

Appendix A. Alternatives the Council considered but eliminated from detailed study, and a brief discussion of the reasons for their elimination.

This section describes alternatives to the proposed actions that the Council considered in developing this document, but decided not to pursue. The description of each alternative is followed by a summary statement of why it was eliminated from more detailed summary.

Rejected Alternatives 1-4. Modify the Council’s current definition of Optimum Yield (OY) for nine species undergoing overfishing (Table 1).

Table 1. OY alternatives for nine species undergoing overfishing.

Alternatives	OY equation	F _{OY} equals
Alternative 1 (Status Quo).	For black sea bass, golden tilefish, snowy grouper, vermilion snapper, and gag, OY equals the yield produced by F _{OY} . F _{OY} equals (75%)(F _{MSY}). If a stock is overfished, F _{OY} equals the fishing mortality rate specified by the rebuilding plan designed to rebuild the stock to SSB _{MSY} within the approved schedule. After the stock is rebuilt, F _{OY} = a fraction of F _{MSY} . F _{OY} equals (75%)(F _{MSY}). For the other species, OY equals the yield produced by F _{OY} . F _{40%SPR} is used as the F _{OY} proxy.	Either (75%)(F _{MSY}) or F _{40%SPR} depending on the species.
Alternative 2.	OY equals the yield produced by F _{OY} . If a stock is overfished, F _{OY} equals the fishing mortality rate specified by the rebuilding plan designed to rebuild the stock to SSB _{MSY} within the approved schedule. After the stock is rebuilt, F _{OY} = a fraction of F _{MSY} .	(55%)(F _{MSY})
Alternative 3.		(65%)(F _{MSY})
Alternative 4.	OY equals the sum of the sector ACTs.	_____pounds (will be added after the Committee & Council specify ACTs.)

Rationale for elimination: The Council had considered this action because of concern that the ACL and ACT could be at or below the ABC. The Council removed the action to specify the definition of OY at their December 2008 meeting since the SSC and Council had recently established definitions of OY for most of the species based on recent SEDAR assessments. The Council indicated OY has been specified as yield at 75%F_{MSY} for snowy grouper, black sea bass, and red porgy in Amendment 15A. Amendment 16 defined OY as the yield at 75%F_{MSY} for gag and vermilion snapper. Amendment 15B specified OY for golden tilefish as the yield at 75%F_{MSY}. OY is not currently being considered for red grouper and black grouper as these species will be assessed beginning in June 2009 and information to determine OY will be available in early 2010. The Council indicated they may want to consider this action in the future after ACLs and ACTs had been established for the nine species.

Rejected Alternatives 5 and 6. Modify the Council’s current definition of minimum stock size threshold (MSST) for nine species undergoing overfishing (Table 2).

Table 2. MSST alternatives for ten species undergoing overfishing.

Alternatives	MSST equation
Alternative 5.	MSST equals $SSB_{MSY}(0.5)$.
Alternative 6.	MSST equals $SSB_{MSY}(0.75)$.

Rationale for elimination: The Council has modified the definition of MSST for snowy grouper and golden tilefish over concern that recruitment fluctuations could cause a reoccurring overfished status determination for these species. The low value for natural mortality creates a numerical similar value for MSST and SSB_{MSY} . The Council decided that the natural mortality estimation for nine species undergoing overfishing is considerably greater than those for snowy grouper and golden tilefish. As such, the same concern doesnot apply to these nine species.

Rejected Alternative 7. Divide the commercial quota for snowy grouper by region/state. Allocate 0.03% to states in the MAFMC’s jurisdiction (excluding North Carolina) (23 pounds gutted weight), 60.26% to North Carolina and South Carolina (50,622 pound gutted weight), and 39.71% to Georgia and Florida (33,355 pounds gutted weight). Each region’s directed quota (after adjustment for PQBM) would be tracked by dealer reporting. After the commercial quota is met in either region, all purchase and sale is prohibited in that region and harvest and/or possession is limited to the bag limit in that region.

Rejected Alternative 8. Divide the commercial quota for snowy grouper by region/state. Allocate 0.03% to states in the MAFMC’s jurisdiction (excluding North Carolina) (23 pounds gutted weight), 35.71% to North Carolina (30,000 pound gutted weight), 24.55% to South Carolina (20,622 lbs gutted weight) and 2.92% to Georgia (2,452 pounds gutted weight), and 36.79% to Florida (30,903 pounds gutted weight). Each state/region’s directed quota (after adjustment for PQBM) would be tracked by dealer reporting. After the commercial quota is met in either region, all purchase and sale is prohibited in that state/region and harvest and/or possession is limited to the bag limit in that state/region.

Rationale for elimination: The Council was concerned that the reduction in the magnitude of the snowy grouper commercial quota for snowy grouper implemented through Amendment 13C could increase the probability that the quota could be met through fishing in one region less affected by inclement weather before the start of the fishing season in another. However, since this action was put into place in 2006, the commercial quota has not been met. It is likely that the small trip limit (100 lb gutted weight) has reduced the incentive for fishermen to target this species. In addition, there was concern that harvest restrictions in other fisheries could amplify this effect by resulting in increased fishing effort in the deepwater fishery. As a result, the Council felt that the implementation of state/regional commercial quotas for snowy grouper could increase the probability that there would be a portion of the commercial quota available to

users of all states/regions before the primary fishing season for snowy grouper in each state/region begins. Alternatives 7 and 8; however, were rejected from detailed analysis as they would allocate an unmanageable and untrackable quota (0.03%) to the MAFMC region. Furthermore, the Council felt that it was not reasonable to divide a small quota (84,000 lbs gutted weight) among other states/regions. The Council previously considered but rejected an alternative in Amendment 13C to divide snowy grouper quota among states because of concerns about accurately tracking the small snowy grouper quotas.

Rejected Alternatives 9-12. Define allocations for eight species in the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Unit undergoing overfishing (Table 3).

Note: The Council's selection of the preferred alternative could vary for eight species experiencing overfishing. In other words, the same preferred alternative does not have to be chosen for all eight species

Alternative 9. Define allocations based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on landings from the years 1986-2007.

Alternative 10. Define allocations based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on landings from the years 2005-2007.

Alternative 11. Define allocations based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on the following formula for each sector: Sector apportionment = (50% * average of long catch range (lbs) 1986-2007) + (50% * average of recent catch trend (lbs) 2005-2007)

Alternative 12. Split the allocation equally among the three sectors.

Rationale for elimination: At their December 2006 meeting, the Council decided not to specify allocations for species in Amendment 17. Interim allocations have been specified for the black sea bass in Amendment 13C and for snowy grouper in Amendment 15b. Interim allocation have been specified for gag and vermilion snapper in Amendment 16. The Council did not feel that it was necessary to specify allocations for speckled hind and warsaw grouper as the Science and Statistical Committee's current recommendation for acceptable biological catch for these two species is zero. Amendment 17B, if implemented, would establish allocations for golden tilefish. Further, the Council did not see a strong need specify black grouper or red grouper allocations at this point since there will be stock assessments completed for these species in the near future. Therefore, if Amendment 17B were to go into place in 2010, it would immediately be followed by the new stock assessment.

Table 3. Percent allocations from allocation alternatives for the ten species undergoing overfishing. CM = Commercial, RC = Recreational, FH = For Hire, PR = Private Recreational, NS=Not Specified.

Species	No Action		Alt. 9. 1986-2007			Alt. 10. 2005-2007			Alt. 11. Equation			Alt. 12. Split Evenly		
	CM	RC	CM	FH	PR	CM	FH	PR	CM	FH	PR	CM	FH	PR
Snowy grouper	95%	5%	89%	5%	6%	68%	32%	0%	79%	18%	3%	33%	33%	33%
Speckled hind	NS	NS	67%	32%	1%	8%	92%	0%	38%	62%	0%	33%	33%	33%
Warsaw grouper	NS	NS	9%	10%	81%	1%	45%	54%	5%	28%	67%	33%	33%	33%
Black grouper	NS	NS	56%	13%	31%	34%	49%	16%	45%	31%	24%	33%	33%	33%
Black sea bass	43%	57%	39%	33%	29%	40%	22%	38%	39%	27%	33%	33%	33%	33%
Gag	51%	49%	64%	19%	17%	59%	17%	25%	61%	18%	21%	33%	33%	33%
Red grouper	NS	NS	55%	20%	25%	41%	14%	44%	48%	17%	35%	33%	33%	33%
Vermilion snapper	68%	32%	64%	32%	4%	62%	34%	5%	63%	33%	4%	33%	33%	33%

Rejected Alternative 13. Establish an ACL of 0 lbs., which would prohibit all fishing for, possession and retention of snowy grouper.

Rationale for elimination: The current ACLs for snowy grouper are 82,900 lbs gw and 523 fish for the commercial and recreational sectors, respectively. These ACLs are based on the yield at F_{OY} . These catch levels were determined to be based upon the best available science by the SSC and would end overfishing and satisfy the requirements of the reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act. To achieve an ACL of 0, the Council would need to propose regulations that would prohibit harvest, possession, and retention of snapper grouper species on the shelf edge. Therefore, reducing the ACL to 0 for both sectors would most likely result in significant beneficial biological benefits to the snowy grouper stock, but would have significant adverse economic and social impacts to fishermen. The Council does not believe that setting an ACL of 0 for snowy grouper is warranted at this time.

Rejected Alternative 14. The commercial quota would serve as the ACL for the commercial and recreational sectors for snowy grouper. The commercial and recreational AM would be to prohibit harvest, possession, and retention in both sectors when the commercial quota is met.

Rationale for elimination: The Council rejected this alternative because the quota for snowy grouper has never been met since implementing new regulations in 2006 through Amendment 13C. Therefore, the Council did not believe that this was a reasonable alternative for ensuring that the recreational sector did not exceed its ACL.

Rejected Alternative 15. For black grouper, black sea bass, gag, red grouper, and vermilion snapper, the recreational sector ACT equals the recreational sector ACL.

Rationale for elimination: The Council did not believe there is a need to establish an ACT if it would equal the ACL.

Rejected Alternative 16. Establish an ACL = 0 for speckled hind and warsaw grouper. Prohibit all fishing for, possession, and retention of all deepwater species (snowy grouper, golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, warsaw grouper, speckled hind, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper). Allow harvest for golden tilefish in the area between 100 m and 300 m depth (coordinates to be specified in Appendix X) (Figures 4-x).

Sub-Alternative 16a. Require the use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any fishing vessel for golden tilefish.

Rejected Alternative 17. Establish an ACL = 0 for speckled hind and warsaw grouper. Prohibit all fishing for, possession, and retention of all deepwater snapper species (snowy grouper, golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, warsaw grouper, speckled hind, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper) beyond a depth of 240 feet (40 fathoms; 73 m). Allow harvest of golden tilefish in the area between 100 m and 300 m depth (coordinates to be specified in Appendix X) (Figures 4-x).

Sub-Alternative 17a. Require the use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any fishing vessel for golden tilefish.

Rationale for elimination: The Council does not believe the creation of allowable golden tilefish areas are necessary. The areas would have a negative effect on law enforcement. Examination of logbook and MRFSS reveals that warsaw grouper and speckled hind were very rarely taken on trips with golden tilefish during 2004-2006 (Tables 1 and 2). Golden tilefish are usually caught over mud habitat in depths of 180 to 300 m (Low et al. 1983; Able et al. 1993) but most commonly occur at depths of 200 m (Dooley 1978). Speckled hind and warsaw grouper prefer rocky habitats and are not found over mud (Heemstra and Randall 1993). Longline gear is sometimes set over rocky bottom in 180 to 300 m where snowy grouper, blueline tilefish, and blackbelly rosefish are caught. On these sets, golden tilefish are also caught in areas where longline gear crosses over mud habitat. While few speckled hind and warsaw grouper are taken on trips with golden tilefish, there is a chance catch of these species could occur when fishing gear is set over rocky habitat and mud.

Table 1. Species taken of commercial trips during 2004-2006 when at least 1 pound of golden tilefish was caught.

COMMON	Obs	Mean	Sum
GOLDEN TILEFISH	1065	980	1,044,019
GROUPE,SNOWY	425	571	242,719
BLACK BELLIED ROSEFISH	176	788	138,643
SHARK,SANDBAR	64	1,499	95,957
TILEFISH,BLUELINE	256	356	91,137
GROUPE,YELLOWEDGE	171	257	43,872
DOLPHINFISH	213	117	24,947
SHARK,HAMMERHEAD	36	481	17,333
GROUPE,RED	42	372	15,623
AMBERJACK,GREATER	72	202	14,518
KING MACKEREL	103	138	14,183
SNAPPER,VERMILION	59	205	12,102
HAKE,ATLANTIC,RED & WHITE	110	82	8,984
GROUPE,BLACK	22	377	8,294
SPANISH MACKEREL	22	322	7,082
SHARK,SILKY	13	389	5,061
SHARK,ATLANTIC SHARPNOSE	20	246	4,929
SCAMP	28	169	4,731

COMMON	Obs	Mean	Sum
SNAPPER,MUTTON	31	152	4,721
HIND,SPECKLED	15	283	4,244
SHARK,BLACKTIP	12	336	4,034
GROUPE,GAG	21	189	3,977
SNAPPER, YELLOWTAIL	33	118	3,898
TRIGGERFISH,GRAY	29	127	3,696
AMBERJACK,LESSER	29	118	3,420
TUNA,YELLOWFIN	9	357	3,210
BARRELFISH	26	118	3,079
EELS,UNC	81	35	2,856
SCORPIONFISH-THORNYHEADS	57	49	2,783
SNAPPER,SILK	22	114	2,507
SHARK,BULL	5	400	1,999
SNAPPER,RED	23	84	1,938
COD,ATLANTIC,UNC	8	238	1,901
JACK,ALMACO	28	58	1,633
SNAPPER,QUEEN	12	125	1,500
FINFISHES,UNC FOR FOOD	29	44	1,286
WRECKFISH	1	1,232	1,232
WAHOO	28	38	1,078
SHARK,LEMON	1	974	974
SHARK,TIGER	8	121	972
BARRACUDA	22	38	840
SHARK,UNC,FINS	13	62	806
EEL,CONGER	16	45	712
SEA BASSE,ATLANTIC,BLACK,UNC	17	40	688
TUNA,BLACKFIN	6	111	666
BLUE RUNNER	37	17	616
SHARK,FINETOOTH	2	288	577
SHARK,GREAT HAMMERHEAD	2	285	570
PORGY,RED,UNC	21	25	523
SNAPPER,MANGROVE	14	36	508
LOBSTER,SPINY	5	97	485
BANDED RUDDERFISH	11	42	458
SHARK,MAKO UNC	5	91	456
GROUPE,YELLOWFIN	4	112	450
PORGY,JOLTHEAD	16	27	435
COBIA	10	43	432
SQUIRRELFISHES	7	60	418
GRUNTS	8	51	408
BLUEFISH	6	66	398
AMBERJACK	1	374	374
GROUPE,WARSAW	2	165	330
35 others			2,447

Table 2. Species taken on MRFSS trips during 2004-2006 when at least 1 golden tilefish was caught.

common	Percent
golden tilefish	61.03%
black sea bass	15.05%
dolphin	11.36%
snowy grouper	5.08%
king mackerel	1.39%
unidentified fish	0.92%
little tunny	0.83%
tautog	0.83%
blueline tilefish	0.74%
red porgy	0.65%
redtail scad	0.55%
vermillion snapper	0.37%
amberjack genus	0.18%
blackfin tuna	0.18%
bigeye	0.09%
cero	0.09%
cobia	0.09%
mutton snapper	0.09%
red grouper	0.09%
sailfish	0.09%
scamp	0.09%
speckled hind	0.09%
tripletail	0.09%

Rejected Alternative 18. For black grouper, black sea bass, gag, red grouper, and vermillion snapper, the recreational sector ACT equals the recreational sector ACL.

Rationale for elimination: The Council did not believe there is a need to establish an ACT if it would equal the ACL.

Annual Catch Limits

Rejected Alternative 19. ACL equals ABC.

Rejected Alternative 20. ACL equals 90% of the ABC.

Rejected Alternative 21. ACL equals 80% of the ABC.

Note: The Council may specify more than one preferred alternative for this action as 10 species are under consideration.

Allocations

Rejected Alternative 22. Define allocations based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on landings from the years 1986-2007.

Rejected Alternative 23. Define allocations based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on landings from the years 2005-2007.

Rejected Alternative 24. Define allocations based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on the following formula for each sector: Sector apportionment = (50% * average of long catch range (lbs) 1986-2007) + (50% * average of recent catch trend (lbs) 2005-2007).

Note: The Council's selection of the preferred alternative could vary for the four species experiencing overfishing. In other words, the same preferred alternative does not have to be chosen for all four species

Annual Catch Targets for the Commercial Sector

Rejected Alternative 25. The commercial sector ACT equals the commercial sector ACL.

Rejected Alternative 26. The commercial sector ACT equals 90% of the commercial sector ACL.

Rejected Alternative 27. The commercial sector ACT equals 80% of the commercial sector ACL.

Note: The Council may specify more than one preferred alternative for this action as 10 species are under consideration.

Annual Catch Targets for the Recreational Sector

Rejected Alternative 28. The recreational sector ACT equals 85% of the private recreational sector ACL.

Rejected Alternative 29. The recreational sector ACT equals 75% of the private recreational sector ACL.

Rejected Alternative 30. The recreational sector ACT equals sector ACL[(1-PSE) or 0.5, whichever is greater].

Note: The Council may specify more than one preferred alternative for this action as 10 species are under consideration.

Accountability Measures for the Commercial Sector

Rejected Alternative 31. Implement Accountability Measures for the commercial sector for **species undergoing overfishing**. If the sector ACT is projected to be met, prohibit the harvest and retention of species or species group. If the sector ACL is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to **reduce the sector ACT** in the following year by the amount of the overage.

Rejected Alternative 32. Implement Accountability Measures for the commercial sector for **species undergoing overfishing**. If the sector ACT is projected to be met, prohibit the harvest and retention of species or species group. If the sector ACL is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to **reduce the length of the following fishing year** by the amount necessary to recover the overage from the prior fishing year.

Rejected Alternative 33. Implement Accountability Measures for the commercial sector for **species undergoing overfishing**. **If the species is overfished or not overfished and the sector ACT** is projected to be met, prohibit the harvest and retention of species or species group. **If the species is overfished and the sector ACL is exceeded**, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the sector ACT in the following year by the amount of the overage. **If the species is not overfished and the sector ACL** is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing year by the amount necessary to recover the overage from the prior fishing year.

Accountability Measures for the Recreational Sector

Rejected Alternative 34. Implement Accountability Measures (AMs) for the recreational sector for species undergoing overfishing. **The AM would not vary depending on stock status.**

Sub-alternative 34A. Do not implement *in season* AMs if the sector ACT is projected to be met. If the sector ACL is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to **reduce the length of the following fishing year** by the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the sector ACT for the following fishing year.

Sub-alternative 34B. Do not implement *in season* AMs if the sector ACT is projected to be met. If the sector ACL is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator

shall publish a notice to **reduce the sector ACT** in the following year by the amount of the overage.

Sub-alternative 34C. If the sector ACT is projected to be met, prohibit the harvest and retention of species or species group. If the sector ACL is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to **reduce the length of the following fishing year** by the amount necessary to recover the overage from the prior fishing year.

Sub-alternative 34D. If the sector ACT is projected to be met, prohibit the harvest and retention of species or species group. If the sector ACL is exceeded, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to **reduce the sector ACT** in the following year by the amount of the overage.

Alternative 35. Implement Accountability Measures for the recreational sector for species undergoing overfishing. **The AM would vary depending on stock status.**

Sub-alternative 35A. Do not implement *in season* AMs if the sector ACT is projected to be met. **If the species is overfished and the ACL is exceeded**, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the sector ACT in the following year by the amount of the overage. **If not overfished and the ACL is exceeded**, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing year by the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the sector ACT for the following fishing year.

Sub-alternative 35B. If the sector ACT is projected to be met, prohibit the harvest and retention of species or species group. **If the species is overfished and the ACL is exceeded**, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the sector ACT in the following year by the amount of the overage. **If not overfished and the ACL is exceeded**, the Assistant Administrator shall publish a notice to reduce the length of the following fishing year by the amount necessary to ensure landings do not exceed the sector ACT for the following fishing year.

Alternative 36. Compare ACL in Alternatives 2 and 3 with recreational landings over a range of years. For 2010, use only 2010 landings. For 2011, use the average landings of 2010 and 2011. For 2012 and beyond, use three year running average.

Rationale for elimination: During the Amendment development process, the Council considered a system that would establish allocations, Annual Catch Limits (ACLs), Annual Catch Targets (ACTs), and Accountability Measures (AMs) for the ten species undergoing overfishing with the SSC's ABC recommendation as an upper limit. Under this system, the Council would then evaluate whether current regulations would be expected to keep the mortality below the ACT for each of these species. If not, the Council would propose regulatory changes.

During the development of the amendment guidelines became available, which indicate ACTs are not a requirement of the reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act. Rather, the Council has the option of using ACTs to ensure ACLs are not exceeded if they feel it is appropriate. The Council is continuing to evaluate ACLs, ACTs, AMs, and management measures in Amendments 17A and 17B for ten species undergoing overfishing (the rationale for the exclusion of allocations alternatives for red snapper is described above). However, the Council has acknowledged that ACLs, ACTs, allocations, and AMs are in place for some fisheries. For example, the Council views the commercial quota for snowy grouper at the yield at the fishing mortality at optimum yield level and the regulations that specify a closure when the quota is projected to be met to represent a commercial ACL and a commercial AM, respectively. The Council directed staff to include these descriptions in the status quo alternative.

In turn, the Council is evaluating where ACLs, ACTs, AMs, allocations, and management measures are not in place or are not sufficient to keep mortality at the ACL and proposing these reference points where appropriate. For example, the Council views the recreational ACL of 523 snowy grouper currently in place as a sufficient ACL for the recreational sector. However, the Council is proposing AMs for the recreational sector for the snowy grouper fishery and a change in regulations to ensure that mortality remains below the recreational ACL. The Council is also considering alternatives that would modify existing ACLs, ACTs, AMs, allocations, and management measures to ensure overfishing does not occur.

In summary, the Council decided to move from a comprehensive approach to establish ACLs, ACTs, allocations, AMs, and management regulations to one that evaluates where these reference points are currently in place. If the management reference points are not in place or are insufficient to meet the goals and objectives of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the Council is proposing action in Amendment 17B.

Rejected Alternative 37. Establish an ACL = 0 for speckled hind and warsaw grouper. Prohibit all fishing for, possession, and retention of all deepwater species (snowy grouper, golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, warsaw grouper, speckled hind, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper). Allow harvest for golden tilefish in the area between 100 m and 300 m depth (coordinates to be specified in Appendix X) (Figures 4-x).

Sub-Alternative 37a. Require the use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any fishing vessel for golden tilefish.

Rejected Alternative 38. Establish an ACL = 0 for speckled hind and warsaw grouper. Prohibit all fishing for, possession, and retention of all deepwater snapper species (snowy grouper, golden tilefish, blueline tilefish, yellowedge grouper, warsaw grouper, speckled hind, misty grouper, queen snapper, and silk snapper) beyond a depth of 240 feet (40 fathoms; 73 m). Allow harvest of golden tilefish in the area between 100 m and 300 m depth (coordinates to be specified in Appendix X) (Figures 4-x).

Sub-Alternative 38a. Require the use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any fishing vessel for golden tilefish.

Rationale for elimination: The Council removed allowable golden tilefish fishing areas from these alternatives. Speckled hind and warsaw grouper are rarely taken on trips where golden tilefish is also harvested.

Rejected Alternative 39. Establish the commercial ACL (quota) at the F_{OY} level. The commercial quota would be 321,003 lbs ww (286,609 lbs gw). The commercial AM for this stock is to prohibit harvest, possession, and retention when the quota is met. All purchase and sale is prohibited when the quota is met.

Rationale for elimination: This alternative did not meet the purpose and need of the amendment as it did not specify a recreational AM.

Rejected Alternative 40. Define allocations for golden tilefish based upon landings from the ALS, MRFSS, and headboat databases. The allocation would be based on landings from the years 1986-2008. The allocation would be 97% commercial and 3% recreational. Beginning in 2010, the commercial allocation would be 291,369 lbs gutted weight and the recreational allocation would be 1,625 fish (9,011 lbs gutted weight). The commercial and recreational allocation specified for 2010 would remain in effect beyond 2010 until modified.

Rationale for elimination: The percentage allocations in this alternative are identical to another alternative being analyzed in detail.