

**Mackerel Committee
Report
August 10, 2015
Pam Dana-Chair**

CMP Amendment 26

Staff reviewed CMP Amendment 26 (**Tab C, No. 4**), which addresses Gulf and South Atlantic actions affecting the respective migratory groups of king mackerel. Actions include changes to annual catch limits, commercial zone management, stock boundaries, allocations, and the Gulf recreational bag limit. Staff highlighted the addition of two alternatives in Action 7. Proposed Alternative 4 would conditionally transfer some percentage of the recreational allocation to the commercial sector, until such a time as the recreational sector lands some percent of its revised allocation; if said threshold is exceeded, then during the following fishing year, the sector allocations in the Gulf would revert back to the allocations described in the original CMP FMP. Proposed Alternative 5 would apply a “sunset provision” to any change in sector allocations for Gulf king mackerel.

The committee recommends, and I so move, to recommend to the Council that proposed Alternatives 4 and 5 for Action 7 be added to the document.

Alternative 4: Conditionally transfer a certain percentage (*Options a-c*) of the recreational allocation to the commercial sector until such a time that recreational landings reach a predetermined threshold (*Options d-f*). If this threshold is met, the recreational and commercial allocations will revert to 68% for the recreational sector and 32% for the commercial sector.

Conditional Quota Transfer (MUST CHOOSE ONE):

Option a: Transfer 5% of the recreational allocation to the commercial sector.

Option b: Transfer 10% of the recreational allocation to the commercial sector.

Option c: Transfer 20% of the recreational allocation to the commercial sector.

Recreational ACL Threshold (MUST CHOOSE ONE):

Option d: Revert to the status quo sector allocations if 80% of the adjusted recreational sector ACL is landed.

Option e: Revert to the status quo sector allocations if 90% of the adjusted recreational sector ACL is landed.

Option f: Revert to the status quo sector allocations if 100% of the adjusted recreational sector ACL is landed.

Alternative 5: Establish a sunset provision for any change in the status quo sector allocations for Gulf migratory group king mackerel (68% for the recreational sector and 32% for the commercial sector). After the predetermined time period, any change in sector

allocations would revert back to the allocations specified in the original Coastal Migratory Pelagics Fishery Management Plan for the Gulf of Mexico.

Option a: Sunset any change in sector allocations after a five year period (2016-2020).

Option b: Sunset any change in sector allocations after a ten year period (2016-2025).

Option c: Sunset any change in sector allocations after a fifteen year period (2016-2030).

Motion carried unanimously.

A committee member asked whether changes in the recreational bag limit would affect the outcomes of other Actions in the document. Staff replied that it was unlikely that any increase in landings due to a recreational bag limit increase would appreciably affect the outcomes of the other Actions.

CMP Amendment 28

Staff reviewed CMP Amendment 28 (**Tab C, No. 4**), which addresses changes to the Joint CMP FMP. The South Atlantic Council has discontinued work on this amendment, and the Gulf Council has directed staff to continue developing alternatives for consideration. Once the Gulf Council has agreed on an initial suite of alternatives, they will submit the revised options paper to the South Atlantic Council for consideration.

This amendment considers splitting the current joint FMP into a Gulf and Atlantic FMP (Action 1), respectively. Such a split will require the current joint commercial king and Spanish mackerel permits to also be divided by jurisdiction. Options for splitting the permits are outlined in Action 2. The committee expressed concern that using a hailing port as a tool for determining which current permit holders would qualify for a Gulf-specific permit may be in conflict with National Standard 4 (geographic discrimination against stakeholders). Adoption of a more recent control date was encouraged to more accurately apply proposed management measures; however, the committee did not recommend a new control date for either king or Spanish mackerel. The committee questioned allowing anyone with Gulf landings to qualify for the Gulf-specific permit as outlined in Option a of Alternative 3 in Action 2. Staff clarified that only current permit holders would qualify for a permit of any type- not simply anyone with landings of federally managed Gulf species. Staff also clarified that multiple options could be selected for the Alternatives in Action 2.

Staff will apply the direction provided by the committee when editing the options paper, and will bring the document back to the Council for consideration at the October meeting.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report.