GMFMC. 2003. Secretarial amendment 2 to the reef fish fishery management plan to set greater amberjack sustainable fisheries act targets and thresholds and to set a rebuilding plan. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Tampa, Florida.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/beta/gmfmcweb/downloads/Secretarial-Amendment-2-RF.pdf>
- GMFMC. 2004a. Final environmental impact statement for the generic essential fish habitat amendment to the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico: shrimp fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, red drum fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, reef fish fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, stone crab fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, coral and coral reef fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, spiny lobster fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, coastal migratory pelagic resources of the Gulf of Mexico of Mexico and South Atlantic. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20EFH%20EIS.pdf>
- GMFMC. 2004b. Amendment 22 to the fishery management plan for the reef fish fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, U.S. waters, with supplemental environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, initial regulatory flexibility analysis, and social impact assessment. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.  
<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Amend%2022%20Final%2070204.pdf>

GMFMC. 2005a. Generic amendment number 3 for addressing essential fish habitat requirements, habitat areas of particular concern, and adverse effects of fishing in the following fishery management plans of the Gulf of Mexico: shrimp fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, United States waters, red drum fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, reef fish fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, coastal migratory pelagic resources (mackerels) in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, stone crab fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, spiny lobster fishery of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic, coral and coral reefs of the Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/FINAL3\\_EFH\\_Amendment.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/FINAL3_EFH_Amendment.pdf)

GMFMC. 2008. Final reef fish amendment 30A: greater amberjack – revised rebuilding plan, accountability measures; gray triggerfish – establish rebuilding plan, end overfishing, accountability measures, regional management, management thresholds and benchmarks including supplemental environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, and regulatory flexibility act analysis. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Amend-30A-Final%202008.pdf>

GMFMC. 2009. Final amendment 31 to the fishery management plan for reef fish resources in the Gulf of Mexico addresses bycatch of sea turtles in the bottom longline component of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery, includes draft environmental impact statement and regulatory impact review. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://www.gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final%20Draft%20RF%20Amend%2031%206-11-09.pdf>

GMFMC. 2010b. Final regulatory amendment the reef fish fishery management plan – greater amberjack – recreational fishing season closure, including an environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, regulatory flexibility analysis, and social impact analyses. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

GMFMC. 2011a. Final generic annual catch limits/accountability measures amendment for the Gulf of Mexico fishery management council's red drum, reef fish, shrimp, coral and coral reefs fishery management plans, including environmental impact statement, regulatory impact review, regulatory flexibility analysis, and fishery impact statement. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

[http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Generic%20ACL\\_AM\\_Amendment-September%209%202011%20v.pdf](http://www.gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Generic%20ACL_AM_Amendment-September%209%202011%20v.pdf)

GMFMC. 2011b. Final regulatory amendment to the reef fish fishery management plan – greater amberjack – recreational fishing season closure, including an environmental assessment, regulatory impact review, regulatory flexibility analysis, and social impact analyses. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.

<http://gulfcouncil.org/docs/amendments/Final%20Greater%20Amberjack%20Reg%20Amend-Fishing%20Season%20Closure%20Dec%202010.pdf>

- GMFMC. 2012. Final regulatory amendment to the reef fish fishery management plan – greater amberjack – Modifications to the Greater Amberjack Rebuilding Plan and Adjustments to the Recreational and Commercial Management Measures. Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa, Florida.  
[http://gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final\\_Amendment\\_35\\_Greater\\_Amberjack\\_Rebuilding\\_8\\_May\\_2012.pdf](http://gulfcouncil.org/Beta/GMFMCWeb/downloads/Final_Amendment_35_Greater_Amberjack_Rebuilding_8_May_2012.pdf)
- Haab, T., Hicks, R. L., Schnier, K., Whitehead, J. C. 2012. Angler heterogeneity and the species-specific demand for marine recreational fishing. Working Paper No. 10-02. Appalachian State University, Department of Economics. Available: <http://econ.appstate.edu/marfin/>. (September 2014).
- Hamilton, A. N., Jr. 2000. Gear impacts on essential fish habitat in the Southeastern Region. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 3209 Frederick Street, Pascagoula, Mississippi 39567. 45 pp.
- Harris, P.J., D.M. Wyanski, D.B. White, P.P. Mikell, P.B. Eyo. 2007. Age, growth, and reproduction of greater amberjack off the southeastern U.S. Atlantic Coast. Transactions of American Fisheries Society 136:1534-1545.
- Harrison, P. 1983. Seabirds: an identification guide. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA. Field Notes 48: 976-978.
- Ingram, G.W. Jr. and W.F. Patterson. 2001. Movement patterns of red snapper (*Lutjanus campechanus*), greater amberjack (*Seriola dumerili*), and gray triggerfish (*Balistes capriscus*) in the Gulf of Mexico and the utility of marine reserves as management tools. Proceedings of the 52<sup>nd</sup> Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Fisheries Institute: 686-699.
- Jacob, S., P. Weeks, B. Blount, and M. Jepson. 2013. Development and evaluation of social indicators of vulnerability and resiliency for fishing communities in the Gulf of Mexico. Marine Policy 37:86-95.
- Jepson, M. and L. L. Colburn. 2013. Development of Social Indicators of Fishing Community Vulnerability and Resilience in the U.S. Southeast and Northeast Regions. U.S. Dept. of Commerce., NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-129, 64 p.
- Justic, D., Turner, R.E., Rabalais, N.N. 2003. Climate influences on riverine nitrate flux: implications for coastal marine eutrophication and hypoxia. Estuaries 26, 1–11.
- Kennedy, V. S., R.R. Twilley, J. A. Kleypas, J. H. Cowan, Jr., S. R. Hare. 2002. Coastal and marine ecosystems and global climate change. Pew Center on Global Climate Change, Arlington, VA. 52 p
- Manooch, C. S., and J. C. Potts. 1997. Age, growth, and mortality of greater amberjack, *Seriola dumerili*, from the U.S. Gulf of Mexico headboat fishery. Bulletin of Marine Science 61:671-683.

McEachran, J.D. and J.D. Fechhelm. 2005. Fishes of the Gulf of Mexico. Volume 2 University of Texas Press, Austin.

Muller, R. G., M. D. Murphy, J. de Silva, and L. R. Barbieri. 2003. Final report submitted to the national marine fisheries service, the Gulf of Mexico fishery management council, and the South Atlantic fishery management council as part of the southeast data, assessment, and review (SEDAR) iii. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, FWC-FMRI Report: IHR 2003-10. Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. St. Petersburg, Florida.

Murawski, S, A., W. T. Hogarth, E. B. Peebles, and L. Barbeiri. 2014. Prevalence of External Skin Lesions and Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbon Concentrations in Gulf of Mexico Fishes, Post-Deepwater Horizon, Trans. Amer. Fish. Soc., 143(4):1084-1097.

Murie, D.J., and D.C. Parkyn. 2008. Age, Growth and Sex Maturity of Greater Amberjack (*Seriola dumerili*) in the Gulf of Mexico. MARFIN Final Report NA05NMF4331071, 52 pp.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2002. Status of red grouper in United States waters of the Gulf of Mexico during 1986-2001, revised. Contribution No. SFD-01/02-175rev. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

NMFS. 2005. Endangered Species Act – Section 7 consultation on the continued authorization of reef fish fishing under the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery management plan and proposed amendment 23. February 15, 2005. National Marine Fisheries Service. St. Petersburg, Florida.

NMFS. 2009. Biological opinion on the continued authorization of reef fish fishing under the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery management plan, including Amendment 31, and a rulemaking to reduce sea turtle bycatch in the eastern Gulf of Mexico bottom longline component of the fishery.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2011. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2009. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. National Marine Fisheries Service-F/SPO-118.

[http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/fisheries\\_economics\\_2009.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/fisheries_economics_2009.html)

NMFS. 2011a. Biological opinion on the continued authorization of Reef Fish fishing under the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan. September 30, 2011. Available at: <http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/esa/Fishery%20Biops/03584%20GOM%20Reef%20Fish%20BiOp%202011%20final.pdf>

NMFS. 2011b. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2009. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum. National Marine Fisheries Service-F/SPO-118. Available at: [http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/fisheries\\_economics\\_2009.html](http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st5/publication/fisheries_economics_2009.html)

NMFS 2014. Summary of Status of Stocks 2014. Annual Report to Congress on the Status of U.S. Fisheries.

[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/fisheries\\_eco/status\\_of\\_fisheries/archive/2014/2014\\_status\\_of\\_stocks\\_final\\_web.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/fisheries_eco/status_of_fisheries/archive/2014/2014_status_of_stocks_final_web.pdf)

Porch, C. E., A. M. Eklund, and G. P. Scott. 2003. An assessment of rebuilding times for goliath grouper. Contribution: SFD 2003-0018. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

Porch, C. E., and S. L. Cass-Calay. 2001. Status of the vermilion snapper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico— assessment 5.0. Sustainable Fisheries Division Contribution No. SFD-01/01-129. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment Division, NOS). 1998. Product overview: Products and services for the identification of essential fish habitat in the Gulf of Mexico. NOS, Page 7-62 DEIS for EFH for the Gulf of Mexico of Mexico FMPs July 2003 Silver Spring MD; National Marine Fisheries Service, Galveston, Texas; and Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. Tampa Florida.

SEDAR 3. 2003. Complete stock assessment report of yellowtail snapper in the southeastern United States – SEDAR 3, Assessment report 1. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 6. 2004a. SEDAR report 2 the hogfish in Florida: Assessment review and advisory report. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 6. 2004b. The goliath grouper in southern Florida: Assessment review and advisory report. Southeast Data, Assessment and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 7. 2005. Stock assessment report of SEDAR 7 Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 7 Update. 2009. Update stock assessment report of SEDAR 7 Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 2006. SEDAR 9 Stock assessment report for Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack. SEDAR9-SAR2. SEDAR, Charleston, SC.

SEDAR 9 Update. 2010. SEDAR 9 stock assessment update report, Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack. Southeast Data, Assessment and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9 Update. 2011b. SEDAR update stock assessment of gray triggerfish in the Gulf of Mexico. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 9 Update. 2011c. SEDAR update stock assessment of gray triggerfish in the Gulf of Mexico. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 10. 2006. Gulf of Mexico gag grouper stock assessment report. Southeast Data, Assessment and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 10 Update. 2009. Stock assessment of gag in the Gulf of Mexico. – SEDAR update assessment. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 12. 2007. SEDAR12-Complete Stock Assessment Report 1: Gulf of Mexico Red Grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 12 Update. 2009. Stock assessment of red grouper in the Gulf of Mexico – SEDAR update assessment. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 15A. 2008. Stock assessment report 3 (SAR 3) South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico mutton snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 15A. 2014. FWC Report IHR2014-05, February 23, 2015. Stock assessment of Mutton Snapper (*Lutjanus analis*) of the U.S. South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico through 2013. [http://sedarweb.org/docs/suar/SEDAR%20Update%20Stock%20Assessment%20of%20Mutton%20Snapper%202015\\_FINAL.pdf](http://sedarweb.org/docs/suar/SEDAR%20Update%20Stock%20Assessment%20of%20Mutton%20Snapper%202015_FINAL.pdf)

SEDAR 19. 2010. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic black grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 22. 2011a. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico tilefish. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 22. 2011b. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico yellowedge grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 23. 2011. Stock assessment report South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico goliath grouper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR 31. 2013. Stock assessment report Gulf of Mexico red snapper. Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review. North Charleston, South Carolina. <http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/>.

SEDAR. 2014. SEDAR 33 Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack Stock Assessment Report. SEDAR, North Charleston SC. 490 pp. [http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/Sedar\\_Workshops.jsp?WorkshopNum=33](http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/sedar/Sedar_Workshops.jsp?WorkshopNum=33)

SEDAR 37. 2013. The 2013 Stock Assessment Report for Hogfish in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, St. Petersburg, Florida.

SEDAR Update 2014. Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack Stock Assessment Report. March 2014 North Charleston, South Carolina.

Sedberry, G.R., O. Pashuk, D.M. Wyanski, J.A. Stephen, and P. Weinbach. 2006. Spawning locations for Atlantic Reef Fishes off the Southeastern U.S. Proceedings of the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Fisheries Institute 57:463-514.

SEFSC 2011. The Commercial Logbook 2011. Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

SEFSC July 2014. The Commercial ACL Data Set for July 2014. Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

SERO 2007. Analyses of greater amberjack management measures for Amendment 30A. NOAA Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office, St. Petersburg, Florida.

SERO 2012a. Gulf of Mexico 2011 red snapper individual fishing quota annual report. SERO-LAPP-2012-04. Southeast Regional Office, National Marine Fisheries Service, 263 13th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33701. 42 pp. [http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/ifq/2011\\_RS\\_AnnualReport\\_Final.pdf](http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/sf/ifq/2011_RS_AnnualReport_Final.pdf).

SERO. 2015. Modeling the Combined Effects of Gulf of Mexico Framework Action Proposed Management Measures for Commercially and Recreationally Caught Greater Amberjack.

SERO-LAPP-2015-01. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Regional Office. St. Petersburg, Florida.

SERO-LAPP-2011-04. 2011. Greater amberjack yield-per-recruit and spawning potential ratio analysis for the Gulf of Mexico. NOAA Fisheries Service. Southeast Regional Office.

SERO-LAPP-2015-04. 2015. Modeling the Combined Effects of Gulf of Mexico Framework Action Proposed Management Measures for Commercially and Recreationally Caught Greater Amberjack. NOAA Fisheries Service. Southeast Regional Office.

Siebenaler, J.B., and W. Brady. 1952. A high speed manual commercial fishing reel. Florida Board of Conservation Tech. Series No. 4.

Sutton, S. G., R. B. Ditton, J. R. Stoll, and J. W. Milon. 1999. A cross-sectional study and longitudinal perspective on the social and economic characteristics of the charter and party boat fishing industry of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Texas A&M University. College Station, Texas. Memorandum Report

Thompson, B. A., M. Beasley, and C. W. Wilson. 1991. Age distribution and growth of greater amberjack, *Seriola dumerili*, from north-central Gulf of Mexico. Fishery Bulletin 97:362-371.

Turner, S. C., C. E. Porch, D. Heinemann, G. P. Scott, and M. Ortiz. 2001. Status of the gag stocks of the Gulf of Mexico: assessment 3.0. August 2001. Contribution: SFD-01/02-134. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

Turner, S.C., N.J. Cummings, and C.P. Porch. 2000. Stock assessment of Gulf of Mexico greater amberjack using data through 1998. NOAA, NMFS, SEFSC, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida 33149. SFD-99/00-100.

Valle, M., C. Legault, and M. Ortiz. 2001. A stock assessment for gray triggerfish, *Balistes capricus*, in the Gulf of Mexico. Contribution: SFD-01/02-124. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Miami, Florida.

Weisberg, R.H., Zheng, L., Liu, Y., Murawski, S., Hu, C., and Paul, J. 2014. Did Deepwater Horizon Hydrocarbons Transit to the West Florida Continental Shelf?, Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, Available online 17 February 2014, ISSN 0967-0645, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2014.02.002>.

Wells, R.J.D., and J.R. Rooker. 2002. Distribution, age, and growth of young-of-the-year greater amberjack (*Seriola dumerili*) associated with pelagic Sargassum. Fishery Bulletin 102:545-554.

Wells, R. J. D., and J. R. Rooker. 2004. Spatial and temporal patterns of habitat use by fishes associated with *Sargassum* mats in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico. Bulletin of Marine Science 74:81–99.

## APPENDIX A. CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED ALTERNATIVES

REMOVED AT JANUARY 2015 COUNCIL MEETING:

**Motion:** In Action 1, to remove sub options 2(a) and 3(a) to considered but rejected:  
Sub-Option a. No ACT buffer (i.e.,  $ABC = ACL = ACT$ ); note this option would require modification of the accountability measures.

## APPENDIX B. OTHER APPLICABLE LAW

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) provides the authority for management of stocks included in fishery management plans in federal waters of the exclusive economic zone. However, management decision-making is also affected by a number of other federal statutes designed to protect the biological and human components of U.S. fisheries, as well as the ecosystems that support those fisheries. Major laws affecting federal fishery management decision-making are summarized below.

### **Administrative Procedure Act**

All federal rulemaking is governed under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. Subchapter II), which establishes a “notice and comment” procedure to enable public participation in the rulemaking process. Under the Act, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is required to publish notification of proposed rules in the *Federal Register* and to solicit, consider, and respond to public comment on those rules before they are finalized. The Act also establishes a 30-day waiting period from the time a final rule is published until it takes effect.

### **Coastal Zone Management Act**

Section 307(c)(1) of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), as amended, requires federal activities that affect any land or water use or natural resource of a state’s coastal zone be conducted in a manner consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with approved state coastal management programs. The requirements for such a consistency determination are set forth in NOAA regulations at 15 CFR part 930, subpart C. According to these regulations and CZMA Section 307(c)(1), when taking an action that affects any land or water use or natural resource of a state’s coastal zone, NMFS is required to provide a consistency determination to the relevant state agency at least 90 days before taking final action.

Upon submission to the Secretary of Commerce, NMFS will determine if this plan amendment is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management programs of the states of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas to the maximum extent possible. Their determination will then be submitted to the responsible state agencies under Section 307 of the CZMA administering approved Coastal Zone Management programs for these states.

### **Data Quality Act**

The Data Quality Act (Public Law 106-443) effective October 1, 2002, requires the government to set standards for the quality of scientific information and statistics used and disseminated by federal agencies. Information includes any communication or representation of knowledge such as facts or data, in any medium or form, including textual, numerical, cartographic, narrative, or audiovisual forms (includes web dissemination, but not hyperlinks to information that others disseminate; does not include clearly stated opinions).

Specifically, the Act directs the Office of Management and Budget to issue government wide guidelines that “provide policy and procedural guidance to federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated by federal agencies.” Such guidelines have been issued, directing all federal agencies to create and disseminate agency-specific standards to: (1) ensure information quality and develop a pre-dissemination review process; (2) establish administrative mechanisms allowing affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information; and (3) report periodically to Office of Management and Budget on the number and nature of complaints received.

Scientific information and data are key components of fishery management plans (FMPs) and amendments and the use of best available information is the second national standard under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. To be consistent with the Act, FMPs and amendments must be based on the best information available. They should also properly reference all supporting materials and data, and be reviewed by technically competent individuals. With respect to original data generated for FMPs and amendments, it is important to ensure that the data are collected according to documented procedures or in a manner that reflects standard practices accepted by the relevant scientific and technical communities. Data will also undergo quality control prior to being used by the agency and a pre-dissemination review.

### **Endangered Species Act**

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended, (16 U.S.C. Section 1531 et seq.) requires federal agencies use their authorities to conserve endangered and threatened species. The ESA requires NMFS, when proposing an action for managed stocks that “may affect” critical habitat or endangered or threatened species, to consult with the appropriate administrative agency (itself for most marine species, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for all remaining species) to determine the potential impacts of the proposed action. Consultations are concluded informally when proposed actions may affect but are “not likely to adversely affect” endangered or threatened species or designated critical habitat. Formal consultations, including a biological opinion, are required when proposed actions may affect and are “likely to adversely affect” endangered or threatened species or adversely modify designated critical habitat. If jeopardy or adverse modification is found, the consulting agency is required to suggest reasonable and prudent alternatives. NMFS, as part of the Secretarial review process, will make a determination regarding the potential impacts of the proposed actions.

On September 30, 2011, the Protected Resources Division released a biological opinion which, after analyzing best available data, the current status of the species, environmental baseline (including the impacts of the recent Deepwater Horizon MC 252 oil release event in the northern Gulf of Mexico), effects of the proposed action, and cumulative effects, concluded that the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is also not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of green, hawksbill, Kemp’s ridley, leatherback, or loggerhead sea turtles, nor the continued existence of smalltooth sawfish (NMFS 2011b).

On September 10, 2014, NMFS published a final rule listing as threatened 20 coral species under the Endangered Species Act. Four of the newly listed coral species are found in the Gulf of

Mexico. NMFS concurs with the effects determination that the continued authorization of the Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan (Reef Fish FMP) is not likely to adversely affect the newly listed coral species. On September 10, 2014, NMFS published a final rule (79 FR 53852) listing as threatened 20 coral species under the Endangered Species Act. Four of the newly listed coral species are found in the Gulf of Mexico. In memos dated September 16, 2014, and October 7, 2014, NMFS determined that activities associated with the subject FMP will not adversely affect any of the newly listed coral species. In the October 7, 2014, memo NMFS also determined that although the September 10, 2014, Final Listing Rule provided some new information on the threats facing *Acropora*, none of the information suggested that the previous determinations were no longer valid.

### **Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act**

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934 (16 U.S.C. 661-667e) provides the basic authority for the USFWS's involvement in evaluating impacts to fish and wildlife from proposed water resource development projects. It also requires federal agencies that construct, license or permit water resource development projects to first consult with the Service (and NMFS in some instances) and State fish and wildlife agency regarding the impacts on fish and wildlife resources and measures to mitigate these impacts.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect wildlife resources pertaining to water resource development as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **National Historic Preservation Act**

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, (Public Law 89-665; 16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*) is intended to preserve historical and archaeological sites in the United States of America. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to evaluate the impact of all federally funded or permitted projects for sites on listed on, or eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places and aims to minimize damage to such places.

Historical research indicates that over 2,000 ships have sunk on the Federal Outer Continental Shelf between 1625 to 1951; thousands more have sunk closer to shore in state waters during the same period. Only a handful of these have been scientifically excavated by archaeologists for the benefit of generations to come. Further information can be found at:

<http://www.boem.gov/Environmental-Stewardship/Archaeology/Shipwrecks.aspx>

The proposed action does not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places nor is it expected to cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. In the Gulf of Mexico, the *U.S.S. Hatteras*, located in federal waters off Texas, is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Fishing activity already occurs in the vicinity of this site, but the proposed action would have no additional adverse impacts on listed historic resources, nor would they alter any regulations intended to protect them.

## **Marine Mammal Protection Act**

The Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) established a moratorium, with certain exceptions, on the taking of marine mammals in U.S. waters and by U.S. citizens on the high seas, and on the importing of marine mammals and marine mammal products into the United States. Under the MMPA, the Secretary of Commerce (authority delegated to NMFS) is responsible for the conservation and management of cetaceans and pinnipeds (other than walruses). The Secretary of the Interior is responsible for walruses, sea and marine otters, polar bears, manatees, and dugongs.

Part of the responsibility that NMFS has under the MMPA involves monitoring populations of marine mammals to make sure that they stay at optimum levels. If a population falls below its optimum level, it is designated as “depleted,” and a conservation plan is developed to guide research and management actions to restore the population to healthy levels.

In 1994, Congress amended the MMPA, to govern the taking of marine mammals incidental to commercial fishing operations. This amendment required the preparation of stock assessments for all marine mammal stocks in waters under U.S. jurisdiction, development and implementation of take-reduction plans for stocks that may be reduced or are being maintained below their optimum sustainable population levels due to interactions with commercial fishing activities, and studies of pinniped-fishing activity interactions.

Under section 118 of the MMPA, NMFS must publish, at least annually, a List of Fisheries that places all U.S. commercial fishing activities into one of three categories based on the level of incidental serious injury and mortality of marine mammals that occurs in each fishing activity. The categorization of a fishing activity in the List of Fisheries determines whether participants in that fishing activity may be required to comply with certain provisions of the MMPA, such as registration, observer coverage, and take reduction plan requirements.

The proposed actions are not reasonably expected to have a substantial adverse effect on endangered or threatened species, their critical habitat, marine mammals, or other non-target species. Although the reef fish fishery as a whole has adverse effects on endangered and threatened species and marine mammals, the proposed action itself cannot reasonably be expected to adversely affect these species or their critical habitat because it is not expected to substantially alter the manner in which the fishery is conducted in the Gulf of Mexico

## **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703) protects migratory birds. The responsibilities of federal agencies to protect migratory birds are set forth in Executive Order 13186. The USFWS is the lead agency for migratory birds. The birds protected under this statute are many of our most common species, as well as birds listed as threatened or endangered. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between NMFS and the USFWS, as required by Executive Order 13186 (66 FR 3853, January 17, 2001), is to promote the conservation of migratory bird populations. This MOU focuses on avoiding, or where impacts cannot be avoided, minimizing to the extent practicable, adverse impacts on migratory birds and strengthening

migratory bird conservation through enhanced collaboration between NMFS and the USFWS by identifying general responsibilities of both agencies and specific areas of cooperation. Given NMFS' focus on marine resources and ecosystems, this MOU places an emphasis on seabirds, but does not exclude other taxonomic groups of migratory birds.

Typically, fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect migratory birds. The proposed actions are not likely to change the way in which the fishery is prosecuted. Thus, no additional impacts are reasonably expected.

### **Paperwork Reduction Act**

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) regulates the collection of public information by federal agencies to ensure the public is not overburdened with information requests, the federal government's information collection procedures are efficient, and federal agencies adhere to appropriate rules governing the confidentiality of such information. The Act requires NMFS to obtain approval from the Office of Management and Budget before requesting most types of fishing activity information from the public. None of the alternatives in this amendment are expected to create additional paperwork burdens.

### **Prime Farmlands Protection and Policy Act**

The Farmland Protection and Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201) was enacted to minimize the loss of prime farmland and unique farmlands as a result of Federal actions by converting these lands to nonagricultural uses. It assures that federal programs are compatible with state and local governments, and private programs and policies to protect farmland.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect farmlands as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **National Wild and Scenic Rivers System**

The National Wild and Scenic Rivers System of 1968 (Public Law 90-542; 16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) preserves certain rivers with outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of present and future generations. The Act safeguards the special character of these rivers, while also recognizing the potential for their appropriate use and development. It encourages river management that crosses political boundaries and promotes public participation in developing goals for river protection.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect wetland habitats as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **North American Wetlands Conservation Act**

The North American Wetlands Conservation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-233) established a wetlands habitat program, administered by the USFWS, to protect and manage wetland habitats for migratory birds and other wetland wildlife in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

The fishery management actions in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely to affect wetland habitats as the economic exclusive zone is from the state water boundary extending to 200 nm from shore.

### **Executive Orders (E.O.)**

#### **E.O. 12630: Takings**

The E.O. on Government Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights that became effective March 18, 1988, requires each federal agency prepare a Takings Implication Assessment for any of its administrative, regulatory, and legislative policies and actions that affect, or may affect, the use of any real or personal property. Clearance of a regulatory action must include a takings statement and, if appropriate, a Takings Implication Assessment. The NOAA Office of General Counsel will determine whether a Taking Implication Assessment is necessary for this amendment.

#### **E.O. 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review**

E.O. 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review, signed in 1993, requires federal agencies to assess the costs and benefits of their proposed regulations, including distributional impacts, and to select alternatives that maximize net benefits to society. To comply with E.O. 12866, NMFS prepares a Regulatory Impact Review (RIR) for all regulatory actions that either implement a new fishery management plan or significantly amend an existing plan. RIRs provide a comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits to society of proposed regulatory actions, the problems and policy objectives prompting the regulatory proposals, and the major alternatives that could be used to solve the problems. The reviews also serve as the basis for the agency's determinations as to whether proposed regulations are a "significant regulatory action" under the criteria provided in E.O. 12866 and whether proposed regulations will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities in compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Analysis. A regulation is significant if it 1) Has an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affects in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments and communities; 2) creates a serious inconsistency or otherwise interferes with an action taken or planned by another agency; 3) materially alters the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or 4) raises novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

#### **E.O. 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations**

This E.O. mandates that each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States and its territories and possessions.

### **E.O. 12962: Recreational Fisheries**

This E.O. requires federal agencies, in cooperation with states and tribes, to improve the quantity, function, sustainable productivity, and distribution of U.S. aquatic resources for increased recreational fishing opportunities through a variety of methods including, but not limited to, developing joint partnerships; promoting the restoration of recreational fishing areas that are limited by water quality and habitat degradation; fostering sound aquatic conservation and restoration endeavors; and evaluating the effects of federally-funded, permitted, or authorized actions on aquatic systems and recreational fisheries, and documenting those effects. Additionally, it establishes a seven-member National Recreational Fisheries Coordination Council (NRFCC) responsible for, among other things, ensuring that social and economic values of healthy aquatic systems that support recreational fisheries are considered by federal agencies in the course of their actions, sharing the latest resource information and management technologies, and reducing duplicative and cost-inefficient programs among federal agencies involved in conserving or managing recreational fisheries. The NRFCC also is responsible for developing, in cooperation with federal agencies, States and Tribes, a Recreational Fishery Resource Conservation Plan - to include a five-year agenda. Finally, the E.O. requires NMFS and the USFWS to develop a joint agency policy for administering the ESA.

### **E.O. 13089: Coral Reef Protection**

The E.O. on Coral Reef Protection requires federal agencies whose actions may affect U.S. coral reef ecosystems to identify those actions, utilize their programs and authorities to protect and enhance the conditions of such ecosystems, and, to the extent permitted by law, ensure actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out do not degrade the condition of that ecosystem. By definition, a U.S. coral reef ecosystem means those species, habitats, and other national resources associated with coral reefs in all maritime areas and zones subject to the jurisdiction or control of the United States (e.g., federal, state, territorial, or commonwealth waters).

Regulations are already in place to limit or reduce habitat impacts within the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. Additionally, NMFS approved and implemented Generic Amendment 3 for Essential Fish Habitat (GMFMC 2005), which established additional habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs) and gear restrictions to protect corals throughout the Gulf of Mexico. There are no implications to coral reefs by the actions proposed in this amendment.

### **E.O. 13132: Federalism**

The E.O. on Federalism requires agencies in formulating and implementing policies, to be guided by the fundamental Federalism principles. The E.O. serves to guarantee the division of governmental responsibilities between the national government and the states that was intended by the framers of the Constitution. Federalism is rooted in the belief that issues not national in scope or significance are most appropriately addressed by the level of government closest to the people. This E.O. is relevant to FMPs and amendments given the overlapping authorities of NMFS, the states, and local authorities in managing coastal resources, including fisheries, and the need for a clear definition of responsibilities. It is important to recognize those components

of the ecosystem over which fishery managers have no direct control and to develop strategies to address them in conjunction with appropriate state, tribes and local entities (international too).

No Federalism issues were identified relative to the action to modify the management of the recreational harvest of greater amberjack. Therefore, consultation with state officials under Executive Order 12612 was not necessary. Consequently, consultation with state officials under Executive Order 12612 remains unnecessary.

#### **E.O. 13158: Marine Protected Areas**

This E.O. requires federal agencies to consider whether their proposed action(s) will affect any area of the marine environment that has been reserved by federal, state, territorial, tribal, or local laws or regulations to provide lasting protection for part or all of the natural or cultural resource within the protected area. There are several marine protected areas, HAPCs, and gear-restricted areas in the eastern and northwestern Gulf of Mexico. The existing areas are entirely within federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico. They do not affect any areas reserved by federal, state, territorial, tribal or local jurisdictions.

## APPENDIX C. SUMMARIES OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

Summary of comments received:

- No Action
- Would prefer a size increase over a closure
- Increase the size limit 34" fork length.
- Commercial trip limit should remain at 2000 lb/trip.
- Increase the size limit to 32" for length.
- Reduce commercial trip limit to 1500 lb/trip.
- Implement measures to immediately end overfishing of greater amberjack.
- Identify a rebuilding date so that the Council can then select legally compliant catch limits that will be effective at rebuilding the stock.
- Act immediately to implement measures necessary to achieve rebuilding in the shortest time possible.

# APPENDIX D. BYCATCH PRACTICABILITY ANALYSIS

## Background/Overview

The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) is required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) §303(a) (11) to establish a standardized bycatch reporting methodology for federal fisheries and to identify and implement conservation and management measures that, to the extent practicable and in the following order: 1) Minimize bycatch, and 2) minimize the mortality of bycatch that cannot be avoided. The Magnuson-Stevens Act defines bycatch as “fish which are harvested in a fishery, but which are not sold or kept for personal use, and includes economic discards and regulatory discards. Such term does not include fish released alive under a recreational catch-and-release fishery management program” (Magnuson-Stevens Act §3(2)). Economic discards are fish that are discarded because they are undesirable to the harvester. This category of discards generally includes certain species, sizes, and/or sexes with low or no market value.

Regulatory discards are fish that are required by regulation to be discarded, but also include fish that may be retained but not sold. NOAA Fisheries Service outlines at 50 CFR §600.350(d) (3) (i) ten factors that should be considered in determining whether a management measure minimizes bycatch or bycatch mortality to the extent practicable.

Guidance provided at 50 CFR 600.350(d)(3) identifies ten factors to consider in determining whether a management measure minimizes bycatch or bycatch mortality to the extent practicable. These are:

1. Population effects for the bycatch species.
2. Ecological effects due to changes in the bycatch of that species (effects on other species in the ecosystem).
3. Changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and the resulting population and ecosystem effects.
4. Effects on marine mammals and birds.
5. Changes in fishing, processing, disposal, and marketing costs.
6. Changes in fishing practices and behavior of fishermen.
7. Changes in research, administration, and enforcement costs and management effectiveness.
8. Changes in the economic, social, or cultural value of fishing activities and non-consumptive uses of fishery resources.
9. Changes in the distribution of benefits and costs.
10. Social effects.

The Councils are encouraged to adhere to the precautionary approach outlined in Article 6.5 of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries when uncertain about these factors.

The harvest of greater amberjack is currently regulated with size limits, bag limits, quotas, and seasonal closures. These measures are generally effective in limiting fishing mortality, the size of fish landed, the number of targeted fishing trips, and/or the time fishermen spend pursuing a

species. However, these management tools may have the unavoidable adverse effect of creating regulatory discards, which reduces landings. Consequently, the Council is considering in this amendment the practicability of taking additional action to further minimize greater amberjack bycatch, by sector.

### **Greater Amberjack Release Mortality Rates**

#### **Commercial Discard Rates**

Greater amberjack discard rates were calculated for the Gulf of Mexico vertical line fishery using both self-reported data (discard coastal logbook) and observer data (SEDAR 33 2014). Total Gulf of Mexico vertical line (handline and electric reel/bandit rig) effort was used along with the calculated discard rates to provide two estimates of total greater amberjack discards from the Gulf of Mexico vertical line fishery. Those calculated discards were also compared with discard estimates calculated for the 2006 greater amberjack assessment (SEDAR 9 2010). Vertical line discards, calculated using the self-reported data, are presented in Table 6.1. Calculation of discards followed the methods used in the 2014 Southeast Data, Assessment and Review (SEDAR) 33 data workshop (SEDAR 33 2014). In that analysis, results from generalized linear models indicated significant differences in discard rates across time period (January - July, August - December) and number of hooks fished per line (1-2, 3-9, >9 hooks). Mean discard rates were calculated for each year, by month, and hooks per line. Total effort was available from the coastal logbook data (a census of landings and effort data from vessels with federal fishing permits). Effort, defined as number of trips, was summed within each year/period/hooks per line. Total discards were calculated for each stratum as: Stratum mean discard rate per trip x the number of stratum total trips. Discards of all strata within a year were summed to provide total yearly discards. Confidence intervals (5% and 95%) were calculated for each stratum specific discard rate. The discard rates at the confidence intervals were also multiplied by total vertical line effort to provide a measure of uncertainty around the discard calculations. Discards were calculated as numbers of discarded fish and were converted to pounds by multiplying by 12.83 pounds, the mean weight of a discarded greater amberjack reported in observer data from years 2002 - 2009. Total weight of discards was also calculated for 20% and 40% discard mortality, following the methods of the SEDAR 33 (2014).

Amendment 1 to the Reef Fish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) implemented a 36-inch fork length commercial minimum size regulation in 1990, thus discarding can be expected for years 1990 and later. To calculate discards for the years 1990 - 2001, the mean discard rate across the years 2002 - 2009 was calculated for each hook per line stratum. Those discard rates were multiplied by total vertical line effort within each year/hooks per line stratum.

The Discard rate was calculated as number of fish discarded per hook-hour fished. Total effort in hook-hours was available from the coastal logbook data. Total discards per year during 2007 - 2009 were calculated as: yearly mean discard rate per hook-hour fished x total hook-hours fished. Yearly discards for the years 1990-2006 were calculated using the mean discard rate across all years, 2007 - 2009, multiplied by the yearly total effort in hook hours. Uncertainty around the yearly calculated discards was determined following the methods described above for self-reported discard analyses. Vertical line discards and the weight of dead discards with 20%

and 40% discard mortality are calculated using the observer data are presented in SEDAR 9 (2006c) in Table (3.3.1.1b).

The SEDAR 9 (2006c) stock assessment provides a comparison of yearly total discards of greater amberjack from commercial vertical line vessels calculated using both self-reported discard data and observer data (Table 1). Total discards calculated using the same data set for the update assessment, but with the corrected code were less than 500,000 pounds per year. It is also noted that the self-reported discards may be unrealistically low due to a proportion of fishers, as many as 40% of all trips in a year, reporting “no discards” for a trip. Total discards calculated using the observer data, in contrast, were more similar to the SEDAR 9 (2006c) discards than to the 2010 self-reported discards. Commercial vertical line discards calculated using observer reported discard rates were much higher in 2008 than in other years. The 2Bertalanffy009 calculated discards, however, were the fewest of any year of the time series. That large variability between years may have resulted from the small number of hook-hours observed, which, by chance, had either much greater (2008) or lesser (2009) discard rates than both the 2007 rate and the mean rate (SEDAR 9 2006c; Table 3.3.2). During each year of available observer data, the sampling fraction (percent of total effort observed) was less than 1% of the total effort reported to the coastal logbook program. Variability in discards among years prior to 2007 was due to yearly differences in total effort because the mean discard rate was applied to yearly effort during that period.

Numbers of discards were calculated using the mean discard rate. Pounds of discards were calculated by applying the mean weight of a discarded fish to the number of discards. Number of discards assuming a 20% and 40% discard mortality were also calculated. Confidence intervals (CI) were the number of discards calculated by applying the discard rates at the 5% and 95% confidence intervals of the mean rate to total effort.

**Table 1.** Mean headboat, MRIP and TPWD charter and private, and commercial estimates of landings and discards in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico (2009-2013).

Species	HEADBOAT				MRIP CHARTER				MRIP PRIVATE				COMMERCIAL	
	Catch (N)	Landings (N)	Discards (N)	Discards (%)	Catch (N)	Landings (N)	Discards (N)	Discards (%)	Catch (N)	Landings (N)	Discards (N)	Discards (%)	Landings (lbs)	Discards (N)
Almaco jack	2,048	2,005	43	2%	6,574	4,587	1,987	43%	6,720	5,100	1,619	32%	36,277	14
Banded rudderfish	7,160	6,094	1,066	17%	26,874	25,473	1,401	6%	36,731	5,606	31,125	555%	17,549	130
Black grouper	123	42	81	193%	48	5	44	963%	5,359	811	4,548	561%	46,855	7,119
Blackfin snapper	142	138	4	3%	0	0	0		0	0	0		4,698	0
Blueline tilefish	196	195	1	0%	43	43	0	0%	0	0	0		67,901	296
Cobia	1,163	933	231	25%	9,102	4,836	4,265	88%	84,797	28,360	56,437	199%	69,204	0
Cubera snapper	204	197	7	3%	32	11	21	185%	694	505	189	37%	1,307	0
Gag	50,769	7,241	43,528	601%	273,454	38,260	235,195	615%	1,511,705	141,368	1,370,337	969%	620,534	120,066
Golden tilefish	323,148	323,148	0	0%	266,716	260,021	6,694	3%	286,715	209,910	76,804	37%	376,649	2,320
Goldface tilefish	7	7	0	0%	0	0	0		0	0	0		9,056	0
Goliath grouper	3	0	3		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	300
Gray snapper	24,672	22,948	1,724	8%	315,349	159,145	156,204	98%	3,959,312	883,280	3,076,032	348%	155,194	14,093
<i>Gray triggerfish</i>	30,683	10,739	19,943	186%	108,470	36,955	71,514	194%	225,842	80,159	145,683	182%	74,997	7,533
Greater amberjack	7,460	3,554	3,906	110%	68,517	27,535	40,982	149%	196,374	30,965	165,409	534%	481,954	13,525
Hogfish	2,140	1,924	216	11%	8,701	8,262	439	5%	122,430	116,183	6,246	5%	36,203	23
<i>King Mackerel</i>	16,344	16,199	144	1%	112,602	95,477	17,124	18%	274,695	190,576	84,120	44%	3,604,244	39,579
Lane snapper	58,989	54,143	4,845	9%	49,927	37,495	12,432	33%	285,923	100,272	185,651	185%	23,923	1,947
Lesser amberjack	363	286	77	27%	142	142	0	0%	447	167	281	168%	21,190	239
Mutton snapper	418	409	9	2%	426	0	426		3,112	426	2,686	630%	77,736	68
Queen snapper	33	33	0	0%	33	0	33		0	0	0		12,427	0
Red grouper	136,517	8,928	127,589	1429%	557,223	70,392	486,830	692%	1,963,520	152,818	1,810,702	1185%	4,992,180	817,288

**Table 1 continued.** Mean headboat, MRIP and TPWD charter and private, and commercial estimates of landings and discards in the U.S. Gulf of Mexico (2009-2013).

Species	HEADBOAT				MRIP CHARTER				MRIP PRIVATE				COMMERCIAL	
	Catch (N)	Landings (N)	Discards (N)	Discards (%)	Catch (N)	Landings (N)	Discards (N)	Discards (%)	Catch (N)	Landings (N)	Discards (N)	Discards (%)	Landings (lbs)	Discards (N)
Red snapper	208,227	112,215	96,011	86%	530,186	166,736	363,451	218%	2,073,714	566,754	1,506,960	266%	3,773,741	226,966
Scamp	4,515	2,515	2,000	80%	15,618	11,832	3,787	32%	50,320	14,248	36,072	253%	246,538	1,126
Silk Snapper	53	53	0	0%	3,495	2,684	811	30%	22,834	22,834	0	0%	38,597	3
Snowy grouper	1,997	100	1,897	1905%	747	723	25	3%	6,358	5,896	462	8%	153,962	224
Spanish Mackerel	2,773	2,749	24	1%	294,725	201,510	93,214	46%	4,000,616	1,762,996	2,237,620	127%	1,506,135	222
Speckled Hind	133	77	56	73%	308	220	89	40%	870	330	539	163%	41,720	56
Vermilion snapper	10,084	0	10,084		0	0	0		0	0	0		2,581,867	5,973
Warsaw grouper	274	113	161	143%	186	176	10	6%	484	484	0	0%	97,402	8
Wenchman	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		30,465	0
Yellowedge grouper	46	45	1	1%	338	330	8	2%	273	273	0	0%	742,028	218
Yellowfin grouper	0	0	0	0%	19	19	0	0%	781	0	781		1,511	0
Yellowmouth grouper	22	22	1	3%	46	46	0	0%	125	0	125		421	0
Yellowtail snapper	3,787	2,837	950	33%	527	518	9	2%	6,569	3,780	2,789	74%	718,060	91,072

Source: SEFSC ACL Data Set (2014).

In the SEDAR 9 (2006c) evaluation of greater amberjack discard rates, estimates of discards were not made for longline gear. For the 2011 update assessment, this convention was carried forward. As summarized earlier in Section 3.2 (Commercial landings summary by gear), this species is not targeted by longline gear. Future assessments evaluations should continue to examine both the self-reported and observer data to better quantify the levels of greater amberjack discards from commercial longline gear.

Release mortality rate for greater amberjack in the Gulf of Mexico is unreported (SEDAR 9 2006c). Headboat and commercial handline observer studies off North Carolina estimated release mortality rate ranges from 8-9% for greater amberjack (Robert Dixon, pers. comm. in SEDAR 9 2006c); however, sample sizes were small for these studies. Release mortality rates were based on observations of greater amberjack at the surface after release (floating, swimming down etc). The SEDAR 9 (2006c) data workshop panel suggested a minimum release mortality rate for greater amberjack of 10% for vertical line, with actual release mortality potentially higher owing to fish dying after release that did not float at the surface. The SEDAR 9 (2006c) data workshop panel recommended using a range of release mortality rates to evaluate the sensitivity of the SEDAR 9 stock assessment to this parameter. Discard mortality rates of 0, 20, and 40% were used for the assessment, with 20% selected based on the information available.

Greater amberjack are also caught as bycatch in shrimp trawls. The SEDAR 9 (2006c) data workshop panel noted that greater amberjack, at that time, was not on the workup for the observer evaluation program. The Panel further noted that because their abundance in trawls is so low as supported by the average percent occurrence values with (99%) and without (8%) Bycatch Reduction Gear that reliable annual estimate would have been difficult with these statistical estimators, primarily due to the high frequency of zero observations, see SEDAR 9 (2006c Data Workshop Report, Section 3.4.2, page 24, and Table 3.5). In general, estimation results from all the methods where estimations were produced (modified Bayesian and Model 7) indicated large to enormous uncertainty and the SEDAR 9 2006c data workshop panel noted the results seemed unrealistic. Estimates from the Bayesian model were not successful. In addition, assigning size (or age) to estimates of shrimp trawl bycatch was not possible at the time of the SEDAR 9 (2006c) stock assessment, as only a very few observations from the observer study had been measured.

### **Recreational Discard Rates**

Unlike the Marine Recreational Informational Program (MRIP), the SEFSC Headboat survey does not provide estimates of released fish. Because a proportion of the released fish are expected to die, the estimated number of releases is necessary to develop a complete time series of removals for use in subsequent population modeling analysis. Table 6.1 provides mean discard estimates (numbers of fish) from the MRIP survey.

The protocols adopted by the SEDAR 9 (2006c) data workshop panel to quantify discards for the headboat mode were continued for the SEDAR 33 (2014). There were two main recommendations made: 1) Estimate the ratio of headboat releases (B2) to the total catch (A+B1+B2) from MRFSS charterboat mode only (Table 5.3 and Table 5.4) and 2) use this

source (and sector) to estimate headboat releases. The SEDAR 9 (2006c) data workshop panel felt that charterboat and headboat fishing are most similar and the rate of released fish would be most alike. Private boat fishing likely would not be the same as the “for-hire” sector. New information on recreational discards available from self-reported logbooks and also from observer trips was also reviewed for the SEDAR 9 Update (2010).

As in the previous three greater amberjack stock evaluations discards were not estimated for Texas Parks and Wildlife Department source data.

## **Other Bycatch**

Species incidentally encountered by the directed greater amberjack fishery include sea turtles, sea birds, and reef fishes. The primary gears of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery (longline and handline) are classified in the proposed List of Fisheries for 2015 (79 FR 50589, August 25, 2014) as Category III gear and is unchanged from the 2014 list. This classification indicates the annual mortality and serious injury of a marine mammal stock resulting from any fishery is less than or equal to one percent of the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortalities, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock, while allowing that stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population.

NMFS has conducted specific analyses (“Section 7 consultations”) to evaluate potential effects from the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery on species and critical habitats protected under the ESA. On September 30, 2011, the Protected Resources Division released a biological opinion (Opinion), which concluded that the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of sea turtles (loggerhead, Kemp’s ridley, green, hawksbill, and leatherback) or smalltooth sawfish (NMFS 2011). The Opinion also concluded that other ESA-listed species are not likely to be adversely affected by the FMP. An incidental take statement was issued specifying the amount and extent of anticipated take, along with reasonable and prudent measures and associated terms and conditions deemed necessary and appropriate to minimize the impact of these takes. The Council addressed further measures to reduce take in the reef fish fishery’s longline component in Amendment 31 (GMFMC 2009).

Subsequent to the completion of the biological opinion, NMFS published final rules listing 20 new coral species (September 10, 2014), and designating critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population segment of loggerhead sea turtles (July 10, 2014). NMFS addressed these changes in a series of consultation memoranda. In a consultation memorandum dated October 7, 2014, NMFS assessed the continued operation of the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery’s potential impact on the newly-listed coral species occurring in the Gulf of Mexico and concluded the fishery is not likely to adversely affect any of the protected coral species. Similarly, in a consultation memorandum dated September 16, 2014, NMFS assessed the continued authorization of South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico fisheries’ potential impacts on loggerhead critical habitat and concluded the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fishery is not likely to adversely affect the newly designated critical habitat.

Three primary orders of seabirds are represented in the Gulf of Mexico, Procellariiformes (petrels, albatrosses, and shearwaters), Pelecaniformes (pelicans, gannets and boobies, cormorants, tropic birds, and frigate birds), and Charadriiformes (phalaropes, gulls, terns, noddies, and skimmers) (Clapp et al., 1982; Harrison, 1983) and several species, including: piping plover, least tern, and roseate tern are listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as either endangered or threatened. Note the brown pelican and bald eagle had been listed as endangered or threatened, but have subsequently been delisted. Human disturbance of nesting colonies and mortalities from birds being caught on fishhooks and subsequently entangled in monofilament line are primary factors affecting sea birds. Oil or chemical spills, erosion, plant succession, hurricanes, storms, heavy tick infestations, and unpredictable food availability are other threats. There is no evidence that the directed greater amberjack fishery is adversely

affecting seabirds. However, interactions, especially with brown pelicans consuming greater amberjack discards and fish before they are landed, are known to occur (SEDAR 7 2005).

Other species of reef fish are also incidentally caught when targeting greater amberjack. In the Gulf of Mexico, almaco jack and vermilion snapper and some deep-water groupers are incidentally caught as bycatch when harvesting greater amberjack. Deep-water groupers are caught both in the eastern and western Gulf of Mexico primarily with longline gear (> 80 percent). The deep-water grouper fishery was managed with a 1.207 million pound annual catch limit. From 2004 until the implementation of the grouper/tilefish IFQ program in 2010 (SERO 2012a), the fishery met their quota and closed no later than July 15 each year. Deep-water grouper closures during this time period may have resulted in some additional discards of grouper by longliners targeting greater amberjack. Since the IFQ program was implemented, deep-water grouper species are landed year-round by holders of IFQ allocation and the quota has not been exceeded. It is unknown how increases in closed season discards might have affected the status of reef fish stocks or the change to an IFQ managed sector.

### **Practicability of current management measures in the directed greater amberjack fishery relative to their impact on bycatch and bycatch mortality.**

The harvest of commercial greater amberjack is managed with a 36-inch fork length (FL) minimum size limit, March through May seasonal closure, and gear restrictions. A 30-inch FL minimum size limit and one-fish bag limit are used to manage the recreational harvest of greater amberjack. The following discusses current and proposed management measures with respect to their relative impacts on bycatch.

#### **Size limits**

Minimum size limits is estimated to be the greatest source of regulatory discards for most reef fish species. In 1990, a 36-inch fork length (FL) commercial minimum size limit and a 28-inch FL recreational minimum size limit were implemented for greater amberjack. The recreational size limit was increased to a 30-inch FL minimum size limit in August 2008.

Size limits are typically established to reduce fishing mortality, increase yield-per-recruit, and prevent growth overfishing. A negative consequence of increasing the minimum size limit is potential increases in discards. A 1996 - 1999 tagging study of commercially caught greater amberjack in the South Atlantic indicated 41% of all greater amberjack caught were discarded (J. McGovern, Southeast Regional Office, pers. comm.). Reducing the commercial minimum size limit would reduce discards significantly (SERO 2007), but would increase harvest rates and therefore fishing mortality, unless further restrictions are imposed. Increasing the recreational minimum size limit is estimated to increase the proportion of dead discards to landings, but the overall magnitude of dead discards is estimated to be less for higher size limits relative to the status quo because of the reductions in harvest being considered in this amendment. Historical trends indicate dead discards increased after implementation of higher size limits, but quickly declined as the size distribution of greater amberjack adjusted to the new minimum size limit.

A yield-per-recruit analysis has recently been conducted to determine if the legal minimum size limit for greater amberjack is adequately protecting against growth overfishing (SEDAR 9 2006c; Appendix 12.4.3). Greater amberjack spawning conditions are described in Section 3.2 and are hereby incorporated by reference. Increasing the recreational minimum size limit could potentially benefit spawning potential if the increase does not result in a significant amount of forgone yield due to losses associated with natural and release mortality. Yield-per-recruit analysis did increase for larger minimum size limits, but only when fishing mortality was greater than the fishing mortality rate corresponding to an equilibrium yield of MSY ( $F_{msy}$ ) ( $F=0.33$  from SEDAR 9 Update 2010), but fishing at this rate would result in overfishing based on the estimates in the 2010 SEDAR 9 Update (Appendix 12.4.3). The yield-per-recruit and spawning potential ratio analysis (Appendix 12.4.3) should be used for theoretical purposes as methods the Council could use for management purposes. ([http://gulfcouncil.org/resources/SSC\\_Reports.php](http://gulfcouncil.org/resources/SSC_Reports.php)).

This amendment includes alternatives to modify the current recreational minimum size limit of 30 inches FL to 32, 34, or 36 inches FL, respectively. Based upon the decision model (SEROLAPP 2015-01), under the assumption of 20% release mortality, the estimated dead discards increase as the minimum size limit increases from 30 inches FL. However, if the minimum size limit is increased, harvest is estimated to slow, because fewer fish are landed so total removals do not increase proportionately. The Council considered increasing the minimum size limit in Amendment 35 (GMFMC 2012) but opted against it, due to concerns about the quota being caught more quickly if the minimum size was modified (i.e., harvest would not be slowed) as well as potentially increasing bycatch mortality.

### **Closed Seasons**

The March through May commercial greater amberjack season closure was implemented in January 1998. The commercial season closure corresponds to the peak period of spawning (Burch 1979; Thompson et al. 1991; Beasley 1993; Harris et al. 2004). Discards are thought to be minimal during the closed season because commercial fishermen can avoid targeting schools of greater amberjack. A June through July recreational fishing closure was implemented in 2011 to prevent the quota from being exceeded. This amendment includes alternatives that would modify the existing June through July recreational closed season to the following: No fixed season closure (i.e., January 1 until the quota is reached), March through May, and a split season closure of January through May and November through December. Implementing a closed season would be expected to increase the number of discards, although the impacts on the stock would be substantially reduced if targeted trips for greater amberjack are eliminated during the closed season as recreational anglers choose to pursue retainable stocks (Reef Fish Amendment 35 Appendix 12.4.1, GMFMC 2012).

### **Bag Limits**

A one-fish greater amberjack recreational bag limit has been in effect since 1997. A restrictive bag limit can encourage discards from high-grading once the bag limit is met. However, the minimum size limit likely plays a more significant role in determining the overall number of recreational discards. During 2003 - 2005, approximately 31% of Marine Recreational Fisheries

Statistical Survey trips landing greater amberjack reported landing one or more greater amberjack per angler (A. Strelcheck, Southeast Regional Office, pers. comm.). This large percentage of trips indicates the potential for discards after the bag limit is met. However, no changes to the bag limit are currently proposed in this amendment for the recreational harvest of greater amberjack.

### **Allowable Gear**

Vertical hook-and-line gear (bandit rigs, manual handlines) is the primary gear used to commercially harvest greater amberjack. Using greater amberjack landings history from 2004 - 2013, commercial vertical line gear (i.e., electric reel, bandit rig, hook and line, and trolling) accounted for 68% of the greater amberjack landings, longlines landed 10% of the greater amberjack and 22% of the landings were from unclassified gear types (SEFSC Commercial ACL Data 2011).

On average, longlines harvest larger greater amberjack than vertical-line gear. Trip Intercept Program data from 2003 - 2005 indicates the average size of greater amberjack caught on longlines was four inches greater than the average size caught on vertical-line gear (43.6 vs. 39.6 inches FL). The difference in size at harvest is evident in size limit analyses for greater amberjack, which indicate greater reductions in harvest occur for vertical-line gear than longlines when comparing similar minimum size limits (SERO 2007). Because the size of landed fish is greater, the number of discards is less on longlines than vertical-line gear because the gear selects for larger fish. McCarthy (2005) estimated vertical-line gear discards of greater amberjack by the commercial fishery during 1993 to 2004, but could not estimate longline discards because of the small number of trips reporting discards. Additionally, little is known on the release mortality rates associated with each of these gears. The SEDAR 33 (2014) assessment assumed a constant 20% release mortality rate for all gears and fisheries. More scientific information is needed to determine the magnitude and release mortality rates for various gears used to commercially harvest greater amberjack. For instance, for commercial red grouper longlines are assumed to have a 45% release mortality rate while vertical-line gear has a 10% release mortality rate. This difference in release mortality rate between gears can be important if one gear discards substantially more fish than the other, but kills a smaller percentage of the fish released.

Rod-and-reel is the primary gear used in the recreational sector. Circle hooks are used by some anglers when targeting greater amberjack. Some greater amberjack are also caught using spears, which do not affect discards or release mortality because all fish caught are killed. Only undersized fish mistakenly killed while spearfishing would contribute to discard mortality.

Recreational discards are primarily due to the recreational size limits and the one-fish greater amberjack bag limit; however, allowable gears can affect release mortality rates. Amendment 27 to the Reef Fish FMP summarizes various research studies examining the effects of circle hooks, hook sizes, venting tools, and dehooking devices on survival of reef fishes after release (GMFMC 2007).

## **Alternatives being considered to minimize bycatch**

Reductions in dead discards can be accomplished either by reducing the number of greater amberjack discarded or reducing the release mortality rate of discards. To reduce the number of discards, management measures must limit fishing effort or change the selectivity of fishing gears in such a way that reduces the harvest of sub-legal fish. To reduce the discard mortality rate of greater amberjack, sources of release mortality must first be identified (e.g., depth, length, hooking location, surface interval, temperature) and management measures must be imposed to reduce discard mortality rates.

This amendment considers several management measures to reduce greater amberjack mortality. However, discards and discard mortality are anticipated to increase in the management measures. Increasing the recreational minimum size limits and closed season is expected to increase the amount of greater amberjack discards. The commercial trip limit management measure is also expected to increase the amount of greater amberjack discards.

## **Practicability Analysis**

### **Criterion 1: Population effects for the bycatch species**

Bycatch of greater amberjack due to management measures such as fixed closed seasons, in-season closures, and minimum size limits could result in loss of yield. Based on theoretical analysis (Amendment 35, Appendix 12.4.1) increasing the minimum size limit based on current estimates of fishing mortality is expected to reduce yield-per-recruit. Any reductions in bycatch of greater amberjack from the directed fishery must be accounted for in stock assessments and when setting the ACL.

### **Criterion 2: Ecological effects due to changes in the bycatch of greater amberjack (on other species in the ecosystem)**

Relationships among species in marine ecosystems are complex and poorly understood, making the nature and magnitude of ecological effects difficult to predict. The Scientific and Statistical Committee accepted the projections from SEDAR 33 (2014) for the purposes of developing management advice. Greater amberjack are opportunistic predators that feed on benthic and pelagic fishes, squid and crustaceans (GMFMC 2004a). Greater amberjack eggs and larvae are pelagic and smaller juveniles (<1 inch standard length) are found associated with pelagic *Sargassum* spp. mats (Bortone et al. 1977; Wells and Rooker 2004). Juveniles then shift to demersal habitats (5 - 6 months), where they congregate around reefs, rocky outcrops, and wrecks (see Section 3.2). Reductions in bycatch and fishing mortality will allow the greater amberjack stock to increase in abundance, resulting in increased competition for prey with other predators. Consequently, it is possible that forage species and competitor species could decrease in abundance in response to an increase in greater amberjack abundance.

### **Criterion 3: Changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and invertebrates and the resulting population and ecosystem effects**

Population and ecosystem effects resulting from changes in the bycatch of other species of fish and invertebrates are difficult to predict. Fishermen can specifically target greater amberjack while they are schooling. Snappers, groupers, and other reef fishes are commonly caught in association with greater amberjack. Those most commonly caught include: almaco jack, vermilion, and deep-water groupers. None of these species are currently undergoing overfishing or being overfished (NMFS 2014 Summary of Stock Status for FSSI). Regulatory discards significantly contribute to fishing mortality in all of these reef fish species, especially deep-water groupers.

Increasing the greater amberjack recreational minimum size limit will increase the proportion of dead discards to landings, but may result in an overall decrease in the magnitude of discards because of the reduction in landings considered in this amendment. Assuming anglers continue to target greater amberjack if the minimum size limits are increased, less effort will be directed at other species thereby providing a small net benefit to those species because of lower fishing mortality and less bycatch.

### **Criterion 4: Effects on marine mammals and birds**

The effects of current management measures on marine mammals and birds are described above. Bycatch minimization measures evaluated in this amendment are not expected to significantly affect marine mammals and birds. There is no information to indicate marine mammals and birds rely on greater amberjack for food, and they are not generally caught by fishers harvesting greater amberjack.

### **Criterion 5: Changes in fishing, processing, disposal, and marketing costs**

Reducing the stock annual catch limit (ACL), recreational management measures and the commercial trip limit will affect costs associated with fishing operations. Modifying recreational seasonal closures for greater amberjack will have direct impacts to recreational anglers. Recreational anglers would incur greater losses in consumer surplus resulting from a seasonal closure when compared to a higher minimum size limit. To the extent that reducing the ACL for greater amberjack would reduce harvest, reductions in commercial revenue and recreational consumer surplus would occur. Commercial fishermen will incur losses in revenue due to limiting the amount of harvest per trip. However, a commercial trip limit is expected to increase the duration of the fishing season and thus increase revenues when the fishery has previously been closed. A trip limit is also expected to bring a higher market price due to the fact that market demand remains constant while there is less fish harvested per trip.

### **Criterion 6: Changes in fishing practices and behavior of fishermen**

Increasing the minimum size limit will increase bycatch catch rates, and affect decisions about where to fish. Seasonal closures and trip limits will alter angler effort, at least initially, and may affect decisions about when and where to fish. Shifts or changes in fishing locations and seasons

will have an effect on fishing behavior and practices that may potentially affect the bycatch of other reef fish.

**Criterion 7: Changes in research, administration, and enforcement costs and management effectiveness**

The proposed management measures are not expected to significantly impact administrative costs. Quotas based on stock allocation measures are currently used to regulate the commercial and recreational sectors harvesting greater amberjack. . All of these measures will require additional research to determine the magnitude and extent of impacts to bycatch and bycatch mortality. Administrative activities such as quota monitoring and enforcement should not be affected by the proposed management measures.

**Criterion 8: Changes in the economic, social, or cultural value of fishing activities and non-consumptive uses of fishery resources**

If the minimum size limit for the recreational harvest of greater amberjack is increased it is expected to positively impact the stock by fostering a faster recovery rate, but may have negative social implications. Had the closed season been modified to coincide with the spawning season rather than the peak months of fishing effort there may have been changes to fishing effort along with social changes.

The establishment of a commercial trip limit is expected to result in positive benefits to the commercial sector. The economic benefits of the commercial trip limit is expected to include extended fishing season, maintaining higher market prices by not flooding the market with large harvest.

**Criterion 9: Changes in the distribution of benefits and costs**

Bycatch minimization measures that provide an overall net benefit to the stock and increase the rate of recovery will benefit both sectors. Additionally, proposed commercial trip limits would reduce the commercial fishermen ability to harvest larger amounts of greater amberjack per trip. Bycatch minimization measures are intended to provide an overall net benefit to the stock, by reducing mortality associated with bycatch and increasing the rate of stock recovery.

**Criterion 10: Social effects**

Bycatch is considered wasteful and it reduces overall yield obtained from the fishery. Minimizing bycatch to the extent practicable will increase efficiency, reduce waste, and benefit stock recovery, thereby resulting in net social benefits. In Action 2.1, of the Recreational Management Measures the proposed increase in recreational size limits from 30 inches to 32, 34, or 36 inches FL would narrow the difference between the 36 inch FL commercial minimum size limit. This may be a social benefit as the size limits would be perceived as more fair and equitable to all user groups.