

Summary of Written Comments on CE-BA 1

ACTION 1. Establishment of CHAPCs

- 6 comments were in support the Council's preferred alternative. Five of those comments also recommended incorporation of CHAPCs into the National Marine Sanctuary system in order to more effectively protect these habitats from non-fishing activities.
- 48 individuals disagreed with the establishment of the CHAPCs as set forth in any of the sub-alternatives under the Council's preferred alternative 2. Moreover, these comments stated that if any CHAPCs are established they should not exclude any recreational activities.
- 48 comments stated that "the SAFMCs continued ignoring of the destructive fishing techniques of the commercial fishing industry must be stopped and these issues must be addressed. Ignoring these issues prevents effective management of the resources."
- One commenter asked whether research vessels would be excluded from the prohibition of anchors, chains and grapples. In addition, the same individual asked whether commercial and recreational vessels be excluded from that clause in the event of foul weather or other duress.

ACTION 2. Establishment of a Shrimp Fishery Access Area

- 4 comments supported the Council's preferred alternative to establish a four-part SFAA.
- 48 individuals submitted comments in support of the No-action alternative. They stated their support for the exclusion of shrimping from all coastal areas. However, they also stated that they *did not disagree* with the Council's preferred alternative (establishing Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas) as long as this did not impact recreational fishing.

ACTION 3. Establishment of Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas

- 4 comments were in favor of the Council's preferred alternative to establish these areas within the Stetson-Miami Terrace CHAPC and Pourtales Terrace CHAPC.
- 48 against individuals stated that they *did not disagree* with the Council's preferred alternative (establishing Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas) as long as this did not impact recreational fishing.

ACTION 4. Requiring vessel monitoring on Golden Crab vessels

- 3 support the Council's preferred (No-action).
- 48 were against the No-action alternative but stated their support for alternatives 2 and 3.

Summary of Oral Testimony on CE-BA 1

- Oceana – support CE-BA 1 but disappointed to see timeline slip. Urge Council not to delay any further.
- 2 commenters supported no action alternative on CHAPCs, no action on SFAA, no action on allowable golden crab areas, support alternatives 2 and 3 (VMS requirement).
- NMS supports proactive action of SAFMC in CE-BA 1 to protect deepwater coral ecosystems. Incorporate especially vulnerable areas within CHAPCs into Sanctuary system in the long-term to provide more comprehensive protection to these habitats.
 - Why was area north of Pourtales Terrace left out of CHAPC designation and why were areas off SC not included either?
 - Support creation of golden crab allowable fishing areas
- ED – supportive of the Council’s selection of their preferred alternative to designate 5 CHAPCs and commend collaboration of industry (shrimp and golden crab) in proposing SFAA and golden crab areas
- Request for access to golden crab fishery in northern zone in areas other than Florida. There is a potential GC fishery off SC and GA. Conflicts with current at certain times of the year but the fishery could operate in these areas (small strips 800-1200 ft.) where there is no coral. Council should consider extending the allowable fishing area in the northern zone further to the north.
- 100-fathom fishing club – calls for assurance that the CE-BA 1 will not restrict use of electric or rod-and-reel deep-drop gear in CHAPCs. Request language to guarantee this right including swordfish deep-dropping. Not conducted near CHAPC areas but over mud.
- Daytime swordfish deep-dropping - some fishermen are no longer using break-away weights because it is expensive.