NORTH CAROLINA MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

MARCH 2025

Business Meeting Briefing Materials

March 12-13, 2025

Kitty Hawk, N.C.

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Table of Contents

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Contents

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Preliminary Matters

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Documents

Meeting Agenda

Draft November 2024 Meeting Minutes

Marine Fisheries Commission Business Meeting
MEETING AGENDA

Hilton Garden Inn; Kitty Hawk, NC
March 12-13, 2025

N.C.G.S. 138A-15(e) mandates at the beginning of any meeting of a board, the chair shall remind all members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest under Chapter 138. The chair also shall inquire as to whether there is any known conflict of interest with respect to any matters coming before the board at that time.

N.C.G.S. 143B-289.54.(g)(2) states a member of the Marine Fisheries Commission shall not vote on any issue before the Commission that would have a "significant and predictable effect" on the member's financial interest. For purposes of this subdivision, "significant and predictable effect" means there is or may be a close causal link between the decision of the Commission and an expected disproportionate financial benefit to the member that is shared only by a minority of persons within the same industry sector or gear group. A member of the Commission shall also abstain from voting on any petition submitted by an advocacy group of which the member is an officer or sits as a member of the advocacy group's board of directors. A member of the Commission shall not use the member's official position as a member of the Commission to secure any special privilege or exemption of substantial value for any person. No member of the Commission shall, by the member's conduct, create an appearance that any person could improperly influence the member in the performance of the member's official duties.

Commissioners having questions about a conflict of interest or appearance of conflict should consult with counsel to the Marine Fisheries Commission or the secretary's ethics liaison. Upon discovering a conflict, the commissioner should inform the chair of the commission in accordance with N.C.G.S. 138A-15(e).

Wednesday, March 12, 2025

2:00 p.m. Public Comment Period

2:30 p.m. Preliminary Matters

- Commission Call to Order* – *Sammy Corbett, Chairman*
- Moment of Silence and Pledge of Allegiance
- Conflict of Interest Reminder
- Roll Call
- **Approval of Agenda ****
- **Approval of Meeting Minutes ****

2:40 p.m. Chairman's Report

- Letters and Online Comments
- Ethics Training and Statement of Economic Interest Reminder

2:45 p.m. Director's Report – *Kathy Rawls*

3:00 p.m. Rulemaking – *Catherine Blum*

- 2023-2024 Rulemaking Cycle Update
- 2024-2025 Rulemaking Cycle
    - **Vote on final adoption of amendment of 15A NCAC 03J .0301 to Simplify Pot Marking Requirements ****
    - **Vote on final adoption of 15A NCAC 03M .0523 for False Albacore Management ****

**** Times indicated are merely for guidance. The commission will proceed through the agenda until completed.***
*****Probable Action Items***

- **Vote on final adoption of 15A NCAC 03O .0601-.0606 for Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact ****

4:00 p.m. Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 5

- Review public comment and AC recommendations – *Joe Facendola, Bennett Paradis*
- **Select preferred management options ****

5:00 p.m. Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3

- Review public comment and AC recommendations – *Lorena de la Garza, Jeff Dobbs*
- **Select preferred management options ****

6:00 p.m. Public Comment Period

Thursday, March 13, 2025

9:00 a.m. 2024 Southern Flounder Preliminary Landings Update – *Anne Markwith, Holly White*

9:30 a.m. Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan Amendment 4

- Presentation of Draft Amendment 4 – *Jeff Dobbs*
- **Vote on approval of draft Amendment 4 for Public and Advisory Committee Review ****

10:30 p.m. Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan Amendment 1 – *Lucas Pensinger, Melinda Lambert*

- **Vote on Final Adoption of Amendment 1 ****

12:00 p.m. Issues from Commissioners

12:30 p.m. Meeting Assignments and Preview of Agenda Items for Next Meeting – *Jesse Bissette*

12:45 p.m. Adjourn

**** Times indicated are merely for guidance. The commission will proceed through the agenda until completed.***

*****Probable Action Items***

Marine Fisheries Commission Business Meeting Minutes
DRAFT
The Islander
Emerald isle, North Carolina
November 20-22, 2024

The Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) held a business meeting November 20-22, 2024, at the Islander hotel in Emerald Isle, North Carolina. In addition to the public comment session, members of the public submitted comment online or via U.S. mail. To view the public comment, go to: https://www.deq.nc.gov/marine-fisheries/marine-fisheries-commission/november-2024-written-public-comment/open

The briefing materials, presentations, and full audio from this meeting are available at: https://www.deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/marine-fisheries/marine-fisheries-commission/past-marine-fisheries-commission-meetings#QuarterlyBusinessMeeting-November20-222024-17220

Actions and motions from the business meeting are listed in **bold** type.

BUSINESS MEETING – MOTIONS AND ACTIONS

November 20, 2024

Public Comment Period

Chairman Sammy Corbett held a public comment session that began at 6:00 p.m. The following members of the public provided comment to the commission: John McQuaid, Herb Schmidt, Dan Moses, Chris Matteo, Steve Anderman, Evan Gadow, Jim Hardin, Van Parrish, Mike Mulchi, Steve Brewster, Ken Pacitto, Becky Garrett, Sean Scully. With no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Corbett ended the public comment period at 06:25 p.m.

View the video recording of the November 20, 2024 public comment session.

November 21, 2024

Public Comment Period

Chairman Corbett convened the MFC business meeting at 9:00 a.m. on November 21, 2024, with the public comment period. The following members of the public provided comment to the commission: Hugh Barwick, Thomas Coltrain, Thomas Newman, Jess Hawkins, Wilbur Vitols, David Sneed, Bert Ownes, Stuart Creighton, Donald Willis, Tim Hergenrader, Ken Seigler, Alan Jernagin, Buddy Garrett. With no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Corbett ended the public comment period at 09:41 a.m.

View the video recording of the November 21, 2024 public comment session.

Preliminary Matters

Prior to the business meeting, there was a presentation of awards by Kathy Rawls and Colonel Carter Witten.

View the video recording of the awards presentation.

New MFC member William Service was sworn in. Commissioner Service replaced Rob Bizzell in the recreational fisherman seat. At Chairman Corbett's request, Commissioner Service introduced himself.

View the video recording of the swearing-in of Commissioner Service.

Chairman Corbett called the November 20-22, 2024, business meeting to order.

Chairman Corbett began the meeting with a moment of silence, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

The Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) MFC Liaison Jesse Bissette read into the record Commissioner Service's Statement of Economic Interest (SEI) for actual and potential conflicts of interest pursuant to Chapter 138A of the N.C. General Statutes.

> For William Service:
> "The State Ethics Commission office has reviewed Commissioner Service's Statement of Economic Interest for actual and potential conflicts of interest pursuant to Chapter 138A of the N.C. General Statutes and did not find an actual conflict of interest but found the potential for a conflict of interest. The potential conflict identified does not prohibit service on the Commission. Mr. Service will fill the role of a person actively engaged in recreational sports fishing who may not derive more than 10% of annual earned income from sports fishing activities. He is a senior environmental toxicologist for Mid-Atlantic Associates, but has advised that as an hourly paid contractor, he has not billed any hours in over a year and has plans to retire. As such, Mr. Service has the potential for a conflict of interest and should exercise appropriate caution in the performance of his public duties, should the business of Mid-Atlantic Associates come before the Commission for official action."

The evaluation of statement of economic interest for each appointee to the MFC is kept on record at the DMF.

Next, Chairman Corbett reminded all commissioners of N.C. General Statute § 138A-15(e), which mandates at the beginning of any meeting of a board, the Chair shall remind all members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest under Chapter 138. The Chair also shall inquire as to whether there is any known conflict of interest with respect to any matters coming before the board at that time. There were no stated conflicts of interest from any commissioner.

The following MFC members were in attendance: Sammy Corbett – Chairman, Ryan Bethea, Mike Blanton, Willie Closs, Sarah Gardner, Alfred Hobgood, Doug Rader, Tom Roller, and William Service.

NC Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Secretary Mary Penny Kelley introduced herself, welcomed Sammy Corbett into the role as MFC Chair, and thanked Rob Bizzell for his service as chairman. She then thanked Marine Patrol for their service across the state to the public.

View the video recording of Secretary Kelley's remarks.

Chairman Corbett asked for any corrections or additions to the meeting agenda, of which there were none, and then requested a motion to approve the agenda.

Motion by Commissioner Rader to approve the meeting agenda.

Second by Commissioner Hobgood.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roller	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion passed unanimously.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Chairman Corbett asked for any corrections, additions or deletions that need to be made to the November 2024 MFC Quarterly Business Meeting minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the minutes.

Motion by Commissioner Roller to approve the August 2024 business meeting minutes.

Second by Commissioner Hobgood.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roller	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion passed unanimously.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Chairman's Report

Letters and Online Comments

Chairman Corbett referred commissioners to letters and comments provided in the briefing materials.

Ethics Training and Statement of Economic Interest Reminder

Chairman Corbett reminded commissioners to work with MFC Liaison Jesse Bissette to stay up to date on their ethics training and Statement of Economic Interest

Election of Vice Chair

Motion by Commissioner Blanton to nominate Commissioner Gardner for Marine Fisheries Commission Vice Chair.

Second by Commissioner Rader.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roller	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion passed 8-0-1.

Commissioner Garder was elected as Marine Fisheries Commission Vice Chair.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Committee Reports

Chairman Corbett referred commissioners to the committee reports provided in the briefing materials.

Nominating Committee

Chris Batsavage presented nominees for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC) obligatory seat. Tim Greiner held an obligatory seat on the SAFMC and is not eligible for reappointment. Nominees for approval by the MFC are Scott Buff, Jack Cox, Alana Harrison, Dewey Hemilright, and Thomas Newman.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Commissioner Gardner to approve the slate of nominees as presented in the briefing materials for the obligatory seat for the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

Second by Commissioner Blanton.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roller	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion passed 8-0-1.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Director's Report

Director Kathy Rawls began her report by addressing public comments concerning shellfish leases. Director Rawls then gave an update on the implementation and outreach efforts regarding the mandatory harvest reporting requirements that were set out in session law. Director Rawls also gave an update regarding the ongoing Coastal Conservation Association (CCA) lawsuit, and Chairman Corbett informed the commission of his potential involvement in the mediation process.

Director Rawls then gave an update on the MFC's request to modify the Annual FMP Review Schedule to amend the Southern Flounder FMP for the review of the plan to begin in 2024.

View the video recording of the Director's Report and discussion.

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Update

DMF Special Assistant for Councils Chris Batsavage gave updates from the recent meeting of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC).

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the ASMFC Update and surrounding discussion.

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council Update

DMF Special Assistant for Councils Chris Batsavage gave updates from the recent meeting of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC).

After the update, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the MAFMC Update and surrounding discussion.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Update

DMF Executive Assistant for Councils Trish Murphy provided an update from the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's (SAFMC) September meeting in Charleston, South Carolina. This update included a discussion regarding a Federal For-Hire Permit.

After the update, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the SAFMC Update and surrounding discussion.

For-Hire Information Paper Presentation

DMF Executive Assistant for Councils Trish Murphy gave a verbal presentation regarding the SAFMC Federal For-Hire Permit Enforcement Review information paper.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the For-Hire Information Paper presentation and surrounding discussion.

Section Updates

Updates were given by License and Statistics Section Chief Brandi Salmon, Fisheries Management Section Chief Jason Rock, Habitat and Enhancement Section Chief Zach Harrison, Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section Chief Shannon Jenkins, and Marine Patrol Colonel Carter Witten.

After the updates, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the Section Updates and surrounding discussion.

Lunch Break

Marine Recreational Information Program Presentation

Brad Johnson and Jeff Moore of DMF's Coastal Angling Program gave a presentation introducing the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) survey and outlining how it is used by the Division.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Fishery Management Plans

Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan Amendment 1

DMF Biologists Lucas Pesinger and Melinda Lambert gave a presentation on the Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Commissioner Hobgood to select the following recommendations as the MFC's preferred management options for the draft N.C. Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan Amendment 1 for:

- **SUSTAINABLE HARVEST:**
  - **Recreational:**
    - **14"-20" slot limit with allowance for one fish over 26"**
    - **3-fish bag limit**
  - **Commercial:**
    - **14"-22" slot limit**
    - **Saturday-Monday closure October-December**
    - **Saturday-Sunday closure January-September**
  - **Stop Net: Formalize management in FMP**
  - **Adaptive Management: Adopt Adaptive Management Framework, with the caveat that adaptive management measures be brought to the MFC for review prior to implementation**
- **SUPPLEMENTAL MANAGEMENT:**
  - **Eliminate captain/crew limit on for-hire trips**
- **COLD STUN MANAGEMENT:**
  - **Extend fishery closure until June 30th following a cold stun**
  - **Adopt Cold Stun Adaptive Management Framework**

Second by Commissioner Gardner.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Roller	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion passed 8-0-1.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Blue Crab Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3

DMF Biologists Robert Corbett and McLean Seward gave an update regarding the Blue Crab FMP Amendment 3.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 5

DMF Biologists Joe Facendola and Bennett Paradis gave a presentation on the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Commissioner Blanton to approve the draft N.C. Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 5 for public and MFC advisory committee review.

Second by Commissioner Rader.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roller	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion passed unanimously.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Chairman Corbett recessed the business meeting at approximately 5:41 p.m.

November 22, 2024

Chairman Corbett reconvened the MFC business meeting at 09:00 a.m.

Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3

DMF Biologists Jeff Dobbs and Lorena de la Garza Lambert gave a presentation on the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Commissioner Rader to approve the draft N.C. Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3 for public and MFC advisory committee review.

Second by Commissioner Gardner.

ROLL CALL VOTE					
Member	**Aye**	**Nay**	**Abstain**	**Recuse**	**Absent**
Bethea	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Blanton	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Closs	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gardner	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hobgood	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rader	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Roller	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Service	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Corbett	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Motion Passed unanimously.

View the video recording of the motion and surrounding discussion.

Overview of the ESA Section 10 Incidental Take Permit

Barbie Byrd gave a presentation updating the Commission on the new ESA Section 10 Incidental Take Permit (ITP), as well as the new Observer Trip Scheduling System (OTSS).

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Rule Suspensions

Jason Rock informed the commission that there have not been any new rule suspensions since the August 2024 meeting.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Rulemaking

DMF Rulemaking Coordinator Catherine Blum provided updates on 2023-2024 rulemaking cycle and the 2024-2025 rulemaking cycle.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Environmental Permit Review Presentation

DMF Biologist Kimberlee Harding gave a presentation on the Environmental Permit Review Program.

After the presentation, Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments and questions.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Issues from Commissioners

Chairman Corbett opened the floor to commissioners for comments, questions, and other discussion.

View the video recording of the Issues from Commissioners.

Meeting Assignments and Preview of Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The DMF's MFC Liaison Jesse Bissette reviewed meeting assignments and provided an overview of the February 2025 meeting items.

View the video recording of the presentation.

Having no further business to conduct, Chairman Corbett adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Chairman's Report

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Documents

State Ethics Education Reminder

2025 Annual Meeting Calendar

MFC Workplan

EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS

Public Servants must complete the Ethics and Lobbying Education program provided by the N.C. State Ethics Commission within **six months** of their election, appointment, or employment. We recommend that this be completed as soon as possible, but the training must be repeated every two years after the initial session.

Our new 90-minute on-demand online program is available on our website under the Education tab. For your convenience, here is the link. The new program is compatible with portable devices such as phones and tablets.

Live webinar presentations are also offered every month. These presentations are 90 minutes in length and give the opportunity to ask questions of the speaker. Registration information for those can be found here.

For questions or additional information concerning the Ethics Education requirements, please contact Tracey Powell at (919) 814-3600.

Marine Fisheries Commission 2025 Calendar

Dates are subject to change.

January

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
				2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19		21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

February

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	**19**	**20**	**21**	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	

March

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

April

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17		19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

May

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	**21**	**22**	**23**	24
25		27	28	29	30	31

June

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

July

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		1	2	3		5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

August

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	**20**	**21**	**22**	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

September

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
		2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

October

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

November

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10		12	13	14	15
16	17	18	**19**	**20**	**21**	22
23	24	25	26			29
30						

December

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23				27
28	29	30	31			

2025 MFC Meeting Dates

MFC Business Meetings	Northern Regional AC	Southern Regional AC
February 19-21	January 7	January 8
May 21-23	March 18	March 19
August 20-22	June 17	June 18
November 19-21	September 23	September 24
Shellfish/Crustacean	**Finfish Standing AC**	**Habitat and Water Quality**
January 9	March 25	January 15
March 20	June 24	March 26
June 19	September 30	June 25
September 25		October 1
Joint Meeting of All ACs: March 13, June 19, September 11		

Calendar Key

	MFC		Shellfish/Crustacean Standing AC
	Northern Regional AC		Habitat and Water Quality Standing AC
	Southern Regional AC		State Holiday
	Finfish Standing AC		Federal Commission or Council Meeting
	Joint Meeting of ACs for MFC Review and Presentation of Action Items		
	Joint Meeting of Northern, Southern, and Finfish AC		

Marine Fisheries Commission Workplan - March 2025

Orange = Action Item			Green = No Action Necessary				
Topic	Nov 2024	Mar 2025	May 2025	Aug 2025	Nov 2025	Feb 2026	May 2026
Active Management Plans							
Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1	Select Preferred Options	Final Adoption					
Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3	Send to AC/Public Review	Select Preferred Options	Final Adoption				
Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5	Send to AC/Public Review	Select Preferred Options	Final Adoption				
Southern Flounder FMP Amendment 4	Announced to MFC	Send to AC/Public Review	Select Preferred Options	Final Adoption			
Southern Flounder FMP Amendment 5	Announced to MFC	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	Send to AC/Public Review	Select Preferred Options	Final Adoption
Blue Crab FMP Amendment 3 - Adaptive Management	In Progress	In Progress	Adopt Adaptive Management				
CSMA Amendment 2 Data Update			Information Presented				
Rulemaking							
False Albacore Rule	In Progress	Final Adoption					
Simplify Pot Marking Requirements	In Progress	Final Adoption					
Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact	In Progress	Final Adoption					
Commission Requests							
Federal Permits - Review Feasibility of State Requirements	Info Presented						
Atlantic Bonito Management	In Progress	In Progress					

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Committee Reports

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Documents

Northern Regional Advisory Committee

Southern Regional Advisory Committee

Shellfish Advisory Committee

Habitat and Water Quality Advisory Committee

JOSH STEIN
Governor
D. REID WILSON
Secretary
KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

DRAFT

January 22, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marine Fisheries Commission
Northern Regional Advisory Committee

FROM: Coral Sawyer, MFC Program Assistant
Marine Fisheries Commission Office

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Marine Fisheries Commission's Northern Regional Advisory Committee, January 7, 2025, to provide recommendations for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

The Marine Fisheries Commission's (MFC) Northern Regional Advisory Committee (AC) held a meeting on January 7, 2025, at the Dare County Administration Building in Manteo, North Carolina, and via webinar. AC members could attend in either setting to communicate with other committee members.

The following Advisory Committee members were in attendance in person: Sara Winslow, Keith Bruno, Herman "Wayne" Dunbar, Melissa Clark, Stuart Creighton, Robert Makowsky, Jonathan Worthington. The following member were in attendance online: Morton Gaskill, Thomas Newman. (Absent: Everett Blake, Jamie Lane Winslow)

Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) Staff: Jesse Bissette, Coral Sawyer, Brandi Salmon, Jeff Dobbs, Dan Zapf, Barbie Byrd, Kathy Rawls, Hope Wade, Jason Walsh, Colonel Carter Witten, Captain Chris Lee, Bennett Paradis, Lorena de la Garza, Joe Facendola, Charlton Godwin, Sgt. Edward Mann, Officer Jacob Williams.

Public: James Fletcher, Bobby Smith, Fletcher O'Neal, Ian Perna

The Northern Regional AC had seven members present in person at the start of the meeting and a quorum was met.

Northern Regional AC Chair Sara Winslow called the meeting to order at 5:59 p.m. The full meeting recording can be viewed here.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Jonathan Worthington and seconded by Melissa Clark. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to approve the minutes from the September 24, 2024, and October 08, 2024, meetings was made by Jonathan Worthington and seconded by Kieth Bruno. The motion passed unanimously.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT EASTERN OYSTER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 5

Eastern Oyster species leads Joe Facendola and Bennett Paradis gave a presentation on draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

Presentation on the draft Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3

Hard Clam species leads Lorena de la Garza and Jeff Dobbs gave a presentation on draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public comment period begin at 7:39 p.m. and ended at 7:48 p.m. Two members of the public, James Fletcher and Bobby Smith, provided public comment.

View the video recording of the public comment period.

VOTE TO RECOMMEND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

EASTERN OYSTER FMP AMENDMENT 5

Chair Sara Winslow opened the floor to discuss potential management options for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5.

Motion by Stuart Creighton to endorse the MFC tasking the DMF with exploring options for a recreational shellfish license/permit outside of the FMP process. Second by Robert Makowsky. Motion passed 8-1.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Keith Bruno to keep options 2 (cultch supported harvest areas) and 3 (rotational cultch sites) with the intent to streamline and adapt procedure for sampling vessels (based on Dan Bolin's study). Because of the unknown advantages and known disadvantages to the commercial industry, the Northern Regional AC does not recommend the Deepwater Oyster Recovery Areas management strategy. Second by Morton Gaskill. Motion passed 7-2.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Robert Makowsky to recommend adopting the adaptive management framework as proposed by the DMF in the cultch supported harvest strategy. Second by Stuart Creighton. Motion passed 8-1.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

HARD CLAM FMP AMENDMENT 3

Chair Sara Winslow opened the floor to discuss potential management options for the Clam FMP Amendment 3.

Motion by Stuart Creighton to endorse the MFC tasking the DMF with exploring options for a recreational shellfish license/permit outside of the FMP process. Second by Jonathan Worthington. Motion passed 8-1.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Stuart Creighton to support the Division's recommendation to phase out mechanical clam harvest as listed in the mechanical clam harvest issue paper. Second by Robert Makowsky. Motion failed 3-5.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Wayne Dunbar for mechanical clam harvest to stay at status quo. Second by Melissa Clark. Motion passed 6-3.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

ISSUES FROM AC MEMBERS

Jesse Bissette gave updates concerning the recent MFC business meeting and plans for future meetings.

View the video recording of this update.

Jonathan Worthington motioned to adjourn, seconded by Wayne Dunbar. Motion passed by unanimous consent. The meeting ended at 08:29 p.m.

JOSH STEIN
Governor

D. REID WILSON
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

January 22, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marine Fisheries Commission
Southern Regional Advisory Committee

FROM: Coral Sawyer, Program Assistant
Marine Fisheries Commission Office

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Marine Fisheries Commission's Southern Regional Advisory Committee, January 8, 2025, to provide recommendations for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

The Marine Fisheries Commission's (MFC) Southern Regional Advisory Committee (AC) held a meeting on January 8, 2025, at the Division of Marine Fisheries Central District Office in Morehead City, North Carolina, and via webinar. AC members could attend in either setting to communicate with other committee members.

The following Advisory Committee members were in attendance in person: Tom Smith, Samuel Boyce, Pam Morris, Michael Oppegard, Kenneth Seigler, John "Glenn" Skinner, Jeremy Skinner, Michael Yates. The following member were in attendance online: Fred Scharf. (Absent: Truby Proctor, Tim Wilson)

Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) Staff: Jesse Bissette, Coral Sawyer, Brandi Salmon, Jeff Dobbs, Dan Zapf, Barbie Byrd, Kathy Rawls, Hope Wade, Jason Walsh, Colonel Carter Witten, Bennet Paradis, Joe Facendola, Lorena de la Garza, Officer Brian Gupton.

Public: Wesley Potter

The Southern Regional AC had eight members present in person at the start of the meeting and a quorum was met.

Southern Regional AC Vice Chair Tom Smith called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The full meeting recording can be viewed here.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Glenn Skinner and seconded by Pam Morris. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion to approve the minutes from the September 25, 2024, meeting was made by Pam Morris and seconded by Glenn Skinner. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Samuel Boyce to approve the minutes from the October 9, 2024, meeting with the amended wording on page 4 to say "Brunswick River" instead of "Brunswick County". The motion was seconded by Glenn Skinner and passed without dissent.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT EASTERN OYSTER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 5

Eastern Oyster species leads Joe Facendola and Bennett Paradis gave a presentation on draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT HARD CLAM FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 3

Hard Clam species leads Lorena de la Garza and Jeff Dobbs gave a presentation on draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public comment period began at 7:42 p.m. and ended at 7:47 p.m. One member of the public, Wesley Potter, provided public comment.

View the video recording of the public comment period.

VOTE TO RECOMMEND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Vice Chair Smith opened the floor to discuss potential management options for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

Motion by Samuel Boyce to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission ask the Division of Marine Fisheries to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process. Second by Michael Oppegard. Motion carries.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Samuel Boyce that the AC supports a significantly narrower approach to DORAs than what is described in the issue paper with the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the closures before considering closing the majority of the area. Second by Michael Yates. Motion passes without dissent.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Michael Oppegard to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission adopt the proposed Cultch-Supported Harvest Strategy as described in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper. Second by Samuel Boyce. Motion passes with one abstention.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Glenn Skinner to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission adopt the Rotational Cultch Site Strategy as described in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper. Second by Michael Yates. Motion passes without dissent.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Samuel Boyce to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission adopt the adaptive management framework as described in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Issue Paper. Second by Michael Oppegaard. Motion passes 5-4.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Glenn Skinner to maintain the status quo in the mechanical clam fishery. Second by Pam Morris. Motion passes 6-1, with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

ISSUES FROM AC MEMBERS

Jesse Bissette gave updates concerning the recent MFC business meeting and plans for future meetings.

View the video recording of this update.

Sam Boyce motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mike Oppegaard. Motion passed by unanimous consent. The meeting ended at 9:09 p.m.

JOSH STEIN
Governor

D. REID WILSON
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

January 22, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marine Fisheries Commission
Shellfish/Crustacean Advisory Committee

FROM: Coral Sawyer, Program Assistant
Marine Fisheries Commission Office

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Marine Fisheries Commission's Shellfish/Crustacean Advisory Committee, January 9, 2025, to provide recommendations for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

The Marine Fisheries Commission's (MFC) Shellfish/Crustacean Advisory Committee (AC) held a meeting on January 9, 2025, at the Department of Environmental Quality Washington Regional Office in Washington, North Carolina, and via webinar. AC members could attend in either setting to communicate with other committee members.

The following Advisory Committee members were in attendance in person: Mike Blanton, William Service, Mike Marshall, Brassai Mustin, Brett Wilson. The following members were in attendance online: Michael Hardison, Tim Willis. (Absent: Lauren Burch, Mary Sue Hamann, Bruce Morris, Brian Shepard)

Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) Staff: Jesse Bissette, Coral Sawyer, Brandi Salmon, Jeff Dobbs, Dan Zapf, Barbie Byrd, Kathy Rawls, Hope Wade, Jason Walsh, Colonel Carter Witten, Bennett Paradis, Lorena de la Garza, Joe Facendola, Jason Rock, Kristina Flanigan, Alan Bianchi, Officer Jonathan Morris, Officer Candace Rose.

Public: Lyle Cahoon, Claudia Cahoon, Christopher Cuthrell, Steve Migette, Lany Paul, Peyton Hassell, Dylan Bland, Chad M., Thomas "Eddie" Newman, Dale Newman, Larry Gill.

The Shellfish/Crustacean AC had seven members present at the start of the meeting and a quorum was met.

Shellfish/Crustacean AC Chair Mike Blanton called the meeting to order at 06:01 p.m. The full meeting recording can be viewed here.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Tim Willis and seconded by Mike Marshall. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion to approve the minutes from the April 11, 2024, and September 26, 2024, meetings was made by Tim Willis and seconded by Mike Marshall. The motion passed unanimously.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT EASTERN OYSTER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 5

Eastern Oyster species leads Joe Facendola and Bennett Paradis gave a presentation on draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public comment period began at 7:18 p.m. and ended at 7:35 p.m. Four members of the public provided comments. They were Larry Gill, Dale Newman, Eddie Newman, and Dylan Bland.

View the video recording of the public comment period.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT HARD CLAM FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 3

Hard Clam species leads Lorena de la Garza and Jeff Dobbs gave a presentation on draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

VOTE TO RECOMMEND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Chair Blanton opened the floor to discuss potential management options for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

Motion by Mike Marshall to recommend the Division's recommendation regarding phasing out the mechanical clam harvest as described in the mechanical clam harvest issue paper (option 3) and to discontinue the allowance of mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging (option 4). Second by Brett Wilson. Motion passes 4-1 with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by William Service to recommend that the MFC ask the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters. Second by Mike Marshall. Motion passes 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Brassai Mustin to maintain status quo regarding strategy 1 (Deepwater Oyster Recovery Areas) in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Issue Paper. Second by Mike Marshall. Motion passes 3-2 with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Mike Marshall to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest Strategy as described in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Issue Paper. Second by Tim Willis. Motion passes 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Brassai Mustin to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission adopt the Rotational Cultch Site Strategy as described in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Issue Paper. Second by Mike Marshall. Motion passes 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Mike Marshall to recommend that the Marine Fisheries Commission adopt the adaptive management framework as described in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Issue Paper. Second by Tim Willis. Motion passes 5-0 with 2 abstentions.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

ISSUES FROM AC MEMBERS

Jesse Bissette gave updates concerning the recent MFC business meeting and plans for future meetings.

View the video recording of this update.

Mike Marshall motioned to adjourn, seconded by Brassai Mustin. Motion passed by unanimous consent.
The meeting ended at 09:01 p.m.

JOSH STEIN
Governor

D. REID WILSON
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

January 22, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marine Fisheries Commission
Habitat & Water Quality Advisory Committee

FROM: Coral Sawyer, Program Assistant
Marine Fisheries Commission Office

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Marine Fisheries Commission's Habitat & Water Quality Advisory Committee, January 15, 2025, to provide recommendations for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

The Marine Fisheries Commission's (MFC) Habitat & Water Quality Advisory Committee (AC) held a meeting on January 15, 2025, at the Division of Marine Fisheries Central District Office in Morehead City, North Carolina, and via webinar. AC members could attend in either setting to communicate with other committee members.

The following Advisory Committee members were in attendance in person: Doug Rader, Sarah Gardner, David Glenn, Nathan Hall, Scott Leahy, Mark Sondar. The following members were in attendance online: Cate Arnold, Lisa Rider. (Absent: Jack Durham, Joel Fodrie, Markham Parrish)

Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) Staff: Jesse Bissette via webinar, Coral Sawyer, Hope Wade, Debbie Manley, Dan Zapf, Barbie Byrd, Kathy Rawls, Mike Loeffler, Colonel Carter Witten, Sgt. Jason Parker, Bennett Paradis, Lorena de la Garza, Joe Facendola, Charlie Deaton, Jason Rock, Jason Peters, Kristina Flanigan, Chloe Dorin, Casey Silva.

Public: Brian Hensky, Nancy Eden, Stanley Pierce.

The Habitat & Water Quality AC had eight members present at the start of the meeting and a quorum was met.

Habitat & Water Quality AC Chair Doug Rader called the meeting to order at 06:01 p.m. The full meeting recording can be viewed here.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Scott Leahy and seconded by Mark Sondar. The motion passed unanimously.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT EASTERN OYSTER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 5

Eastern Oyster species leads Joe Facendola and Bennett Paradis gave a presentation on draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT HARD CLAM FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 3

Hard Clam species leads Lorena de la Garza and Jeff Dobbs gave a presentation on draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3 and the Division of Marine Fisheries preliminary recommendations for that plan.

View the video recording of the presentation and surrounding discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

A public comment period began at 7:24 p.m. and ended at 7:27 p.m. One member of the public, Nancy Eden, provided public comment.

View the video recording of the public comment period.

VOTE TO RECOMMEND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Chair Rader opened the floor to discuss potential management options for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

Motion by Scott Leahy to recommend that the MFC adopt the strategies proposed by the Division in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management issue paper (DORAs, Cultch-Supported Harvest, and Rotational Cultch Sites), and to recommend that the MFC ask the Division to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, with the intent to move towards a stock assessment and stock level management for both hard clam and oysters; and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvester with Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality health and safety information outside of the FMP process. Second by Cate Arnold. Motion passes 8-0.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Lisa Rider that the AC supports the expansion of monitoring efforts and the establishment of sentinel sites as a critical step in validating the success of FMPs, and to prioritize the proper funding and partnerships with research institutions. Second by Nathan Hall. Motion passes 8-0.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

Motion by Scott Leahy to endorse the Division's recommendation in the Mechanical Clam Harvest Issue Paper (option 3 and 4). Second by David Glenn. Motion passes 8-0.

View the video recording of this motion and surrounding discussion.

ISSUES FROM AC MEMBERS

Jesse Bissette gave updates concerning the recent MFC business meeting and plans for future meetings.

View the video recording of this update.

Doug Rader motioned to adjourn. Motion passed by unanimous consent. The meeting ended at 08:26 p.m.

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Director's Report

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Documents

Spotted Seatrout Cold Stun Memo

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Meeting Report

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting Summary Report

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting Report

JOSH STEIN
Governor

D. REID WILSON
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

February 5, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission

FROM: Lucas Pensinger and Melinda Lambert
Spotted Seatrout Species Co-Leads

SUBJECT: January 2025 Cold Stun

Issue

The Division of Marine Fisheries (the Division) began receiving reports of cold stunned spotted seatrout on January 13, 2025, following six nights of below freezing temperatures and six days of near freezing temperatures and continued to receive additional cold stun reports over the next eight days.

Background

By January 22, 2025, the Division had received reports of 10 distinct cold stun events from the Little Alligator River (Tyrrell County) to Queen's Creek near Swansboro (Onslow County). Division staff responded and confirmed multiple cold stuns of spotted seatrout, red drum, and striped mullet occurred across this range. Water temperature data loggers near areas of observed cold stunned fish confirmed temperatures fell below temperature thresholds and exceeded time limits established by the Division's Guidelines for Adaptive Management for Cold Stun Closures.

Discussion

The Division Director issued Proclamation FF-11-2025 on January 22, 2025, to close the commercial and recreational spotted seatrout fishery in Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters effective at 5:00 p.m. on January 24 extending to 11:59 p.m. on June 15, 2025 unless the reopening date is modified by the adoption of Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan. The closure follows the Marine Fisheries Commission's (MFC) management strategy in the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan, which instructed the Director to close the fishery in the event of a significant cold stun.

With an extended cold period and 5+ inches of snowfall in most areas of coastal N.C. after the fishery closure, the potential of fish to succumb to low water temperatures still

exists. Since Proclamation FF-11-2025 was issued, the Division has received 13 additional reports of cold stunned spotted seatrout. Staff have confirmed cold stuns of thousands of spotted seatrout, thousands of weakfish, 10s of thousands of spot and Atlantic croaker, 100s of striped mullet, approximately 40 red drum, a few black drum, a few bluefish, a few sheepshead, and thousands of menhaden from the Little Alligator River to Topsail Island. Spotted seatrout cold stuns have also occurred in Virginia, South Carolina, and Georgia. Additionally, analysis of water temperature data at 27 water temperature monitoring stations either adjacent to a confirmed cold stun or located deeper in the water column throughout the state showed loggers at 21 of these stations recorded temperatures below temperature thresholds and exceeding the time limits established in the Division's Guidance for Adaptive Management for Cold Stun Closures (Figure 1). An additional logger was downloaded one day prior to exceeding the time limit for temperature thresholds. Water temperature data from the remaining five stations showed clear signs of loggers being out of the water due to high winds and tidal ranges causing exceptionally shallow water at these stations. Staff are continuing to actively investigate reports of cold stuns and collect biological and environmental data from areas affected.



Figure 1. A map of North Carolina showing locations of HOBO water temperature logger stations where water temperatures below temperature thresholds and exceeding the time limits established in the Division's Guidance for Adaptive Management for Cold Stun Closures were recorded during the January 2025 cold stun.

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

NEWS RELEASE

Sustainable and Cooperative Management of Atlantic Coastal Fisheries

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
December 17, 2024

PRESS CONTACT: Tina Berger
703.842.0749

Atlantic Striped Bass Board Initiates Addendum to Consider 2026 Management Measures

Arlington, VA – The Commission's Atlantic Striped Bass Management Board has initiated Draft Addendum III to consider recreational and commercial management measures for 2026 to support rebuilding the stock by 2029. Options will consider a range of reductions for the recreational and commercial fisheries. Recreational reductions will consider season and size limits that take into account regional differences, including no-harvest and no-targeting closures. Final action is planned for no later than October 2025 with implementation in early 2026.

"We want to thank the thousands of members of the public who took the time to provide thoughtful comments ahead of this Board meeting," said Board Chair Megan Ware from Maine. "We understand that many will be disappointed in the Board's decision to initiate an addendum versus taking immediate action. However, after deliberating for more than three hours about the path forward, the Board came to the conclusion that the best course of action is to proceed with an addendum which will allow for clarity on 2024 removals and additional analyses."

The action responds to the results of the 2024 Stock Assessment Update, which indicates the resource remains overfished but is not experiencing overfishing. Short-term projections estimate an increase in fishing mortality in 2025 due to the above average 2018 year-class entering the current recreational ocean slot limit combined with the lack of strong year-classes behind it. This action is intended to increase the probability of rebuilding the stock by adjusting subsequent 2026 management measures to ensure the stock is on the necessary rebuilding trajectory.

At the meeting, the Board considered two possible paths forward. The first was to take immediate Board action to reduce fishing mortality in 2025. The second was a longer, more comprehensive process given one of the primary options being considered is seasonal closures, which represents a new management approach for the Board. Ultimately, the Board chose the second path by initiating an addendum that would provide the Board more time to develop a fuller suite of management options, allow for the incorporation of full 2024 fishery removals data, and afford the public with a more robust opportunity to provide input. The Board noted preliminary data indicate the current measures

implemented through Addendum II are on track to reduce 2024 removals from 2023 and 2022 levels. The Board also recognized the importance of the thousands of public comments submitted for this meeting and the upcoming public input through the addendum process on 2026 management measures.

For more information, please contact Emilie Franke, Fishery Management Plan Coordinator, at efranke@asmfc.org.

###

PR24-40

Motions

Main Motion

Move to initiate an addendum to support striped bass rebuilding by 2029 in consideration of 2024 recreational and commercial mortality while balancing socioeconomic impacts. Options should include, if needed, a range of overall reductions, consideration of recreational versus commercial contributions to the reductions, recreational season and size changes taking into account regional variability of availability, and no harvest vs no target closures. Final action shall be taken at the Summer 2025 meeting to be in place for the 2026 recreational and commercial fisheries.

Motion made by Mr. Nowalsky and seconded by Mr. Clark

Motion to Amend

Motion to amend to replace "at the summer" with "by the annual"

Motion made by Mr. Luisi and seconded by Mr. Geer. Motion passes (12 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstentions).

Main Motion as Amended

Move to initiate an addendum to support striped bass rebuilding by 2029 in consideration of 2024 recreational and commercial mortality while balancing socioeconomic impacts. Options should include, if needed, a range of overall reductions, consideration of recreational versus commercial contributions to the reductions, recreational season and size changes taking into account regional variability of availability, and no harvest vs no target closures. Final action shall be taken by the 2025 Annual Meeting to be in place for the 2026 recreational and commercial fisheries.

Motion to Substitute

Move to substitute to take Board action to implement in 2025 recreational season closures to achieve a 9% reduction and decrease the commercial quotas by 9%. The recreational season closures will be implemented regionally, as follows:

- **Maine–Rhode Island: no-harvest closures of 22 days in Wave 3 plus the number of days needed in Wave 5 to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Connecticut–North Carolina: no-harvest closures of the same number of days in Wave 2 and Wave 6 needed to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Chesapeake Bay: Maryland no-targeting closure of 22 days in Wave 4 to lengthen the existing closure [9% reduction as calculated with "striped bass only trips eliminated" assumption]. Virginia no-harvest closure of 18 days at the end of Wave 6 [9% reduction].**
- **New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area-specific fisheries: seasonal closures to achieve 9% reductions.**

The regions/states will submit implementation plans for Board approval at the Winter 2025 Meeting Week. If a region can't decide on uniform dates, the Board will make the selection. The implementation deadline is April 1, 2025.
Motion made by Ms. Meserve and seconded by Ms. Patterson.

Motion to Amend
Move to amend the commercial reduction by replacing 9% with 1%.
Motion made by Mr. Kaelin and seconded by Mr. Hasbrouck. Motion fails (7 in favor, 7 opposed, 2 abstentions).

Motion to Substitute
Move to substitute to take Board action to implement in 2025 recreational season closures to achieve a 9% reduction and decrease the commercial quotas by 9%. The recreational season closures will be implemented regionally, as follows:

- **Maine–Rhode Island: no-harvest closures of 22 days in Wave 3 plus the number of days needed in Wave 5 to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Connecticut–North Carolina: no-harvest closures of the same number of days in Wave 2 and Wave 6 needed to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Chesapeake Bay:**
  Maryland no-targeting closure of 22 days in Wave 4 to lengthen the existing closure [9% reduction as calculated with "striped bass only trips eliminated" assumption]. Virginia no-harvest closure of 18 days at the end of Wave 6 [9% reduction].
- **New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area-specific fisheries: seasonal closures to achieve 9% reductions.**

The regions/states will submit implementation plans for Board approval at the Winter 2025 Meeting Week. If a region can't decide on uniform dates, the Board will make the selection. The implementation deadline is April 1, 2025.
Motion made by Ms. Meserve and seconded by Ms. Patterson.

Motion to Amend
Move to amend the commercial reduction by replacing 9% with 5%.
Motion made by Mr. Hasbrouck and seconded by Mr. Kane. Motion passes (10 in favor, 4 opposed, 2 abstentions).

Motion to Substitute as Amended
Move to substitute to take Board action to implement in 2025 recreational season closures to achieve a 9% reduction and decrease the commercial quotas by 5%. The recreational season closures will be implemented regionally, as follows:

- **Maine–Rhode Island: no-harvest closures of 22 days in Wave 3 plus the number of days needed in Wave 5 to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Connecticut–North Carolina: no-harvest closures of the same number of days in Wave 2 and Wave 6 needed to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**

- **Chesapeake Bay:**
  Maryland no-targeting closure of 22 days in Wave 4 to lengthen the existing closure [9% reduction as calculated with "striped bass only trips eliminated" assumption]. Virginia no-harvest closure of 18 days at the end of Wave 6 [9% reduction].
- **New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area-specific fisheries: seasonal closures to achieve 9% reductions.**

The regions/states will submit implementation plans for Board approval at the Winter 2025 Meeting Week. If a region can't decide on uniform dates, the Board will make the selection. The implementation deadline is April 1, 2025.

Motion to Amend
For the area specific fisheries, move to amend to add after seasonal closures "or size limit changes"
Motion made by Mr. Clark and seconded by Ms. Meserve. Motion passes (13 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions).

Motion to Substitute as Amended
Move to substitute to take Board action to implement in 2025 recreational season closures to achieve a 9% reduction and decrease the commercial quotas by 5%. The recreational season closures will be implemented regionally, as follows:

- **Maine–Rhode Island: no-harvest closures of 22 days in Wave 3 plus the number of days needed in Wave 5 to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Connecticut–North Carolina: no-harvest closures of the same number of days in Wave 2 and Wave 6 needed to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region.**
- **Chesapeake Bay:**
  Maryland no-targeting closure of 22 days in Wave 4 to lengthen the existing closure [9% reduction as calculated with "striped bass only trips eliminated" assumption]. Virginia no-harvest closure of 18 days at the end of Wave 6 [9% reduction].
- **New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area-specific fisheries: seasonal closures or size limit changes to achieve 9% reductions.**

The regions/states will submit implementation plans for Board approval at the Winter 2025 Meeting Week. If a region can't decide on uniform dates, the Board will make the selection. The implementation deadline is April 1, 2025.

Motion to Amend
Under Maryland Chesapeake Bay, move to amend to add "and or no harvest" and strike of 22 days.
Motion made by Mr. Sikorski and seconded by Mr. Abbott. Motion approves by consent.

Motion to Substitute as Amended
Move to substitute to take Board action to implement in 2025 recreational season closures to achieve a 9% reduction and decrease the commercial quotas by 5%. The recreational season closures will be implemented regionally, as follows:

- **Maine–Rhode Island: no-harvest closures of 22 days in Wave 3 plus the number of days needed in Wave 5 to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region**

- **Connecticut–North Carolina: no-harvest closures of the same number of days in Wave 2 and Wave 6 needed to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region**
- **Chesapeake Bay:**
  Maryland no-targeting closure and or no harvest in Wave 4 to lengthen the existing closure [9% reduction as calculated with "striped bass only trips eliminated" assumption]. VA no-harvest closure of 18 days at the end of Wave 6 [9% reduction].
- **New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area-specific fisheries: seasonal closures or size limit changes to achieve 9% reductions.**

The regions/states will submit implementation plans for Board approval at the Winter 2025 Meeting Week. If a region can't decide on uniform dates, the Board will make the selection. The implementation deadline is April 1, 2025.

Motion to Amend
For Maine—Rhode Island, Connecticut—North Carolina, and Virginia Chesapeake Bay, move to amend to add "and or no targeting closures" and strike "of 22 days," and "of 18 days" and "of the same number of days."
Motion made by Mr. Nowalsky and seconded by Mr. Hasbrouck. Motion passes (9 in favor, 5 opposed, 2 abstentions).

Motion to Substitute as Amended
Move to substitute to take Board action to implement in 2025 recreational season closures to achieve a 9% reduction and decrease the commercial quotas by 5%. The recreational season closures will be implemented regionally, as follows:

- **Maine–Rhode Island: no-harvest closures and or no targeting closures in Wave 3 plus the number of days needed in Wave 5 to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region**
- **Connecticut–North Carolina: no-harvest closures and or no targeting closures in Wave 2 and Wave 6 needed to achieve a combined 9% reduction across both Waves, to be implemented in uniform dates across the region**
- **Chesapeake Bay:**
  Maryland no-targeting closure and or no harvest in Wave 4 to lengthen the existing closure [9% reduction as calculated with "striped bass only trips eliminated" assumption]. Virginia no-harvest closure and or no targeting closures at the end of Wave 6 [9% reduction].
- **New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware area-specific fisheries: seasonal closures or size limit changes to achieve 9% reductions.**

The regions/states will submit implementation plans for Board approval at the Winter 2025 Meeting Week. If a region can't decide on uniform dates, the Board will make the selection. The implementation deadline is April 1, 2025.
Motion fails (4 in favor, 11 opposed, 1 null)

Main Motion as Amended

Move to initiate an addendum to support striped bass rebuilding by 2029 in consideration of 2024 recreational and commercial mortality while balancing socioeconomic impacts. Options should include, if needed, a range of overall reductions, consideration of recreational versus commercial contributions to the reductions, recreational season and size changes taking into account regional variability of availability, and no harvest versus no target closures. Final action shall be taken by the annual 2025 meeting to be in place for the 2026 rec and comm fisheries.

Motion passes (14 in favor, 2 opposed).

December 2024 Council Meeting Summary

The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council met December 10-12, 2024, in Annapolis, Maryland. The following is a summary of actions taken and issues considered during the meeting. Presentations, briefing materials, motions, and webinar recordings are available on the Council's December 2024 meeting page.

HIGHLIGHTS

During this meeting, the Council:

- Finalized an amendment to modify the species separation requirements for the Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog fisheries
- Reviewed previously adopted recreational measures for summer flounder and scup and determined that no changes are needed for either species in 2025*
- Adopted status quo recreational management measures for black sea bass in 2025*
- Approved a scoping document for the Recreational Sector Separation and Data Collection Amendment*
- Set the spiny dogfish acceptable biological catch for 2025 equal to the overfishing limit (the maximum legally possible), resulting in a commercial quota of about 9.3 million pounds
- Adopted a more flexible minimum mesh requirement for directed butterfish fishing
- Reviewed the final 2024 EAFM risk assessment report, which incorporates a number of recent updates and improvements
- Approved a Comprehensive Five-Year (2025-2029) Research Priorities document
- Approved the 2025 Implementation Plan
- Reviewed the results of a Council-funded project that has developed a hub for river herring and shad run data
- Endorsed recommendations from the Highly Migratory Species Committee regarding the NOAA Fisheries Atlantic HMS Proposed Rule for Electronic Reporting
- Presented the Ricks E Savage Award to former Council member Dewey Hemilright

** Items denoted with an asterisk (*) were undertaken during joint meetings with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's Summer Flounder, Scup, Black Sea Bass Management Board or Interstate Fisheries Management Program Policy Board*

Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Species Separation Requirements Amendment

The Council took final action on the Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Species Separation Requirements Amendment. After considering the outcomes from the October 2024 Species Separation Requirements Amendment Implementation Issues Workshop, the Council selected modified Alternative 5 (Increased Observer Coverage and Self-reported Discards; Mixed Trips Sort at Dealer with NOAA Catch Monitors) as the preferred alternative. Alternative 5 would allow for mixed surfclam and quahog species trips with sorting of mixed catch at the dealer, implement a new NOAA shoreside (dealer/processing plant-based) catch monitoring program, improve discard estimation via a combination of improved vessel reporting and increased observer coverage, and modify the allocation tracking and tagging system, among other changes to regulations. The Council will submit the amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for review and rulemaking.

2025 Recreational Management Measures for Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass

The Council met jointly with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Management Board (Board) to consider 2025 recreational management measures (i.e., bag, size, and season limits) for summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass.

Summer Flounder and Scup

The Council and Board reviewed previously adopted recreational measures for summer flounder and scup and determined that no changes are needed for either species in 2025. Last year, the Council and Board adopted two-year recreational measures for summer flounder and scup following the Percent Change Approach implemented through Framework 17/Addendum XXXIV. For summer flounder, a 28% reduction in harvest was required, which was taken via adjustments to 2024-2025 state waters measures under conservation equivalency. For scup, a 10% reduction in harvest was required, which was taken via adjustments to 2024-2025 state waters measures. The intent of the Percent Change Approach is to hold measures constant across both years unless new data suggest a major change in the expected impacts of those measures on the stock or the fishery.

For summer flounder, state measures under regional conservation equivalency are expected to remain the same as in 2024, as described in the staff memo for recreational summer flounder measures. For scup, state and federal measures are expected to remain the same as in 2024, as described in the staff memo for recreational scup measures.

Black Sea Bass

Unlike summer flounder and scup, black sea bass recreational measures were not previously adopted for 2025. The Council and Board agreed to maintain status quo recreational measures in 2025 given that the recreational harvest limit (RHL) is unchanged compared to 2024, stock status remains positive, and an updated assessment will be available next year to inform the setting of 2026-2027 measures. Status quo includes continuing to waive the federal waters measures in favor of state waters measures through conservation equivalency. More details are provided in the staff memo. If states wish to consider slight season adjustments under the status quo approach (e.g., to maintain a Saturday opening), those proposals must be approved by the Board.

Recreational Sector Separation and Data Collection Amendment

The Council met jointly with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's Interstate Fishery Management Program Policy Board (Policy Board) to consider approval of a draft scoping document/Public Information Document (PID) for the Recreational Sector Separation and Data Collection Amendment to the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass and Bluefish Fishery Management Plans. This action, previously referred to as the "Recreational Sector Separation and Catch Accounting Amendment," was initiated in 2020 as part of the Recreational Reform Initiative, but has been on hold since that time to prioritize other management actions. The amendment will (1) explore options for managing for-hire and private/rental recreational fisheries separately (referred to as sector separation), and (2) consider approaches to improve or supplement the collection and use of recreational data that support management decisions for these species.

The Council and Policy Board approved the scoping document/PID, with minor modifications, for public comment in early 2025. As the first step in the Council and Commission's amendment process, scoping will provide an opportunity for the public to identify major issues and potential management approaches that should be explored during the development of this amendment. Following the initial phase of information gathering and public comment, the Council and Policy Board will identify categories of alternatives for further development.

The final scoping document will be available on the Council's website in early 2025, along with an announcement of the scoping hearing schedule and written comment instructions.

2025 Spiny Dogfish Specifications

The Council adopted 2025 specifications that would set the spiny dogfish acceptable biological catch (ABC) equal to the overfishing limit (OFL) for the 2025 fishing year. This is the highest catch legally allowed under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), and results in the highest quota possible. The resulting specifications, if implemented by NOAA Fisheries, would result in a commercial quota of about 9.3 million pounds (a 9% reduction from the 2024 quota but almost 10% higher than last year's (2023) landings). The Northeast Fisheries Science Center will conduct new projections in 2025 for the 2026 and 2027 fishing years, and a management track stock assessment will be conducted in 2027 for setting 2028-2031 specifications.

Butterfish Mesh Requirements

After considering recommendations from its Law Enforcement Committee, the Council voted to modify the butterfish mesh regulations to allow square mesh greater than 2 5/8 inches for directed butterfish fishing. Current regulations require a minimum mesh size of 3-inch diamond or 3-inch square mesh to possess more than 5,000 pounds of butterfish. The proposed modification was supported by research conducted by the Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County, NY and by input from industry about their experience with different mesh configurations, both indicating that the change would add flexibility for fishermen while still reducing the retention of juvenile butterfish. The Council did not recommend any changes to the 3-inch minimum mesh size for diamond mesh. If implemented by NOAA Fisheries, the change would apply to vessels with moratorium butterfish permits and could be effective in early to mid 2025.

2024 Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) Risk Assessment

The Council reviewed the final 2024 EAFM risk assessment report. Risk assessment is the first step in the Council's EAFM structured decision process to incorporate species, fleet, habitat, and climate interactions into management. The risk assessment report is typically updated each spring to provide a snapshot of the current risks to meeting the management objectives and helps the Council decide where to focus limited resources to address priority ecosystem considerations in its science and management programs. The 2024 risk assessment report incorporates the changes and updates approved by the Council following the 2023 comprehensive review and recent recommendations provided by the Ecosystem and Ocean Planning (EOP) Committee and Advisory Panel on elements that needed further refinement and development. The 2025 EAFM risk assessment will be presented to the Council in April and will incorporate the latest information, including updated indicators from the 2025 Mid-Atlantic State of the Ecosystem report.

2025-2029 Research Priorities

The Council reviewed and approved the Comprehensive Five-Year (2025-2029) Research Priorities document. This is the Council's fourth research priorities document since the 2006 re-authorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act required each of the regional councils to identify five-year research priorities. The 2025-2029 research priorities document builds off the organizational and prioritization framework implemented during the development of the 2020-2024 document and has been updated to incorporate the extensive input received throughout 2024. The broad research themes and species-specific priorities included in the new document reflect the current state of scientific knowledge and the Council's management challenges and science needs.

2025 Implementation Plan

The Council approved the 2025 Implementation Plan after making several revisions. The plan lists activities and priorities for the coming year and is linked to the Council's strategic plan. The Council agreed to add a new deliverable which will task the Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) with development of a white paper on the scientific considerations of developing separate overfishing limits (OFLs) and Acceptable Biological Catches (ABCs) for the commercial and recreational sectors for the summer flounder, scup, and black sea bass fisheries. The Council also agreed to add the following items to the list of "Possible Additions" for 2025: (1) Develop guidance to address circumstances under which the Council could consider suspension of its Risk Policy, and (2) Develop a white paper to explore potential Council and NOAA Fisheries involvement in surfclam stock enhancement efforts in the New York Bight and Central Atlantic. The final implementation plan will be posted on the Council's website at https://www.mafmc.org/strategic-plan once available.

Manomet River Herring Portal

Staff from Manomet presented the results of a Council-funded project that has developed a hub for river herring and shad run data. Manomet is finalizing several features of the web-based portal and will be conducting outreach in 2025 to gather additional run data from east coast entities that would like their data to be available, as well as to make potential users aware of the portal's features. Emily Farr of Manomet (efarr@manomet.org) can be contacted for more information.

Highly Migratory Species

The Council reviewed recommendations from its Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Committee regarding the NOAA Fisheries Atlantic HMS Proposed Rule for Electronic Reporting. The proposed action would modify and/or expand reporting requirements for Atlantic HMS, including reporting by commercial, for-hire, and private recreational vessel owners and dealers. The Committee supported some of the agency's preferred alternatives but expressed substantial concern with the preferred alternatives identified for the HMS commercial and for-hire open access permits (i.e., Atlantic Tunas General and Harpoon Category, Swordfish General Commercial, and HMS Charter/Headboat Permits). The Council endorsed the Committee's comments and directed staff to submit a comment letter before the comment deadline.

Ricks E Savage Award

Captain Dewey Hemilright was presented with the Council's Ricks E Savage Award. The award is given each year to a person who has added value to the Council process and management goals through significant scientific, legislative, enforcement, or management activities. He was appointed to the Council in 2012 to fill a mid-term vacancy as an obligatory member from the state of North Carolina. He went on to serve three additional full terms, for a total of 11 years. With more than three decades of commercial fishing experience, Dewey brought valuable on-the-water perspective to Council discussions and helped managers understand how potential management decisions would affect people's lives and livelihoods. "Dewey asked great questions and was always willing to share his own knowledge and experience with the Council and others," said Council Chair Wes Townsend. "While he often served as a voice for the U.S. fishing industry, he did an outstanding job of balancing the interests of commercial fisheries and the sustainable management of the resources as required under Magnuson." Dewey served as chair of the Council's Highly Migratory Species Committee for seven years and participated on most of the Council's other committees at different times. He also served as liaison to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council and as Council representative on the NMFS HMS Advisory Panel.

Recreational Tilefish Permitting and Reporting – Enforcement Update

A representative from NOAA's Office of Law Enforcement reported that a New Jersey based recreational vessel operator was recently issued a $500 fine for possession of a blueline tilefish without the required permit. As a reminder, recreational anglers fishing for golden and blueline tilefish north of the North Carolina/Virginia border are required to have a free recreational tilefish permit and submit a trip report within 24 hours of returning to port from any trip where tilefish were targeted (even if none were caught or kept). These requirements are intended to help improve our understanding of recreational tilefish catch and effort. Consistent and accurate reporting by recreational fishermen helps ensure the long-term sustainability of the tilefish fisheries. Additional information about private recreational tilefish permitting and reporting requirements is available on the Council's website or in this flyer.

Upcoming Meetings

The 2025 Council Meeting Schedule is available here. Please note that the dates for the June and December meetings have been revised. The June meeting will be held June 3-5, 2025 (a week earlier than originally scheduled), and the December meeting will be held December 15-18, 2025 (a week later than originally scheduled). A complete list of upcoming meetings can be found at https://www.mafmc.org/council-events.

The next Council meeting will be held via webinar **February 11-12, 2025.**

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

News Release

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
December 10, 2024

CONTACT: Kim Iverson
Public Information Officer
Toll Free: 866/SAFMC-10 or 843/571-4366
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Council Black Sea Bass Management Options Approved for Public Scoping; NOAA Fisheries Provides Red Snapper Update

Discussions on management options for Black Sea Bass in federal waters continued last week during the meeting of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council in Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina. Due to low stock abundance, options are being considered to reduce allowable catch levels for Black Sea Bass.
The Council reviewed input from its Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel and Scientific and Statistical Committee while considering management options to include in Amendment 56 to the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan. The amendment currently includes options to review allocations between commercial and recreational sectors, changes to fishing year start dates, and to reopen nearshore areas to the use of on-demand (ropeless) black sea bass pot commercial gear.

Amendment 56 may also include options to reduce recreational discards of Black Sea Bass through actions such as the use of single-hook rigs, closed nearshore areas in federal waters, changes to recreational bag and size limits, and a recreational seasonal closure. Public scoping meetings to get input on the options being considered will be held via webinar prior to the Council's March 2025 meeting.

Red Snapper
NOAA Fisheries provided an update on the status of the Secretarial Amendment being developed by the agency to end overfishing of Red Snapper in the South Atlantic. During the Council meeting, a Fishery Bulletin was released by NOAA Fisheries that summarized actions being considered. The Council was informed that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is conducting an update to the Red Snapper stock assessment to inform actions in the Secretarial Amendment. The Council will receive additional information from NOAA Fisheries during its March 2025 meeting.

Council members also received an update on the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Exempted Fishing Permit Project. The ongoing project, funded through NOAA Fisheries, collaborates with fishermen to obtain catch and discard data, test ways to reduce discards, and allow additional harvest of Red Snapper. Participants must complete an online education course, report their fishing trips via an app, and complete an angler satisfaction survey. The project is currently scheduled to last until July 2025.

Dolphin
The Council received a presentation on the Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) being completed for the Dolphin fishery. Dolphin are managed by the Council in federal waters along the entire Atlantic coast. The Council is considering management options for Dolphin through Regulatory Amendment 3 to the Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plan. The Dolphin MSE is intended to help the Council identify and evaluate management actions to ensure a sustainable fishery. The Council will hold a meeting of its Dolphin Wahoo Advisory Panel in the spring and continue to discuss management options during its June 9-13, 2025, meeting in Cape Canaveral, Florida.

For-Hire Reporting

The Council continued discussions on the need to improve compliance from nearly 2000 federally permitted for-hire (charter) vessels in the South Atlantic required to report through the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting (SEFHIER) Program. SEFEIER is administered by NOAA Fisheries and designed to improve data collection in the for-hire fishery. The program was initiated in 2021, but there are concerns about the level of participation. Council members shared frustration from for-hire fishermen who have participated in the program for the past four years without having seen the results of those efforts. The Council reviewed input from its Social and Economic Panel during the meeting and is developing an amendment to improve the program. A new For-Hire Reporting Advisory Panel and the Council's Law Enforcement AP will meet prior to the Council's March 2025 meeting to provide recommendations.

Additional Information

Additional information about the Council's December meeting, including individual committee reports and reports from meetings of the Full Council, is now available from the Council's website: https://safmc.net/events/december-2024-council-meeting/. The next meeting of the Council is scheduled for March 3-7, 2025, in Jekyll Island, Georgia.

The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, one of eight regional councils, conserves and manages fish stocks from three to 200 miles offshore of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and east Florida.

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Fishery Management Plans

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Documents

Southern Flounder Memo

Draft Southern Flounder FMP Amendment 4

Spotted Seatrout Decision Document

Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1

Eastern Oyster Decision Document

Draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5

Hard Clam Decision Document

Draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3

JOSH STEIN
Governor
D. REID WILSON
Secretary
KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

January 31, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission

FROM: Jeffrey Dobbs and Daniel Zapf
Fishery Management Plan Coordinators

SUBJECT: Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan Amendment 4

Issue
Review draft of Southern Flounder Amendment 4 and vote to send document out for public and advisory committee (AC) review.

Supporting Documents
- Draft Amendment 4 to the Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

Action
Vote to send draft Southern Flounder Amendment 4 out for public and AC review.

Background
At their August 2024 business meeting the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) passed a motion "to ask the DMF Director to ask the DEQ Secretary to modify the Annual FMP Review Schedule to amend the Southern Flounder FMP for the review of the plan to begin in 2024. The intent is to allow for more recreational access while maintaining the rebuilding requirements of Amendment 3". The secretary subsequently approved this schedule change along with a request from the DMF to begin concurrent development of Amendment 5 to explore long-term solutions to the issue of recreational access while maintaining Amendment 3 rebuilding requirements. The primary purpose of Amendment 4 is to immediately address the August 2024 MFC motion by implementing the 50/50 sector allocation in 2025 allowing additional recreational access to the Southern Flounder resource.

While nothing about Southern Flounder management is simple, the most straightforward approach to address the MFC request in 2025 is to expedite the sector (commercial/recreational) allocation transition to 50/50 (i.e., parity) in 2025 rather than in 2026 as prescribed in Amendment 3 to the Southern Flounder FMP. The Amendment 3 management strategy transitions sector (commercial/recreational) allocation on the following schedule: 2023: 70/30; 2024: 70/30; 2025: 60/40; 2026: 50/50. Amendment 3 does not include a mechanism to alter the sector allocation shift schedule so amending the plan (Amendment 4) is the only method to

immediately address the MFC motion and provide recreational access to the Southern Flounder resource in 2025. Under the Amendment 3 allocation shift schedule to 60/40 in 2025, there will likely be a short recreational season that year. Expediting the shift to 50/50 reduces the possibility of recreational catch overages that may mitigate the need for future season closures, though will not increase the length of the recreational season. However, maintaining Amendment 3 rebuilding requirements does not provide substantial harvest opportunities for any fishing sector regardless of allocation, and given recreational harvest levels in recent years, even with a shift to 50/50 allocation, full season closures in 2026 and beyond remain a possibility due to overages.

Estimated recreational landings during 2022 and 2023 indicate an increase in catch over shorter seasons (Table 1). Even with a shift to 50/50 allocation, a recreational season at the one fish bag limit from Amendment 3 would only be able to be open between two and four weeks to maintain allowable landings (266,176 pounds; Table 2) while accounting for dead discards.

Table 1. Recreational harvest estimates (pounds) from 2022 and 2023, MRIP and recreational gig survey. An asterisk (*) indicates the 2022 estimate was used because data from 2023 were not available.

Year	Hook and Line Landings	Gig Landings	Total Landings	Hook and Line Dead Discard	Gig Dead Discard	Total Dead Discard	Total Catch	Season length
2022	166,091	7,882	173,973	52,771	251	53,022	226,995	4 weeks
2023	192,168	7,882*	200,050	41,308	*251**	41,559	241,609	2 weeks

The Amendment 3 management strategy prescribes how the shift in landings from the commercial to the recreational sector will occur. Per Amendment 3, the pound net total allowable landings (TAL) allocation will remain at 186,458 pounds and the poundage shifted to recreational harvest will come from the commercial mobile gear TAL allocation (Table 2).

Table 2. Annual Allocations, in pounds, for the Southern Flounder commercial and recreational fisheries and associated sub-allocations for each sector that maintains a 72% overall reduction and the current pound net sub-allocation. An asterisk (*) indicates catch from Recreational Commercial Gear License holders is not included in the Total Allowable Landings.

					Commercial Fisheries			**Recreational Fisheries***		
Year	**Allocation**	**Total Allowable Catch**	**Dead Discards**	**Total Allowable Landings**	**Total Allowable Commercial Landings**	**Mobile Gears**	**Pound Nets**	**Total Allowable Recreational Landings**	**Hook and Line**	**Gigs**
2021	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2022	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2023	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2024	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2025	60/40	548,034	15,682	532,352	319,411	132,953	186,458	212,941	189,608	23,333
2026	50/50	548,034	15,682	532,352	266,176	79,718	186,458	266,176	237,010	29,166

Following an accelerated timeline allows for adoption of Amendment 4 to the Southern Flounder FMP by the MFC in August 2025 at the earliest (Table 3). If any step in this timeline is not completed as shown, it will result in an implementation date after the allowed window for a recreational season (August 16 – September 30) negating any possible gain in recreational access this amendment could provide. As such, if any schedule milestones are missed, development of this amendment would be terminated, and sector allocation shifts would continue to occur as prescribed in Amendment 3.

Table 3. Proposed timeline for development and adoption of Amendment 4 to the Southern Flounder FMP.

Milestones	Completion Date
DMF drafts Amendment 4	October 31 - December 20, 2024
Advisory committee review draft Amendment 4 (Finfish AC)	January 27, 2025
NCMFC approves Amendment 4 for AC review and public comment	February 19 - 21, 2025
Public and NCMFC AC review (Northern, Southern, Finfish)	March 7, 2025 - April 7, 2025
NCMFC selects preferred management options	May 21 - 23, 2025
DEQ Secretary and legislative committee review of draft Amendment 4	June - July, 2025
NCMFC approves Amendment 4	August 20 - 22, 2025
Implement management	August 2025

Development and adoption of Amendment 4, as proposed, is a short-term solution to address recreational access. Amendment 5 will explore long-term solutions to the issue of recreational access while maintaining Amendment 3 rebuilding requirements.

Management Options

Status Quo: maintain Amendment 3 allocation transition schedule.

Expedite Allocation Shift: Expedite the sector (commercial/recreational) allocation transition to 50/50 in 2025 rather than in 2026 as prescribed in Amendment 3.

Next Steps

At their February business meeting, the MFC will vote on whether to send draft Amendment 4 out for public and MFC AC review. If approved, a public comment period and AC review will occur in March and April 2025. Public comment and AC recommendations will be presented to the MFC at their May 2025 business meeting. At that meeting, the MFC will select preferred management options and draft Amendment 4 will then be sent for Department of Environmental Quality and legislative review.

North Carolina
Southern Flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*)
Fishery Management Plan

Amendment 4

By

North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
P.O. Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557

This document may be cited as:

NCDMF (North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries). 2025. North Carolina Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan Amendment 4. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 33 p.

Disclaimer: Data in this Fishery Management Plan may have changed since publication based on updates to source documents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Amendment 4 to the North Carolina (NC) Fishery Management Plan (FMP) was developed by the NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ), Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) under the auspices of the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) with the advice of the Finfish Advisory Committee acting as the Southern Flounder Advisory Committee (AC). Deserving special recognition are the members of the Finfish AC and the NCDMF Plan Development Team (PDT) who contributed their time and knowledge to this effort.

Advisory Committee

Jeff Buckel
Lewis Dunn
Jake Griffin
Jesse Mock III
Randy Proctor
William Tarplee
Sammy Corbett
Tom Roller

Southern Flounder Plan Development Team

Anne Markwith (co-lead)
Holly White (co-lead)
Charlton Godwin
Chris Stewart
Jeffrey Dobbs
Christina Bland
Todd Mathes
Brenton Griffin
Tina Moore (mentor)
Michael Binkley
Kevin Aman
Brian Deanes
Jonathan Weaver
Kristina Flanigan
Alan Bianchi
Brad Johnson
Jason Walsh

The following division staff were also invaluable in assisting with the development of this document: Barbie Byrd, Daniel Zapf, Jason Rock, Kathy Rawls, Jesse Bissette, Catherine Blum, and the many reviewers of the multiple drafts of this plan. Also grateful for the administrative support from Deborah Manley, Hope Wade, and Patricia Smith.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*** This section is completed prior to final approval***

INTRODUCTION

This is Amendment 4 to the Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan (FMP). By law, each FMP must be reviewed at least once every five years (G.S. 113-182.1). The NC Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) reviews each FMP annually and a comprehensive review is undertaken about every five years. The last comprehensive review of the plan (Amendment 3; NCDMF 2022) was approved by the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) in 2022. FMPs are the ultimate product that brings all information and management considerations into one document. The DMF prepares FMPs for all commercially and recreationally significant species or fisheries that comprise state marine or estuarine resources adopted by the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC). The goal of these plans is to ensure long-term viability of these fisheries. All management authority for the North Carolina Southern Flounder fishery is vested in the State of North Carolina. The NCMFC adopts rules and policies and implements management measures for the Southern Flounder fishery in Coastal Fishing Waters in accordance with 113-182.1. Until Amendment 4 is approved for management, Southern Flounder are managed under Amendment 3 (NCDMF 2022).

Fishery Management Plan History

Original FMP Adoption:	February 2005	
Amendments:	Amendment 1 February 2013 Amendment 2 August 2019 Amendment 3 May 2022	
Revisions:	None	
Supplements:	Supplement A to the FMP	February 2011
	Supplement A to Amendment 1	August 2017
Information Updates:	None	
Schedule Changes:	Scheduled review was moved up from 2027 to begin concurrent development of Amendments 4 and 5 in 2024	
Comprehensive Review:	Five years after adoption of Amendment 5	

Past versions of the Southern Flounder FMP (NCDMF 2005, 2011, 2013, 2017, 2019, 2022) are available on the DMF website.

Management Unit

The management unit of this FMP includes all Southern Flounder inhabiting North Carolina coastal and joint fishing waters including the Atlantic Ocean.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of Amendment 4 is to manage the Southern Flounder fishery to achieve a self-sustaining population that provides sustainable harvest using science-based decision-making processes. The following objectives will be used to achieve this goal:

- Implement management strategies within North Carolina and encourage interjurisdictional management strategies that maintain/restore the Southern Flounder spawning stock with expansion of age structure of the stock and adequate abundance to prevent overfishing.
- Restore, enhance, and protect habitat and environmental quality necessary to maintain or increase growth, survival, and reproduction of the Southern Flounder population.

- Use biological, environmental, habitat, fishery, social, and economic data needed to effectively monitor and manage the Southern Flounder fishery and its ecosystem impacts.
- Promote stewardship of the resource through increased public outreach and interjurisdictional cooperation throughout the species range regarding the status and management of the Southern Flounder fishery, including practices that minimize bycatch and discard mortality.
- Promote the restoration, enhancement, and protection of habitat and environmental quality in a manner consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STOCK

Biological Profile

Southern Flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma)* is a bottom dwelling species of left eyed flounder found in the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, and estuaries from Virginia to northern Mexico (Blandon et al. 2001). This species is one of three commonly caught left eyed flounder in North Carolina; Southern Flounder, Gulf Flounder (*P. albigutta*), and Summer Flounder (*P. dentatus*). Southern Flounder supports important commercial and recreational fisheries along the U.S. South Atlantic and Gulf coasts and is particularly important to fisheries in North Carolina. Based on tagging, genetic, and age structure morphology data, the biological unit stock for Southern Flounder includes fish from North Carolina to the east coast of Florida. Evidence also suggests some adult Southern Flounder return to the estuaries after spawning in the ocean, while others remain in the ocean (Watterson and Alexander 2004; Taylor et al. 2008; NCDMF 2024a). Tagged fish are typically recaptured south of original tagging locations and often in other states once in the ocean (Craig et al. 2015; Loeffler et al. 2019). Limited data from South Carolina and Georgia tagging programs suggest a low probability of adult movement from South Carolina or Georgia to North Carolina waters (Wenner et al. 1990; SCDNR Inshore Fisheries Section, unpublished data; Flowers et al. 2019).

DMF data indicates with the onset of maturity in the fall, females migrate to ocean waters to spawn. Spawning locations in the Atlantic Ocean are unknown; however, Benson (1982) observed the pelagic larval stage over the continental shelf where spawning is reported to occur. Data from satellite tagged Southern Flounder indicate a potential suite of migratory behaviors and habitat uses ranging from inshore estuarine environments to offshore outer continental shelf habitats (NCDMF 2024a). Southern Flounder can produce approximately 3 million eggs per female during multiple spawning events in a season, and spawning is thought to take place between November and April (Gunther 1945; Hettler and Barker 1993; Watanabe et al. 2001; Midway and Scharf 2012; Hollensead 2018). Larval Southern Flounder pass through inlets within 30 to 45 days of hatching and settle throughout the sounds and rivers in the winter and early spring (Burke et al. 1991; Miller et al. 1991; Daniels 2000; Glass et al. 2008; Taylor et al. 2010; Lowe et al. 2011). Juveniles likely spend at least one year in inshore waters before migrating to the ocean (McKenna and Camp 1992; Hannah and Hannah 2000; Watterson and Alexander 2004; Taylor et al. 2008).

Nearly half of female Southern Flounder are mature by ages 1 and 2 (at approximately 16 inches TL; Monaghan, Jr. and Armstrong 2000; Midway and Scharf 2012). Females grow larger than males and Southern Flounder collected in the ocean tend to be larger and older than fish caught in estuarine waters. The largest female Southern Flounder observed in North Carolina was 33-inches TL and the largest male was 20-inches TL (Lee et al. 2018; Flowers et al. 2019; Schlick et al. 2024). The maximum observed age was 9 years for females and 6 years for males. Southern Flounder captured in North Carolina represent the oldest ages observed throughout the range (Lee et al. 2018; Flowers et al. 2019; Schlick et al. 2024).

For additional information about Southern Flounder life history and biology see NCDMF (2019) and NCDMF (2022).

Assessment Methodology

For additional assessment history see Lee et al. (2018) and Flowers et al. (2019).

Commercial and recreational landings and dead discards and data from eight fishery-independent surveys, were incorporated from all states across the biological unit stock (North Carolina south to the east coast of Florida). When considering population size and long-term viability, stock assessments most often use a measure of female spawning stock biomass (SSB) to determine the population's health. Female spawning stock biomass includes mature female fish capable of producing offspring. Fishing mortality (F) is a measure of how fast fish are removed from the population by fishing activities. Removals include fish that are kept, discarded dead, or die after release.

The stock assessment estimates of female SSB and F were compared to levels, or reference points, that are considered sustainable. Reference points include a target and threshold. The threshold is the minimum level required for sustainability and when that level is achieved, the stock is considered healthy. The target is a level that minimizes risk and increases the probability of rebuilding or maintaining stock. If female SSB is less than the biomass threshold ($SSB_{25\%}$), the stock is overfished. If the harvest rate is greater than the F threshold ($F_{25\%}$), the rate of removals is too high, and overfishing is occurring. Overfishing is the removal of fish at an unsustainable rate that will ultimately reduce female SSB and result in an overfished stock.

Stock Status

The South Atlantic Southern Flounder stock is overfished, and overfishing is occurring as of 2017, the terminal year of the 2019 coastwide stock assessment update (Flowers et al. 2019). Results indicate SSB has decreased since 2006 and recruitment, while variable, has generally declined. Fishing mortality is less variable and decreased slightly in 2017.

The model estimated a value of 0.35 for $F_{35\%}$ (F target) and a value of 0.53 for $F_{25\%}$ (F threshold). The estimate of $SSB_{35\%}$ (target) was 5,452 metric tons and the estimate of $SSB_{25\%}$ (threshold) was 3,900 metric tons.

The female SSB that represents the minimum level of sustainability for Southern Flounder was estimated at 8.6 million pounds. The stock assessment estimate of female SSB in 2017 was 2.3 million pounds (Figure 1). Because the 2017 estimate of female SSB is below the threshold reference point, the stock is considered overfished. The probability the 2017 estimate of SSB is below the threshold is 100%.

A second update to the ASAP model, with data through 2022, was completed in 2024. The update continued to show declining trends in SSB and recruitment since 2006; however, F decreased significantly in the last two years of the assessment (Schlick et al. 2024). Several trends and diagnostics from the model raised concerns, and division staff and partners from the other states decided to not use the new update for management. A new benchmark assessment is recommended no sooner than 2026.



Figure 1. Estimated spawning stock biomass compared to established reference points, 1989-2017 (Flowers et al. 2019).

The assessment model estimated the *F* threshold at 0.53 (Figure 2). The 2017 *F* estimate was 0.91, which is above the *F* threshold. Because the 2017 *F* estimate is above the threshold, overfishing is occurring. The probability the 2017 *F* estimate is above the threshold is 96%. For additional information about the 2019 coastwide stock assessment see NCDMF (2019).



Figure 2. Estimated fishing mortality rates (numbers-weighted, ages 2-4) compared to established reference points, 1989-2017 (Flowers et al. 2019).

DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERY

Additional in-depth analyses and discussion of North Carolina's historical commercial and recreational Southern Flounder fisheries can be found in previous versions of the Southern Flounder FMP (NCDMF 2005, NCDMF 2019, NCDMF 2022). Commercial and recreational landings can be found in the License and Statistics Annual Report (NCDMF 2024b).

Discussion of socio-economic information in the License and Statistics Annual Report describes the fishery as of 2023 and is not intended to be used to predict potential impacts from management changes. This and other information are legislatively mandated and included to help inform decision-making regarding the long-term viability of the state's commercial and recreationally significant species and fisheries. For a detailed explanation of methodology used to estimate economic impacts, refer to the License and Statistics Section Annual Report (NCDMF 2023).

For additional discussion of commercial and recreational Southern Flounder fishery landings trends see Appendix 1: Increasing Recreational Access to Southern Flounder Through Sector Allocation Parody.

Commercial Fishery

All flounder landings reported as caught in inshore waters are considered Southern Flounder by the DMF Trip Ticket Program. Data from fishery-dependent sampling indicate Summer Flounder and Gulf Flounder account for approximately two percent or less of the flounder harvested from internal waters, while Southern Flounder make up less than one percent of the catch from ocean waters (NCDMF, unpublished data).

Most Southern Flounder commercial landings are from gill nets and pound nets, although gigs and other inshore gears (e.g., trawls) land flounder in smaller numbers. Between 1972 and 2022, peak commercial landings occurred in 1994 (Figure 3). Over this timeframe, there have been fluctuations in whether pound nets or gill nets were the dominant gear in terms of pounds landed (Figure 3). Historically, pound nets were the dominant gear, but gill nets became the dominant gear from 1994 to 2013 (Figure 3). The dominant gear switched back to pound nets from 2014 through 2020. Declining landings trends since 2010 were due, in part, to gill net regulations implemented to reduce the number of sea turtle and Atlantic Sturgeon interactions in this gear (78 FR 57132[1], 79 FR 43716[2]). Though less harvest overall comes from the gig fishery, harvest from this gear has generally increased over time, especially since 2010. Harvest by other commercial inshore gears decreased to its lowest point in 2023.

[1] https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2013/09/17/2013-22592/endangered-species-file-no-16230
[2] https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2014/07/28/2014-17645/endangered-species-file-no-18102



Figure 3. Southern Flounder landings (pounds) for total commercial fishery and top two gears (gill nets and pound nets) from the NC Trip Ticket Program 1972-2023 with major fishery regulation changes noted. Noted regulation changes do not represent a comprehensive list. For additional regulation changes see Lee et al. (2018).

Commercial harvest from 2019 to 2023 was impacted by regulations implemented through Amendments 2 and 3 to the NC Southern Flounder FMP. Amendment 2 implemented seasons in the commercial Southern Flounder fishery for the first time, and Amendment 3 introduced quota management of the fishery. Under Amendment 2, the commercial fishing season was open for a maximum of 33 days in 2020 (Proclamation FF-25-2020) and 21 days in 2021 (Proclamation FF-40-2021) depending on management area. Under Amendment 3 the commercial fishery was separated into two mobile gear management areas (northern and southern) and three-pound net management areas. During 2022 - 2024, the commercial fishery was open between six and 28 days, depending on management areas and gear type. For mobile gears, however, gill nets were not necessarily open all of those days.

Table 1. Number of days the Southern Flounder commercial fishery was open in 2022-2024 by gear type and management area: mobile gear, northern and southern management areas; pound nets, northern, central, and southern management areas.

	Mobile Gear		Pound Nets		
	Northern	Southern	Northern	Central	Southern
Year	Days open	Days open	Days open	Days open	Days open
2022	28	11	23	21	6
2023	21	21	21	24	8
2024	11	10	28	19	12

Trends in commercial trips reported between 1994 and 2023 have generally followed landings trends (Figure 4). Trips include the number of trip ticket records with landings reported; some trips may represent more than one day of fishing. The number of trips for all gears targeting Southern

Flounder has decreased since regulatory changes due to Amendment 2 (seasonal management) and Amendment 3 (quota management) were implemented limiting the number of days flounder could be harvested.



Figure 4. Southern Flounder commercial trips (numbers) and landings (pounds) from NC Trip Ticket Program, 1994-2023.

Recreational Fishery

Recreational harvest of Southern Flounder is mainly by hook-and-line and gigs, with a small amount of harvest by spearfishing or Recreational Commercial Gear License (RCGL) gears (prior to 2022).

Hook-and-line harvest can be split into ocean and inshore harvest, with most Southern Flounder harvested inshore. Between 1989 and 2023, hook-and-line harvest peaked in 2010 (Figure 5). Seasonal closures implemented through Amendment 2 to the NC Southern Flounder FMP impacted recreational harvest in 2020 and 2021. The season was shortened from 45 days in 2020 to 14 consecutive days in 2021 due to excessive overages that occurred during the 2020 season. Amendment 3 implemented fishing seasons to maintain recreational harvest within a quota and added paybacks to the following year for overages. The season in 2022 was 30 days and the 2023 season was shortened to 14 days. Due to overages in 2022, the 2023 TAC (landings plus dead discards) was adjusted from 170,655 pounds to 114,315 pounds. In 2023, 192,168 pounds of Southern Flounder were caught recreationally by hook-and-line, exceeding the expected catch by 127,294 pounds. Because of these overages, there was no recreational flounder season in 2024.



Figure 5. MRIP estimates of recreational hook-and-line Southern Flounder harvest (pounds) and major fishery regulation changes, 1989-2023. Noted regulation changes do not represent a comprehensive list. For additional regulation changes see Lee et al. (2018).

Trends in recreational trips are difficult to interpret because they represent all recreationally important Paralichthyid flounder species commonly caught in North Carolina (Southern, Summer, and Gulf flounder). This is because anglers only report targeting 'flounder' rather than a particular flounder species. Trips can be defined in several ways, but in this document all trips that harvested or released any Paralichthyid flounder species were included. Trends in trips and harvest are similar throughout the time-series, but trips have declined since 2014 while harvest has varied (Figure 6). Recreational estimates across all years have been updated and are now based on the 2018 MRIP Fishing Effort Survey-based calibrated estimates. For more information on MRIP see https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/topic/recreational-fishing-data.



Figure 6. MRIP estimates of recreational hook-and-line harvest (pounds) and all trips that harvested or released Paralichthyid flounder species, 1989-2023. Data prior to 2004 were calibrated to align with MRIP estimates post-2004.

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC IMPACT

For detailed discussion of economic impacts of the commercial and recreational Southern Flounder fisheries see Appendix 1. For additional information see NCDMF (2022).

Commercial Fishery

Historically, the Southern Flounder commercial fishery has been a strong economic driver for the state and one of its largest fisheries. Within the direct impacts effort and production have on the value of the commercial flounder industry, there are several factors that can dictate total economic impact of this fishery on a broader market level and individual product level. As a popular seafood across the country, the value of flounder in North Carolina is influenced by broader trends of supply and demand. There is a wide range of competitive substitutes for North Carolina caught flounder, including flounder caught in other states, as well as seafood products with comparatively similar properties, such as halibut (*Hippoglossus* spp.) or sole (*Solea* spp.). Because of this, the value of flounder in North Carolina is not only influenced by in-state product availability but also regulations, seasons, and effort for the harvest of flounder and substitute products worldwide. However, as flounder is a popular fish with several available substitutes, it is difficult to accurately track how supply of other products directly influences in state prices.

In addition to broader dynamics of supply and demand that influence North Carolina's flounder market, there are specific factors that can adjust product value on different time scales. Method of catch often influences price, as consumers seek product caught with gears perceived to be more environmentally friendly, or gears that produce higher-quality flounder (Asche and Guillen 2011). This can lead to increased prices on flounder caught with certain gears.

Additionally, enterprise level marketing can impact product value. Fishermen and dealers market their business and product as they wish. When marketing strategies are successful, prices and value can increase, though this is on an individual level and demonstrates the volatility within the market. Such changes in value are demonstrated by the positive effects local product branding

and direct-to-consumer strategies have produced in North Carolina (NCREDC 2013; Stoll et al. 2015). While these are just two examples of the variety of factors influencing value of North Carolina's flounder industry, they demonstrate the complicated dynamics at play, as many factors driving the price of flounder are not dictated by fishery managers, but by consumers and producers within the market.

Recreational Fishery

The top industries impacted by recreational Southern Flounder fishing in terms of output sales and employment are retail gasoline stores, retail sporting goods stores, retail food and beverage stores, real estate, and wholesale trade businesses. Due to the magnitude and popularity of the recreational flounder fishery in North Carolina, changes in access may lead to tangible, yet unquantifiable impacts to the value of other sport fisheries (Scheld et al. 2020). Broadly, participants target or catch flounder more than any other recreational species due to higher personal satisfaction gained from fishing for this species over others. However, it is unknown whether this benefit from flounder fishing would transfer to other fisheries if effort restrictions were put in place. There is a possibility that when faced with reduced access to flounder fishing, some anglers may choose not to fish, rather than seek out new target species, while others may target other species more frequently or switch to catch-and-release flounder fishing.

Through this complicated dynamic, the value and economic impact of other recreationally important species may increase or decrease. However, while it is important to acknowledge how flounder management may economically impact other fisheries, this interaction is not fully understood, and therefore, it cannot be determined how the value of other recreational species would shift with changes in access to flounder.

ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND IMPACT

Habitat use patterns of Southern Flounder vary by life stage over time and space. Growth and survival of Southern Flounder within the habitats they use is maximized when water quality parameters, such as temperature, salinity, and dissolved oxygen, are within optimal ranges. Good water quality is essential for supporting the various life stages of Southern Flounder (Figure 7) and maintaining their habitats. Natural processes and human activities can alter salinity or temperature conditions, elevate toxins, nutrients, turbidity, as well as lower dissolved oxygen levels which can degrade water quality.

For additional information about habitat use by life stage and optimal water quality parameters, see the Description of the Stock section of this FMP, NCDMF (2019), or NCDMF (2022). For a comprehensive review of ecosystem impacts from the Southern Flounder fishery, including habitat degradation and loss, water quality degradation, gear impacts on habitat, bycatch and discards of non-target species, protected species, climate change and resiliency, and habitat protection, see NCDMF (2022).



Figure 7. Effects of threats and alterations on water quality and coastal habitats and their ultimate impact on the growth and survival of Southern Flounder.

Coastal Habitat Protection Plan

The Fisheries Reform Act statutes require a CHPP be drafted by the NCDEQ and reviewed every five years (G.S. 143B-279.8). The CHPP is a resource and guide compiled by NCDEQ staff to assist the NCMFC, Environmental Management (EMC), and Coastal Resources commissions (CRC) in developing goals and recommendations for the continued protection and enhancement of fishery habitats in North Carolina. These commissions are required by state law (G.S. 143B-279.8) to adopt and implement management strategies specified in the CHPP as part of a coordinated management approach. Habitat recommendations related to fishery management can be addressed directly by the NCMFC. The NCMFC has passed rules providing protection for Southern Flounder habitat including the prohibition of bottom-disturbing gear in specific areas, and designation of sensitive fish habitat such as nursery areas and submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) beds with applicable gear restrictions. Habitat recommendations not under NCMFC authority (e.g., water quality management and shoreline development) can be addressed by the other commissions through the CHPP process. The CHPP helps to ensure consistent actions among these commissions as well as their supporting NCDEQ divisions. The CHPP also summarizes the economic and ecological value of coastal habitats to North Carolina, their status, and potential threats to their sustainability (NCDEQ 2016).

FINAL AMENDMENT 4 MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

****Section will be completed when the MFC selects preferred management and prior to DEQ secretary and legislative committees review****

RESEARCH NEEDS

The research recommendations listed below are offered by the DMF to improve future management strategies of the southern fishery. They are considered high priority as they will help to better understand the Southern Flounder fishery and meet the goal and objectives of the FMP. A more comprehensive list of research recommendations is provided in the Annual FMP Review and DMF Research Priorities documents.

- Conduct studies to quantify fecundity and fecundity-size/age relationships in Atlantic Southern Flounder.
- Improve estimates of the discard (B2) component (catches, lengths, and ages) for Southern Flounder from MRIP.
- Expand, improve, or add fisheries-independent surveys of the ocean component of the stock.
- Determine locations of spawning aggregations of Southern Flounder.
- Complete and age validation study using known age fish.

MANAGEMENT FROM PREVIOUS PLANS

There are several management measures from Amendment 3 to carry forward in Amendment 4 that address fishing behavior and potential changes in effort to minimize the possibility of catching Southern Flounder in greater volume than predicted.

Unless otherwise stated, all Southern Flounder Amendment 3 management measures will be carried forward in Amendment 4 and remain in effect including, but not limited to, the following:

- A commercial and recreational minimum size limit of 15 inches TL;
- A minimum mesh size of 6.0-inch stretched mesh (ISM) for anchored large-mesh gill nets used in the taking of flounder;
- A minimum mesh size of 5.75-ISM for pound net escape panels;
- Reduced commercial anchored large-mesh gill-net soak times to single overnight soaks where nets may be set no sooner than one hour before sunset and must be retrieved no later than one hour after sunrise the next morning;
- For anchored large-mesh gill nets with a 4.0 through 6.5 ISM, maintain a maximum of 1,500-yards in Management Units A, B, and C and a maximum of 750-yards in Management Units D1, D2, and E unless more restrictive yardage is specified through adaptive management or through the sea turtle or sturgeon Incidental Take Permit (ITP);
- Removal of all commercial gears targeting Southern Flounder from the water (e.g., commercial and RCGL anchored large-mesh gill nets and gigs) or make them inoperable (flounder pound nets) in areas and during times outside of an open season with exceptions for commercial large-mesh gill-net fisheries that target American shad (*Alosa sappidissima*), hickory shad (*A. mediocris*) and catfish species if these fisheries are only allowed to operate during times of the year and locations where bycatch of Southern Flounder is unlikely.
- Unlawful to use any method of retrieving live flounder from pound nets that causes injury to released fish (e.g., picks, gigs, spears, etc.);
- Unlawful for commercial fishery to possess any species of flounder harvested from the internal waters of the state during the closed Southern Flounder season;
- Combine mobile gears (gill nets, gigs, and “other” gears) into one gear category and maintain pound nets as their own separate commercial fishery;
- Divide mobile gears into two areas using the ITP boundary line for management sub-units Northern D1 and Southern D1, maintaining consistency with Amendment 2 and Amendment 3 boundary line;
- Divide the pound net fishery into three areas maintaining consistency with areas in Amendment 2 and 3;
- Maintain 72% reduction and current sub-allocation for the pound net fishery.
- Implement trip limits for pound nets, gigs, and hook and line only to maximize reopening after reaching division closure threshold;

- Implement a single season for the recreational gig and hook-and-line fisheries to constrain them to an annual quota;
- Maintain the recreational bag limit of flounder at one fish per person per day;
- Do not allow harvest of Southern Flounder using RCGL;
- Should landings be available, allow potential for spring ocellated flounder season to occur from March 1-April 1 in ocean waters only using hook-and-line gear with one-fish ocellated only bag limit;
- Maintain the adaptive management framework based on the peer-reviewed and approved stock assessment;

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Increasing Recreational Access to Southern Flounder Through Sector Allocation Parity

Issue

Provide the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) with an option to increase recreational access to the Southern Flounder fishery by accelerating the shift to sector allocation parity in 2025 rather than in 2026 as originally scheduled in the Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 3.

Origination

At the August 2024 NCMFC business meeting, the NCMFC passed a motion "to ask the DMF Director to ask the DEQ Secretary to modify the Annual FMP Review Schedule to amend the Southern Flounder FMP for the review of the plan to begin in 2024. The intent is to allow for more recreational access while maintaining the rebuilding requirements of the North Carolina Southern Flounder FMP Amendment 3 (Amendment 3)".

Background

A coast-wide stock assessment update of Southern Flounder completed in 2019 concluded the stock was overfished and overfishing was occurring (Flowers et al. 2019). To rebuild the spawning stock biomass (SSB) to the target by 2028, a 72% coast-wide reduction in Total Allowable Catch (landings and dead discards; TAC), measured in pounds, was adopted.

Amendment 3 was adopted in May 2022 and implemented a quota-based approach to reduce North Carolina's portion of the catch from the terminal year (2017) of the assessment by 72% to help rebuild the stock to the target SSB (NCDMF 2022). The quota was set so the Total Allowable Landings (TAL) that establishes annual maximum fishing limits (in pounds) for all participants does not exceed a pre-determined amount. Quota management includes paybacks for more precise management and to account for quota overages. The quota that met the required reductions and the NCMFC allocation motion was 548,034 pounds of TAC, which results in 532,352 pounds of TAL. This TAL was further divided into commercial and recreational sector allocations. The allocation was set to 70% commercial and 30% recreational for 2021 through 2024, moving to 60% commercial and 40% recreational in 2025, and 50% commercial and 50% recreational beginning in 2026 (Table 1.1).

Commercial Fisheries

The TAL allocated to the commercial sector from the overall quota are 372,646 pounds of southern flounder for 2021 through 2024, 319,411 pounds in 2025, and 266,176 pounds beginning in 2026 (Table 1.1).

Table 1.2. Allocation in pounds for commercial and recreational fisheries for the North Carolina Southern Flounder Fishery that maintains overall reductions of 72%. An asterisk (*) indicates that Recreational Commercial Gear License (RCGL) gear removals are not included in the Total Allowable Landings.

					Commercial Fisheries	Recreational Fisheries*
Year	Allocation	Total Allowable Catch	Dead Discards	Total Allowable Landings	Total Allowable Commercial Landings	Total Allowable Recreational Landings
2021	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	159,706
2022	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	159,706
2023	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	159,706
2024	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	159,706
2025	60/40	548,034	15,682	532,352	319,411	212,941
2026	50/50	548,034	15,682	532,352	266,176	266,176

Commercial Gear Sub-Allocations

Given the large reduction needed to achieve sustainable harvest and the importance of maintaining each sector within its allowed landings, it was most practical to separate the commercial gears into two categories: pound nets and mobile gears. Mobile gears include those that target Southern Flounder, primarily gigs and gill nets, and "other" gears that do not target Southern Flounder such as shrimp trawls, crab pots, and fyke nets.

Allowed landings in the commercial sector were sub-allocated into the two commercial gear categories. Due to the scheduled shift in allocation between commercial and recreational sectors, it was prudent to evaluate the sub-allocations for the commercial fishery. Amendment 3 adopted sub-allocations so the pound net fishery could maintain its 2017 harvest of 186,458 pounds because of the increased monetary investment of operating and maintaining pound net gear (Table 1.2).

Table 1.3. Allocation in pounds for the North Carolina Southern Flounder commercial and recreational fisheries and associated sub-allocations for each sector that maintains overall reductions of 72% but maintains the current level of sub-allocation for the pound net fishery. An asterisk (*) indicates that RCGL gear removals are not included in the Total Allowable Landings.

						Commercial Gear			Recreational Gear*	
Year	Allocation	Total Allowable Catch	Dead Discards	Total Allowable Landings	Total Allowable Commercial Landings	Mobile Gears	Pound Nets	Total Allowable Recreational Landings	Hook-and-line	Gigs
2021	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2022	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2023	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2024	70/30	548,034	15,682	532,352	372,646	186,188	186,458	159,706	142,206	17,500
2025	60/40	548,034	15,682	532,352	319,411	132,953	186,458	212,941	189,608	23,333
2026	50/50	548,034	15,682	532,352	266,176	79,718	186,458	266,176	237,010	29,166

Commercial Areas Allocation

Because of the migratory nature of Southern Flounder, management areas were established in Amendment 3 to allow more equitable access by fishermen across the state with seasonal openings varying by area (Figure 1.1). After investigating North Carolina Trip Ticket data by waterbody, the fishery was split into two areas for mobile gears and three areas for pound nets. Management area sub-allocations were determined by 2017 landings (Table 1.3)



Figure 1.8. Boundary descriptions for the two mobile gear (left) and three pound net (right) management areas adopted in Amendment 3.

Table 1.4. Total allowable landings (in pounds) for the North Carolina Southern Flounder commercial fishery and associated sub-allocations for each gear management area adopted in Amendment 3.

Commercial Gear Sector	Allocation %	Management Area/Total Allowable Landings			
		Northern	Central	Southern	Total Allowable Landings
Mobile Gears	70	123,879	-	62,309	186,188
	60	88,460	-	44,493	132,953
	50	53,040	-	26,678	79,718
Pound Nets	70	39,700	121,756	25,002	186,458
	60	39,700	121,756	25,002	186,458
	50	39,700	121,756	25,002	186,458

Recreational Fisheries

The TAL allocated to the recreational sector, including hook-and-line and gigs, from the overall quota will change from 159,706 pounds in 2021 through 2024, to 212,941 pounds in 2025, and from 2026 onward the TAL will be 266,176 pounds (Table 1.1).

The recreational allocation was further refined to allow an annual harvest of 89% of the recreational TAL for the hook-and-line fishery and 11% of the recreational TAL for the recreational gig fishery. However, it was determined that concurrent seasons for the recreational hook-and-line and gig fisheries be maintained to keep from undermining the success of achieving necessary reductions.

Landings and Reductions

Under Amendment 3, commercial landings have been closely monitored by the Trip Ticket Program to maintain total landings near the quota in near real-time for each gear and management area sub-allocation. This approach is not realistic for the recreational sector; thus, a one-fish bag limit and restricted harvest seasons have been used to constrain recreational landings. Total recreational landings are estimated through the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) and the DMF Gig Mail surveys and those data are not available until after the fishing season. A restructuring of the license database in 2023 disrupted the division's ability to establish a sampling of eligible anglers for mail surveys. As a result, the mail surveys could not be administered, and survey estimates are not available for 2023. Since the mail survey estimates are used in determining if the recreational fishery exceeded their TAC, recreational gig data from 2022 was used as a proxy for 2023. Dead discards for both sectors are not available until after the fisheries close but are added to make sure that the sector's total allowable catch is not exceeded each year. Management under Amendment 3 achieved a 59% harvest reduction in 2022, and 68% in 2023 (Table 1.4). However, the 72% target reduction has not been met through 2023 due to overages in the recreational fishery (Table 1.5).

In 2022, total removals from the recreational fishery (226,995 pounds) exceeded its TAC by an estimated 56,340 pounds (Table 1.5). This overage was deducted from the 2023 recreational TAC and the season was reduced to two weeks (Proclamation FF-31-2023). Despite this adjustment, recreational removals increased to 241,609 pounds in 2023, resulting in an overage of 127,294 pounds. The overage was deducted from the 2024 recreational TAC (170,655 pounds), leaving 43,361 pounds in adjusted TAC which was less than the predicted recreational dead discards (47,291 pounds), causing the DMF to not open the recreational season in 2024. A major contributor to recreational overages has been the higher than expected dead discards in the hook-and-line fishery, which have remained at or above the level observed in 2017 (39,080 pounds) despite shortened seasons. Regardless of the closed season in 2024, estimated dead discards and landings that were allowed by the NC Wildlife Resources Commission in internal waters will be used to adjust the TAC for the 2025 season.

Table 1.5. Catch estimates with target and actual reductions from the North Carolina Southern Flounder fishery, 2017-2023. (North Carolina Trip Ticket Program and MRIP). *Target reductions under Amendment 2.

Year	Total Landings	Dead Discards	Total Removals	2017 Total Removals	Target reduction	Actual reduction
2017	1,901,256	56,008	1,957,264	1,957,264	.	.
2018	1,452,590	36,670	1,489,259	1,957,264	.	.
2019	1,233,695	41,309	1,275,003	1,957,264	62%*	34.9%
2020	905,149	45,266	950,415	1,957,264	72%*	51.4%
2021	1,071,541	52,132	1,123,673	1,957,264	72%*	42.6%
2022	540,494	62,668	603,162	1,957,264	72%	69.2%
2023	576,013	48,457	624,470	1,957,264	72%	68.1%

Table 1.6. Recreational Total Allowable Catch (TAC) and catch estimates in pounds with adjusted TAC based on overage reductions, 2022-2024. Estimates are based on data from the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) and recreational gig survey. An asterisk (*) indicates that the value is estimated from the previous year.

Year	TAC	Adjusted TAC	MRIP Landings	Gig Landings	Total Landings	MRIP Dead Discard	Gig Dead Discard	Total Dead Discard	Total Removals	Overage deducted from next year's TAC
2022	170,655	170,655	166,091	7,882	173,973	52,771	251	53,022	226,995	56,340
2023	170,655	114,315	192,168	*7,882**	200,050	41,308	*251**	41,559	241,609	127,294
2024	170,655	43,361	not yet available							

In response to the closed recreational season in 2024, at the August 2024 NCMFC business meeting, the NCMFC passed a motion to request modification of the Annual FMP Review Schedule to amend the Southern Flounder FMP for the review of the plan to begin in 2024 to allow more recreational access to the fishery while maintaining Amendment 3 rebuilding requirements.

Socioeconomic Analysis

Commercial

Southern Flounder has historically been one of the top harvested species by the commercial fleet in North Carolina. From 2014 until 2021 Southern Flounder was in the top five species ranked by ex-vessel value (point of sale value). In 2022 and 2023 the ex-vessel value dropped below one million dollars from a high of over seven million dollars in 2017 (Table 1.6). Participation in the fishery decreased from 1,759 participants in 2014 to 492 in 2023.

Using IMPLAN modelling software and expenditure estimates from NOAA's Fisheries Economics of the U.S. (FEUS) report, the indirect impacts of the Southern Flounder fishery to the state economy at-large can also be estimated. By assuming the flounder industry contributes to these expenditure categories at a proportion equal to their contribution to total commercial ex-vessel values, estimates of the total economic impact of flounder harvest can be generated. For a detailed explanation of the methodology used to estimate the economic impacts please refer to the NCDMF's License and Statistics Section Annual Report.

Overall, the large economic impact of Southern Flounder to the state's commercial fishing industry is reflected in its effect on the state economy. Total impacts vary slightly year-over-year, though these values remain relatively consistent from a state-impact perspective until 2020. The ex-vessel value has declined significantly since 2014, with a precipitous decline in 2020 due to restrictive management and high supply of Summer Flounder. This reduced value has persisted through 2022 and 2023. These years had the lowest landings and ex-vessel value of Southern Flounder in the last ten years.

Flounder landings as a proportion of total commercial catch has decreased from a peak of 7% in 2017 to the current low of 2% (Figure 1.2).

Table 1.7. Commercial Southern Flounder economic contribution estimates from 2023-2014 reported in 2023 dollars.

Year	Pounds Landed	Ex-Vessel Value	Job Impacts	Income Impacts	Value Added Impacts	Sales Impacts
2023	375,963	$837,570	492	$1,633,087	$2,854,513	$3,665,223
2022	366,510	$979,684	568	$2,190,945	$3,699,221	$4,939,489
2021	485,024	$1,626,653	674	$3,820,854	$6,005,097	$8,767,231
2020	479,905	$1,244,878	630	$3,128,717	$5,072,299	$7,024,328
2019	800,080	$3,669,245	1,086	$9,300,809	$13,624,054	$21,729,471
2018	903,842	$4,640,012	1,263	$10,491,007	$17,252,260	$23,825,993
2017	1,396,384	$7,039,608	1,662	$18,245,416	$27,209,451	$42,008,243
2016	899,932	$4,593,509	1,357	$12,121,629	$18,679,737	$27,651,565
2015	1,202,952	$4,916,044	1,463	$12,849,015	$19,860,767	$29,247,840
2014	1,673,511	$6,229,650	1,759	$15,135,194	$22,775,298	$34,894,849



Figure 1.9. Pounds of Southern Flounder landed as a percent of total commercial finfish landed in North Carolina from 2014-2023.

Recreational

The economic impact estimates of Southern Flounder recreational fishing represent the economic activity generated from trip expenditures. These estimates are a product of annual trip estimations originating from the NOAA Fisheries Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) effort data by area and mode (i.e., shore, for-hire, private/rental vessel, and man-made), and trip expenditure estimates from the NCDMF economics program biennial socioeconomic survey of Coastal Recreational Fishing License holders (Dumas et al. 2009; Crosson 2010; Hadley 2012; Stemle 2018). The product of these estimates provides an annual estimate of trip expenditures made by all licensed anglers for a given year. For this analysis, a recreational flounder trip is defined as any trip in which flounder was the primary or secondary target species by the angler, or if Southern Flounder was caught during that trip.

Additionally, these data are used to generate state-level economic impact estimates of recreational flounder fishing in North Carolina. Using IMPLAN statistical software, these direct expenditure estimates for recreational flounder fishing produce indirect output impacts to the state economy across four categories: sales, labor income, value-added impacts, and employment. Additionally, all imputed expenditure estimates are adjusted for inflation based on 2023 prices, as this was the most recent year of expenditure survey data. For a detailed explanation of the methodology used to estimate the economic impacts please refer to the NCDMF's License and Statistics Section Annual Report.

Since 2020 trips have declined with 2023 having the lowest number of trips in the time series (Table 1.7). The number of flounder trips as a percentage of total recreational trips ranged from a high of 5% in 2015 to a low of 1% in 2022 (Figure 1.3). The relative number of flounder trips increased to 3% in 2023.

Table 1.8. Recreational flounder economic contribution estimates from 2023-2014 reported in 2023 dollars.

Year	Trips	Expenditure	Job Impacts	Income Impacts	Value Added Impacts	Sales Impacts
2023	414,322	$107,560,907	736	$33,825,714	$52,588,610	$91,413,988
2022	515,638	$111,446,340	711	$33,956,950	$52,603,145	$92,802,221
2021	518,636	$124,895,817	736	$37,060,764	$57,416,999	$103,850,738
2020	891,057	$236,224,061	1,521	$76,653,218	$109,987,034	$195,316,448
2019	1,118,505	$291,045,600	1,880	$88,935,317	$135,155,036	$244,036,124
2018	1,179,891	$308,646,579	2,003	$96,804,743	$146,722,413	$261,904,279
2017	1,234,219	$313,229,181	2,066	$97,779,917	$147,510,316	$270,355,489
2016	1,676,500	$435,414,429	2,935	$139,973,659	$208,013,684	$377,002,717
2015	1,723,014	$446,698,257	2,901	$138,075,359	$224,369,794	$373,979,472
2014	1,619,852	$435,654,166	2,887	$135,636,199	$201,597,395	$360,751,939

It should be noted that not included in these estimates, but presented in NCDMF overall recreational impacts models, are the durable good impacts from economic activity associated with the consumption of durable goods (e.g., rods and reels, other fishing related equipment, boats, vehicles, and second homes). Durable goods represent goods that a have multi-year life spans and are not immediately consumable. Some equipment related to fishing are considered durable goods. However, we cannot estimate the durable good expense of anglers for a given species.

Durable good expenses and impacts are estimated on an annual basis and serve to supplement angler expenditures outside of trip-based estimates.



Figure 1.10. Number of flounder trips as a percent of total recreational fishing trips in North Carolina from 2014-2023.

Authority

North Carolina General Statutes

G.S. 113-134 RULES
G.S. 113-182 REGULATIONS OF FISHING AND FISHERIES
G.S. 113-182.1 FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
G.S. 143B-289.52 MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION – POWERS AND DUTIES

North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission Rules

15A NCAC 03H .0103 PROCLAMATIONS, GENERAL
15A NCAC 03M .0503 FLOUNDER
15A NCAC 03M .0512 COMPLIANCE WITH FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS

Discussion

The most straightforward approach to immediately address recreational access in time for a 2025 recreational season is to expedite the sector (commercial/recreational) allocation transition to 50/50 in 2025 rather than 2026 as prescribed in Amendment 3 by amending the plan (Amendment 4). This would result in a 66.7% increase in recreational TAL by adding 106,470 pounds from the commercial sector to the recreational sector allocation in 2025 (Table 1.2). Under the Amendment 3 allocation shift schedule to 60/40 in 2025, there would likely be a short recreational season in 2025. Expediting the shift to 50/50 in 2025 reduces the possibility of recreational catch overages

that may mitigate the need for future season closures, though may not increase the length of the recreational season. However, maintaining Amendment 3 rebuilding requirements does not provide substantial harvest opportunities for any fishing sector regardless of allocation, and given recreational landings and discard levels in recent years, even with a shift to 50/50 allocation, season closures in 2026 and beyond remain a possibility due to overages. This allocation shift is a short-term approach to address recreational access. Long-term, more comprehensive approaches for recreational and commercial management will be addressed during subsequent development of Amendment 5.

Recreational Season

Estimated recreational landings from 2022 and 2023 indicate an increase in catch over shorter seasons (Tables 1.8). More successful trips are to be expected on a rebuilding stock that has taken such a large reduction. Angler reports to the DMF of seeing more flounder than ever are good signs the management is working. Even with a shift to 50/50 allocation, a recreational season that maintains the one fish bag limit from Amendment 3 would need to be brief (e.g., between two and four weeks) to maintain allowable landings (266,176 pounds; Table 1.2) while accounting for dead discards. The recreational catch estimates from 2024 will be available in 2025. These estimates will be used to determine if recreational catch estimates exceeded the adjusted TAC (43,361 pounds) in 2024. Any overages will be subtracted from the 2025 TAL.

Table 1.9. Recreational harvest estimates during 2022 and 2023 from the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) and recreational gig survey. An asterisk (*) indicates the 2022 estimate was used because data from 2023 were not available.

Year	Hook-and-line Landings	Gig Landings	Total Landings	Hook-and-line Dead Discard	Gig Dead Discard	Total Dead Discard	Total Catch	Season length
2022	166,091	7,882	173,973	52,771	251	53,022	226,995	4 weeks
2023	192,168	*7,882**	200,050	41,308	*251**	41,559	241,609	2 weeks

Commercial Implications

The Amendment 3 management strategy provides guidance on the shift in landings from the commercial to the recreational sector. Per Amendment 3, the pound net TAL allocation will be maintained at 186,458 pounds and the poundage shifted to recreational landings will come from the commercial mobile gear TAL allocation (Tables 1.2; 1.3). This will leave 79,718 pounds of TAL for mobile gears, minus any overages that may have occurred in 2024. While the number of participants in the Southern Flounder commercial fishery declined precipitously following adoption of Amendment 2 (2019) and declined further following adoption of Amendment 3 (2022), participation remains relatively high considering the constrained season (Table 1.9). Based on recent mobile gear landings trends, the scheduled allocation shift will result in a mobile gear season that will likely last one or two days, which may be non-consecutive.

Table 1.10. Commercial Southern Flounder pounds landed, number of trips landing southern flounder, and number of commercial participants and dealers participating in the fishery.

Year	Pounds	Trips	Participants	Dealers
2018	903,842	13,320	912	186
2019	800,080	10,036	781	175
2020	479,905	3,485	522	144
2021	485,024	3,142	541	139
2022	366,510	1,927	485	125
2023	375,963	2,157	430	118

The 70% commercial, 30% recreational allocation (Tables 1.1; 1.2) from Amendment 3 is based on historical harvest for each sector through 2017. Different allocation scenarios have the potential to significantly reduce available harvest in a sector which may have ramifications for the viability of those sectors. Under the Amendment 3 allocation schedule, and the shift proposed in this Amendment, allocations for some sectors may be too low to viably prosecute.

Shifting allocation between sectors is within the authority of the MFC (G.S. 113-134, 113-182, 113-182.1, and 143B-289.52). Allocation changes may have positive or negative impacts on different sectors of the southern flounder fishery. Amendment 5 will further examine long-term management for both sectors.

Management Options

Status Quo

Status quo would maintain the allocation transition schedule from Amendment 3, moving to 60% commercial and 40% recreational in 2025, and 50% commercial and 50% recreational beginning in 2026. This does not immediately address the NCMFC motion to increase recreational access to the Southern Flounder fishery. The motion would be addressed by a more comprehensive amendment process.

Expedited Allocation Shift

Expedite the sector (commercial/recreational) allocation transition to 50/50 in 2025 rather than in 2026 as prescribed in Amendment 3. This option immediately addresses the NCMFC motion to increase recreational access to Southern Flounder. Long-term, more comprehensive approaches for recreational and commercial management will be addressed during subsequent development of Amendment 5 to the NC Southern Flounder FMP.

Recommendations

The DMF does not have a recommendation for this issue.

REFERENCES

Asche, F., and J. Guillen. 2012. The importance of fishing method, gear and origin: The Spanish hake market. Marine Policy 36(2):365–369.

Benson, N.G. (editor). 1982. Life history requirements of selected finfish and shellfish in Mississippi Sound and adjacent waters. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-81/51. 97 p.

Blandon, I. R., R. Ward, and T. L. King. 2001. Preliminary genetic population structure of southern flounder, *Paralichthys lethostigma*, along the Atlantic Coast and Gulf of Mexico. Fisheries Bulletin 99(4):671–678.

Craig, J. K., W. E. Smith, F. S. Scharf, and J. P. Monaghan. 2015. Estuarine residency and migration of southern flounder inferred from conventional tag returns at multiple spatial scales. Marine and Coastal Fisheries 7:450–463.

Crosson, S. 2010. A Social and Economic Survey of Recreational Saltwater Anglers in North Carolina. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries.

Daniels, H. V. 2000. Species profile: southern flounder. Southern Regional Aquaculture Center Publication No. 726. 4 p.

Dumas, C., J. Whitehead, C. Landry, and J. Herstine. 2009. Economic Impacts and Recreational Value of the North Carolina For-Hire Fishing Fleet. North Carolina Sea Grant Fishery Resource Grant Report 07-FEG-05.

Flowers, A. M., S. D. Allen, A. L. Markwith, and L. M. Lee (editors). 2019. Stock assessment of southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) in the South Atlantic, 1989–2017. Joint report of the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Georgia Coastal Resources Division, Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, and Louisiana State University. NCDMF SAP-SAR-2019-01. 213 p.

Glass, L. A., J. R. Rooker, R. T. Kraus, and G. J. Holt. 2008. Distribution, condition, and growth of newly settled southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) in the Galveston Bay Estuary, TX. Journal of Sea Research 59(4):259–268.

Gunther, G. 1945. Studies on marine fishes of Texas. Publications of the Institute for Marine Science, University of Texas 1:1–190.

Hadley, J. 2012. A Social and Economic Profile of Ocean Fishing Piers in North Carolina. Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries.

Hannah, T., and P. Hannah. 2000. Crab trawl tailbag testing. North Carolina Fisheries Resource Grant. FRG-98-10. North Carolina Sea Grant. Raleigh, NC 19 p.

Hettler Jr., W. F., and D. L. Barker. 1993. Distribution and abundance of larval fishes at two North Carolina inlets. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 37:161–179.

Hollensead, L. D. 2018. Multi-scale examination of habitat use and migration dynamics of southern flounder in a North Carolina estuary using acoustic telemetry techniques. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, North Carolina.

IMPLAN® model, [2024] Data, using inputs provided by the user and IMPLAN Group LLC, IMPLAN System (data and software), 16905 Northcross Dr., Suite 120, Huntersville, NC 28078 www.IMPLAN.com

Lee, L. M., S. D. Allen, A. M. Flowers, and Y. Li (editors). 2018. Stock assessment of southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) in the South Atlantic, 1989–2015. Joint report of the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Georgia Coastal Resources Division, Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, and Louisiana State University. NCDMF SAP-SAR-2018-01. 425 p.

Loeffler, M. S., L. M. Paramore, S. P. Darsee, T. M. Mathes, A. M. Comer-Flowers, C. B. Stewart, S. J. Poland, T. C. Bauer, A. L. Markwith, and T. K. Scheffel. 2019. North Carolina multi-species tagging program. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, CRFL Grant 2F40 F017, Morehead City, NC. 29 p.

McClellan, C. M. 2001. Mesoscale habitat use of juvenile southern flounder, *Paralichthys lethostigma*: responses to environmental variability. Master's thesis. Duke University Nicholas School of the Environment, Durham, North Carolina. 116 p.

McKenna, S. A., and J. T. Camp. 1992. An examination of the blue crab fishery in the Pamlico River Estuary. Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study, No. 92-08. 101 p.

Midway, S. R., and F. S. Scharf. 2012. Histological analysis reveals larger size at maturity for southern flounder with implications for biological reference points. Marine and Coastal Fisheries 4:628–638.

Miller, J. M., J. S. Burke, and G. R. Fitzhugh. 1991. Early life history patterns of Atlantic North American flatfish: Likely (and unlikely) factors controlling recruitment. Netherlands Journal of Sea Research 27:261–275.

Monaghan, J. P., and J. L. Armstrong. 2000. Reproductive ecology of selected marine recreational fishes in North Carolina: southern flounder, *Paralichthys lethostigma*. Completion Report Grant F-60. Segments 1-2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 1.1-1.17.

National Marine Fisheries Service. 2024. Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2022. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-248B, 28 p.

NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality). 2016. North Carolina Habitat Protection Plan: Source document. Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 475 p.

NCDEQ. 2020. North Carolina Climate Risk Assessment and Resiliency Plan. 1601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC.

NCDMF (North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries). 2005. North Carolina southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) fishery management plan. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 260 p.

NCDMF. 2011. Supplement A to the 2005 NC Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 12 p.

NCDMF. 2013. North Carolina southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) fishery management plan: Amendment 1. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 380 p.

NCDMF. 2017. North Carolina southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) fishery management plan: Supplement A to Amendment 1. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 83 p.

NCDMF. 2019. North Carolina southern flounder (Paralichthys lethostigma) fishery management plan: Amendment 2. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 62 p.

NCDMF. 2022. Amendment 3 to the North Carolina Southern Flounder (*Paralicthys lethostigma*) Fishery management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 176 p.

NCDMF. 2024a. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries Southern Flounder satellite tagging study. North Carolina Commercial Fishing Resource Fund Grant #2358-0006. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 48 p.

NCDMF. 2024b. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries License and Statistics Section Annual Report. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC.

NCREDC (North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center). 2013. A Supply Chain Analysis of North Carolina's Commercial Fishing Industry.

Scheld, A. M., W. M. Goldsmith, S. White, H. J. Small, and S. Musick. 2020. Quantifying the behavioral and economic effects of regulatory change in a recreational cobia fishery. Fisheries Research 224. [online serial].

Schlick, C. J. C., L. M. Lee, S. D. Allen, A. L. Markwith, and H. White (editors). 2024. Stock Assessment of Southern Flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) in the South Atlantic, 1989–2022. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, NCDMF SAP-SAR-2024-01. Morehead City, North Carolina.

Stemle, A., and M. Condon. 2018. Socioeconomic Survey of Recreational Saltwater Anglers in North Carolina 2016. Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC

Stoll, J. S., B. A. Dubik, and L. M. Campbell. 2015. Local seafood: rethinking the direct marketing paradigm. Ecology and Society 20(2):40. [online serial].

Taylor, J. C., J. M. Miller, L. J. Pietrafesa, D. A. Dickey, and S. W. Ross. 2010. Winter winds and river discharge determine juvenile southern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) recruitment and distribution in North Carolina estuaries. Journal of Sea Research 64:15–25.

Taylor, J. C., J. M. Miller, and D. Hilton. 2008. Inferring southern flounder migration from otolith microchemistry. Final Report Fishery resource Grant 05-FEG-06, Morehead City, NC.

Watanabe, W. O., P. M. Carroll, and H. V. Daniels. 2001. Sustained, natural spawning of southern flounder *Paralichthys lethostigma* under an extended photothermal regime. Journal of the World Aquaculture Society 32(2):153–166.

Watterson, J. C., and J. L. Alexander. 2004. Southern flounder escapement in North Carolina, July 2001–June 2004. Final Performance Report Grant F-73 Segments 1–3. North Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, North Carolina. 41 p.

Wenner, C. A., W. A. Roumillat, J. E. Moran Jr., M. B. Maddox, L. B. Daniel III, and J. W. Smith. 1990. Investigations on the life history and population dynamics of marine recreational fishes in South Carolina: Part 1. Marine Resources Research Institute, South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department, Charleston, SC. 180 p.

DECISION DOCUMENT

Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan

Amendment 1

This document was developed by the Division of Marine Fisheries to help the Marine Fisheries Commission track previous activity and prepare for upcoming actions for the Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1.

February 2025

Summary

At their November 2024 Business Meeting, the Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) selected their preferred management options for Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan (FMP). The draft FMP was revised to include these selected options and then provided to the Secretary of the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality for their review. The Secretary made no revisions and submitted the draft FMP to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Agriculture and Natural and Economic Resources (AgNER) for their 30-day review period (N.C. General Statute § 113-182.1(e)). The AgNER made no revisions. The draft FMP will be provided to the MFC for their vote on final adoption of Amendment 1 at their February 2025 Business Meeting.

This revised Decision Document includes the MFC preferred management options selected at the November 2024 Business Meeting and the suite of management options and rationale behind them that were provided to the MFC for their consideration at that meeting.

Background

The 2022 stock assessment indicated the Spotted Seatrout stock in North Carolina and Virginia waters is not overfished but overfishing is occurring. The North Carolina Fishery Reform Act of 1997 requires a Fishery Management Plan to specify a timeframe not to exceed two years from the date of adoption of the plan to end overfishing (G.S. 113-182.1).

Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan is being developed to address overfishing in the Spotted Seatrout fishery. Although the 2022 stock assessment covers spotted seatrout in both North Carolina and Virginia waters, the management unit covered by Amendment 1 is limited to all Spotted Seatrout within the Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters of North Carolina. A harvest reduction of 19.9% is required to reach the F20% threshold while a harvest reduction of 53.9% will reach the F30% target. A harvest reduction of at least 19.9% meets the statutory requirement to end overfishing.

The Spotted Seatrout fishery is primarily a recreational fishery, with recreational harvest accounting for 86% of total harvest since 2012. Commercial harvest has accounted for 14% of total Spotted Seatrout harvest over the same period. However, harvest in both sectors increased sharply in 2019 and has remained high through 2022. As such, management measures to achieve sustainable harvest focus on both sectors.

Amendment Timing

(gray indicates completed step)

March 2023	DMF holds public scoping period
May 2023	MFC approves goal and objectives of FMP
May 2023 – March 2024	DMF drafts FMP
April 2024	DMF held workshop to review and further develop draft FMP with the Spotted Seatrout FMP Advisory Committee
May – July 2024	DMF updates draft plan
August 2024	MFC Reviews draft and votes on sending draft FMP for public and AC review
October 2024	MFC Regional and Standing Advisory Committees meet to review draft FMP and receive public comment
November 2024	**MFC selects preferred management options**
December 2024 – January 2025	DEQ Secretary and Legislative review of draft FMP
You Are Here: February 2025	MFC votes on final adoption of FMP
TBD	DMF and MFC implement management strategies

Goal and Objectives

The goal of this plan is to manage the Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) fishery to maintain a self-sustaining population that provides sustainable harvest based on science-based decision-making processes. The following objectives will be used to achieve this goal:

1. Implement management strategies within North Carolina that end overfishing and maintains the Spotted Seatrout spawning stock abundance and recruitment potential.
2. Promote restoration, enhancement, and protection of critical habitat and environmental quality in a manner consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan, to maintain or increase growth, survival, and reproduction of the Spotted Seatrout stock.
3. Monitor and manage the fishery in a manner that utilizes biological, socioeconomic, fishery, habitat, and environmental data.
4. Promote outreach and interjurisdictional cooperation regarding the status and management of the Spotted Seatrout stock in North Carolina and Virginia waters, including practices that minimize bycatch and discard mortality.

Management Measures

Management Carried Forward in Amendment 1

There are management measures from the original FMP to carry forward into Amendment 1 unless otherwise changed in Amendment 1. Management measures from the original Spotted Seatrout FMP that will be carried forward into Amendment 1 are listed below:

- It is unlawful to set gill nets in Joint Fishing Waters from 12:01 A.M. on Saturday to 12:01 A.M. on Monday except in Albemarle and Currituck sounds.
- It is unlawful for a commercial fishing operation to possess more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day taken by hook-and-line.
- It is unlawful to take more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day for recreational purposes.
- 75-fish commercial trip limit (excluding for the stop net fishery and spotted seatrout taken by hook-and-line)

MFC Selected Management Measures

Outlined below are the preferred management options selected by the MFC for Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan (FMP). For those options that were different than the DMF recommendation, a super-majority of votes was needed. The selected options are estimated to result in an approximately 28.0% overall harvest reduction (27.0% Recreational, 38.0% Commercial) to end overfishing with a greater than 70% probability of keeping spawning stock biomass (SSB) above the target.

Recreational Fishery

- 3-fish recreational bag limit (*Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest Issue Paper)*
- 14- to 20-inch recreational slot limit with allowance for one fish >26 inches (*Appendix 2: Harvest Issue Paper*)
- Eliminate the captain/crew allowance on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit (*Amendment 3: Supplemental Management Issue Paper*)

Commercial Fishery

- 14- to 22-inch commercial slot limit
- Saturday through Sunday commercial Spotted Seatrout harvest closure from January through September (*Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest Issue Paper)*
- Saturday through Monday commercial Spotted Seatrout harvest closure from October through December (*Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest Issue Paper)*
- Formalize the Stop Net Management detailed in the plan *(Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest Issue* Paper)

General

Adaptive Management

- Adopt the Adaptive Management Framework detailed in the plan with the caveat that adaptive management measures for sustainable harvest must be brought to the Commission for review prior to implementation. (*Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest Issue Paper)*

Cold Stun Management

- Extend harvest closure by 15 days, to June 30, following a cold stun (*Appendix 4: Cold Stun Management Issue Paper*)
- Adopt the Cold Stun Adaptive Management Framework detailed in the plan (*Appendix 4: Cold Stun Management Issue Paper*)

Suite of Management Options Presented

Rationale for Division of Marine Fisheries Recommendations

It is important to remember that spotted seatrout are *not overfished*; however, *overfishing is occurring* in the fishery. N.C. General Statute 113-182.1 states that fishery management plans shall specify a time period not to exceed two years from the date of adoption of the plan to end overfishing. This distinction shapes the management approach: since the stock does not require rebuilding, *the goal is to reduce fishing effort and harvest*.

The 2020 Spotted Seatrout Stock Assessment showed a significant increase in harvest and total removals in biological year 2019 compared to previous years. While biological year 2019 was originally an outlier, *recent harvest trends show it is not*. Biological years 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022 represent the four highest years of harvest and total removals in the entire timeseries (1991–2023) with total removals in 2020 replacing 2019 total removals as the timeseries high. Biological year 2023 experienced a small decline in harvest and total removals; however, recreational harvest through Wave 4 of biological year 2024 is on track to reach a new time series high for both harvest and total removals. Fishing effort, measured by the number of trips, has also increased recreationally and commercially.

The spotted seatrout fishery has faced unprecedented levels of harvest and total removals since 2019. While the population level effects of increased harvest in these years cannot be determined outside of an updated stock assessment, it is DMF's position that management of the spotted seatrout stock proceed with a precautious management approach. N.C. General Statute 113-182.1 states that fishery management plans shall specify a time period not to exceed two years from the date of adoption of the plan to end overfishing. Taking precautionary actions now helps ensure the long-term sustainability of the stock under higher fishing effort. Proactive management reduces the likelihood of more drastic measures or management strategies being necessary in years to come and is projected to maintain the stock at current levels of high spawning stock biomass. The DMF sustainable harvest recommendations are estimated to result in an approximately 40.0% overall harvest reduction (40.0% recreational, 40.0% commercial).

Recreational Recommendations

Slot Limit

A slot limit as a standalone measure does nothing to address increased fishing effort. As more anglers enter the fishery, management that does not account for increased effort is unlikely to succeed long-term.

Implementing a spotted seatrout slot limit as a standalone measure is also unlikely to achieve the harvest reduction needed to end overfishing. On paper, it is technically possible to end overfishing through implementation of a slot limit given the slot is narrow enough. A 16”–20” slot with an allowance for one fish >24” was suggested at the Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee Workshop and was the recreational management option recommended by the Finfish Advisory Committee. While a slot limit may initially reduce harvest levels, the effectiveness will likely diminish over time. In the short term, fewer fish will be harvested because individuals that are too small or too large will not be harvested. However, size limit increases rarely result in long term harvest reductions but instead act to delay harvest of those newly sublegal fish until they grow back into the fishery. The realized reduction will then be lower than intended.

Implementing a maximum size limit as part of a slot limit likely provides a longer-term reduction in harvest. However, introducing a trophy allowance could counter this benefit because more larger fish will be available within trophy limits. Additionally, implementing a recreational slot limit without a size limit change in the commercial fishery may result in more larger fish being harvested commercially undermining the goal of reducing overall harvest through a slot limit alone.

A slot limit as a standalone measure fails to address the issue of increased fishing effort. Without additional strategies to decrease fishing effort and harvest, any reduction from a narrow slot limit will likely be undermined by increased fishing pressure. Considering the public’s desire for a slot limit, spotted seatrout biology, and input received from the Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee Workshop, DMF developed the recommended 14”-20” slot with an allowance for 1 fish >26” in combination with other management strategies (3-fish bag limit, January-February season closure). The slot limit was combined with other management strategies due to concerns discussed above and in the sections that follow. Combining these measures enhances the prospect of harvest reductions being realized and ending overfishing.

Bag Limit

To more effectively address overfishing, a 3-fish bag limit is recommended alongside a slot limit and season closure. This measure directly reduces the number of fish each angler can harvest per day, which directly decreases harvest.

Season Closure

In addition to a slot limit and a bag limit, DMF recommends a January-February season closure to further reduce fishing effort and harvest. Throughout development of Amendment 1, recreational anglers have indicated a strong preference for not managing the spotted seatrout fishery using a season closure. In many cases, a caveat was included that if a season closure is implemented, it should be as short as possible. Every member of the Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee who spoke about season closures expressed a preference for not having a closure but wanted as short a

closure as possible if such management was deemed necessary, with one member suggesting a season closure of less than 90 days would be most palatable if necessary.

The most effective period to close a fishery is at the end of the fishing year or when most removals occur. The spotted seatrout fishery is historically most active during the fall and early winter months with most landings occurring from October-December. However, the fishing or biological year is from March through February of the following year, meaning a closure in the fall and early winter would not occur at the end of the fishing year allowing for recoupment of harvest after the season reopens. Additionally, the public and the Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee expressed the importance of maintaining access to the fishery during this period. Considering input received, the timing of the biological year, and balancing the desire for a short season closure while maintaining the effectiveness of that season closure, DMF recommends a January-February closure.

To account for the unprecedented levels of spotted seatrout harvest and total removals since the stock assessment, the high potential for harvest recoupment with other management strategies, and unchecked effort increases in recent years, DMF considers a season closure to be the most effective and efficient management option to reduce effort and harvest as more anglers enter the fishery. A winter season closure provides additional benefits including:

- Protection of spawning capable spotted seatrout while they are aggregated and susceptible to increased harvest and cold stuns.

- A larger harvest reduction in a shorter amount of time as opposed to a longer season closure during the spring and summer months to achieve the same harvest reduction.

During the season closure, increased catch-and-release activity may result in increased dead discards. However, the discard mortality rate will likely be lower during the winter closure compared to other seasons due to higher dissolved oxygen levels and cooler water temperatures. Additionally, the number of dead discards will be lower than the number of fish that would have otherwise been harvested had a season closure not been implemented. The DMF will continue Ethical Angling outreach which includes education on best handling and fishing practices that can increase the survival of released fish.

Commercial Recommendations

Slot Limit

Neither a size limit increase nor a slot limit would be an effective form of management in the commercial spotted seatrout fishery. Additionally, a size or slot limit in the commercial fishery does not address increasing effort. The DMF does not recommend changing the minimum size limit or implementing a slot limit in the commercial spotted seatrout fishery.

Trip Limit

Achieving the necessary harvest reductions through lowering the commercial spotted seatrout trip limit alone is not realistic. Additionally, a more restrictive trip limit in the commercial fishery does not address increasing effort. The DMF does not recommend changing the current 75-fish trip limit in the commercial spotted seatrout fishery. In 2014, the Finfish Advisory Committee voted to include in the next FMP update a discussion of allowing two commercial license holders fishing one set of gear on a single boat to harvest two commercial limits of spotted seatrout. This discussion is included in

Amendment 1; however, such a change to the spotted seatrout trip limit is likely to increase commercial harvest. As management measures in Amendment 1 are designed to reduce harvest, DMF does not recommend allowing multiple commercial trip limits per vessel.

Season Closure

Throughout development of Amendment 1, input from the public and Advisory Committees has consistently shown interest in aligning spotted seatrout and striped mullet management. The shared seasonality and use of similar gear types in both fisheries make this alignment desirable to stakeholders as it could simplify regulations, reduce user conflict, and reduce discards. Spotted seatrout are the most common incidental catch in the striped mullet fishery and vice versa. However, spotted seatrout life history would limit the effectiveness of aligning the two closures completely. In the late fall and early winter, as striped mullet begin to move into the ocean to spawn, spotted seatrout begin aggregating in the upper estuary. In other words, striped mullet migration patterns in the late fall and early winter allow for escapement while spotted seatrout migration patterns during this same time make them more susceptible to harvest. A shift in commercial effort to weekdays would likely lead to a high degree of recoupment in the spotted seatrout fishery with the potential to greatly decrease the expected reductions from matching the weekend closures in Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet FMP. A January–February closure reduces fishing pressure while spotted seatrout are aggregated and more vulnerable to harvest.

Additionally, a January-February commercial closure aligns with the recommended closure in the recreational fishery and balances the most effective management with minimal disruption to the fishery. Should the commercial spotted seatrout fishery not close in January-February, reductions from a recreational closure will likely not meet the necessary reductions to end overfishing.

Adaptive Management

Adaptive Management would be a valuable tool for the management of the spotted seatrout fishery, offering a more responsive and proactive approach compared to the traditional Fishery Management Plan (FMP) review process. One common concern is that the current process of conducting a full FMP review takes too long, which can delay necessary adjustments to management strategies. Adaptive Management provides a solution by allowing the DMF to adjust management measures between full FMP reviews through the Director's proclamation authority. This flexibility is driven by science-based metrics, including both fishery-independent and fishery-dependent data.

If science-driven metrics indicate that current management measures are not achieving sustainable harvest goals, Adaptive Management would allow the Director to make timely changes to management strategies such as season and day of week closures, trip and bag limits, size and slot limits, and gear regulations, all within the scope defined by Amendment 1. The ability to adjust management between full FMP reviews enables the DMF to address issues before they become critical, preventing the need for more drastic and disruptive measures during the next review cycle. By incorporating Adaptive Management, the DMF can proactively respond to shifting fishery conditions, maintaining sustainable harvest goals and ensuring the long-term viability of the spotted seatrout population. This approach not only increases the resilience of fishery management but also reinforces science-based, flexible management practices that benefit both the fishery and its stakeholders. The DMF recommends adopting the Adaptive Management Framework.

Management Options by Issue Paper

(Options recommended by DMF are outlined in blue)

Sustainable Harvest (Appendix 2)

These management options attempt to strike a balance between access to the fishery for both sectors, the necessary harvest reduction to end overfishing, accounting for potential harvest recoupment, and maintaining the current abundance of Spotted Seatrout. Additionally, management in the recently adopted Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet Fishery Management Plan was considered as there is a high degree of overlap in the seasonality and gear types used in the commercial Striped Mullet and Spotted Seatrout fisheries. These options are predicted to reduce harvest of Spotted Seatrout in ways that are quantifiable using existing data.

A 19.9% reduction in total harvest relative to 2019–2022 total harvest is required to reach the fishing mortality threshold and meet the statutory requirement to end overfishing while a harvest reduction of 53.9% is required to reach the fishing mortality target. Because of spikes in effort across both sectors in recent years and the potential for harvest recoupment from some management measures, the DMF recommends a precautionary approach to increase the likelihood of achieving sustainable harvest.

Option 1: Size Limits

(Refer to pp. 50-55 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

Changing the current Spotted Seatrout minimum size of 14" is unlikely to reach the needed harvest reduction to meet statutory requirements. Additionally, the reduction from increasing the minimum size is most likely to be achieved in the short term while the long term harvest reduction is lower with some portion of harvest being recouped. A delay in harvest could provide non-quantifiable benefits by allowing more fish to spawn prior to harvest. However, Spotted Seatrout growth rates would likely minimize these non-quantifiable benefits as sub-legal fish grow quickly back into the fishery. Harvest reduction from a slot limit is more likely to be realized in the long term as Spotted Seatrout would grow out of the fishery relatively quickly. Implementing a slot limit for the commercial sector would likely increase dead discards. Pairing a slot limit with corresponding changes to allowable mesh sizes could prove ineffective at reducing dead discards due to the lack of size selectivity across various mesh sizes (Page 30 of Draft Amendment 1). A very narrow slot limit, even if implemented for just the recreational sector, could theoretically reduce total harvest more than the 19.9% reduction needed to reach $F_{Threshold}$ (Page 53 of draft Amendment 1, Table 2.3). However, size limit changes alone will not address the potential for increased dead discards, the high recoupment potential if commercial harvest shifted toward larger fish, and the recent trend of increased effort in both sectors. For a full discussion of size limits, see pp. 50–55 in draft Amendment 1.

a. Status Quo – no change to commercial size limit. Consider recreational size limit changes as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option

b. Recreational 16"–20" slot limit with allowance for one fish over 24" and commercial 16" minimum size limit

Option 2: Seasonal Closures

(Refer to pp. 55-59 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

Seasonal closures can be an effective way of limiting harvest, especially when closures are at the end of the biological year to prevent recoupment of harvest. It is possible to end overfishing through a closure that spans the spawning season (p. 57 of draft Amendment 1, Table 2.4), however; it is likely some amount of recoupment would occur after the season closure. A spawning season closure would also have to be longer than a winter closure (i.e., a closure at the end of the biological year) to reduce harvest to a level that will meet management objectives. Closures not at the end of the biological year should be extended or paired with other management options to increase the likelihood of reaching management objectives. Day of the week closures are a type of season closure and could be used for the commercial sector to reduce harvest. Similar to other seasonal closure options not at the end of the biological year, there is the potential for harvest recoupment if commercial effort shifts to days when the fishery is open. Day of the week closures could be considered in tandem with other management measures to ensure management objectives are met. See pp. 55-59 of draft Amendment 1 for a full discussion of seasonal closures.

a. Status Quo – manage fishery without seasonal harvest closure

b. Dec 16 – Feb 28/29 harvest closure (both sectors)

c. 11:59 p.m. Friday–12:01 a.m. Tuesday commercial harvest closure October 1–December 31 and January 1–February commercial harvest closure. Consider recreational seasonal closures as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.

d. Nov 1 – February 28/29 harvest closure (both sectors)

Option 3: Bag and Trip Limits

(Refer to pp. 59-61 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

It is possible to reduce total Spotted Seatrout harvest to reach the $F_{Threshold}$ by decreasing the recreational bag and commercial trip limits, but it is not possible to reduce total harvest to reach the F_{Target} through changes to the bag or trip limits alone (draft Amendment 1 pp. 59 and 61, Tables 2.5 and 2.6). Any recreational bag or commercial trip limit would be a daily limit. Recreational bag and commercial trip limit changes could be accompanied by gear changes or limits to allowable gear (See Amendment 1, Appendix 1 and Appendix 3) to minimize the probable increase in dead discards caused by bag or trip limit changes. For a full discussion of bag and trip limit options, see pp. 59-61 of draft Amendment 1.

a. Status Quo – manage fishery without changes to current commercial trip limit and consider recreational bag limit changes as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.

b. Reduce recreational bag limit to 2 fish and commercial trip limit to 45 fish

Option 4: Stop Nets

(Refer to pp. 61-62 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

The stop net fishery is a modification of a traditional beach seine that primarily targets Striped Mullet and is unique to Bogue Banks. The 2012 Spotted Seatrout FMP implemented a 75 fish trip limit, but the MFC tasked the DMF Director with addressing the stop net fishery outside the 2012 FMP. Since 2012, the Bogue Banks stop net fishery has opened and closed by proclamation and operates with a 4,595 lb. Spotted Seatrout quota with various reporting requirements outlined in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed by a party of the fishery and the DMF Fisheries Management Section Chief. Due to the strict existing management of this fishery, the potential for additional harvest reduction from the recently adopted Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet FMP, and the low contribution to Spotted Seatrout landings under current management, additional harvest restrictions may not be necessary for the stop net fishery. However, formalizing current management of the stop net fishery should be considered in this amendment. See Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 pp. 61–62 for a full discussion of stop net management.

a. Status Quo – 4,595 lb. season quota with terms and conditions of stop net fishery and responsibilities of the stop net crew outlined in Memorandum of Agreement.

b. Stop nets are restricted to the Atlantic Ocean on Bogue Banks and maintain a 4,595 lb. Spotted Seatrout season quota. The season will open no sooner than October 15 and close no later than the sooner of December 31 or when the Spotted Seatrout quota is reached. Any weekend closures to commercial harvest implemented in Option 2 will also apply to the Bogue Banks stop net fishery. Stop net crews must contact N.C. DMF Marine Patrol Communication each time a stop net is set and at least two hours prior to each time a stop net is fished. The same day a stop net is fished and the catch is landed at the fish house, a representative of the stop net crew must contact DMF Fisheries Management Section to report the daily total of Spotted Seatrout harvest in pounds as it appears on the trip ticket. Same day reporting is required even if zero Spotted Seatrout are harvested. Failure to follow reporting requirements will result in an immediate closure of the stop net fishery. The stop net fishery will be managed by proclamation consistent with but not limited to previous proclamations

Option 5/6: Combination Management Measures

(Refer to pp. 62-65 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

Combining multiple strategies to achieve management goals is common in fisheries management. Multiple management measures rather than a single, standalone management measure allow for more specific, targeted management to account for a variety of factors including species life history and biology, differences in the fishery (e.g., industry, regional, etc.), or competing interests in the fishery, and better minimize recoupment. As there are few standalone management measures to end overfishing in the Spotted Seatrout fishery, combination measures will help ensure management is realistic and management objectives are more likely to be achieved. See pp. 62–65 of the Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for a full discussion of combination management measures.

Combination Management Measures

Table 2.7. Combination management measures for the recreational fishery to end overfishing and achieve sustainable harvest. The Total % Reduction column shows the total percent reduction if no changes to commercial management are implemented. Unless otherwise noted, season closures or bag limit reductions include the entirety of the month. *Total reduction does not reduce F to the 19.9% threshold (options 5.A and 5.B). Harvest reduction in pounds is based on 2019–2022 average recreational harvest. Option 5.I, outlined in a blue rectangle, represents the DMF recommendation.

OPTION #	SEASON CLOSURE	BAG LIMIT (NUMBER OF FISH)	SIZE LIMIT	RECREATIONAL REDUCTION (LB)	RECREATIONAL REDUCTION (%)	TOTAL % REDUCTION
5.A	Jan-Feb	Oct-Dec 3 fish	-	738,113	22.1	18.9*
5.B		Nov-Feb 3fish	16” minimum	741,453	22.2	19.0*
5.C	-	Oct-Feb 3 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	824,950	24.7	21.1
5.D	Jan 16-Feb	-	14-20”, 1 over 26”	935,166	28.0	23.9
5.E	Dec 16-Feb	3 fish	-	1,015,323	30.4	26.0
5.F	Jan-Feb	-	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,078,781	32.3	27.6
5.G	Jan-Feb	Oct-Dec 3 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,205,696	36.1	30.9
5.H	Apr-Jun	3 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,292533	38.7	33.1
5.I	Jan-Feb	3 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,319,252	39.5	33.8
5.J	Dec 16-Feb	3 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,436,148	43.0	36.7
5.K	Apr-Jul	3 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,439,488	43.1	36.8
5.L	Dec-Feb	2 fish	14-20”, 1 over 26”	1,923,770	57.6	49.2

Table 2.8 Combination commercial management measures to end overfishing and achieve sustainable harvest. The Total % Reduction column shows the total percent reduction if no recreational management changes are implemented. No management options applied solely to the commercial sector reduce *total* harvest to a level where F meets the 19.9% threshold. Unless otherwise noted, seasonal closures include the entirety of the month. Harvest reduction in pounds is based on 2019–2022 average commercial harvest. The DMF recommendation for the commercial fishery is a standalone measure Option 2.c, which is not represented in this table of combination measures.

OPTION #	SEASON CLOSURE	TRIP LIMIT (NUMBER OF FISH)	SIZE LIMIT	COMMERCIAL REDUCTION (LB)	COMMERCIAL REDUCTION (%)	TOTAL % REDUCTION
6.A	Jan 16-Feb	60	-	131,210	23.1	3.4
6.B	Jan-Feb	65	-	145,979	25.7	3.7
6.C	Jan-Feb	-	16” min	149,955	26.4	3.8
6.D	Feb	45	-	164,155	28.9	4.2
6.E	Jan 16-Feb	45	-	193,124	34.0	4.9
6.F	Jan-Feb	50	-	197,100	34.7	5.0
6.G	Dec 16-Feb	60	-	202,780	35.7	5.2
6.H	Dec-Feb	40	-	314,110	55.3	8.0

Option 7: Adaptive Management

(Refer to pp. 65-66 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

The current Spotted Seatrout adaptive management framework needs to be updated. Adaptive management is a structured decision-making process when uncertainty exists, with the objective of reducing uncertainty through time with monitoring. Adaptive management provides flexibility to incorporate new information and accommodate alternative and/or additional actions.

1. The adaptive management framework allows for adjusting management measures outside of an updated stock assessment to ensure compliance with and effectiveness of management strategies adopted in Amendment 1 and is a tool to respond to concerns with stock conditions and fishery trends. Upon evaluation by the DMF, if the management strategy implemented to achieve sustainable harvest (either through Amendment 1 or a subsequent revision) is not achieving the intended purpose, management measures may be revised or removed and replaced using adaptive management; provided it conforms to part 2.
2. Management measures that may be adjusted using adaptive management include:
    a. Season closures
    b. Day of week closures
    c. Trip and vessel limits
    d. Size limits
    e. Bag and vessel limits
    f. Gear restrictions in support of the measures listed in a-e

Supplemental Management (Appendix 3)

As a result of the popularity of Spotted Seatrout as a targeted species; (MFC), MFC Advisory Committee members, and the public have mentioned a wide variety of potential recreational and commercial management strategies that could benefit the Spotted Seatrout stock but the scope of which are not immediately quantifiable. The increase in recreational trips targeting Spotted Seatrout and increased total Spotted Seatrout harvest in recent years combined with the presence of a dedicated catch and release segment of the recreational fishery suggest that even management measures lacking immediately quantifiable benefits are worth exploring. Additionally, there are management measures that could provide supplementary benefits when paired with sustainable harvest measures discussed in Appendix 2 of the draft FMP.

Option 1: Recreational Vessel Limits

(Refer to pp. 75-76 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

Limiting the harvest of fish through a vessel limit less than the sum of individual bag limits when multiple anglers are on a vessel or by eliminating the allowance for captain and crew to keep a recreational limit when on for-hire trips are common practices in many state and federal fisheries. For a full discussion of vessel limits, see pp. 75–76 of draft Amendment 1.

a. Status Quo – Manage fishery without changes to the recreational vessel limit or for-hire captain/crew allowance

b. Eliminate captain/crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout on for-hire trips with no broader recreational vessel limit

c. Implement 8 fish Spotted Seatrout recreational vessel limit with captain/crew allowance on for-hire trips counted as part of vessel limit

Option 2: Commercial Vessel Limits

(Refer to pp. 80-81 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

At their April 2014 meeting, the MFC Finfish Advisory Committee (AC), while acting as the Striped Mullet AC, passed a motion to recommend allowing two commercial fishing license holders fishing from the same vessel using one set of gear to harvest two commercial limits of spotted seatrout. At their May 2014 business meeting, the MFC voted to include discussion of the Finfish AC recommendation in the next scheduled Spotted Seatrout FMP rather than reopening the plan for an amendment. It is very likely that adopting the 2014 Finfish recommendation would increase harvest in the Spotted Seatrout fishery. For a full discussion of commercial vessel limits, see pp. 80–81 of draft Amendment 1.

a. Status Quo – Maintain current management of one 75 fish trip limit per vessel per day.

b. Allow two commercial license holders fishing on one boat with one set of gear to harvest two commercial limits of Spotted Seatrout

Cold Stun Management (Appendix 4)

Spotted Seatrout are susceptible to periodic cold stun events which occur when water gets so cold that it slows down a fish's body functions, making them sluggish or unable to move. In North Carolina, Spotted Seatrout are more likely than other commercially and recreationally important fish species to experience population-level effects from these events. Cold stun events can occur because of snow and ice melt following a winter storm or by sudden and-or prolonged periods of cold temperatures. At their February 2012 business meeting, the MFC directed the DMF to remain status quo regarding spotted seatrout cold stun management, with the assumption that in the event of a "catastrophic" cold stun the director would use proclamation authority to enact a temporary closure. The objective of a spotted seatrout harvest closure after a cold stun event is to allow surviving fish an opportunity to spawn during their spring spawning season, potentially increasing recruitment the following year. Cold stun management options include size limits (draft Amendment 1 pp. 88–89), recreational bag and commercial trip limits (draft Amendment 1 pp. 89–90), seasonal closures (draft Amendment 1 pp. 87), area closures (draft Amendment 1 pp. 90), and an adaptive management framework (draft Amendment 1 pp. 91).

Option 1: Season Closures

(Refer to pp. 87 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

a. Status Quo – fishery closed until June 15 following a cold stun

b. Extend harvest closure until June 30 following a cold stun

c. Extend harvest closure until October 15 following a cold stun

Option 2: Size Limits

(Refer to pp. 88-89 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

a. Status Quo – no size limit change following a cold stun

b. Temporary adjustment of size and-or slot limits following a cold stun

Option 3: Bag and Trip Limits

(Refer to pp. 89-90 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

a. Status Quo – no recreational bag or commercial trip limit changes following a cold stun

b. Temporary adjustment of recreational bag or commercial trip limits following a cold stun

Option 4: Adaptive Management Framework

(Refer to pp. 91 in the Draft Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1 for additional details)

1. If a severe cold stun event occurs the Director will close the spotted seatrout fishery statewide through the date adopted in this Amendment
2. Temporary measures that may be implemented through adaptive management to aid in stock recovery after the standard closure period following a cold stun event include:
    a. recreational bag limit
    b. commercial trip limit
    c. size limit changes
    d. seasonal closure
    e. gill net yardage restrictions
    f. Use of adaptive management to further aid in stock recovery once the fishery reopens following a cold stun event is contingent on approval by the Marine Fisheries Commission.

Next Steps

The MFC selected their preferred management options at their November 2024 Business Meeting. The Amendment was then reviewed by the DEQ Secretary and the appropriate legislative bodies. At the February 2025 business meeting, the MFC will be presented any comments from the review and will vote on adoption of Amendment 1.

DRAFT, 2025

North Carolina
Spotted Seatrout
Fishery Management Plan Amendment 1

North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
P. O. Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557

This document may be cited as:
NCDMF (North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries). 2025. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan, Amendment 1. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 109 p.

Disclaimer: Data in this Fishery Management Plan may have changed since publication based on updates to source documents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Amendment 1 to the North Carolina (NC) Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan (FMP) was developed by the NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ), Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) under the auspices of the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) with the advice of the Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee (AC). Deserving special recognition are the members of the Spotted Seatrout AC and the DMF Plan Development Team (PDT) who contributed their time and knowledge to this effort.

Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee

Joe Albea
Stephen Brewster
Johnna Brooks
Jie Cao
Stuart Creighton
Doug Cross
Harman Wayne Dunbar
Matthew Littleton
Kevin Poole
James Reilly
Rick Sasser
Jeremy Skinner
Donald Willis

Spotted Seatrout Plan Development Team

Alan Bianchi
Ami Staples
Anne Markwith
Brad Johnson
Brooke Lowman (VMRC)
Doug Monroe
Edward Mann
Jason Rock (Mentor)
Jason Walsh
Jeffrey Moore
Joshua McGilly (VMRC)
Kevin Aman
Lucas Pensinger (Co-lead)
Matthew Doster
Melinda Lambert (Co-lead)
Nathanial Hancock
Neil Kendrick
Zach Harrison

The following Division staff were also invaluable in assisting with the development of this document: Corrin Flora, Debbie Manley, Casey Knight, Lee Paramore, Steve Poland, and Tina Moore.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Figures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Spotted Seatrout are one of the most sought-after species in North Carolina's estuarine and coastal waters. Due to their temporal and spatial availability and popularity among anglers, they support an active, year-round recreational fishery. The commercial Spotted Seatrout fishery is smaller compared to the recreational fishery and primarily uses run around gill nets to target Spotted Seatrout.

The 2022 North Carolina and Virginia Spotted Seatrout stock assessment, including data through 2019, determined the stock is not overfished but overfishing is occurring. North Carolina law requires management action be taken to end overfishing within two years with at least a 50% probability of success from the date the plan is adopted. A 19.9% reduction in harvest is required to end overfishing of the Spotted Seatrout stock. Supplement A to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan was adopted in March 2014 and maintained measures adopted by the original Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan. Supplement A management measures expire upon adoption of Amendment 1 by the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) unless they are maintained in Amendment 1.

The goal of Amendment 1 is to manage the Spotted Seatrout fishery to maintain a self-sustaining population that provides sustainable harvest based on science-based decision-making processes. The following objectives will be used to achieve this goal: implement management strategies within North Carolina that end overfishing and maintain the Spotted Seatrout spawning stock abundance and recruitment potential; promote restoration, enhancement, and protection of critical habitat and environmental quality in a manner consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan, to maintain or increase growth, survival, and reproduction of the Spotted Seatrout stock; monitor and manage the fishery in a manner that utilizes biological, socioeconomic, fishery, habitat, and environmental data; and promote outreach and interjurisdictional cooperation regarding the status and management of the Spotted Seatrout stock in North Carolina and Virginia waters, including practices that minimize bycatch and discard mortality.

To meet statutory requirements to achieve a self-sustaining Spotted Seatrout stock, sustainable harvest is addressed in Amendment 1. Quantifiable and non-quantifiable management measures are discussed for both the recreational and commercial fisheries. Non-quantifiable management measures for both fisheries in response to a cold stun, as well as information about the small mesh gill net fishery for Spotted Seatrout are also discussed. Specific management measures adopted by the NCMFC at its November 2024 business meeting are as follows:

1) Sustainable Harvest
    - Implement a recreational 14- to 20-inch slot limit with an allowance for one fish over 26 inches.
    - Implement a recreational 3-fish bag limit.
    - Implement a commercial 14- to 22-inch slot limit.

- Implement a commercial Saturday through Sunday Spotted Seatrout harvest closure from January to September and a Saturday through Monday closure from October to December.
- Formalize the commercial stop net fishery management in the fishery management plan.
- Adopt the adaptive management framework, with the caveat that adaptive management measures for sustainable harvest must be brought to the Commission for review prior to implementation.

The adopted sustainable harvest management strategy is estimated to result in an approximately 27.0% harvest reduction in the recreational fishery, a 38.0% harvest reduction in the commercial fishery, and 28.0% overall harvest reduction.

2) Supplemental Management
    - Eliminate the captain and crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit.

3) Cold Stun Management
    - Extend the harvest closure by 15 days, to June 30, following a cold stun.
    - Adopt the cold stun adaptive management framework detailed in the plan.

Additionally, the following management measures from the original FMP are carried forward into Amendment 1:

- It is unlawful to set gill nets in Joint Fishing Waters from 12:01 A.M. on Saturday to 12:01 A.M. on Monday except in Albemarle and Currituck sounds.
- It is unlawful for a commercial fishing operation to possess more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day taken by hook-and-line.
- It is unlawful to take more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day for recreational purposes.
- Commercial trip limit: 75 fish (excluding the stop net fishery and spotted seatrout taken by hook-and-line)

INTRODUCTION

This is Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan (FMP). FMPs are the ultimate product that brings all information and management considerations into one document. The N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) prepares FMPs for adoption by the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) for all commercially and recreationally significant species or fisheries that comprise state marine or estuarine resources. The goal of these FMPs is to ensure long-term viability of these fisheries. By law, each FMP must be reviewed at least once every five years (G.S. 113-182.1). The DMF reviews each FMP annually and a comprehensive review is undertaken approximately every five years. The last comprehensive review of the Spotted Seatrout FMP was approved by the NCMFC in 2012. All management authority for the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery is vested in the State of North Carolina. The NCMFC adopts rules and policies and implements management measures for the Spotted Seatrout fishery in Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters in accordance with G.S. 113-182.1. Until Amendment 1 is approved for management, Spotted Seatrout is managed under the Spotted Seatrout FMP (NCDMF, 2012, 2014).

Fishery Management Plan History

Original FMP Adoption:	February 2012
Amendments:	None
Revisions:	None
Supplements:	Supplement A to the 2012 FMP – February 2014
Information Updates:	None
Schedule Changes:	None
Comprehensive Review:	Five years after the adoption of Amendment 1

The original Spotted Seatrout FMP (NCDMF 2012) and Supplement A to the 2012 FMP (NCDMF 2014) are available on the DMF website.

Management Unit

The management unit includes all Spotted Seatrout within the Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters of North Carolina.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of this plan is to manage the Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) fishery to maintain a self-sustaining population that provides sustainable harvest based on science-based decision-making processes. The following objectives will be used to achieve this goal.

1. Implement management strategies within North Carolina that end overfishing and maintain the Spotted Seatrout spawning stock abundance and recruitment potential.
2. Promote restoration, enhancement, and protection of critical habitat and environmental quality in a manner consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan, to maintain or increase growth, survival, and reproduction of the Spotted Seatrout stock.
3. Monitor and manage the fishery in a manner that utilizes biological, socioeconomic, fishery, habitat, and environmental data.
4. Promote outreach and interjurisdictional cooperation regarding the status and management of the Spotted Seatrout stock in North Carolina and Virginia waters, including practices that minimize bycatch and discard mortality. including practices that minimize bycatch and discard mortality.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STOCK

Biological Profile

Spotted Seatrout, also known as speckled trout, are an estuarine fish species that inhabit rivers, estuaries, and shallow coastal systems. Spotted Seatrout are found in coastal waters ranging from Massachusetts to southern Florida continuing throughout the Gulf of Mexico but are most abundant in the mid-Atlantic and southeastern regions of the United States. Genetic markers in North Carolina fish suggest mixing between two genetically distinct populations: one population from Georgia to the Cape Fear River, North Carolina and a another that expands north from Bogue Sound, North Carolina (Ellis et al., 2018; O'Donnell et al., 2014).

Spotted Seatrout have distinct seasonal migrations. In the winter, fish migrate to shallow estuarine habitats (Ellis, 2014). As waters warm, fish will return to oyster beds, shallow bays, and grass flats (Daniel, 1988). Although Spotted Seatrout seasonally migrate, based on tag return studies, most individuals exhibit strong site fidelity traveling less than 50 km (Music, 1981; Ellis, 2014; Moulton et al., 2017; Loeffler et al., 2019).

Spawning occurs from April to October with peak spawning occurring in May and June (Burns, 1996). Spawning generally occurs near inlets or within estuaries. Because Spotted Seatrout are batch spawners, females are capable of spawning multiple times throughout the season. Fish mature between the ages of one and three. Younger, newly matured fish may spawn every four days while fish older than three years may spawn every two days (Roumillat & Brouwer, 2004). Estimates of the number of eggs a female can produce in a year vary based on age and size but range between 3-20 million eggs per year (Nieland et al., 2002; Roumillat & Brouwer, 2004; Murphy et al., 2010). Most male Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina are mature at 7.9 inches total length (TL) and most females are mature at 9.9 inches TL. All males are mature at 12 inches and all females are mature at 15 inches.

North Carolina's state record is currently a 12.5 pound, 33.5-inch fish caught from the lower Neuse River in 2022. The annual average size of Spotted Seatrout from 1991-2021

ranged from 14.4 to 18.3 inches in North Carolina's commercial fisheries and 14.2 to 17.6 inches in the recreational fishery. Spotted Seatrout can live as long as ten years old. The oldest, otolith-based age of both male and female fish reported in North Carolina is 9 years old.

Spotted Seatrout are especially susceptible to cold stun events, times in which water temperatures drop below what the fish can survive. The effect of cold stuns on Spotted Seatrout abundance depends on the severity and duration of the event. The impact can be minimal if only sub-adults are affected, if the event is localized to a few areas, or if the event is short lived. Cold stun events can have a substantial impact if all size classes are affected, if larger areas are affected, or if the event lasts for an extended period. Interannual Spotted Seatrout abundance can be driven by cold stun events that cause large losses to the stock, which can prompt management to suspend both recreational and commercial harvests (Hurst, 2007; NCDMF, 2012).

These fish are known to be highly opportunistic predators, feeding on a variety of prey items depending on their size and availability. Their diet mainly consists of small fish, shrimp, crabs, and other invertebrates. Spotted Seatrout are ambush predators, relying on camouflage and patience to wait for prey to come within striking distance. They are most active during dusk and dawn.

Assessment Methodology

A seasonal size-structured assessment model was applied to data characterizing commercial and recreational landings and discards, fisheries-independent survey indices, and biological data collected from 1991 through 2019. A nonstationary process was assumed for natural mortality and growth in the model. The seasonal time step and nonstationary natural mortality assumption allows for capturing the cold-stun effects that have been observed for Spotted Seatrout. Both the observed data and model predictions suggest a shift in population dynamics around 2004 when the fisheries-independent survey index data became available. Lower fishing mortality and higher spawning stock biomass and recruitment with greater variation were predicted for the period after 2004. This trend was also observed in the recreational landing and discard data, which exhibited higher values after 2004.

Stock Status

Reference point thresholds for the Spotted Seatrout stock were based on 20% spawner potential ratio (SPR). Due to large uncertainty in the terminal year (2019) estimates, a weighted average of the estimates over the most recent three years (2017–2019) was used to represent the terminal year estimate for determination of stock status. The estimates of 2017–2019 from the base model were weighted by the inverse of their CV values before calculating the average. The threshold and target values for the terminal year were also averaged over 2017–2019. The estimated F threshold $F20\%$ was 0.60 per year, and the estimated terminal year (2019) F was 0.75 per year. Thus, the estimated $F/F20\%$ for 2019 is greater than one (1.3), suggesting the stock is currently experiencing overfishing (Figure 1). The estimated SSB threshold (SSB20%) for 2019 was 1,143 metric tons, and the estimated 2019 SSB was 2,259 metric tons. Therefore, the estimated

SSB/SSB20% for 2019 is greater than one (2.0), suggesting the stock is not currently overfished (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Annual predicted fishing mortality relative to the fishing mortality threshold (F/F20) from the base model of the stock assessment, biological years (Mar–Feb) 1991–2019. The horizontal black line shows a ratio of one. The terminal-year estimate is an average of the most recent three years weighted by the inverse CV values.



Figure *1*. Annual predicted spawning stock biomass (metric tons) relative to the spawning stock biomass threshold (SSB/SSB20) from the base model of the stock assessment, biological years (Mar–Feb) 1991–2019. The horizontal black line shows a ratio of one. The terminal-year estimate is an average of the most recent three years weighted by the inverse CV values.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERY

Additional in-depth analyses and discussion of North Carolina's commercial and recreational Spotted Seatrout fisheries can be found in the original Spotted Seatrout FMP and Supplement A (NCDMF 2012 and 2014); all FMP documents are available on the DMF Fishery Management Plans website and commercial and recreational landings can be found in the License and Statistics Annual Report (NCDMF, 2023) produced by the DMF and found on the Fisheries Statistics page.

Recreational and commercial landings are typically variable from year to year and are influenced by winter weather conditions (i.e., low harvest follows severe winters) and fish availability. Confirmed cold stun events, with varying severity, occurred in 1995, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2009, 2010, 2014, 2015, 2018, and 2022 (Table 1). Since cold stuns typically occur in December and January (the end of the biological year), their impacts to recreational and commercial landings are experienced the following year.

Table 1. Confirmed Spotted Seatrout cold stun events and harvest closure dates, 1995-2022.

Calendar Year	Month	Biological Year	Closure	Harvest Closure Dates*
1995	December	1995	No	-
2000	January	1999	No	-
2001	January	2000	No	-
2003	January	2002	No	-
2004	December	2004	No	-
2010	January	2009	No	-
2010	December	2010	Yes	Jan. 14 - June 15, 2011
2014	January	2013	Yes	Feb. 5 - June 14, 2014
2015	February	2014	No	-
2018	January	2017	Yes	Jan. 5 - June 14, 2018
2022	December	2022	No	-

Commercial Fishery

The DMF instituted a mandatory, dealer-based, trip-level, reporting system known as the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program (NCTTP) for all commercial species in 1994. All seafood landed in North Carolina and sold by licensed commercial fishermen must be reported on a trip ticket by a licensed seafood dealer. For more information about licensing requirements for purchasing and selling seafood in North Carolina and how commercial fishing data were collected prior to 1994, please refer to the DMF License and Statistics Section Annual Report (NCDMF, 2023). In 2022, 138 seafood dealers reported Spotted Seatrout on trip tickets, landed by 701 fishery participants during 11,695 fishing trips (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Annual number of trips and participants for the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery from 1994 to 2022.

Annual Landings and Value

In recent years (2012 to 2022), total landings averaged 361,656 pounds per year (**Error! Reference source not found.**). The lowest landings during this period were 115,547 pounds in 2015 and the highest were 654,327 pounds in 2021. Spotted Seatrout landings have increased in recent years, exceeding 650,000 pounds in 2020 and 2021. Annual dockside value of Spotted Seatrout commercial landings averaged $891,180 from 2012 to 2022. Annual dockside value was lowest in 2015 at $290,709 and reached a high of just under $1.7 million in 2021.



Figure 4. North Carolina annual Spotted Seatrout commercial landings and ex-vessel value, 1994-2022. Values include all market grades and are not adjusted for inflation. The biological year begins in March and ends in February the following year (e.g., biological year 1994 begins in March 1994 and ends in February 1995). Gray bars indicate years without a cold

stun or cold stun closure, blue bars indicate years with a confirmed cold stun event, and yellow bars indicate years with a cold stun closure.

Landings by Month

Spotted Seatrout are harvested year-round but there are distinct seasonal peaks (Figure 3). From 1994 through 2022, on average the largest harvest peak occurred from October through February, with a second smaller harvest plateau from April through May. The fall/winter harvest season accounted for 71% of the harvest and the shorter spring season has accounted for 12% of the harvest during 1994-2022. Harvest is typically highest in colder months as Spotted Seatrout aggregate in smaller waterbodies and can be caught in higher numbers. Harvest tends to taper off as waters warm and fish disperse in preparation for the summer spawning season.



Figure 3. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout commercial landings proportion by month, 1994-2022. Months are ordered according to the biological year which begins in March and ends in February the following year.

Landings by Area

Spotted Seatrout are harvested statewide. The main harvest areas are typically Pamlico Sound, followed by the Neuse and Bay rivers and Central Sounds area (Core, Back, and Bogue sounds; Figure 4). Pamlico Sound accounted for 28% of the harvest from 2012 through 2022. Annual harvest from Pamlico Sound during this period ranged from 11,569 pounds in 2018 to 255,176 pounds in 2021. During this same period, the Neuse and Bay rivers accounted for 24%, the Central Sounds and Southern area each accounted for 13%, Albemarle Sound accounted for 11%, the Pamlico and Pungo rivers accounted for 9%, and the Ocean accounted for 2% of the harvest.



Figure 4. North Carolina annual Spotted Seatrout commercial landings proportion by area, 1994-2022. Albemarle Sound includes Albemarle, Currituck, Croatan, and Roanoke sounds and their tributaries. Pamlico Sound includes Pamlico Sound and its bays and tributaries. Central Sounds includes Core, Back, and Bogue Sounds and their tributaries. Southern includes the White Oak River and all waters south to the SC state line.

Landings by Gear Type

Spotted Seatrout are harvested with a variety of gears but anchored gill nets and runaround gill nets account for most of the harvest (Figure 5). Other gears used include haul seines, beach seines, and ocean gill nets. Since 2012, anchored gill nets have accounted for 43% of the harvest and runaround gill nets have accounted for 48% of the harvest.



Figure 5. North Carolina annual Spotted Seatrout commercial landings proportion by gear type, 1994-2022. *Beach Seine landings combined with Other Gears due to data confidentiality. **Beach Seine and Haul Seine landings combined with Other Gears due to data confidentiality.

Commercial bycatch

Large-mesh (≥ 5 inches stretched mesh [ISM])anchored gill nets target demersal fish such as flounder during the fall months and pelagic fish such as clupeids during the spring months. Small-mesh (<5 ISM) anchored gill-net trips occur consistently throughout the year dependent on the target species for that time of year. Spotted Seatrout are targeted primarily during fall and winter. The Spotted Seatrout small-mesh fishery would potentially interact with sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon. Most sea turtle interactions occur in the late summer and fall months. Sea turtle movement is typically influenced by water temperature. As soon as water temperatures start to decline within the estuaries, incidental takes significantly decline. Atlantic Sturgeon have the greatest abundance in spring but fall and winter make up 47% of estimated discards in the small-mesh fishery.

Table 2. Estimates for the number of green sea turtles, Kemp's ridley sea turtles, and Atlantic sturgeon caught incidentally in the small-mesh and large-mesh anchored gill-net fisheries from 2013-2022 by Management Unit (MU). A hyphen (-) represents values that could not be calculated based on available data.

		Green Sea Turtle discards		Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle discards		Atlantic Sturgeon discards	
Seasons	MU	Large Mesh	Small Mesh	Large Mesh	Small Mesh	Large Mesh	Small Mesh
Spring	A	17	4	19	-	1,805	181
	B	66	125	13	-	18	478
	C	15	5	4	-	93	41
	Core	37	22	-	-	7	114
	D	4	1	1	-	1	1
	E	19	6	7	-	15	15
Summer	A	16	3	19	-	119	11
	B	313	62	66	-	8	64
	C	28	5	8	-	11	5
	Core	121	3	-	-	3	4
	D	21	2	4	-	1	1
	E	121	9	54	-	7	4
Fall	A	63	8	38	-	1,773	88
	B	1,050	206	143	-	96	249
	C	55	14	7	-	72	31
	Core	316	81	-	-	26	134
	D	110	24	8	-	5	1
	E	194	58	43	-	37	39
Winter	A	8	3	-	-	722	131
	B	11	30	-	-	4	125
	C	1	3	-	-	3	27
	Core	1	1	-	-	1	5
	D	1	1	-	-	1	1
	E	2	4	-	-	1	9
Total		2,590	680	434	-	4,829	1,759

Recreational Fishery

The Spotted Seatrout fishery in N.C. is predominately a recreational fishery. Since 2012, recreational landings have accounted for approximately 86% of total landings. Recreational harvest, release, and trip data are estimated from the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP), which is a series of surveys designed to estimate total recreational catch. Recreational estimates across all years have been updated and are now based on MRIP's new Fishing Effort Survey-based calibrated estimates. For more information on MRIP see NOAA's MRIP informational page.

Annual landings and releases

Between 1991 and 2022, landings increased sharply in 2019 and have remained high through 2022 (Figure 6). In recent years (2012 to 2022) landings averaged 2,212,806 pounds, but since 2019 (2019 to 2022) landings averaged 3,339,879 pounds. Landings have been below a million pounds in only two years since 2012 (2015, 339,436 pounds and 2018, 728,411 pounds) and both years follow documented cold stuns including a harvest closure in 2018 (Table 1). Landings from 2019–2022 represent the four highest landings values between 2012-2022 and four of the five highest landings since 1991.



Figure 6. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout recreational landings biological years 1991–2022 (March–February).

There is a dedicated catch and release segment of the recreational fishery, though how anglers participate in this segment varies. Some anglers release all fish, some anglers release all larger fish (e.g., any fish over 20 inches TL), and some anglers continue to target Spotted Seatrout for catch and release fishing after harvesting their limit. Recreational releases vary annually, but have generally increased since 2009 (Figure 9). The number of recreational releases in 2018 represents a large outlier for the time series (1991-2022) and should be viewed with caution due to Hurricane Florence impacting

MRIP surveys throughout most of North Carolina in late 2018. Excluding this outliner, anglers released an average of 6,150,931 fish annually from 2009–2022. Recreational releases may change seasonally as well because Spotted Seatrout growth rates and life history can lead to greater numbers of sublegal fish at times.



Figure 9. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout recreational releases biological years 1991–2022 (March–February). Hurricane Florence impacted MRIP sampling in most of North Carolina in late 2018. As such recreational releases from 2018 should be viewed with a high degree of caution.

Landings by month

Although recreational harvest occurs throughout the year, most harvest occurs in late fall and early winter. Harvest increases in October, peaks sharply in November, then decreases in winter but remains above average compared to the rest of the year in December, January, and February (Figure 107). A second, slight increase in landings occurs in June and July, likely driven by tourism. From 1991 to 2022 approximately 63% of harvest occurred during the primary harvest peak (October – February) while the slight increase in June and July encompassed about 11% of harvest. In recent years (2012–2022), the general harvest patterns remain, but winter months make up a larger proportion of harvest (Figure 11). Though minor regional variation in these seasonal patterns might exist, these patterns are broadly consistent across the state.



Figure 107. North Carolina average monthly Spotted Seatrout recreational landings proportion by month, 1991-2022. Months are ordered according to the biological year (March – February).



Figure 11. North Carolina average monthly Spotted Seatrout recreational landings proportion by month, 2012-2022. Months are ordered according to the biological year (March – February).

Recreational releases also occur throughout the year; however, releases are concentrated in October, November, and December. In recent years (2012–2022) a slightly larger proportion of fish are released in January compared to the rest of the year, but releases remain relatively consistent outside October, November, and December (Figure 12).



Figure 12. North Carolina average monthly Spotted Seatrout recreational releases proportion by month, 2012-2022. Months are ordered according to the biological year (March – February).

Summary of Economic Impact

Modeling software, IMPLAN, is used to estimate the economic impacts of an industry to the state at-large, accounting for revenues and participation. For a detailed explanation of the methodology used to estimate the economic impacts please refer to the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) License and Statistics Section Annual Report. Due to the management options being considered, this analysis includes both the recreational and commercial industries.

Commercial

Commercial landings and effort data collected through the DMF Trip Ticket Program are used to estimate the economic impact of the commercial fishing industry. For commercial fishing output, total impacts are estimated by incorporating modifiers from NOAA's Fisheries Economics of the United States reports from 2012-2020, which account for proportional expenditures and spillover impacts from related industries. By assuming the Spotted Seatrout commercial fishery's economic contribution is a proportion equal to its contribution to total commercial ex-vessel values, we can generate an estimate of the economic contribution of the commercial Spotted Seatrout fishery statewide.

From 2012 to 2022 Spotted Seatrout economic sales impacts have varied from a low of approximately $360,000 in 2015 to a high of $1.5 million dollars in 2022 and supports between 575 and 1,200 jobs annually. Annual sales impacts have varied over the decade but have averaged $5.9 million from 2012 to 2022.

Table 3. Annual economic contributions from the Spotted Seatrout commercial fishery to the state of North Carolina from 2012 to 2022 reported in 2022 dollars.

Year	Pounds Landed	Ex-Vessel Value	Job Impacts	Income Impacts	Value Added Impacts	Sales Impacts
2022	520,994	$1,480,294	834	$3,413,446	$5,432,284	$7,819,923
2021	654,327	$1,833,146	846	$4,305,885	$6,767,404	$9,880,173
2020	653,093	$1,709,539	862	$4,296,534	$6,965,574	$9,646,212
2019	443,629	$1,182,385	822	$2,986,277	$4,369,883	$6,959,060
2018	151,708	$461,888	575	$1,044,323	$1,717,370	$2,371,747
2017	259,432	$810,368	898	$2,100,330	$3,132,230	$4,835,802
2016	273,848	$864,570	775	$2,281,480	$3,515,818	$5,204,455
2015	115,547	$358,921	633	$938,109	$1,450,039	$2,135,390
2014	226,394	$671,553	846	$1,631,567	$2,455,165	$3,761,647
2013	364,123	$1,035,645	1,194	$2,528,888	$3,938,648	$5,769,680
2012	315,128	$811,864	1,081	$2,858,981	$3,908,590	$6,278,522

Recreational

Recreational effort data are provided from the Marine Recreational Information Program, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as well as survey responses collected from North Carolina recreational fishing participants administered by the Fisheries Economics Program at DMF. For recreational fishing output, total impacts are estimated by incorporating modifiers from NOAA's Fisheries Economics of the United States reports from 2012 to 2020, which account for proportional recreational expenditures and spillover impacts from related industries. By assuming the Spotted Seatrout recreational fishery's contribution to expenditure categories is at a proportion equal to its contribution to total recreational trips and durable goods expenditure, we can generate an estimate of the total economic contribution of Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina.

From 2012 to 2022 Spotted Seatrout economic sales impacts have varied from a low of about $267 million in 2015 to a high of $581 million dollars in 2020. Similarly, job impacts span from approximately 2,700 to 5,500 jobs annually. Annual sales impacts have varied over the described time horizon but have averaged $438 million from 2012 to 2022.

Table 4. Annual economic contributions of the Spotted Seatrout recreational fishery to the state of North Carolina from 2012 to 2022 reported in 2022 dollars.

Year	Trips	Expenditure	Job Impacts	Income Impacts	Value Added Impacts	Sales Impacts
2022	2,952,725	$610,166,244	4556	$186,974,466	$287,883,774	$508,297,606
2021	2,254,224	$527,895,592	4318	$167,784,164	$253,959,746	$455,899,909
2020	2,719,670	$680,865,862	5486	$231,035,451	$328,868,972	$580,954,157
2019	2,528,247	$635,730,887	5252	$195,627,253	$296,435,669	$535,753,473
2018	1,773,091	$439,207,323	3185	$141,032,169	$213,419,087	$380,831,319
2017	1,555,087	$380,456,082	3573	$117,806,629	$177,609,593	$325,543,922
2016	2,091,731	$522,385,203	4526	$164,680,710	$244,974,745	$443,331,488
2015	1,295,843	$321,730,351	2709	$98,681,487	$160,541,925	$267,200,930
2014	1,510,415	$384,591,773	3635	$116,796,277	$173,912,242	$309,980,126
2013	2,065,210	$552,161,892	4451	$390,676,333	$248,904,256	$532,736,812
2012	2,112,138	$587,450,277	4679	$176,846,782	$263,358,908	$473,618,472

ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND IMPACT

Coastal Habitat Protection Plan

The Fishery Reform Act statutes require that a Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) be drafted by the NCDEQ and reviewed every five years (G.S. 143B-279.8). The CHPP is intended as a resource and guide compiled by NCDEQ staff to assist the Marine Fisheries, Environmental Management, and Coastal Resources commissions in developing goals and recommendations for the continued protection and enhancement of fishery habitats in North Carolina. Habitat recommendations related to fishery management can be addressed directly by the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC). The NCMFC has passed rules that provide protection for Spotted Seatrout habitat including the prohibition of bottom-disturbing gear in specific areas, designation of sensitive fish habitat, such as nursery areas, and SAV beds, with applicable gear restrictions. Habitat recommendations not under NCMFC authority (e.g., water quality management, shoreline development) can be addressed by the other commissions through the CHPP process. The CHPP helps to ensure consistent actions among these commissions as well as their supporting NCDEQ divisions. The CHPP also summarizes the economic and ecological value of coastal habitats to North Carolina, their status, and potential threats to their sustainability (NCDEQ, 2016).

Spotted Seatrout make use of a variety of habitats during their life history with variations in habitat preference due to location, season, and ontogenetic stage. They are found most often in habitats identified in the CHPP including water column, wetlands, submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV), soft bottom, and shell bottom (NCDEQ, 2016). Spotted Seatrout are found throughout estuarine systems and can migrate offshore to deeper marine soft bottom areas and beaches in response to falling temperatures (ASMFC, 1984; Mercer, 1984). Spotted Seatrout do, however, show a strong preference for low-flow areas with SAV or soft bottom (Tabb, 1958; Moulton et al., 2017). Growth and survival of Spotted Seatrout within the habitats they use are maximized when water quality

parameters such as temperature, salinity, and dissolved oxygen are within optimal ranges. Maintenance and improvement of suitable estuarine habitat and water quality may be the most important factors in sustaining Spotted Seatrout stocks. Additional information on the habitats discussed below, threats to these habitats, water quality degradation, and how these topics relate to fisheries can be found in the CHPP (NCDEQ, 2016).

Threats and Alterations

Suitable habitat is a critical element in the ecology and productivity of estuarine systems. Degradation or improvement in one aspect of habitat may have a corresponding impact on water quality. All habitats used by Spotted Seatrout are threatened in some way.

Water Column

The water column habitat is defined as "the water covering a submerged surface and its physical, chemical, and biological characteristics" (NCDEQ, 2016). Spotted Seatrout spawning is generally limited to estuarine waters in the late summer and early fall in response to temperature and salinity but can also include inlets in North Carolina (ASMFC, 1984; Mercer, 1984; Saucier & Baltz, 1992, 1993; Holt and Holt, 2003; Kupschus, 2004; Stewart & Scharf, 2008; Ricci et al., 2017). Spawning sites have been noted to include tidal passes, channels, river mouths, and waters in the vicinity of inlets (Saucier & Baltz, 1992, 1993; Roumillat et al., 1997; Luczkovich et al., 1999; Stewart & Scharf, 2008; Lowerre-Barbieri et al., 2009; Boucek et al., 2017). For the portion of the Spotted Seatrout population that spawns inshore or offshore of inlets, they are a critical component of water column habitat for Spotted Seatrout and the larvae that must pass through inlets to reach estuarine nursery areas (Churchill et al., 1997; Hare et al., 1999; Luettich et al., 1999). Due to the importance of inlets to the movement of larval Spotted Seatrout into nursery areas and of adult Spotted Seatrout into oceanic waters while avoiding lower estuarine temperatures, terminal groins may threaten Spotted Seatrout stocks by impeding recruitment and preventing adults from avoiding cold stuns, since they can obstruct inlet passage (Kapolnai et al., 1996; Churchill et al., 1997; Blanton et al., 1999). Inlets are hydraulically dredged on a regular basis to ensure safe passage for vessels of all sizes. Though DMF recommends an in-water-work moratorium of April 1 to July 30 to minimize impacts during peak biological activity, most projects are given moratorium relief due to public safety. Large hydraulic dredge boats are used inside the inlets and have the highest potential to draw in fishes and invertebrates of all life stages. However, this type of dredge is most impactful to eggs and larval fish, as their reduced swimming ability means they are unable to actively avoid the suction field (Todd et al., 2015).

Soft Bottom

Soft bottom habitat plays an important role in estuarine system function, acting as both a source and sink (storage) for nutrients, chemicals, and microbes. Estuarine soft bottom habitats, especially those adjacent to wetlands, act as Spotted Seatrout nursery areas, provide key food sources for all life stages, and refuge from large predators (Ross & Epperly, 1985; Noble & Monroe, 1991; Powers, 2012). Soft bottom sediments support

algae and the benthic invertebrates that eat algae, which are important food sources for juvenile and adult Spotted Seatrout. Spotted Seatrout begin their lives eating primarily copepods and mysid shrimps before transitioning to penaeid and palaemonid shrimps (Peterson and Peterson 1979; Daniel 1988; McMichael and Peters 1989). Soft bottom habitat, along with SAV, are more heavily utilized by Spotted Seatrout than other habitat types (Tabb, 1958; Moulton et al., 2017). Dredging threatens soft bottom habitat, potentially affecting Spotted Seatrout food sources and water quality. Dredging removes all benthic infauna from the affected areas immediately, which reduces food availability temporarily to bottom feeding fish such as the Spotted Seatrout (NCDEQ, 2016).

In addition to estuarine soft bottom habitats, there are also surf zone and deeper marine soft bottom habitats used by adult Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina during late autumn temperature migrations (ASMFC, 1984; Mercer, 1984). The threats to ocean beaches and surf zone include beach nourishment and storm water outfalls.

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) is a fish habitat dominated by one or more species of underwater vascular plants and occurs in both subtidal and intertidal zones, sometimes over extensive areas (NCDEQ, 2016). SAV acts as a crucial structured habitat for fishes and invertebrates, providing refuge from predators and food sources such as epiphytic (living on the surface of vegetation) algae and animals. Spotted Seatrout use SAV as spawning sites, nurseries, forage areas, refuge areas, and for feeding on invertebrates on seagrasses and other structures. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) lists SAV as a Habitat Area of Particular Concern (HAPC) for Spotted Seatrout (ASMFC, 1984). All life stages of Spotted Seatrout have been documented in mesohaline and polyhaline seagrass beds (Tabb, 1966; ASMFC, 1984; Mercer, 1984; Thayer, Kenworthy & Fonseca, 1984; McMichael & Peters, 1989; Rooker et al., 1998). Spotted Seatrout use SAV habitat as much, if not more, than other spawning sites (Ricci et al., 2017; Boucek et al., 2017). Juvenile Spotted Seatrout are abundant in high salinity SAV in both Pamlico and Core sounds (Purvis, 1976; Wolff, 1976) and juvenile abundances were found to be greater in SAV than soft bottom and oyster reef and were greater than or equivalent to abundances in wetland habitats (Minello, 1999; Minello et al., 2003). Seagrass beds are threatened by physical destruction from bottom disturbing fishing gear, dredging, and damage from boat use, as well as degradation of water quality. Declines in SAV, globally and in North Carolina, due to increased coastal development and decreased water quality, are also altering these ecosystems and their community structure.

Shell Bottom

Shell bottom is defined as estuarine intertidal or subtidal bottom made of surface shell concentrations of living or dead oysters, hard clams, and other shellfish (NCDEQ, 2016). This includes oyster beds and reefs and shell hash (a mixture of sediments and broken shell). Spawning aggregations of Spotted Seatrout have been documented over shell bottom areas in North Carolina including in the Neuse River (Barrios et al., 2006). Shell bottom habitats have been shown to provide an important forage base of invertebrates

and small finfish for juvenile and adult Spotted Seatrout (Coen et al. 1999; ASMFC, 2007). Oyster reefs and shell hash areas can be damaged by bottom-disturbing fishing gears, disease, and overfishing.

Wetlands

Wetlands are areas that are inundated or saturated by the accumulation of surface or groundwater, enough to support a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions (NCDEQ, 2016). Estuarine wetlands are tidal and are found in bays, sounds, and rivers in brackish waters. Freshwater wetlands include freshwater marshes, bottomland, hardwood forests, and swamp forests in low salinity to freshwater areas of creeks, streams, and rivers. Wetlands are particularly valuable as juvenile Spotted Seatrout appear to use estuarine wetlands, particularly the marsh edge habitat of salt/brackish marshes, as nurseries (Tabb, 1966; ASMFC, 1984; Mercer, 1984; Hettler 1989; Rakocinski et al., 1992; Baltz et al., 1993; Peterson & Turner, 1994). Abundances of juveniles in wetlands were found to be less than or equal to abundances in SAV (Minello, 1999; Minello et al., 2003). Wetlands are threatened by many human activities, including dredging for marinas and channels, filling for development, ditching and draining for agriculture, silviculture, channelization, and shoreline stabilization. Wetland loss and decreasing vegetative buffers can hasten excessive nutrient loading impacts to the surrounding water and other habitat types (NCDWQ, 2000a).

Water Quality Degradation

Good water quality is essential, both for supporting the various life stages of Spotted Seatrout and for maintaining their habitats. Naturally occurring and anthropogenic activities can alter the salinity and temperature conditions or elevate levels of toxins, nutrients, and turbidity, as well as lower dissolved oxygen levels, which can degrade water quality and impact Spotted Seatrout survival. Water quality degradation through stormwater runoff, discharges, toxic chemicals, sedimentation, and changes in turbidity can threaten Spotted Seatrout survival. Salinity particularly affects the eggs of Spotted Seatrout which rely on high spawning salinities to remain positively buoyant allowing for wind and tidally driven distribution throughout the estuary (Churchill et al., 1999; Holt & Holt, 2003); however, sudden salinity reductions cause Spotted Seatrout eggs to sink, thus reducing dispersal and survival (Holt & Holt, 2003).

More detailed information on water quality degradation, including the topics of hypoxia, toxins, and temperature in North Carolina and the effect on fish stocks can be found in the NCDWQ guides on the NCDWQ website (NCDWQ, 2000b; NCDWQ, 2008) and in the CHPP (NCDEQ, 2016). More information about the water quality requirements for Spotted Seatrout can be found in the DESCRIPTION OF THE STOCK section of this FMP.

Gear Impacts on Habitat

Bottom disturbing fishing gear can impact ecosystem function through habitat degradation. Static (non-mobile) gears tend to have a lesser impact on habitat compared to mobile gears, as the amount of area affected by static gears tends to be insignificant

when compared to that of mobile gears (Rogers et al., 1998). Both bottom disturbing and static gears can have impacts of bycatch while in operation and can have negative impacts if the gear is abandoned or lost.

The primary gears used in the Spotted Seatrout commercial fishery are estuarine gill nets (runaround, strike, or set), long haul seines, beach seines, and ocean gill nets. In the recreational fishery, rod and reel is the primary gear. Other gears that may harvest Spotted Seatrout as incidental catch include pounds nets, crab pots, drift gill nets, and fyke nets. Many gears that interact with Spotted Seatrout are considered static gear (Barnette, 2001; NCDEQ, 2016) and generally have minimal impact on habitat.

Beach seines and runaround gill nets are both mobile and may disturb local habitats. Impacts from mobile bottom-disturbing fishing gears such as seines and runaround gill nets include changes in community composition from the removal of species and physical disruption of the habitat (Barnette, 2001). Gears may damage or uproot SAV as they are dragged across the seafloor, potentially reducing productivity and destroying structures that provide feeding surfaces and shelter for Spotted Seatrout (NCDEQ, 2016). Gears that drag across the seafloor may also suspend sediments, temporarily increasing turbidity (Corbett et al., 2004) and reducing clarity, SAV growth, productivity, and survival (NCDEQ, 2016). Sediment suspended by bottom disturbing fishing gears and boat propeller wash may also bury SAV (Thayer et al., 1984), degrading habitat quality and reducing productivity.

Extreme Weather Events

Extreme weather events have always occurred, but scientists anticipate that changes to North Carolina's climate in this century will be larger than anything experienced historically (Kunkel et al., 2020). It is predicted that average annual temperatures will continue to increase, sea level will continue to rise, the intensity of hurricanes will increase, total annual precipitation from hurricanes and severe thunderstorms will increase resulting in increased flooding events, while severe droughts will also likely increase due to higher temperatures (Kunkel et al., 2020). Flood events can flush contaminated nutrient-rich runoff into estuaries causing degraded water quality. Runoff from flood events can cause eutrophication resulting in fish kills due to hypoxia, algal blooms, and alteration of the salinity regime. Flood events can also cause erosion of shorelines resulting in loss of important coastal habitats, such as SAV, soft bottom, and wetlands, that are critical to Spotted Seatrout throughout their life history. Potential increases in extreme weather events could have an inverse effect on the recruitment and survival of Spotted Seatrout in the estuarine system.

Included in extreme weather events are winter storms. Spotted Seatrout display a greater sensitivity to sharp drops in water temperatures than many other species. Throughout their range, Spotted Seatrout are periodically exposed to water temperatures below their thermal tolerance (i.e., below temperatures they can tolerate without experiencing stress) because of prolonged cold air temperatures or from snow and ice melt after a winter storm. For more information on how Spotted Seatrout are affected by winter events, please see the Cold Stun Management issue paper in this FMP.

FINAL AMENDMENT ONE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The NCMFC selected management measures:

APPENDIX 2: ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE HARVEST IN THE NORTH CAROLINA SPOTTED SEATROUT FISHERY

- Implement a recreational 14- to 20-inch slot limit with an allowance for one fish over 26 inches.
- Implement a recreational 3-fish bag limit.
- Implement a commercial 14- to 22-inch slot limit.
- Implement a commercial Saturday through Sunday Spotted Seatrout harvest closure from January to September and a Saturday through Monday closure from October to December.
- Formalize the commercial stop net fishery management in the fishery management plan.
- Adopt the adaptive management framework, with the caveat that adaptive management measures for sustainable harvest must be brought to the Commission for review prior to implementation.

APPENDIX 3: SUPPLEMENTAL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS IN THE NORTH CAROLINA SPOTTED SEATROUT FISHERY

- Eliminate the captain and crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit.

APPENDIX 4: COLD STUN MANAGEMENT

- Extend the harvest closure by 15 days, to June 30, following a cold stun.
- Adopt the cold stun adaptive management framework detailed in the plan.

MANAGEMENT CARRIED FORWARD

There are management measures from the original FMP to carry forward into Amendment 1 unless otherwise changed in Amendment 1. Management measures from the original Spotted Seatrout FMP that will be carried forward into Amendment 1 are:

- It is unlawful to set gill nets in Joint Fishing Waters from 12:01 A.M. on Saturday to 12:01 A.M. on Monday except in Albemarle and Currituck sounds.
- It is unlawful for a commercial fishing operation to possess more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day taken by hook-and-line.
- It is unlawful to take more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day for recreational purposes.
- 75-fish commercial trip limit (excluding for the stop net fishery and spotted seatrout taken by hook-and-line)

RESEARCH NEEDS

The research recommendations listed below are offered by the division to improve future management strategies of the Spotted Seatrout fishery. They are considered high priority as they will help to better understand the Spotted Seatrout fishery and meet the goal and objectives of the FMP. A more comprehensive list of research recommendations is provided in the Annual FMP Update and DMF Research Priorities documents.

- Integrate tagging data into stock assessment model so both tagging data and other data sources can work together to give a better picture of the population dynamics including estimates of survival and natural mortality.
- Conduct additional work to evaluate more fully the utility of the Program 120 survey and determine if alternative sampling methodologies or expanded sampling seasonality could provide a more robust index.
- Develop programs to incorporate information on size of recreational releases such as Citizen Science initiatives; Improve estimates of recreational discard mortality.
- Conduct a detailed analysis of the existing data (i.e., Program 915) to determine the extent to which late fall and spring provide insights into overwinter changes in abundance.
- Conduct research to generate accurate fecundity estimates for North Carolina Spotted Seatrout.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: SMALL-MESH GILL NET CHARACTERIZATION IN THE NORTH CAROLINA SPOTTED SEATROUT FISHERY

ISSUE

The small-mesh (<5 ISM) gill-net fishery in North Carolina is managed and regulated by species-specific fishery management plans (FMPs), and numerous Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) rules and Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) proclamations. However, concerns about biological impacts from the use of small-mesh gill nets remain. The primary issues to be addressed concern greater flexibility with constraining harvest in the Spotted Seatrout fishery, reducing bycatch, and to the greatest extent practical reducing conflict between gill-net users and other stakeholders. Specific management options for gill-net regulations can be found in Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest Issue Paper.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission.

BACKGROUND

At their August 2021 business meeting, the MFC passed a motion to not initiate rulemaking on small-mesh gill nets but refer the issue through the FMP process for each species, and any issues or rules coming out of the species-specific FMP to be addressed at that time. In North Carolina, small-mesh gill nets are the predominant gear used to harvest Spotted Seatrout. Most Spotted Seatrout are harvested commercially using set gill nets or runaround gill nets. Per direction from the MFC, small-mesh gill nets must be addressed during review of the Spotted Seatrout FMP.

North Carolina General Statutes authorize the MFC to adopt rules for the management, protection, preservation, and enhancement of the marine and estuarine resources within its jurisdiction (G.S. 113-134; G.S. 143B-289.52). The MFC has authority to adopt FMPs and the DMF is charged with preparing them (G.S. 113-182.1; G.S. 143B-289.52). Further, the MFC may delegate to the DMF director in its rules the authority to issue proclamations suspending or implementing MFC rules that may be affected by variable conditions (G.S. 113-221.1; G.S. 143B-289.52). Variable conditions include compliance with FMPs, biological impacts, bycatch issues, and user conflict, among others (MFC Rule 15A NCAC 03H .0103). The estuarine gill-net fishery in North Carolina is managed and regulated by FMPs and numerous MFC rules and DMF proclamations. Rules are periodically amended to implement changes in management goals and strategies for various fisheries and are the primary mechanism for implementing FMPs under the Fisheries Reform Act of 1997 (FRA).

In recent years, modifications to gill-net management resulting from the adoption of FMPs or other circumstances have largely been implemented through the DMF director's proclamation authority, not through rulemaking. This is primarily due to the need to

implement management changes in a timely fashion and to accommodate variable conditions. Over time, this has resulted in incongruent restrictions between rules and proclamations. Additionally, many of the rules related to small-mesh gill nets were first developed prior to the FRA and have not been thoroughly evaluated since the addition of more recent rules developed through the FMP process.

The Spotted Seatrout small-mesh gill-net fishery operates year-round, but the type of gill net used varies by season and area (NCDMF 2018). Multiple species may be landed during a single trip; however, the target species usually dominates the catch (NCDMF 2008). In North Carolina, gill nets are restricted to a minimum mesh size of 2.5 inches stretched mesh [ISM; MFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0103(a)]. The DMF categorizes gill nets from 2.5 to less than 5 ISM as small-mesh (Daniel 2013). Although the rule uses “mesh length” and not “mesh size”, their meanings are identical for the purpose of this document; this helps to demarcate the discussion of “mesh size” from “net length” throughout the document. Small-mesh gill nets are generally classified into three categories based on how the net is deployed and fished: set gill nets, runaround gill nets, and drift gill nets [Figure 1.1; Table 1.1; (Steve et al. 2001)]. For the purposes of this document, “set” gill nets, or “set nets”, include anchored, fixed, and stationary gill nets.



Figure 1. 1 Illustrations of (a) set, (b) runaround, and (c) drift gill nets extracted from Steve et al. (2001).

Set nets (Figure 1.1a) are the second most common gill-net type used for commercial Spotted Seatrout harvest in North Carolina. They are kept stationary with the use of anchors or stakes attached to the bottom or attached to some other structure attached to the bottom, at both ends of the net (MFC Rule 15A NCAC 03I .0101). Set nets can be further classified as sink or float gill nets (Steve et al. 2001). A sink gill-net fishes from the bottom up into the water column a fixed distance by having a lead line (bottom line) heavy

enough to sink to the bottom. Depending on the height of the net and the depth of the water, the float line (top line) may or may not be submerged below the surface of the water. A float gill net may fish the entire water column by having the top line with buoys sufficient for floating on the surface of the water, or a portion of the water column depending on the depth of the net (number of meshes deep). Set nets are deployed by dropping one end of the net and running out the rest of the length of net usually in a line. Once deployed, soak times for fishing set nets vary depending on factors such as target species, water temperature, season, waterbody, and regulations (NCDMF 2018).

A runaround gill net is the most common gill-net method used for commercial Spotted Seatrout harvest in North Carolina. It is an actively fished gear used to encircle schools of fish (Figure 1.1b). They are deployed with a weight and a buoy at one end that enables the rest of the net to be fed out, creating a closed circle around the school of fish due to the vessel's path. Runaround gill nets tend to be deep nets capable of fishing the entire water column. Mesh sizes and net lengths vary depending on the target species (Steve et al. 2001). Another form of runaround gill net is the strike net or drop net. Rather than deploying the net in a circle, the net is set parallel to shore, often with one end anchored to the bank. Once the net is set, the boat is driven between the net and the shore to drive fish into the net (NCDMF 2018). Soak times for all types of runaround gill nets are almost always an hour or less.

Drift gill nets are unanchored, non-stationary gill nets that are actively attended (i.e., remain attached to the vessel or the fishing operation remains within 100 yards of the gear; Figure 1.1c) and tend to have shorter soak times than set gill nets. They are constructed with lighter lead lines to allow for the net to drift with the current. The small-mesh drift gill nets currently employed in North Carolina estuaries are primarily used to target Spanish Mackerel and Bluefish in Pamlico Sound. This gear can also be used to target Spot (as a sink net) and Striped Mullet (typically fishing the entire water column) in areas primarily from Core Sound and south (Steve et al. 2001). Drift gill nets typically account for less than 0.5% of annual Spotted Seatrout landings. However, from 2019 through 2022 drift gill nets accounted for 2.5% of Spotted Seatrout landings.

Table 1.1 Small-mesh gill net gear categories with descriptions and capture method descriptions.

Small-Mesh Gill Net Gear Categories	Sub-Categories	Gear Description	Capture Method
Anchored, Fixed, Stationary, Set	Sink	Attached to bottom or some other structure by anchors or stakes at both ends. Sink nets are fished from the bottom up into the water column	Passively Fished - For both sink and float set nets the gear is left in place for a period of time. Fish, if appropriately sized, swim into the net and are gilled.
	Float	Attached to bottom or some other structure by anchors or stakes at both ends. Float nets are fished from the top down into the water column. Depending on target species, nets fish part of the water column or the entire water column.	
Runaround	Circle	Attached to the bottom at one end. Once the end is set, the rest of the net is then fed out of a boat creating a circle and meeting back at the original set point. Generally, these nets fish the entire water column.	Actively Fished - Used to encircle a school of fish. Primary target species for this gear is Striped Mullet.
	Strike, Drop	Attached to the bottom at one end. Deployed along shore with the terminal end finishing at another point along the shore. The boat is driven into the blocked section to "drive" the fish into the net and are then retrieved.	Actively Fished - Used to corral or intercept a school of fish and then immediately retrieved. Primary target species for this gear is Striped Mullet, and Spotted Seatrout to a lesser extent.
Drift		Attached to boat or free-floating with close attendance. Lighter lead lines and no anchors allow the net to drift. Depending on target species and water depth, nets fish part of the water column or the entire water column. Primarily used in Pamlico Sound to target Spanish Mackerel and Bluefish.	Actively Fished - Drift with the water current with continuous attendance.

.

METHODS

Information specific to the North Carolina gill net fishery was gathered from the N.C. Trip Ticket Program and two DMF sampling programs briefly described below:

N.C. Trip Ticket Program

The N.C. Trip Ticket Program began in 1994. This program requires licensed commercial fishermen to sell their catch to licensed fish dealers, who are then required to complete a trip ticket for every transaction. Data collected on trip tickets include gear type, area fished, species harvested, and total weights of each species. Information recorded on trip tickets for gear type and characteristics is self-reported by the dealer. This information may be verified by DMF fish house staff after the fact, but the potential exists that some trips may be mischaracterized by dealers. In 2004, trip tickets included mesh size categories for gill nets: small-mesh < 5 ISM and large-mesh ≥ 5 ISM. However, the use of this new field was not prevalent until about 2008 because dealers were still using old trip tickets they had on hand.

Commercial Fish House Sampling

Commercial fishing activity is monitored through fishery-dependent (fish house) sampling. Sampling occurs dockside as fish are landed. Commercial fishermen and/or dealers are interviewed by DMF staff, and the catch is sampled. Samplers collect data on location fished, effort (soak time, net length, etc.), gear characteristics (net type, net depth, mesh size, etc.), and the size distribution of landed species.

Commercial Observer Program

On board observations of commercial estuarine gill nets, primarily set gill nets, occur through Program 466. Observers collect data on effort (soak time, net length, etc.), location fished, gear characteristics, size, and the fate (harvest, discard, etc.) of captured species. The Observer Program was born out of the need to estimate incidental takes of protected species such as sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon in estuarine set gill nets per the Endangered Species Act Section 10 Incidental Take Permits (NMFS 2013, 2014). As a result, observations of runaround or drift gill nets are rare.

The following analysis and information presented are used to characterize the Spotted Seatrout small-mesh gill-net fishery in North Carolina relative to time, area, configuration, and species composition of the harvested and discarded catch. Data from biological years 2012 through 2022 for these three programs were used to characterize the current North Carolina Spotted Seatrout small-mesh gill-net fisheries.

Using trip ticket data, trips where Spotted Seatrout were the species of highest abundance in landings or the most abundant finfish species of those species typically targeted with small-mesh gill nets were considered targeted Spotted Seatrout trips. Basing analysis on trips where Spotted Seatrout are the presumed target species allows for results that describe the gear parameters associated with the directed Spotted Seatrout fishery (see NCDMF 2008 for further description of methodology). Once targeted Spotted Seatrout trips were identified, the method of fishing (set gill net or runaround gill net), mesh size, and net length were characterized based on available fish house sampling data from 2012 through 2022. Analysis of fish house sampling data was limited to samples where only one gear was used on the trip.

Regional analysis of the Spotted Seatrout small-mesh gill-net fishery was investigated by waterbody of landing. Waterbodies were grouped into seven regions using distinct area boundaries or clear differences in fishing practices (Figure 1.2).



Figure 1.2. Map of defined regions used for regional characterization of the Spotted Seatrout small-mesh gill-net fishery.

RESULTS

For information regarding characterization of small-mesh gill nets across all fisheries in North Carolina please refer to the Small Mesh Gill Net Rule Modifications Information Paper presented to the MFC at its August 2021 business meeting.

Spotted Seatrout Fishery General Characterization

The commercial Spotted Seatrout fishery is currently managed with a 14” minimum size limit and 75-fish daily trip limit (except for the stop net fishery and spotted seatrout taken by hook-and-line). Since 2012, runaround gill nets have been the primary gear used to harvest Spotted Seatrout in the commercial fishery, followed by small-mesh set gill net (Figures 1.3 and 1.4). From April through October, most Spotted Seatrout harvest comes from small-mesh set gill nets. However, from November through March, commercial landings switch to runaround gill nets as Spotted Seatrout aggregate in the fall and winter and are more easily targeted by commercial fishermen (Figure 1.5).



Figure 1.3. Spotted Seatrout commercial landings by gear reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.



Figure 1.4. Percent of Spotted Seatrout commercial landings by year and gear reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.



Figure 1 5. Percent of Spotted Seatrout commercial landings by month and gear reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

Spotted Seatrout are caught in small-mesh gill nets with stretched mesh sizes ranging from 2.5 ISM to 4.88 ISM. Mesh size does not appreciably affect the overall size range of Spotted Seatrout caught in small-mesh gill nets (set and runaround; Figure 1.6). As stretched mesh size increases, the minimum size of Spotted Seatrout harvested increases to some degree but there is a lot of overlap in the size of Spotted Seatrout caught with various mesh sizes. An R^2 value of 0.17 indicates a weak linear relationship between mesh size and the size of Spotted Seatrout harvested. The lack of a strong relationship between mesh size and the size of Spotted Seatrout captured makes it difficult to increase the minimum size limit or implement a slot limit without tight mesh size restrictions to protect or select for specific sizes of Spotted Seatrout. The lack of selectivity is likely due to Spotted Seatrout having a relatively soft body resulting in a wide size range of fish able to become lodged in a particular mesh size. Also, Spotted Seatrout frequently become entangled in gill nets around the mouth area either by their teeth or jaw, which results in larger Spotted Seatrout being captured than would typically become caught in the webbing of a gill net.



Figure 1.6. Relationship of stretched mesh size versus total length of Spotted Seatrout sampled from the commercial fish house sampling program (2012-2022). A trendline (black solid line) is provided for reference. The dashed gray line shows the current 14-inch TL minimum size limit.

An example of the impact of increasing the minimum size limit from 14 inches to 15 inches is shown in Figure 1.7. As mesh size increases, the percent of Spotted Seatrout under 15 inches (blue bars) that will be discarded decreases. From the Spotted Seatrout measured through division fish house sampling, approximately 22% of fish measured from 3 ISM gill nets are under 15 inches compared to 3% from 3.5 ISM gill nets. In this example, setting the minimum mesh size to harvest Spotted Seatrout at 3.5 ISM will result in a minimal increase in discards of sublegal fish and maximize the realized reduction if the minimum size limit is raised to 15 inches.



Figure 1.7. Length distribution of Spotted Seatrout measured from the division's commercial fish house sampling programs by mesh size. Blue bars indicate percent of Spotted Seatrout by size bin below the minimum size limit if it is raised to 15 inches. Orange bars indicate the percent of Spotted Seatrout by size bin above the minimum size limit if it is raised to 15 inches.

When looking at a narrow slot limit, the needed mesh size restrictions will be more severe. For example, Figure 1.8 shows the impact of a harvest slot limit of 16 inches to 20 inches (fish 20 inches and larger cannot be harvested). The difficulty in implementing mesh size restrictions for a slot limit comes when trying to balance and minimize discards of fish both below slot and above slot size (blue bars). From division fish house sampling, approximately 4% of Spotted Seatrout measured from 3 ISM gill nets are 20 inches or larger but 50% of Spotted Seatrout are below 16 inches. In comparison, approximately 31% of Spotted Seatrout measured from 4 ISM are 20 inches or larger but only 3% are below 16 inches. In this example, limiting the gill net mesh sizes used to harvest Spotted

Seatrout from 3.5 to 3.75 ISM will best minimize discards of below slot and above slot size Spotted Seatrout.



Figure 1.8. Length distribution of Spotted Seatrout measured from the division's commercial fish house sampling programs by mesh size. Blue bars indicate percent of Spotted Seatrout by size bin below the minimum size limit if it is raised to 16 inches and above the maximum size limit if it is set at 20 inches. Orange bars indicate the percent of Spotted Seatrout by size bin above the minimum size limit if it is raised to 16 inches and below the maximum size limit if it is set at 20 inches (i.e., 16-20 slot limit).

Most Spotted Seatrout harvest occurs in Pamlico Sound (28%) and the Neuse and Bay rivers (24%; Figure 1.9). These areas are followed by the Central Sounds (13%), Southern (13%), Albemarle Sound (11%), and Pamlico and Pungo rivers (9%). Runaround gill net is the primary gear used to harvest Spotted Seatrout in the Neuse and

Bay rivers and Central Sounds regions. Small-mesh set gill net is the dominant gear in the other regions. (Figure 1.10). The increase in commercial landings beginning in 2019 is largely driven by an expansion of the Spotted Seatrout fishery in the Pamlico Sound, Neuse and Bay rivers, and Pamlico and Pungo rivers regions.



Figure 1.9. Annual commercial landings of Spotted Seatrout commercial landings by region reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.



Figure 1.10. Percent of total Spotted Seatrout commercial landings by gear for each area reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

Due to the low contribution of ocean waters to the Spotted Seatrout small-mesh gill-net fishery (Figure 1.9) it is excluded from the analysis in the following gear-specific sections.

Set Gill Nets

Spotted Seatrout targeted small-mesh set gill-net trips were defined as trips where Spotted Seatrout were the species of highest abundance or the most abundant finfish species. Small-mesh set gill nets are the second most common gear used to capture Spotted Seatrout (Figures 1.3 - 1.4) in North Carolina and are the dominant gear in the Albemarle Sound, Pamlico River, Pamlico Sound, and Ocean regions (Figure 1.10). Spotted Seatrout are the third most important species targeted in the North Carolina small-mesh set gill-net fishery behind Bluefish and Spanish Mackerel (Figure 1.11). They make up the largest proportion of monthly small-mesh set gill-net trips in November, December, and January.



Figure 1.11. Percentage of total set gill-net trips for each of the 10 primary target species across months in N.C. waters, 2012-2022.

Spotted Seatrout are primarily landed incidentally in the set gill-net fishery during most of the year; however, they are targeted more in the fall and winter months as Spotted Seatrout aggregate in smaller waterbodies. From 2012 through 2018, the use of set gill nets to target Spotted Seatrout declined through 2018. Beginning in 2019, the number of trips increased and has remained high, although the number of participants has remained steady since 2015 (Figure 1.12). This increase in trips matches well with the increase in landings in the Spotted Seatrout fishery over the same period.



Figure 1.12 Targeted trips and participants in the set small-mesh gill-net Spotted Seatrout fishery by year reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012-2022.

Approximately 50% of targeted Spotted Seatrout small-mesh set gill-net trips land 30 or less Spotted Seatrout (Figure 1.13). However, roughly 24% of trips land more than 60 Spotted Seatrout and about 16% of trips land 71-75 Spotted Seatrout per trip. Most of these trips, roughly 70%, occur from October through January (Figure 1.14). Although approximately 20% of the trips occurring each month from November through March land 71-75 Spotted Seatrout per trip (Figure 1.13). Trips landing 71-75 Spotted Seatrout per trip account for approximately 35% of small-mesh set gill-net landings from targeted Spotted Seatrout trips (Figure 1.16).



Figure 1.13. Percent of targeted Spotted Seatrout trips grouped by number of fish landed per trip in the small-mesh set gill-net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.



Figure 1.14. Monthly distribution of total trips reaching the trip limit (71-75 fish estimated to be landed) for targeted Spotted Seatrout trips in the small mesh set gill net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022. For example, if there are 100 trips in a year that reached the trip limit and 10 of those trips occurred in March, then the percent of annual trip limit trips in March will be 10%.



Figure 1.15. Percent of monthly trips reaching the trip limit (71-75 fish estimated to be landed) for targeted Spotted Seatrout trips in the small mesh set gill net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022. For example, if there are 100 trips in March and 10 of those trips reached the trip limit, then the percent of trip limit trips in March will be 10%.



Figure 1.16. Percent of total pounds landed grouped by number of fish landed per targeted Spotted Seatrout trip in the small mesh set gill net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

The modal mesh size used to catch Spotted Seatrout in the set gill net fishery was 3.0 ISM (Table 1.2). Average total net length was 691 yards, with a maximum of 3,000 yards. Approximately 42% of all set gill net trips fished 500 yards or less of gill net (Figure 1.17). For reference, small-mesh gill nets are currently restricted to a maximum of 800 yards. Reducing the yardage fished could be a means to reduce harvest in this fishery. Yardage

restrictions would be best used in conjunction with trip limits to ensure minimal discards. For more information on possible management applications of set gill net yardage restrictions, see Appendix 2.

Table 1.2. Small-mesh (<5 inches stretched mesh) set gill net trips in North Carolina using data from the N.C. Trip Ticket Program with associated gear characteristics from commercial fish house sampling, 2012-2022.

Species	Trips	Avg Trips/Yr.	Modal Mesh	Avg Yds	Max Yds
Spotted Seatrout	14,224	1,293	3.0	696	3,000



Figure 1.17. Percent of total trips sampled grouped by yards fished per trip in the Spotted Seatrout small-mesh set gill net fishery using data from the commercial fish house sampling program, 2012–2022.

When targeting Spotted Seatrout with small-mesh set gill nets, it is common to catch other species incidentally. The most common species landed incidentally when targeting Spotted Seatrout with set gill nets are Striped Mullet, Bluefish, Red Drum, White Perch, Black Drum, and Spot (Figure 1.18). Conversely, Spotted Seatrout are most commonly caught incidentally when set gill net fishermen are targeting Bluefish, Striped Mullet, and Spot (NC trip ticket data). This overlap between the Spotted Seatrout and Bluefish, Striped Mullet, and Spot set gill net fisheries could have management implications for these fisheries if gear restrictions are put in place to restrict Spotted Seatrout harvest.



Figure 1.18. Proportion of incidental catch landed by species in the set small-mesh set gill-net Spotted Seatrout fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

Spotted Seatrout discards in the set gill-net fishery are difficult to characterize due to limited data but appear to be minimal based on observations from the commercial observer program. Of the over 3,400 Spotted Seatrout observed in set small-mesh gill nets (2012-2022), 392 fish were discarded. A discard rate of 11.3%. The low rate of Spotted Seatrout discards in the set small-mesh fishery is likely due to there being an adequate trip limit for commercial harvest. Increased restrictions on Spotted Seatrout harvest could increase discards in this fishery. For more information on Spotted Seatrout bycatch in the set gill-net fishery, please refer to the Spotted Seatrout Bycatch section of the FMP.

Discards of other species from Spotted Seatrout targeted small-mesh set gill net trips could not be characterized due to limited data. Of the 1,044 observed small mesh set gill net trips observed from the observer program (2012-2022), only 114 Spotted Seatrout targeted trips have been observed. In those trips, 18 managed species were discarded, including Atlantic Menhaden, Red Drum, Black Drum, Blue Crab, and Southern Flounder.

Runaround Gill Nets

Spotted Seatrout targeted runaround gill-net trips were defined as trips where Spotted Seatrout were the species of highest abundance in landings or were the most abundant finfish species. Runaround gill nets are the predominant gear used to catch Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina (Figures 1.3 and 1.4) and the dominant gear in the Neuse and Bay rivers, Central Sounds, and Southern regions (Figure 1.10). The runaround gill-net fishery is more targeted than the set gill-net fishery and is the main gear used to catch Spotted Seatrout when they form aggregations in smaller waterbodies from November

through March (Figure 1.5). During this time, catches from runaround gill nets can be higher than other times of the year as fishermen target Spotted Seatrout after the fall Striped Mullet season. Spotted Seatrout is the second most targeted species in the North Carolina runaround gill-net fishery (Figure 1.19). Spotted Seatrout targeted trips make up the largest proportion of runaround gill-net trips from December through March.



Figure 1.19. Percent of total runaround gill-net trips for each of the 10 primary target species across months in N.C. waters during 2012-2022.

From 2012 through 2018, effort and participation in this fishery remained relatively consistent, then increased sharply in 2019 and has remained high through 2022 (Figure 1.20). The increase in targeted Spotted Seatrout trips could be due to fishermen shifting to the fishery from other more restricted fisheries.



Figure 1.20. Targeted trips and participants in the runaround gill-net Spotted Seatrout fishery by year reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

Runaround gill nets tend to land more Spotted Seatrout per trip than set gill nets, with roughly 33% of trips landing 30 or less Spotted Seatrout. Approximately 38% of targeted Spotted Seatrout runaround gill-net trips land more than 60 Spotted Seatrout with 27% of targeted trips landing 71-75 Spotted Seatrout (Figure 1.21). This is likely due to runaround gill nets being able to better target Spotted Seatrout aggregation areas in the fall and winter months. Most of these trips, roughly 73%, occur from October through January (Figure 1.22). Approximately 30% of the trips occurring each month from November through March land 71-75 Spotted Seatrout per trip (Figure 1.23). Trips landing 71-75 Spotted Seatrout per trip account for approximately 47% of runaround gill-net landings from targeted Spotted Seatrout trips (Figure 1.24).



Figure 1.21. Percent of targeted Spotted Seatrout trips grouped by number of fish landed per trip in the runaround gill-net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.



Figure 1.22. Monthly distribution of total trips reaching the trip limit (71-75 fish estimated to be landed) for targeted Spotted Seatrout trips in the runaround gill-net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022. For example, if there are 100 trips in a year that reached the trip limit and 10 of those trips occurred in March, then the percentage of annual trip limit trips in March will be 10%.



Figure 1.23. Percent of monthly trips reaching the trip limit (71-75 fish estimated to be landed) for targeted Spotted Seatrout trips in the runaround gill-net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022. For example, if there are 100 total trips in March and 10 of those trips reached the trip limit, then the percentage of trip limit trips in March will be 10%.



Figure 1.24. Percent of total pounds landed grouped by number of fish landed per targeted Spotted Seatrout trip in the runaround gill-net fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

Runaround gill nets have a higher modal mesh size (3.75 ISM) than set small-mesh gill nets (3.0 ISM; Table 1.3). The average net length is 430 yards with a maximum of 3,000 yards, with 72% of trips fishing 500 yards (Figure 1.25). Runaround gill nets tend to be shorter than set gill nets because runaround gill nets are actively fished to encircle schools of fish. This allows for less yardage needed to catch the fish than the passively fished set gill nets. Since the runaround gill nets are already shorter than set gill nets, and can be fished several times consecutively, maximum yardage restrictions may not be effective in restricting harvest in this fishery. For more information on possible management applications of runaround gill net yardage restrictions, see Appendix 2.

Table 1.3. Small-mesh (<5 inches stretched mesh) runaround gill-net trips in North Carolina using data from the N.C. Trip Ticket Program with associated gear characteristics from fish house sampling, 2012-2022.

Species	Trips	Avg Trips/Yr.	Modal Mesh	Avg Yds	Max Yds
Spotted Seatrout	14,749	1,340	3.75	430	3,000



Figure 1.25. Percent of total trips sampled grouped by yards fished per trip in the Spotted Seatrout runaround gill net fishery using data from the commercial fish house sampling program, 2012–2022.

When targeting Spotted Seatrout with runaround gill nets, it is common to catch other species incidentally. The most common species landed incidentally when targeting Spotted Seatrout with runaround gill nets are Striped Mullet, Red Drum, Black Drum, Bluefish, White Perch, and Spot (Figure 1.26). Conversely, Spotted Seatrout are most commonly caught incidentally when runaround gill-net fishermen are targeting Striped Mullet, Spot, and Bluefish (NC trip ticket data). This overlap between the Spotted Seatrout and Striped Mullet, Spot, and Bluefish runaround gill-net fisheries could have management implications for these fisheries if gear restrictions are put in place to restrict Spotted Seatrout harvest.

No data is available to characterize discards in this fishery because the observer program does not prioritize observing runaround gill-net trips.



Figure 1.26. Proportion of incidental catch landed by species in the runaround gill-net Spotted Seatrout fishery reported through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, 2012–2022.

Appendix 2: ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE HARVEST IN THE NORTH CAROLINA SPOTTED SEATROUT FISHERY

ISSUE

Implement management measures to end overfishing and achieve sustainable harvest in the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF).

BACKGROUND

North Carolina and Virginia tagging studies indicate Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina coastal waters are part of a combined North Carolina and Virginia stock (Ellis 2014). The 2022 North Carolina Spotted Seatrout benchmark stock assessment indicated the Spotted Seatrout stock in North Carolina and Virginia waters is not overfished; however, overfishing is occurring (NCDMF 2022). Reference point thresholds for the Spotted Seatrout stock status are based on a 20% spawning potential ratio which is the comparison of spawning stock biomass (SSB) under a specific fishing regime – i.e., 20% – to a hypothetical unfished SSB. If SSB is below this ratio, the stock is overfished. If fishing mortality (F) is above the level that would lead to this ratio, overfishing is occurring. Due to large uncertainty in the stock assessment terminal year (2019) and based on the recommendation of the external, independent peer review panel, a weighted average of F and SSB from 2017-2019 was used to represent the terminal year and to estimate the threshold and target reference points (NCDMF 2022). The SSB target ($SSB_{30\%}$) and SSB threshold ($SSB_{20\%}$) were estimated at 3,778,723 pounds and 2,519,884 pounds respectively and both were based on 2017-2019 averages. The estimated $SSB_{2019Avg}$ was 4,980,243 pounds which indicates the Spotted Seatrout stock is not overfished (Figure 1). The F target ($F_{30\%}$) and F threshold ($F_{20\%}$) were estimated at 0.38 and 0.60 respectively and were also based on 2017-2019 averages. $F_{2019Avg}$ was estimated at 0.75 which is above the threshold indicating overfishing is occurring (Figure 2.1).

The General Statutes of North Carolina require a Fishery Management Plan to specify a timeframe not to exceed two years from the date of adoption of the plan to end overfishing (G.S. 113-182.1). A harvest reduction of 19.9% is required to reach the $F_{20\%}$ threshold while a harvest reduction of 53.9% will reach the $F_{30\%}$ target. A harvest reduction of at least 19.9% meets the statutory requirement to end overfishing. In developing management measures in Amendment 1 to end overfishing, only harvest reductions from the North Carolina portion of Spotted Seatrout harvest were considered. The original Spotted Seatrout FMP and Supplement A management will remain in place until adoption of Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan.

Discussion of management measures focuses on quantifiable measures that meet the reductions necessary to comply with statutory requirements. Harvest of Spotted Seatrout primarily occurs in the recreational fishery, however; harvest in both the recreational and commercial fisheries increased sharply in 2019 and has remained high through 2022

(Figure 2.1). As such, discussion will focus on both sectors. Management measures considered include seasonal closures, size limits, trip/creel limits, and combinations of these management measures. For an in-depth characterization of the commercial and recreational fisheries as well as management measures intended to support sustainable harvest, please see Appendix 1: Small Mesh Gill Net Characterization in the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout Fishery and Appendix 3: Supplemental Management Options in the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout Fishery. Single solution management measures that do not meet the necessary reductions to comply with statutory requirements will still be discussed here. Such measures may be included in combination management options but will not be presented as single solution management options.



Figure 2.1. Annual harvest of Spotted Seatrout in pounds by biological year (March–February) and sector, 1991–2022. Bars are total annual harvest with commercial harvest as the yellow portion and recreational harvest as the purple portion of the total.

AUTHORITY

G.S. 113-134 RULES
G.S. 113-182 REGULATION OF FISHING AND FISHERIES
G.S. 113-182.1 FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
G.S. 113-221.1. PROCLAMATIONS; EMERGENCY REVIEW
G.S. 143B-289.52 MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION-POWERS AND DUTIES
15A NCAC 03H .0103 PROCLAMATIONS, GENERAL
15A NCAC 03M .0512 COMPLIANCE WITH FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
15A NCAC 03M .0522 SPOTTED SEATROUT

DISCUSSION

Management carried forward

There are management measures from the original FMP to carry forward into Amendment 1 unless otherwise changed in Amendment 1. Management measures from the original Spotted Seatrout FMP that will be carried forward into Amendment 1 are:

- It is unlawful to set gill nets in Joint Fishing Waters from 12:01 A.M. on Saturday to 12:01 A.M. on Monday except in Albemarle and Currituck sounds.
- It is unlawful for a commercial fishing operation to possess more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day taken by hook-and-line.
- It is unlawful to take more than the recreational bag limit of Spotted Seatrout per person per day for recreational purposes.
- 75-fish commercial trip limit (excluding for the stop net fishery and spotted seatrout taken by hook-and-line)

Size Limits

Throughout this section, unless otherwise specified, all lengths refer to total length (TL), which is a measurement from the tip of the snout to the tip of the compressed tail.

Size limits are a common fisheries management tool designed to protect smaller, juvenile fish from harvest until at least a portion of these fish are large enough to spawn and thus contribute to sustaining the population. Size limits should be set based on management objectives and species life history as these factors influence the effectiveness of the management. For example, setting a size limit below the length at which 50% of females are mature (L_{50}) does not allow most females to be large enough to spawn prior to being harvested. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) manages Spotted Seatrout in all Atlantic states that have a declared interest in the species under the Omnibus Amendment to the Interstate Fishery Management Plans for Spanish Mackerel, Spot, and Spotted Seatrout (ASMFC 2012). The Omnibus Amendment sets a minimum size limit of 12 inches. In North Carolina, female Spotted Seatrout L_{50} is estimated at 9.88 inches (NCDMF 2022) with nearly all female Spotted Seatrout mature by the time they are recruited to the fishery at 14 inches (Roumillat and Brouwer, 2004; Jensen, 2009).

Spotted Seatrout fecundity has been shown to increase with fish size as larger females produce more eggs and spawn more frequently (Brown-Peterson and Warren, 2001; Nieland et al., 2002; Roumillat and Brouwer, 2004; Murphy et al., 2010). In many species, due to their increased reproductive capacity, large, female fish are expected to have a disproportionately large contribution to populations (Froese 2004; Berkeley et al. 2004; Barneche et al. 2018). More recently however, the general impact of size-specific contributions of individual fish to populations has come into question with some evidence that the collective reproductive output of many, smaller, mature fish may contribute more to populations compared to the reproductive output of fewer, larger fish (Barneche et al. 2018; Lavin et al. 2021) indicating that simply protecting “BOFFFs” (big old fat fecund female fish) may not have the desired conservation effect.

Generally, recreational anglers and commercial fishers in North Carolina target any Spotted Seatrout of legal size. Fish harvested commercially tend to be slightly larger than those harvested recreationally (Table 2.1). There is a dedicated catch and release segment of the recreational fishery (see Recreational Fishery section for more detail). Spotted Seatrout are harvested for consumption regardless of sector.

Slot limits are a specific type of size limit where harvest is restricted to fish above a minimum size but below a maximum size. Sometimes slot limit management will include a trophy limit which allows limited harvest of fish above the maximum size. A slot limit for Spotted Seatrout could protect fish below the minimum size that are not large enough to spawn and fish above the maximum size that may spawn more often and produce more eggs per batch (Brown-Peterson and Warren, 2001; Nieland et al., 2002; Roumillat and Brouwer, 2004; Murphy et al., 2010). Slot limits can help balance various competing interests that may exist in a fishery and provide a path to achieve management goals (Ahrens et al. 2020). For example, the Spotted Seatrout fishery includes part-time and full-time commercial fishers and part-time and full-time charter guides interested in the economic benefits of the fishery and recreational anglers who may want a robust trophy fishery or to maximize harvest potential, among a variety of other interests (Ahrens et al., 2020).

Table 2.1 Mean, minimum, and maximum lengths (fork length, inches) of Spotted Seatrout measured from the commercial and recreational fisheries, calendar years 2012–2022.

Year	Commercial				Recreational			
	Mean Length	Min Length	Max Length	Total Number Measured	Mean Length	Min Length	Max Length	Total Number Measured
2012	16.5	7.4	31.1	4,822	16.5	13.0	24.1	939
2013	16.7	8.7	28.5	6,144	16.8	10.1	23.5	865
2014	17.3	5.5	28.3	3,321	17.6	13.1	26.0	381
2015	18.3	8.9	30.9	2,676	16.9	12.8	25.0	154
2016	17.3	9.4	31.7	3,025	16.8	13.0	25.2	647
2017	17.6	7.6	32.9	3,066	17.0	11.6	25.8	864
2018	17.2	10.5	28.0	1,180	15.7	9.3	23.3	274
2019	17.3	10.1	28.9	2,622	16.7	10.7	24.6	1,574
2020	17.5	10.9	33.4	2,851	17.0	12.1	26.8	1,119
2021	17.5	10.9	29.9	3,432	17.0	11.1	26.5	1,019
2022	17.9	13.2	28.3	3,314	17.4	12.6	28.0	632

As a standalone management measure, changes to the current Spotted Seatrout minimum size limit are unlikely to reach the necessary harvest reductions to meet statutory requirements. Reductions from increasing the minimum size limit are most likely to be achieved in the short term while long term harvest reductions are lower with some portion of harvest recouped. A delay in harvest could allow more fish to spawn prior to harvest, providing non-quantifiable benefits to the stock. However, Spotted Seatrout growth rates would likely minimize the non-quantifiable benefits from harvest delay as sub-legal fish are recruited to the fishery within a spawning season. Increasing the minimum size limit to 15 inches appears to result in an 8.6% harvest reduction. On average, Spotted Seatrout grow 4.5 inches between year one and year two (Table 2.2)

meaning a 14-inch fish at the beginning of the biological year (March) is likely to be well over a 15-inch minimum size during the spawning season (May-August). Most harvest occurs in October, November, and December which means fish well below a 15" minimum size will likely enter the fishery prior to the end of the fishing year but may have a chance to spawn prior to being subject to harvest in the fall. Fish of sub-legal size in the fall would probably not recruit to the fishery until the following spring allowing for some reduction in harvest. As females grow faster than males, sub-legal female fish will recruit to the fishery more rapidly diminishing any potential quantifiable or non-quantifiable benefits from a size limit increase. With the current minimum size at L_{100} and the growth rates of Spotted Seatrout, an increase in the minimum size may be less effective at reducing harvest than anticipated but may have unquantifiable benefits. Increasing the minimum size limit should be considered in conjunction with other measures as means to ensure sustainable harvest.

Table 2.2. Average length at age in inches for female and pooled (male and female) Spotted Seatrout calculated using von Bertalanffy growth parameters from 2022 stock assessment (NCDMF 2022).

Age	Mean Length (female)	Mean Length (pooled)
0	7.6	6.6
1	14.3	12.1
2	19.4	16.6
3	23.1	20.1
4	25.9	23.0
5	28.0	25.3
6	29.6	27.2
7	30.8	28.7
8	31.6	29.9
9	32.8	30.8

Implementing a slot limit alone will not reduce fishing mortality below the threshold unless the size range available for harvest is very limited (Table 2.3), but reductions from a slot limit are more likely to be realized over the long-term than reductions from increasing the minimum size. Rapid growth early in life means Spotted Seatrout recruit to the fishery quickly but will also quickly grow out of a narrow slot limit. The average length of a one-year-old female fish is 14.3 inches and average length increases to 19.4 inches and 23.1 inches by ages two and three respectively (Table 2.2). On average, a female Spotted Seatrout will be recruited to the fishery with a narrow slot range for about one or two years. The probability of a relatively short harvest window of each year class, particularly for female fish, makes a slot limit a potentially useful management measure especially when combined with other measures. Allowing the harvest of a "trophy", or over slot fish, should be considered with caution. Relatively few Spotted Seatrout over 24" are harvested meaning a trophy allowance of less than 24" will result in a minimal overall harvest reduction. Most of the reduction in harvest gained from a 14"–20" slot limit is from fish between 20" - 22" with almost all the harvest reduction coming from fish less than 26" (Table 2.3). A trophy limit with a higher minimum trophy size (e.g., allowing harvest of one fish over 24" or over 33.5" which is the length of the current state record Spotted Seatrout) would maintain most of the harvest reductions gained from a traditional slot limit while still

allowing for the harvest of “a fish of a lifetime” or the setting of a new Spotted Seatrout state record.

Anecdotally, the practice of “high grading” is common in the Spotted Seatrout fishery. High grading is where someone catches a legal limit of fish, keeps that limit in their possession, and continues fishing for larger or higher quality fish. Upon catching such a fish, the smaller or lower quality fish are discarded, and the larger or higher quality fish are kept. These discarded fish have higher than usual mortality rates (Nelson et al. 2021). “Possession” is defined in NCMFC rule as “actual or constructive holding whether under claim of ownership or not” [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03I .0101 (2)(g)] making the practice of high grading illegal as it involves possessing more than a legal limit of Spotted Seatrout. For example, an angler who catches a four fish limit of Spotted Seatrout and keeps those fish in a live well, but continues fishing until catching a larger Spotted Seatrout, then discards one of the fish from the live well has possessed five fish or one fish more than the legal possession limit for Spotted Seatrout, even if only for a short period of time. Despite the illegality of high grading, enforcement is exceedingly difficult. A traditional slot limit would likely reduce instances of high grading, but a trophy limit could encourage more anglers to participate in this behavior and subsequently decrease potential reductions by increasing dead discards in the fishery though it is impossible to quantify by how much.

Table 2.3. Expected reductions in harvest from various size limits in the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery. The only realistic size limit change that will end overfishing as a standalone measure is a narrow slot limit with no trophy allowance or a trophy allowance of 24” or longer. Rec Reduction (lb) is based on average recreational landings from 2019 to 2022. *Total % Reduction includes a 24,424lb (4.3%) reduction in commercial harvest for 15” minimum size and a 36,921lb (6.5%) reduction in commercial harvest for 16” minimum size based on average commercial landings from 2019 to 2022. Commercial harvest reduction is 0% in all other cases.

Size limit examples (inches Total Length)			
Size Limit	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Total % Reduction
15” minimum	183,693	5.5	5.3*
16” minimum	554,420	16.6	15.1*
14”–20”	617,878	18.5	15.8
14”–22”	240,471	7.2	6.2
14”–24”	106,876	3.2	2.7
14”-20” with one fish over 24”	507,662	15.2	13.0
14”–20” with one fish over 26”	601,178	18.0	15.4
14”–20” with one fish over 30”	617,878	18.5	15.8
15”–20” with one fish over 24”	731,433	21.9	18.7
16”–20” with one fish over 24”	1,102,159	33.0	28.2

A slot limit could be implemented either in the recreational sector or across both the recreational and commercial sectors. A recreational slot limit might lead to increased dead discards. Though the expected discard mortality rate for Spotted Seatrout caught with hook and line is low and the discard mortality rate for larger Spotted Seatrout may be lower than the average rate (Gearhart 2002), the already high number of discarded Spotted Seatrout underscores the importance of considering release mortality when exploring management options. Gear requirements (e.g., circle hooks when fishing live or natural bait) and continued ethical angling education could help minimize dead discards in the recreational fishery. Similarly, a commercial slot limit would likely lead to increased dead discards. North Carolina specific estimates for total mortality (at-net mortality plus delayed mortality) of discarded Spotted Seatrout only exist for the anchored small-mesh gill-net fishery and vary depending on mesh size with an average of 79% (Price and Gearhart 2002). Though anchored small-mesh gill nets have historically been the predominate gear in this fishery, recently runaround gill nets have become increasingly common. Data characterizing dead discards in the commercial fishery are limited though Observer Program data shows limited discards in the anchored gill-net fishery and about 84% of total trips land less than the 75 fish limit (Appendix 1). These data indicate dead discards are likely low under current management. However, it is unclear if dead discards will increase if management changes. Pairing a commercial slot limit with corresponding mesh size changes may not be effective in reducing discards due to the lack of size selectivity across various mesh sizes for Spotted Seatrout (see Appendix 1). Prohibiting commercial gear based on reducing dead discards in the Spotted Seatrout fishery would affect a variety of other fisheries. Since implementing a commercial slot limit would either broadly affect other fisheries or likely increase dead discards, thus reducing the effectiveness of management, a commercial slot limit is not the most effective management option to reduce commercial harvest. Implementing a slot limit for the recreational sector only may simply shift the harvest of large fish to the commercial fishery resulting in the projected harvest reduction not being realized, though quantifying this shift is not possible.

A narrow slot limit with a trophy allowance of one fish over 24” implemented just for the recreational sector could reduce total harvest below the level of harvest that would lead to $F_{Threshold}$ (total harvest reduction of 28.2%, Table 2.3). It is possible that reduction may be less than expected due to increased dead discards in the recreational sector and a portion of that reduction would be recouped by the commercial sector resulting in a realized reduction less than 28.2%. As such, more conservative management measures to buffer overall harvest reductions should be considered if a slot limit is implemented. For example, a recreational slot limit of 16”–20” with an allowance for one fish over 24” paired with a commercial minimum size of 16” would reduce total harvest by 29.1% which would reduce F below the threshold and minimize some of the recoupment potential in the commercial sector. If combined with changes to the allowable stretched mesh size for commercial harvest of Spotted Seatrout, it should be possible to reduce harvest and minimize dead discards in the commercial sector. However, such a measure would not address the potential for increased dead discards from the release of out of slot fish, the high recoupment in the commercial sector if commercial harvest significantly shifted toward larger fish, and the recent trend of increased effort in both sectors.

Option 1: Size Limit Options

a. *Status Quo – no change to the 14" minimum commercial size limit. Consider recreational size limit changes as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.*
b. *Recreational 16"–20" slot limit with allowance for one fish over 24" and commercial 16" minimum size limit*

Seasonal Closures

The Spotted Seatrout fishery in North Carolina predominantly occurs in fall across both the recreational and commercial sectors (Figure 2.2). For a more detailed description of seasonal harvest, see the Commercial and Recreational Fishery sections of Amendment 1. While there might be small regional variations in these seasonal patterns, broadly the patterns are consistent statewide.



Figure 2.2 Average monthly harvest of Spotted Seatrout in pounds by sector from Biological Year 2012–2022. The top panel is recreational harvest, and the bottom panel is commercial harvest. Note: the vertical axis scale is different between panels to illustrate seasonal variation. The Biological Year is March – February.

Seasonal closures can be an effective way of limiting harvest, especially when closures are at the end of the fishing year to prevent recoupment of harvest. Closures prior to the end of the fishing year should include a buffer above the desired reduction to account for recoupment. It is possible to end overfishing in the Spotted Seatrout fishery through seasonal closures. In theory, a closure that spans the spawning season could reduce overall harvest enough to reach the threshold F (Table 2.4) and provide the added benefit of allowing more Spotted Seatrout to spawn each season. Though 2022 spawning stock biomass does not indicate the need for additional spawning protections, reducing harvest during the spawning season would have non-quantifiable benefits to the Spotted Seatrout stock. A spawning season closure, however, is not at the end of the fishing year therefore it is likely some amount of recoupment would occur after the season closure. A spawning season closure would also have to be longer than a winter closure to reduce harvest to a level that will meet management objectives (Table 2.4). Because recoupment is likely with a spawning season closure or closures that extend past the end of the biological year the closure should be extended, or other management options considered in tandem with the closure to ensure harvest reductions end overfishing. For example, during the AC Workshop there was discussion about a January–March commercial season closure (Table 2.4). While the bulk of reductions from such a closure come from January and February, the reductions gained in March are likely to be recouped throughout the year though some fish are likely to spawn prior to being harvested providing additional benefits to the stock. Extending the January–March closure or including additional management strategies should be considered to increase the likelihood of reaching management objectives. Input received during the public scoping period and from discussions with the Spotted Seatrout FMP Advisory Committee indicate that stakeholders would prefer a shorter season closure if possible. A winter closure at the end of the biological year could reach similar harvest reductions as a spawning season closure over a shorter timeframe with no recoupment of harvest.

A seasonal closure could be over the same timeframe for the commercial and recreational sectors or could vary depending on sector. A consistent season for both sectors is easier for recreational anglers and commercial fishers to understand, would ease the enforcement burden, and can decrease user group conflict. Ending overfishing in both sectors is more complicated with the same season across sectors as is ensuring a similar reduction for each sector. For example, if the Spotted Seatrout fishery is closed January 1 and does not reopen until the end of February, there would be a 21.6% reduction in commercial harvest (ends overfishing in the commercial sector), but only a 17.4% reduction in recreational harvest (does not end overfishing in the recreational sector). Different seasons for each sector could help ensure parity between sectors and that harvest is reduced enough to reach the threshold or target F but could cause confusion for stakeholders though there is precedent for different recreational and commercial seasons in multiple N.C. fisheries (e.g., Southern Flounder and Striped Bass).

Table 2.4. Expected reductions in harvest for each sector from seasonal closures in the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery. Reduction in pounds are based on average harvest from 2019 to 2022. Unless otherwise noted, monthly closures are for the entire month and day of week closures begin at 11:59 p.m. the day prior to the beginning and end at 12:01 a.m. the day after the end (e.g., for a Sat-Sun closure, the fishery will close at 11:59 p.m. Friday and reopen at 12:01 a.m. Monday). A reduction of at least 19.9% (threshold) is needed to end overfishing. *Day of week closures are only calculated for commercial sector. **Reduction for period does not meet the harvest reduction necessary to meet the F threshold.

Season Closure Examples						
Month Closures	Day of Week Closures*	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Commercial Reduction (lb)	Commercial Reduction (%)	Total Reduction (%)
-	Jan–Sep, Sat–Sun; Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon	0.00**	0.0**	172,107	30.3	4.4**
Jan–Feb	-	581,139	17.4**	122,690	21.6	18.0**
Apr–Jul	Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon	584,479	17.5**	213,572	37.6	20.4
Jan–Mar	-	741,538	22.3	153,363	27.0	23.0
Dec 16–Feb	-	738,113	22.1	168,131	29.6	23.2
Jan–Feb	Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon	581,139	17.4**	228,340	40.2	28.2
Nov–Feb	-	1,843,613	55.2	323,198	56.9	55.4
May 16–Sep	-	714,734	21.4	80,657	14.2**	20.4

Though the general seasonal pattern of Spotted Seatrout harvest is consistent across the state, season closures could have unexpected outcomes due to small, regional differences in these broad patterns. For example, anecdotal reports from the for-hire industry indicate the importance of the small June and July harvest increase (Figure 2.2) to charter captains in the northern region of the state. A harvest closure during the spawning season could have a larger than expected impact on the northern for-hire fleet, though data to determine the extent of any impact is unavailable. A season closure outside the spawning season – e.g., a season closure at the end of the biological year – could mitigate the financial impact to the northern for-hire fleet while also reducing the potential for recoupment and length of a harvest closure.

It is also important to consider other potential target species during a proposed closed season. The most common species landed on commercial trips that land Spotted Seatrout is Striped Mullet (see Appendix 1). Similarly, Spotted Seatrout is the most common species landed on commercial trips that land Striped Mullet. Fishers in both fisheries use similar gear types with runaround gill nets becoming more common in recent years but anchored small mesh gill nets still common. The overlap in gear types and landings provides strong evidence that the Spotted Seatrout and Striped Mullet commercial fisheries operate alongside each other underscoring the importance of considering how management changes in the recently adopted Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet FMP might affect Spotted Seatrout harvest and vice versa. The selected sustainable harvest management option in the Striped Mullet FMP is weekend

commercial harvest closures on Saturday and Sunday January through September and Saturday through Monday October through December. Mirroring these weekend closures for the Spotted Seatrout commercial fishery would simplify management, could theoretically end overfishing in the commercial sector (Table 2.4), and reduce the potential for dead discards in both fisheries. However, if commercial fishers increase effort during the week to compensate for lost weekend days harvest recoupment is likely. Striped Mullet offshore spawning migrations in the fall largely coincide with wind events providing an opportunity for large numbers of fish to avoid harvest when a "mullet blow" occurs during a closed weekend period. Spotted Seatrout do not have this same migratory behavior. In fact, Spotted Seatrout overwinter in sometimes large aggregations in the upper estuary and begin forming these aggregations in the fall. Such aggregations allow for easier targeting of large numbers of Spotted Seatrout and could lead to a much greater degree of harvest recoupment from a shift in fishing effort compared to Striped Mullet. Day of the week closures could be considered in tandem with other management measures to ensure overfishing is ended. For example, combining the weekend closures adopted in Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet FMP with a January–February harvest closure would give an on paper commercial harvest reduction of around 47% (46.8%). Even though it is unlikely that full harvest reduction is reached, the January–February harvest closure would provide a buffer and increase the likelihood of ending overfishing. However, if the reduction in recreational harvest were less than 47%, the perception could exist of the commercial sector taking a larger harvest reduction despite the commercial sector accounting for a smaller proportion of overall landings even though the realized reduction would probably fall well below the on-paper reduction. Mirroring a portion of the Striped Mullet regulations could act to balance the benefits of similar management across FMPs and the perception of a lack of parity between sectors. For example, implementing the same management as the Striped Mullet FMP during the peak harvest for both species (Saturday–Monday harvest closure October–December) with an additional Spotted Seatrout harvest closure January–February would match management between FMPs during the timeframe when most harvest occurs and result in a 40.2% on paper reduction in Spotted Seatrout harvest. This would reduce dead discards in both fisheries and decrease possible confusion caused by different management measures for each fishery during peak harvest seasons while still providing additional Spotted Seatrout management beyond weekend closures to account for expected recoupment in that fishery. Even if recreational management is expected to result in a harvest reduction less than 40%, it is likely the realized reduction percentages would be closer offering less of a chance for perceived lack of parity between sectors.

The types of baits and gear used in the recreational fishery are also commonly used when targeting Red Drum, Striped Bass, Southern Flounder, and Black Drum. When open, Striped Bass and Southern Flounder are quota managed species, therefore harvest of these species could not increase if effort shifts occur. If recreational anglers unable to target Spotted Seatrout due to a seasonal closure instead targeted Red Drum or Black Drum, this could lead to an increase in harvest. It is not possible to predict how angler behavior might change when regulations change, however; the seasonality of the Red Drum and Black Drum fisheries could be considered when determining the timeframe for a Spotted Seatrout seasonal closure.

Option 2: Seasonal Closure Options

a. *Status Quo – manage fishery without seasonal harvest closure*
b. *Dec 16 – Feb 28/29 harvest closure (both sectors)*
c. *11:59 p.m. Friday–12:01 a.m. Tuesday commercial harvest closure October 1–December 31 and Jan 1–February commercial harvest closure.* Consider recreational seasonal closures as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.
d. *Nov 1 – Feb 28/29 harvest closure (both sectors)*

Bag and Trip Limits

The recreational bag limit for Spotted Seatrout is currently 4 fish per person per day. Most recreational anglers, however, harvest less than their limit of Spotted Seatrout. From 2019-2022 – just over 73% of anglers harvested two or fewer Spotted Seatrout and nearly 48% of anglers harvested just one Spotted Seatrout. Harvest reductions needed to reach the F threshold could be achieved in the recreational fishery through bag limit changes, but harvest reductions needed to reach the F target are not possible with bag limit changes as a standalone measure (Table 2.5). Reducing recreational harvest to reach the F threshold would require decreasing the recreational bag limit to two fish per person per day. Reducing the allowable bag limit to meet the minimum reduction necessary to end overfishing in the recreational sector would enact management that is easy to understand, easy to enforce, and straightforward. Even though a two fish bag limit would result in a 27.7% reduction (Table 2.5), the public could potentially conflate the number of fish an angler is theoretically allowed to harvest with the number of fish most anglers actually harvest leading to the misperception that a two fish bag limit is a 50% reduction (Figure 2.3).

Table 2.5. Expected reductions in recreational harvest and total harvest from bag limit changes. Reductions in pounds are based on average recreational harvest from 2019 to 2022. Total harvest reductions assume no other management is implemented. Reductions of at least 19.9% (threshold) up to 53.9% (target) are needed to end overfishing. *Reduction does not meet the 19.9% (3 fish bag limit) or 53.9% (1 fish bag limit) harvest reduction necessary to reach $F_{Threshold}$ or F_{Target}.

Bag Limit Reduction Examples			
Bag Limit	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Total Harvest Reduction
3	394,106	11.8*	10.1*
2	925,146	27.7	23.7
1	1,760,116	52.7*	45.0*



Figure 2.3. The proportion of total recreational Spotted Seatrout harvest where bar color refers to the number of fish harvested. Though the specific proportions of total harvest from each harvest bin vary year to year, approximately 75% of recreational anglers consistently harvest two or fewer Spotted Seatrout.

Currently there is a 75 fish commercial trip limit for Spotted Seatrout. Approximately 16% of commercial trips reach that limit with about half (52%) harvesting 30 or less Spotted Seatrout and over three quarters (84%) harvesting 70 or fewer fish. Reductions to the threshold in the commercial sector could be achieved through lowering the commercial trip limit as a standalone measure but, while technically possible, it is unlikely the necessary trip limit (<20 fish) to approach the target is realistic (Table 2.6). Regardless of whether commercial harvest is reduced to the threshold or the target level, management to reduce commercial harvest would not end overfishing in the combined Spotted Seatrout fishery. Like the recreational sector, there exists the potential for public misperception about harvest reductions stemming from changes to trip limits. For example, reducing the commercial trip limit to 45 fish results in a 21.5% reduction in commercial harvest (Table 2.6) but could be incorrectly perceived as a larger reduction if commercial fishers conflate the actual harvest reduction with the theoretical reduction in allowable harvest (40%).

Table 2.6. Expected reductions in commercial harvest from trip limit changes. Reductions in pounds are based on average commercial harvest from 2019 to 2022. Total harvest reductions assume no other management is implemented. Reductions of at least 19.9% (threshold) up to 53.9% (target) are needed to end overfishing. *Reduction does not meet the 19.9% (55 fish trip limit) or 53.9% (20 fish trip limit) harvest reduction necessary to reach $F_{Threshold}$ or F_{Target}.

Trip Limit Reduction Examples			
Trip Limit	Commercial Reduction (lb)	Commercial Reduction (%)	Total Harvest Reduction (%)
55	70,433	12.4*	1.8
45	122,122	21.5	3.1
20	301,046	53.0*	7.7

Lowering the Spotted Seatrout recreational bag limit or commercial trip limit would probably cause increased dead discards of Spotted Seatrout in both sectors of the fishery which can act to decrease the effectiveness of management changes. Changes to bag limits could be paired with gear requirements (see Appendix 3) and commercial trip limit changes could be accompanied by changes or limits to allowable gear (see Appendix 1) to mitigate dead discards in the fishery.

Option 3: Bag and Trip Limit Options

a. *Status Quo – manage commercial fishery with no changes to the 75 fish trip limit and consider recreational bag limit changes as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.*
b. *Reduce recreational bag limit to 2 fish and commercial trip limit to 45 fish*

Stop Nets

The stop net fishery is a modification of a traditional beach seine that primarily targets Striped Mullet and is unique to Bogue Banks. This fishery holds historic and cultural value in North Carolina and especially Carteret County (See Striped Mullet FMP and Amendment 1 for review of historical significance of stop net fishery). Where traditional beach seine fisheries involve setting and hauling a net from the beach, the stop net fishery adds a stationary "stop net" set perpendicular to the beach in an L-shape (see Spotted Seatrout FMP for more detail on the execution of the stop net fishery). The 2012 Spotted Seatrout FMP implemented a 75 fish commercial trip limit, but it was noted in the plan there was the potential for dead discards to exceed harvest in high-volume fisheries like the stop net fishery (NCDMF 2012). The MFC tasked the DMF Director with addressing the stop net fishery outside of the 2012 FMP. Since 2013, the stop net fishery has opened and closed by proclamation and operates under an annual Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) signed by a party of the combined fishing operation and the DMF Fisheries Management Section Chief. The MOA sets a 4,595 lb. Spotted Seatrout season quota, requires a party to the stop net fishery to alert the DMF prior to fishing the stop nets, and requires reporting of Spotted Seatrout landings in pounds the same day the stop nets are fished. In recent years the stop net fishery has opened around October 15 and closed on December 31. Additionally, stop nets are limited to a maximum of four stop nets between Beaufort Inlet and Bogue Inlet at any one time with each combined fishing operation allowed to set a maximum of two stop nets.

Since implementation of current management in 2013, the stop net fishery has never reached their 4,595 lb. quota. Stop net landings represent a very minor proportion of Spotted Seatrout commercial landings and an even smaller portion of total commercial and recreational landings. For example, the highest stop net landings from 2013 through 2022 were 3,700 lb. which accounted for 1.4% of commercial landings and 0.2% of total landings in that year. Most years the stop net fishery accounts for less than half a percent of commercial landings and less than a tenth of a percent of combined landings. Due to the strict existing management of the stop net fishery, the potential for additional harvest reductions from the recently adopted Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet FMP, and the low contribution to Spotted Seatrout landings under the current stop net fishery management, additional harvest restrictions may not be necessary in the stop net fishery. However, formalizing current management of the stop net fishery should be considered in this amendment.

Option 4: Stop Net Management Options

a) *Status quo – 4,595 lb. season quota with terms and conditions of stop net fishery and responsibilities of the stop net crew outlined in Memorandum of Agreement.*
b) *Stop nets are restricted to the Atlantic Ocean on Bogue Banks with a 4,595 lb. Spotted Seatrout season quota. The season will open no sooner than October 15 and close when the Spotted Seatrout quota is reached or no later than December 31. Any weekend closures to commercial harvest implemented in Option 2 will also apply to the Bogue Banks stop net fishery. Stop net crews must contact N.C. DMF Marine Patrol Communication each time a stop net is set and at least two hours prior to each time a stop net is fished. The same day a stop net is fished and the catch is landed at the fish house, a representative of the stop net crew must contact DMF Fisheries Management Section to report the daily total of Spotted Seatrout in pounds as it appears on the trip ticket. Same day reporting is required even if zero Spotted Seatrout are harvested. Failure to follow reporting requirements will result in an immediate closure of the stop net fishery. The stop net fishery will be managed by proclamation consistent with but not limited to previous proclamations.*

Combination Management Measures

Combining multiple strategies to achieve management goals is common in fisheries management including in the original Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan which combines size limits with trip and bag limits and weekend prohibitions on commercial harvest or possession of Spotted Seatrout in joint waters. Multiple management measures rather than a single, standalone management measure allow for more specific, targeted management to account for a variety of factors including species life history and biology, differences in the fishery (e.g., industry, regional, etc.), or competing interests in the fishery. As there are few standalone management measures to end overfishing in the Spotted Seatrout fishery, combination measures will help ensure management is realistic and management objectives are more likely to be achieved. Additionally, a management strategy comprised of more than one management measure can allow for increased or

more consistent access to the fishery (Tables 2.7 and 2.8). For example, implementing a slot limit along with a seasonal closure in the Spotted Seatrout recreational fishery would allow for a shortened closure period when compared to a seasonal closure as a standalone measure.

Table 2.7. Combination recreational management measures to end overfishing and achieve sustainable harvest. The Total % Reduction column shows the total percent reduction if no changes to commercial management are implemented. Unless otherwise noted, season closures or bag limit reductions include the entirety of the month. *Total reduction does not reduce F to the 19.9% threshold (options 1.a, and 1.b). Harvest reductions in pounds are based on 2019–2022 average recreational harvest.

Option #	Season Closure	Bag Limit (number of fish)	Size Limit	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Total % Reduction
5.a	Jan–Feb	Oct-Dec 3 fish	-	738,113	22.1	18.9*
5.b		Nov-Feb 3 fish	16” minimum	741,453	22.2	19.0*
5.c	-	Oct-Feb 3 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	824,950	24.7	21.1
5.d	Jan 16–Feb	-	14–20”, 1 over 26”	935,166	28.0	23.9
5.e	Dec 16–Feb	3 fish	-	1,015,323	30.4	26.0
5.f	Jan–Feb	-	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,078,781	32.3	27.6
5.g	Jan–Feb	Oct-Dec 3 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,205,696	36.1	30.9
5.h	Apr–Jun	3 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,292,533	38.7	33.1
5.i	Jan–Feb	3 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,319,252	39.5	33.8
5.j	Dec 16–Feb	3 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,436,148	43.0	36.7
5.k	Apr–Jul	3 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,439,488	43.1	36.8
5.l	Dec–Feb	2 fish	14–20”, 1 over 26”	1,923,770	57.6	49.2

Table 2.8. Combination commercial management measures to end overfishing and achieve sustainable harvest. The Total % Reduction column shows the total percent reduction if no recreational management changes are implemented. No management options applied solely to the commercial sector reduce *total* harvest to a level where F meets the 19.9% threshold. Unless otherwise noted, seasonal closures include the entirety of the month. Harvest reductions in pounds are based on 2019–2022 average commercial harvest.

Option #	Season Closure	Trip Limit (number of fish)	Size Limit	Commercial Reduction (lb)	Commercial Reduction (%)	Total % Reduction
6.a	Jan 16-Feb	60	-	131,210	23.1	3.4
6.b	Jan-Feb	65	-	145,979	25.7	3.7
6.c	Jan-Feb	-	16” min	149,955	26.4	3.8
6.d	Feb	45	-	164,155	28.9	4.2
6.e	Jan 16-Feb	45	-	193,124	34.0	4.9
6.f	Jan-Feb	50	-	197,100	34.7	5.0
6.g	Dec 16-Feb	60	-	202,780	35.7	5.2
6.h	Dec-Feb	40	-	314,110	55.3	8.0

Multiple strategies to manage a fishery can be especially helpful when considering different and potentially competing stakeholder objectives as well as ensuring management objectives are realistic for different sectors and therefore more likely to be achieved. However, combining multiple strategies can also lead to more complex management potentially resulting in stakeholder confusion and enforcement difficulties. It is important to balance the increasing complexity of multiple management layers with stakeholder and management objectives.

Options 5/6: Combination Management Options

a) *Option 5.i with commercial management handled through seasonal closures as a standalone measure (see Option 2.c)*

Adaptive Management

The current Spotted Seatrout adaptive management framework needs to be updated. Adaptive management is a structured decision-making process when uncertainty exists, with the objective of reducing uncertainty through time with monitoring. Adaptive management provides flexibility to incorporate new information and accommodate alternative and/or additional actions. The original FMP included adaptive management to "achieve one half of the reductions necessary and to reassess after three years to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures to reduce harvest" and for the Director to "intervene in the event of a catastrophic" cold stun event (NCDMF 2012).

While success or failure of any given management strategy to sustain the stock is best determined through a quantitative stock assessment the ability to adjust management between stock assessments based on evidence of management strategies not sustaining the stock can be an important conservation tool. For example, by itself failure to achieve projected harvest reductions does not necessarily indicate failure of a management measure but could conversely indicate improving stock conditions. However, failure to achieve harvest reductions combined with warning signs in dependent or independent sampling (e.g., a decrease in independent sampling abundance or a truncation of age or length distributions in dependent or independent catch) could indicate a need to adjust management strategies. Peer reviewed stock assessments and stock assessment updates should continue to be used to guide management decisions for the Spotted Seatrout stock. The 2022 peer reviewed stock assessment (NCDMF 2022) should be updated, at least once between full reviews of the plan to gauge success in maintaining sustainable harvest and to monitor changes in *F.* The 2022 stock assessment had a terminal year of 2019 and Amendment 1 management measures will be implemented, at the earliest, in 2025. Given this timeline, the earliest a stock assessment update should be completed is during 2026 with the inclusion of data from 2025. The timing of a stock assessment update is at the discretion of the Division and will consider stock trends and the timing of prior management when determining the appropriate schedule. An assessment update will best determine if management goals are being met, but an adaptive management structure that allows for needed adjustments to management measures between stock assessment updates is an important tool for attaining management goals.

The existing Spotted Seatrout rule, 15A NCAC 03M .0522, provides the Fisheries Director proclamation authority pursuant to 15A NCAC 03H .0103 to impose any of the following restrictions on the taking of Spotted Seatrout:

1) Specify time;
2) Specify area;
3) Specify means and methods;
4) Specify season;
5) Specify size; and
6) Specify quantity.

Upon adoption of Amendment 1, the adaptive management framework will consist of the following:

Option 7: Adaptive Management Framework

1) The adaptive management framework allows for adjusting management measures outside of an updated stock assessment to ensure compliance with and effectiveness of management strategies adopted in Amendment 1 and is a tool to respond to concerns with stock conditions and fishery trends. Upon evaluation by the division, if the management strategy implemented to achieve sustainable harvest (either through Amendment 1 or a subsequent revision) is not achieving the intended purpose, management measures may be revised or removed and replaced using adaptive management; provided it conforms to part 2.
2) Management measures that may be adjusted using adaptive management include:
    a. Season closures
    b. Day of week closures
    c. Trip or vessel limits
    d. Size limits
    e. Bag or vessel limits
    f. Gear restrictions in support of the measures listed in a-e

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Table 2.9. Management options to achieve sustainable harvest in the Spotted Seatrout fishery.

Topic	Option	Description
Size limits	1.a	Status quo – no change to commercial size limit. Consider recreational size limit changes as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.
	1.b	Recreational 16”–20” slot limit with allowance for one fish over 24” and commercial 16” minimum size limit
Season closure	2.a	Status quo – no season closure as standalone measure
	2.b	Statewide season closure Dec 16 – Feb 28/29 (both sectors)
	2.c	11:59 p.m. Friday-12:01 a.m. Tuesday statewide commercial harvest closure Oct-Dec and Jan-Feb commercial harvest closure. Consider recreational season closures as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.
	2.d	Statewide season closure Nov 1 – Feb (both sectors)
Bag and trip limits	3.a	Status quo – no change to commercial trip limit. Consider recreational bag limit changes as a part of the overall management strategy to achieve sustainable harvest but not as a single solution option.
	3.b	Reduce recreational bag limit to 2 fish and commercial trip limit to 45 fish
Stop net	4.a	Status quo – no change
	4.b	No change to quota but formalize management in FMP
Combinations	5.a-j & 6.a-h	See tables 2.7 and 2.8
Adaptive management	7	

Table 2.10. Expected reduction in recreational and commercial harvest from management examples organized by single solution ideas including size limit changes (SL.1–10), seasonal or day of the week closures (SC.1–11), commercial trip limit changes (TL.1–6), and recreational bag limit changes (BL.1–6) and combination management ideas including recreational combination management ideas (5.a–l) and commercial combination management ideas (6.a–h). These management examples can be found in Tables 2.3–2.8 but are included in this table for ease of reference. Reductions in pounds are based on average recreational or commercial harvest from 2019 to 2022. Total harvest reductions assume no other management is implemented. Reductions of at least 19.9% (threshold) up to 53.9% (target) are needed to end overfishing. Important table notes: Management examples presented here are not additive. In other words, an overall total expected harvest reduction for combinations of single solution ideas cannot be reached by adding together the Total % Reduction of each individual single solution ideas. **Management examples that do not reach *at least* a 19.9% reduction in harvest will not meet the statutory requirement of ending overfishing.** *Day of week harvest closures are only for commercial harvest, therefore any harvest reduction from day of week closures only includes reductions in commercial harvest.

Management Examples	Month Closure	Day of Week Closure	Bag Limit (number of fish)	Trip Limit (number of fish)	Size Limit	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Commercial Reduction (lb)	Commercial Reduction (%)	Total % Reduction
Single Solution Ideas										
SL.1	-	-	-	-	14”–24”	106,876	3.2	26,696	4.7	3.4
SL.2	-	-	-	-	15” minimum	183,693	5.5	24,424	4.3	5.3
SL.3	-	-	-	-	16” minimum	554,420	16.6	39,921	6.5	6.2
SL.4	-	-	-	-	14”–22”	240,471	7.2	65,321	11.5	7.8
SL.5	-	-	-	-	14”–20”, 1 >24”	507,662	15.2	0	0	13.0
SL.6	-	-	-	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	601,178	18.0	0	0	15.4
SL.7	-	-	-	-	14”–20”, 1 >30”	617,878	18.5	0	0	15.8
SL.8	-	-	-	-	15”–20”, 1 >24”	731,433	21.9	0	0	18.7
SL.9	-	-	-	-	14”–20”	617,878	18.5	202,212	35.6	21.0
SL.10	-	-	-	-	16”–20”, 1 >24”	1,102,159	33.0	0	0	28.2
SC.1	-	Jan–Sep, Sat–Sun; Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon	-	-	-	0	0	172,107	30.3	4.4
SC.2	Apr–Jun	-	-	-	-	407,465	12.2	99,970	17.6	13.0
SC.3	Apr–Jun	Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon*	-	-	-	407,465	12.2	213,572	37.6	15.7
SC.4	Apr–Jul	-	-	-	-	584,478	17.5	107,922	19.0	17.7
SC.5	Jan–Feb	-	-	-	-	581,139	17.4	122,690	21.6	18.0
SC.6	Apr–Jul	Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon*	-	-	-	584,479	17.5	213,572	37.6	20.4

DRAFT – SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Management Examples	Month Closure	Day of Week Closure	Bag Limit (number of fish)	Trip Limit (number of fish)	Size Limit	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Commercial Reduction (lb)	Commercial Reduction (%)	Total % Reduction
SC.7	May 16–Sep	-	-	-	-	714,734	21.4	80,657	14.2	20.4
SC.8	Jan–Mar	-	-	-	-	741,453	22.2	153,363	27.0	22.9
SC.9	Dec 16–Feb	-	-	-	-	738,113	22.1	168,131	29.6	23.2
SC.10	Jan–Feb	Oct–Dec, Sat–Mon*	-	-	-	581,139	17.4	228,340	40.2	28.2
SC.11	Nov–Feb	-	-	-	-	1,843,613	55.2	323,198	56.9	55.4
TL.1	-	-	-	65	-	0	0	29,537	5.2	0.8
TL.2	-	-	-	60	-	0	0	48,849	8.6	1.3
TL.3	-	-	-	55	-	0	0	70,433	12.4	1.8
TL.4	-	-	-	45	-	0	0	122,122	21.5	3.1
TL.5	-	-	-	40	-	0	0	151,659	26.7	3.9
TL.6	-	-	-	20	-	0	0	301,046	53.0	7.7
BL.1	-	-	Oct–Dec 3 fish	-	-	190,373	5.7	0	0	4.9
BL.2	-	-	Nov–Feb 3 fish	-	-	223,772	6.7	0	0	5.7
BL.3	-	-	Oct–Feb 3 fish	-	-	273,870	8.2	0	0	7.0
BL.4	-	-	3 fish	-	-	394,106	11.8	0	0	10.1
BL.5	-	-	2 fish	-	-	925,146	27.7	0	0	32.7
BL.6	-	-	1 fish	-	-	1,1760,116	52.7	0	0	45.0
Rec Combo Ideas										
5.a	Jan–Feb	-	Oct–Dec 3 fish	-	-	738,113	22.1	0	0	18.9
5.b	-	-	Nov–Feb 3 fish	-	16” minimum	741,453	22.2	0	0	19.0
5.c	-	-	Oct–Feb 3 fish	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	824,950	24.7	0	0	21.1
5.d	Jan 16–Feb	-	-	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	935,166	28.0	0	0	23.9
5.e	Dec 16–Feb	-	3 fish	-	-	1,015,323	30.4	0	0	26.0
5.f	Jan–Feb	-	-	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,078,781	32.3	0	0	27.6

Management Examples	Month Closure	Day of Week Closure	Bag Limit (number of fish)	Trip Limit (number of fish)	Size Limit	Recreational Reduction (lb)	Recreational Reduction (%)	Commercial Reduction (lb)	Commercial Reduction (%)	Total % Reduction
5.g	Jan–Feb	-	Oct–Dec 3 fish	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,205,696	36.1	0	0	30.9
5.h	Apr–Jun	-	3 fish	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,292,533	38.7	0	0	33.1
5.i	Jan–Feb	-	3 fish	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,319,252	39.5	0	0	33.8
5.j	Dec 16–Feb		3 fish		14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,436,148	43.0	0	0	36.7
5.k	Apr–Jul	-	3 fish	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,439,488	43.1	0	0	36.8
5.l	Dec–Feb	-	2 fish	-	14”–20”, 1 >26”	1,923,770	57.6	0	0	49.2
Com Combo Ideas										
6.a	Jan 16–Feb	-	-	60	-	0	0	131,210	23.1	3.4
6.b	Jan–Feb	-	-	65	-	0	0	145,979	25.7	3.7
6.c	Jan–Feb	-	-	-	16” min	0	0	149,955	26.4	3.8
6.d	Feb	-	-	45	-	0	0	164,155	28.9	4.2
6.e	Jan 16–Feb	-	-	45	-	0	0	193,124	34.0	4.9
6.f	Jan–Feb	-	-	50	-	0	0	197,100	34.7	5.0
6.g	Dec 16–Feb	-	-	60	-	0	0	202,780	35.7	5.2
6.h	Dec–Feb	-	-	40	-	0	0	314,110	55.3	8.0

RECOMMENDATIONS

Division Recommendation (estimated to result in an approximately 40.0% recreational harvest reduction, 40.0% commercial harvest reduction, 40.0% overall harvest reduction):

The DMF recommends the following options that are projected to end overfishing with a greater than 70% probability of keeping SSB above the target:

Option 1.a Size Limits

- *No change to commercial size limit.*

Option 2.c Seasonal Closures

- *Oct–Dec, 11:59 p.m. Friday to 12:01 a.m. Tuesday statewide commercial harvest closure*
- *Jan–Feb statewide commercial harvest closure*

Option 3.a Bag and Trip Limit

- *No change to commercial trip limit.*

Option 4.b Stop Net Management

- *Stop nets are restricted to the Atlantic Ocean on Bogue Banks and maintain a 4,595 lb. Spotted Seatrout season quota.*
- *The season will open no sooner than October 15 and close when the Spotted Seatrout quota is reached or no later than December 31.*
- *Stop net crews must contact N.C. DMF Marine Patrol Communication each time a stop net is set and two hours prior to each time a stop net is fished.*
- *The same day a stop net is fished and the catch is landed at the fish house, a representative of the stop net crew must contact DMF Fisheries Management Section to report the daily total of Spotted Seatrout in pounds as it appears on the trip ticket. Same day reporting is required even if zero Spotted Seatrout are harvested.*
- *Failure to follow reporting requirements will result in an immediate closure of the stop net fishery.*
- *The Bogue Banks stop net fishery will be managed by proclamation consistent with but not limited to prior proclamations.*

Option 5.i Combination Management Measures

- *3 fish recreational bag limit*
- *14”–20” recreational slot limit with allowance for one fish >26”*
- *Jan–Feb statewide recreational harvest closure*

Option 7 Adaptive Management Framework

Advisory Committee Recommendations and Public Comment: see Appendix 8

NCMFC Selected Management Options (estimated to result in an approximately 28.0% overall harvest reduction):

Recreational (estimated to result in an approximately 27.0% harvest reduction):

- 14- to 20- inch slot limit with an allowance for one fish over 26 inches.
- 3-fish bag limit

Commercial (estimated to result in an approximately 38.0% harvest reduction):

- 14- to 22- inch slot limit.
- Oct–Dec, 11:59 p.m. Friday to 12:01 a.m. Tuesday and Jan-Sept, 11:59 p.m. Friday to 12:01 a.m. Monday statewide commercial harvest closure
- Formalize the commercial stop net fishery management in the fishery management plan

Both sectors

- Adopt the adaptive management framework, with the caveat that adaptive management measures must be brought to the Commission for review prior to implementation.

Appendix 3: SUPPLEMENTAL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS IN THE NORTH CAROLINA SPOTTED SEATROUT FISHERY

ISSUE

The results of qualitative management measures on the North Carolina Spotted Seatrout stock cannot be quantified but implementing these management measures may serve to reduce dead discards, reduce harvest by an unknown amount, and improve the overall Spotted Seatrout stock.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF).

BACKGROUND

As outlined in Appendix 2, total Spotted Seatrout harvest increased sharply in 2019 and has remained high in the ensuing years through 2022. Most harvest occurs October – December each year. The recreational fishery includes a robust catch and release segment. Since 2012 the recreational sector has accounted for, on average, approximately 85% of Spotted Seatrout harvest (Appendix 2) and the number of recreational trips targeting Spotted Seatrout increased in recent years with biological years 2019 through 2022 representing the four highest numbers of trips since 2012 (Figure 3.1). The proportion of trips that are successful (i.e., anglers are targeting Spotted Seatrout and catch Spotted Seatrout) has remained relatively steady since 2012. The high number of trips targeting Spotted Seatrout has led to not only increased harvest, but also increased dead discards – or fish that are released alive but ultimately die because of the fishing interaction – though on an individual basis discard mortality depends on a variety of factors and is likely low (Gearhart 2002; James et al. 2007; NCDMF 2022). Though the commercial fishery has only accounted for about 15% of total harvest since 2012, commercial landings have also increased in recent years. While commercial dead discards are likely minimal, changes to commercial management (e.g., decreasing trip limits) could cause an unintended increase in dead discards.



Figure 3.1. Annual MRIP trips where Spotted Seatrout were reported as the primary or secondary target by Biological Year (March–February). Bars are total annual trips with "successful" trips (i.e., a Spotted Seatrout was either harvested or released on the trip) as the purple portion and "unsuccessful" trips (i.e., no Spotted Seatrout were caught) as the yellow portion of the total.

As a result of the popularity of Spotted Seatrout as a targeted species; Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) commissioners, MFC Advisory Committee members, and the public have mentioned a wide variety of potential recreational and commercial management strategies that could benefit the Spotted Seatrout stock but the scope of which are not immediately quantifiable. The increase in recreational trips targeting Spotted Seatrout and increased total Spotted Seatrout harvest in recent years combined with the presence of a dedicated catch and release segment of the recreational fishery suggest that even management measures lacking immediately quantifiable benefits are worth exploring. Additionally, there are management measures that could provide supplementary benefits when paired with sustainable harvest measures discussed in Appendix 2. For example, gear requirements designed to reduce recreational discard mortality would not provide a quantifiable benefit to the Spotted Seatrout stock, but when paired with a seasonal harvest closure could help prevent an increase in dead discards during the closed season. Discussion will focus on measures specific to the Spotted Seatrout recreational

fishery, those more broadly affecting multiple recreational fisheries, and measures specific to the commercial fishery not discussed in Appendix 1.

AUTHORITY

G.S. 113-134 RULES
G.S. 113-182 REGULATION OF FISHING AND FISHERIES
G.S. 113-182.1 FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
G.S. 113-221.1. PROCLAMATIONS; EMERGENCY REVIEW
G.S. 143B-289.52 MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION-POWERS AND DUTIES
15A NCAC 03H .0103 PROCLAMATIONS, GENERAL
15A NCAC 03M .0512 COMPLIANCE WITH FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
15A NCAC 03M .0522 SPOTTED SEATROUT

DISCUSSION

Spotted Seatrout Specific Recreational Management

Recreational Vessel limits

Limiting the harvest of fish through a vessel limit less than the sum of individual bag limits when multiple anglers are on a vessel is a common practice in many state and federal fisheries. Spotted Seatrout recreational harvest is limited to four fish per person per day. When multiple anglers are fishing from the same vessel, the anglers may keep the individual bag limit for each angler on board. For example, eight anglers fishing from one boat could harvest eight times the individual bag limit or 32 Spotted Seatrout. Similarly, charter captains and any crew are allowed to harvest their own recreational limit of Spotted Seatrout while running charter trips. The prevalence of multiple anglers on private or for-hire boats harvesting multiple individual limits is unknown but implementing a boat limit and/or eliminating the charter captain and crew allowance should aid in meeting sustainability goals. During the Spotted Seatrout public scoping period, Division staff received public comments suggesting vessel limits and suggesting eliminating the captain/crew allowance. Conversely, during the Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee Workshop, committee members generally spoke out against vessel limits in the fishery but indicated input members had received from the for-hire industry was generally supportive of eliminating the captain/crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout.

There are anecdotal reports of charter captains and crew harvesting multiple bag limits when running more than one trip in a day (DMF Staff, personal communication) though it is not clear how prevalent this behavior is nor is it possible to assess the impact such behavior has on managed fish stocks. Harvesting multiple charter captain/crew allowances in a day is not legal and leads to unreported harvest of managed fish species. However, enforcement to ensure a single charter captain/crew allowance is difficult as it would require proof that a captain or crew harvested their personal bag limit on a trip previously taken that same day. During the Spotted Seatrout Public Scoping period there was support voiced for eliminating the captain/crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout, but Spotted Seatrout are not the only species in North Carolina where a charter captain/crew allowance is permitted. Changes to the captain/crew allowance in the Spotted Seatrout

fishery could lead to confusion about when a captain/crew allowance is permitted, but there is a precedent for eliminating the captain/crew allowance for a single species in other states. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries included a ban on charter captains/crew harvesting Spotted Seatrout while on a for-hire trip in their November 2023 regulation changes. In its most recent Spotted Seatrout regulation changes, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission implemented similar regulations prohibiting captain/crew harvest while engaged in a for-hire trip. Since addressing the charter captain/crew allowance for multiple species is outside the scope of this amendment, management options here will deal specifically with the Spotted Seatrout fishery.

Option 1: Recreational Vessel Limit Options

a) *Status Quo – Manage fishery without changes to vessel limit or for-hire captain/crew allowance*
b) *Eliminate captain/crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit*
c) *Implement 8 fish Spotted Seatrout vessel limit with captain/crew allowance on for-hire trips counted as part of vessel limit.*

Effort Controls

One way to reduce harvest in a fishery is to limit those able to participate in the fishery. There are a multitude of ways to limit entry to a fishery and measures to limit recreational participation in the Spotted Seatrout fishery would reduce harvest pressure and would probably reduce fishing effort. G.S. 113-182.1(g) gives authority to the MFC to limit entry into a fishery, however; the authority granted by this statute is limited only to cases where "the Commission determines that sustainable harvest cannot otherwise be achieved." Participation in the fishery increased markedly in biological year 2019 and has remained high since, but Spotted Seatrout life history allows this species to readily recover from periods of high mortality (e.g., cold stuns). Furthermore, Appendix 2 presents multiple options with an at least 50% chance of ending overfishing within a two-year timeframe of plan implementation (G.S. 113-182 .1). The combination of current stock status, species life history, and other available options expected to end overfishing make the Spotted Seatrout fishery unlikely to meet the level required for the MFC to limit entry.

Recreational management beyond Spotted Seatrout

Gear Requirements

Recreational catch and release fishing for Spotted Seatrout has increased in popularity in recent years whether from anglers switching to catch and release fishing after harvesting their limit or from dedicated catch and release anglers. Released Spotted Seatrout have far outpaced harvested fish. From 2017-2019, recreational anglers released almost six times as many fish as were harvested (Table 3.1). Delayed mortality, or discard mortality, is the measure of how many fish released alive ultimately die because of the fishing interaction and, on an individual basis, is likely low for Spotted Seatrout (Murphy et al. 1995; Gearhart 2002; James et al. 2007). Conversely, delayed mortality

for throat or gut hooked fish is quite high. Delayed mortality is also dependent on factors such as salinity, dissolved oxygen levels, and length or health of fish (Gearhart 2002; James et al. 2007). Spotted Seatrout aggregations in the small creeks and bays of the upper estuary during winter months could potentially have a larger than expected impact on dead discards in the fishery as anglers are able to fish more efficiently on schools at smaller spatial scales than other times of the year, though any such effects could be mitigated by lower water temperatures and higher dissolved oxygen levels during the winter months. Even with low individual discard mortality rates, the sheer number of releases in recent years makes the cumulative number of dead discards impactful and management to reduce the delayed mortality rate worth discussing.

Table 3.1. Harvest and releases of Spotted Seatrout in numbers of fish for biological years 2017-2022.

Biological Year	Harvest	Release
2017	1,054,500	4,725,746
2018	499,560	16,426,444
2019	2,415,394	7,050,238
2020	1,605,723	5,428,133
2021	1,495,385	6,859,777
2022	1,852,135	11,468,873

Studies of gear requirements that could reduce recreational discard mortality are severely lacking outside of those studies examining the differences in discard mortality when using circle hooks or “J” hooks. Although there are not specific studies exploring differences in circle and J hook mortality rates for Spotted Seatrout, hooking location and the severity of injuries related to hooking are important factors impacting Spotted Seatrout delayed mortality (Murphy et al. 1995; Gearhart 2002; Stunz and McKee 2006; James et al. 2007) and generally studies show circle hooks reduce hooking injuries compared to J hooks in marine species (Skomal et al. 2002; Cooke et al. 2003; Millard et al. 2005; Vecchio and Wenner 2007). In theory, other gear requirements such as eliminating the use of treble hooks with natural baits, using barbless treble hooks or inline hooks on artificial baits, and requiring rubberized landing nets when handling fish should help reduce discard mortality as well, however; there are few studies that attempt to quantify the benefits of these measures.

Implementing gear requirements in the Spotted Seatrout fishery to reduce mortality of released fish would benefit the stock, but single species gear requirements in multi-species fisheries like the Spotted Seatrout fishery can introduce difficulties in enforcement and decrease compliance with the requirements. Enforcement is difficult because it requires proof of an angler’s intent to fish for Spotted Seatrout and the enforcement difficulty provides a built-in loophole for anglers to avoid gear requirements. For example, requiring circle hooks when fishing with natural or artificial baits in the Spotted Seatrout fishery could also affect other robust recreational fisheries like Sheepshead, Red Drum, Estuarine Striped Bass, Summer Flounder, and Kingfishes regardless of whether anglers in these fisheries target Spotted Seatrout as well. If anglers follow Spotted Seatrout gear requirements when fishing for these other species, there could be decreases in recreational discard mortality across multiple fisheries. However, if anglers use these other fisheries to avoid Spotted Seatrout gear requirements, the discard mortality benefit

in the Spotted Seatrout fishery would be reduced. Regardless of angler behavior, enforcement remains difficult. Implementing gear requirements such as requiring circle hooks across multiple fisheries could be a way to improve angler compliance, simplify enforcement, and gain the benefit of reduced discard mortality in these fisheries. Circle hooks could be required when fishing with any natural or artificial bait, when using natural or artificial baits in certain areas (e.g., the sounds or rivers), when using natural or artificial baits in combination with hooks of a certain size, or when using natural or artificial baits where the fishing method is similar. The latter two examples could help provide exceptions for instances where circle hooks could significantly affect angler efficiency such as when anglers are targeting Sheepshead or offshore trolling. Gear requirements are likely better discussed outside of species-specific FMPs because of the wide-ranging effects of requirements across multiple fisheries and species-specific FMPs.

Tournaments

Spotted Seatrout are either directly or indirectly a popular target for many saltwater fishing tournaments in North Carolina. The DMF does not formally track or register saltwater fishing tournaments though if tournaments wish to sell their catch – common with billfish or King Mackerel tournaments – they must obtain a license from DMF. Additionally, DMF does obtain age samples from some tournaments, mostly billfish or King Mackerel tournaments. The last time DMF staff attempted to generate a list of saltwater fishing tournaments was 2021 and staff learned of 154 tournaments, however Division staff did not consider the list exhaustive. Of the 154 tournaments, 49 either directly targeted Spotted Seatrout or had categories specifically for Spotted Seatrout and 32 tournaments took place where Spotted Seatrout were likely to be encountered even if it was unclear whether a Spotted Seatrout category existed. In other words, over half of the saltwater tournaments the DMF was aware of in 2021 either targeted or had a high likelihood of encountering Spotted Seatrout.

Understanding the impact of fishing tournaments on Spotted Seatrout or other marine and estuarine fish species would require a catalogue of North Carolina saltwater fishing tournaments that does not exist at this time, an idea of the number of participants in each tournament, information on the type of tournament (e.g., catch and release or harvest), data on the number and species of fish caught in each tournament, and additional research. Most existing research exploring the effects of tournaments on fish populations, fish behavior, immediate mortality, and post release mortality have focused on freshwater systems though there have been some recent attempts to understand the impacts of saltwater tournaments on estuarine fish species. Specifically in Texas and Alabama, studies examining initial and post-release mortality of Spotted Seatrout from live-release tournaments found mortality rates well above recent estimates of recreational release mortality (James et al. 2007; Nelson et al. 2021). The same study in Alabama found similar mortality rates as recent estimates of recreational release mortality for Red Drum (Nelson et al. 2021) implying that the effect of tournaments may vary by species. Requiring a license or some sort of registration process with DMF in order to hold a saltwater fishing tournament in North Carolina could help in gathering these necessary data.

However, the 81 saltwater fishing tournaments known to the Division in 2021 targeting or likely to encounter Spotted Seatrout directly targeted or were also likely to encounter other fish species regularly found in similar habitats such as Red Drum, Striped Bass, Black Drum, flounder, Bluefish, Weakfish, and Sheepshead among many other fish species. The other 73 tournaments were predominately King Mackerel, billfish, or Dolphin/Wahoo tournaments which also target regulated species. The diversity of target species and broad spatial range of saltwater fishing tournaments – from many miles up local creeks to many miles offshore – make the potential effects of these tournaments much further reaching than just the Spotted Seatrout fishery. The effects of any attempt to manage saltwater tournaments based on the Spotted Seatrout fishery could have unforeseen influence on other fisheries. For example, if tournaments could not target Spotted Seatrout as a reward category or had to register to do so, this could potentially cause tournament organizers to focus on a different species thus increasing the impact of saltwater tournaments on that species. In order to better understand the current effect saltwater tournaments have on a variety of North Carolina fishes and to better predict how a system of tournament registration or licensing would affect tournaments, this issue should be examined on a broader basis across multiple fisheries. A separate information paper – rather than this amendment – may be the appropriate place for that exploration.

Spotted Seatrout Specific Commercial Management

Hook and Line Harvest

During the Spotted Seatrout Public Scoping Period recreational anglers and commercial fishers regularly expressed interest in a commercial hook and line fishery. The context of interest in a commercial hook and line fishery varied from making the trip limit the same regardless of gear to making the hook and line trip limit consistent with the broader commercial trip limit but prohibiting gill nets as a legal harvest gear to prohibiting gill nets as a legal harvest gear but keeping the hook and line trip limit consistent with the recreational bag limit and other variations on these ideas. Spotted Seatrout Advisory Committee members also discussed commercial hook and line harvest and generally expressed support for the idea with a similar range of context for that support. There is precedent in other states for allowing increased harvest of Spotted Seatrout by hook and line. Some states combine their hook and line allowance with gill net prohibitions (e.g., Florida and Louisiana) while other states allow both hook and line and gill net harvest (e.g., Mississippi). Commercial harvest in other states is minimal, however, and there does not appear to be a directed Spotted Seatrout fishery outside of North Carolina.

Ultimately, it is unclear how changes to the commercial hook and line trip limit would affect the sustainability of Spotted Seatrout harvest. It is likely the benefits or detriments resulting from changes would largely depend on fisher behavior and the specific implementation of such changes. A decrease to the general trip limit would increase dead discards making management less effective, but if a general trip limit decrease were paired with an exclusively hook and line fishery, the potential increase in dead discards could be greatly mitigated (see Appendix 2 for a more detailed discussion on anchored gill net and hook and line discard mortality). Raising the hook and line trip limit in the absence of other gear limitations should be considered with caution since it is unclear the

effect such a change would have on current commercial fisher behavior. In theory, consistent trip limits regardless of gear could increase the number of participants in the fishery as fishers with the expertise to fish gill nets would likely continue doing so, fishers without that expertise would no longer be held to the recreational bag limit when fishing with hook and line, and generally increase the areas accessible for commercial harvest (e.g., areas currently closed to gill net harvest or where fishers cannot set gill nets because of environmental conditions such as heavy tides). A hook and line trip limit consistent with other commercial gears could encourage recreational anglers to obtain a commercial license to keep the commercial limit of Spotted Seatrout. A higher hook and line commercial trip limit could also encourage for-hire captains who currently hold a commercial license to use it to allow their clients to keep a commercial limit. Similarly, for-hire captains who do not currently hold a commercial license could be encouraged to obtain one for the same reasons. These scenarios could increase commercial harvest, though if and how much would depend on other management implemented. For example, a hook and line fishery combined with a decreased trip limit could discourage some of this behavior. Changes to the commercial hook and line limit should be preceded by further outreach and stakeholder engagement to help determine the logistics and sustainability of a commercial hook and line fishery.

The potential issues and benefits of a hook and line commercial fishery are not unique to the Spotted Seatrout fishery. The benefits to other species would likely be similar and, depending on the management conditions (e.g., a mismatch of bag and trip limits or open and closed season between the recreational and commercial sectors), the concerns with developing hook and line fisheries are also the same. There are anecdotal reports of recreational anglers using commercial licenses to harvest commercial limits in the cobia and flounder fisheries though the extent of this practice is unclear. Since the issues surrounding hook and line commercial fisheries are the same across the span of multiple species, it may make more sense to discuss commercial hook and line harvest more broadly outside of species-specific FMPs.

Commercial Vessel Limits

At their April 2014 meeting, the MFC Finfish Advisory Committee, while acting as the Striped Mullet Advisory Committee, passed a motion to recommend allowing two commercial fishing license holders fishing from the same vessel using one set of gear to harvest two commercial limits of Spotted Seatrout. Discussion around this recommendation centered on increased safety – especially in the winter – as well as decreasing the amount of gear in the water. The Finfish recommendation was presented to the MFC at their May 2014 business meeting; however, as addressing this recommendation immediately would have required reopening the Spotted Seatrout FMP for an amendment, the MFC instead voted to include discussion of the Finfish Advisory Committee recommendation in the next scheduled Spotted Seatrout FMP update. At their October 2024 meeting, the MFC Southern Advisory Committee voted to recommend the 2014 Finfish Advisory Committee recommendation (hereafter the Southern AC recommendation). Throughout the Spotted Seatrout FMP update process, this issue was raised by one stakeholder in public comment.

Adopting the Southern AC recommendation would likely reduce the amount of gear in the water somewhat and increase boater safety. However, it is unclear how much the Southern AC recommendation would reduce gear in the water because it is not clear how many participants in the fishery currently fish with only one license holder on the boat. It is also not possible to know how many of this unknown number of commercial fishers would change their behavior if the Southern AC recommendation were adopted. While fisher safety is a very real concern, it is similarly unclear how much safer the Southern AC recommendation would make the Spotted Seatrout fishery for the same reasons: it is unknown how many commercial fishers already fish with two people onboard and it is unknown how behavior would change.

It is very likely the Southern AC recommendation would increase harvest though the amount of that increase cannot be quantified. Anecdotal reports from commercial stakeholders indicate few commercial trips reach their limit of Spotted Seatrout primarily because commercial fishers approaching their limit are unlikely to continue fishing for Spotted Seatrout (personal communication). Adopting the Southern AC recommendation would double the number of Sotted Seatrout that could be harvested prior to approaching the trip limit. It is highly likely this would increase harvest even though it is not possible to quantify exactly how much. There are other fisheries where multiple trip limits are allowed with multiple license holders onboard (e.g., Striped Bass), but these are predominantly quota managed species where the quota already caps allowable harvest. Additionally, there are anecdotal reports of commercial fishers participating in the Striped Bass fishery obtaining licenses for family members as a way of increasing allowable harvest per trip (NCDMF, personal communication). While the effects of any individual trip are limited by the Striped Bass quota, there is no quota in the Spotted Seatrout fishery, therefore, such behavior in the Spotted Seatrout fishery would increase harvest would. As overfishing is occurring in the Spotted Seatrout fishery, management that has a chance of increasing harvest, even if that increase cannot be quantified, should not be considered. As such, the Division does not recommend adopting the 2014 Finfish Advisory Committee and 2024 Southern Advisory Committee recommendations in Amendment 1.

Option 2: Commercial Vessel Limit Options

a) *Status Quo – Maintain current management of one 75 fish trip limit per vessel per day.*
b) *Allow two commercial license holders fishing on one boat with one set of gear to harvest two commercial limits of Spotted Seatrout.*

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Table 3.2 Supplemental management options for the Spotted Seatrout fishery. Options would likely provide benefits to the stock but are not able to be quantified.

Topic	Option	Description
Recreational Boat limits and captain/crew allowance	1.a	Status quo – no boat limit, continue captain/crew allowance
	1.b	Eliminate captain/crew allowance on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit.
	1.c	Implement 8 fish vessel limit with captain/crew allowance on for-hire trips counted as part of vessel limit.
Commercial vessel limits	2.a	Status quo – no change to commercial trip limits
	2.b	Allow two commercial license holders fishing on one boat with one set of gear to harvest two commercial limits of Spotted Seatrout.

RECOMMENDATION

Division Recommendation:

Option 1.b Eliminate the captain/crew allowance on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit.

Option 2.a Status quo – Maintain current management of one 75 fish trip limit per vessel per day.

Advisory Committee Recommendations and Public Comment: see Appendix 8

NCMFC Selected Management Options:

Option 1.b Eliminate the captain/crew allowance for Spotted Seatrout on for-hire trips with no broader vessel limit.

Appendix 4: COLD STUN MANAGEMENT

ISSUE

Implement additional management measures to protect Spotted Seatrout spawning stock biomass after periodic cold stun events.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF).

BACKGROUND

Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus)* and other finfish that over-winter in estuarine environments in North Carolina are susceptible to periodic cold stun events. Cold stun events occur when water temperatures drop below a fish's metabolic minimum, impairing their physiological functions and rendering them lethargic or immobile. These events are associated with rapid weather changes that disrupt the thermal balance of coastal waters. In North Carolina, cold stuns can be triggered by snow and ice melt following a winter storm or by sudden and-or prolonged periods of cooler temperatures from cold fronts. Cold stun events can be localized to individual tributaries, or they can be widespread across multiple estuaries. Mass mortality events can occur in these periods of sub-optimal water temperatures because the impaired function of the fish makes them unable to move to warmer waters. Cold stuns are not always lethal, but if water temperatures drop too low or remain low for too long and fish are unable to move to find thermal refuge, they are unlikely to survive. Fish in a stunned state are also easy targets for scavengers, predators, and can be susceptible to harvest with methods like dip nets.

Cold Tolerance

To better understand environmental conditions that lead to Spotted Seatrout cold stuns, several studies have investigated the temperatures at which Spotted Seatrout become stunned and experience mortality. In North Carolina, laboratory experiments suggest the temperatures in which Spotted Seatrout become stunned, or experience a complete loss of equilibrium, range from 2 to 4°C (Ellis et al. 2017). However, Spotted Seatrout begin showing signs of stress at temperatures as high as 7°C. An adult Spotted Seatrout's critical thermal minimum, or the lowest temperature Spotted Seatrout can be exposed to for a short time and still survive, was found to be approximately between 2-3°C. When adult Spotted Seatrout were acclimated and exposed over time to low water temperatures, a water temperature of 3°C was found to be 100% lethal after less than 2 days (Ellis et al. 2017). At 5°C, 93% were still alive after 5 days, but only 15% survived after 10 days. There was high survival (83%) after 10 days at 7°C. Based on this research, we have learned that Spotted Seatrout's survival of cold stun events is not only related to water temperature, but also the length of time they are exposed to these stressful conditions. Similar studies from South Carolina and Texas conducted on Spotted Seatrout saw comparable temperatures leading to Spotted Seatrout loss of equilibrium and mortality (Anweiler et al. 2014; McDonald et al. 2010), although lower temperatures were

required to induce mortality in adults (~2°C) than juvenile (~3°C) Spotted Seatrout, indicating the possibility of size-dependent mortality (McDonald et al. 2010).

For Spotted Seatrout, cold water temperatures disrupt cellular processes, making it difficult to maintain osmotic balance of ion concentrations within their body (Hurst 2007). If temperatures drop below a threshold for long enough, and the fish is unable to leave the area, the imbalance will impact their central nervous system and result in loss of equilibrium, causing the "stunned" response where fish float on top of the water or lay along the bottom.

Population Impacts of Cold Stuns

Spotted Seatrout mature quickly, with most able to reproduce by age one. Spotted Seatrout are also highly fecund, meaning they can produce many offspring within a spawning season and over an individual's lifetime. Females spawn multiple times throughout a season and can produce 3-20 million eggs per year (Murphy et al., 2010; Nieland et al., 2002; Roumillat & Brouwer, 2004). Though Spotted Seatrout have a high capacity to replenish spawning stock biomass (SSB), they are also especially susceptible to cold stuns due to their limited tolerance for abrupt temperature shifts, particularly when these shifts occur outside of their preferred thermal range (Ellis, 2014). North Carolina Spotted Seatrout are more so susceptible to being impacted by cold stuns because they are near the northern extent of their geographical range.

Cold stun mortality has been shown to have population-level effects on Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina (NCDMF 2012; Ellis 2014; Ellis et al. 2018) by reducing stock size and annual cohort strength (Hurst 2007). Overall, the rate of mortality due to fishing activity or natural causes like cold stuns vary seasonally and annually. Using tag return data, Spotted Seatrout natural mortality has been estimated to be higher than fishing mortality during winters in which cold stuns occurred (Ellis et al. 2018; Loeffler et al. 2018; Bauer and Flowers 2019). The division does not have a method to quantify the severity of a cold stun on Spotted Seatrout SSB in real-time, or as the cold temperatures are occurring. However, eliminating or reducing harvest after a cold stun event protects the remaining SSB by ensuring surviving adults have a chance to spawn.

Compared to other commercially and recreationally important fish species in North Carolina, Spotted Seatrout are more likely to experience population-level impacts from cold stun events. Spotted Seatrout are a subtropical fish species, with North Carolina being one of the northernmost points of their range. Consequently, Spotted Seatrout are not as well adapted as other species to withstand winters with below average temperatures and winter storms that occur every few years. In addition, Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina overwinter in shallow estuarine creeks and bays which makes them more susceptible to being stunned or dying compared to other species that overwinter offshore, like weakfish, adult Red Drum, and mature southern flounder (Ellis 2014; Ellis et al. 2017b; McGrath and Hilton 2017; Bacheler et al. 2009; Krause et al. 2020). By overwintering in shallow creeks and bays, Spotted Seatrout have an increased risk of exposure to rapid declines in water temperature, usually due to runoff following snow or

ice melt from a winter storm. Spotted Seatrout can also become trapped in estuarine creeks due to rapid water temperature drops making escape difficult and mortality likely.

North Carolina Cold Stun Response

In 2015, the DMF started a comprehensive, statewide water quality monitoring program (Program 909) and deployed an array of continuous water temperature loggers. A total of 80 loggers at 55 stations measure the water temperature every 15 minutes. Station locations are distributed throughout coastal North Carolina with specific locations that staff determined were either representative of the riverine and estuarine systems they were in and-or locations of historic cold stuns (Figure 4.1). At depths greater than 2 meters, two loggers were placed to monitor temperatures at the surface and bottom to help managers identify water column stratification and turnover events.

Combining known Spotted Seatrout temperature tolerances and available water temperature data allows for more quantitative information that can be used in determining the necessity of a potential harvest closure. Quantitative temperature triggers that incorporate estimated probabilities of mortality could inform Spotted Seatrout harvest closure decisions.



Figure 4.1. Locations of DMF water temperature loggers in coastal North Carolina.

Mortality due to cold stuns is recognized in the 2012 Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan (FMP) as a factor impacting the abundance of Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina (NCDMF 2012). At their February 2012 business meeting, the Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) directed the division to remain status quo regarding Spotted Seatrout management, with the assumption that in the event of a "catastrophic" cold stun the director would use proclamation authority to enact a temporary closure (NCDMF 2012). The objective of a Spotted Seatrout harvest closure after a cold stun event is to allow surviving fish an opportunity to spawn during their spring spawning season, potentially increasing recruitment the following year.

Spotted Seatrout have a long history of cold stuns and winter mortality in North Carolina. Spotted Seatrout cold stuns have been recorded in North Carolina as far back as over

300 years, and have occurred as recently as the winters of 2000, 2002, 2004, 2009, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2017, and 2022.

AUTHORITY

G.S. 113-134 RULES
G.S. 113-182 REGULATION OF FISHING AND FISHERIES
G.S. 113-182.1 FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
G.S. 113-221.1. PROCLAMATIONS; EMERGENCY REVIEW
G.S. 143B-289.52 MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION-POWERS AND DUTIES
15A NCAC 03H .0103 PROCLAMATIONS, GENERAL
15A NCAC 03M .0512 COMPLIANCE WITH FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
15A NCAC 03M .0522 SPOTTED SEATROUT

DISCUSSION

Several management strategies can be used to further protect Spotted Seatrout SSB after periodic cold stun events. These strategies may include temporary slot limits, harvest closures, spatial (area) closures, or some combination of these options. Management strategies also include the need for the use of adaptive management. Given the inherent difficulty in quantifying the severity of cold stun events as they occur, subsequent management strategies also lack precise quantification methods to determine effectiveness. The proposed management strategies are therefore grounded in a pragmatic, common-sense approach to protect SSB.

Seasonal Closures

The spawning season for Spotted Seatrout varies by location (Brown-Peterson et al., 2002; Nieland et al., 2002; Roumillat & Brouwer, 2004) and can occur with one or two peaks in spawning activity. In North Carolina, Spotted Seatrout have a protracted spawning season, usually lasting from April to October (Burns, 1996). Larger and older females are more developed at the beginning of the spawning season, will spawn sooner than smaller fish, and will spawn for a more protracted season. Smaller fish, that are virgin spawners at the beginning of the season, might enter the spawning stock and spawn later in the year through October.

Following a significant cold stun event, the Spotted Seatrout fishery has historically been closed until June 15th. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout have been observed to have a peak in spawning activity in May and June (Burns, 1996), with some individuals spawning later into the fall months. The option to maintain the status quo would continue to close the fishery until June 15th after a significant cold stun event. However, extending the standard closure to June 30th may ensure that more of the spawning peak is protected and would likely allow most of the larger, older fish to spawn at least once before the chance of significant harvest. Another option would be to extend the standard closure until October 15th, ensuring most surviving fish have the opportunity to spawn during the entire spawning season, but this would result in less fishing opportunities for anglers and likely have a diminishing return for the stock over protection during the peak spawn.

Size Limits

Size and slot limits are a common management strategy to limit harvest of specific size and-or age classes of fish in a stock. By setting a minimum size limit based on length at maturity, management can ensure a portion of the females in the stock have a chance to spawn at least once before harvest. The upper bound of a slot limit likewise helps protect larger females which have a greater reproductive capacity, meaning they can produce more eggs. Estimates of Spotted Seatrout fecundity range from 3 to 20 million eggs per year depending on age, length, and water temperature (Lowerre-Barbieri et al., 2009; Nieland et al., 2002; Roumillat & Brouwer, 2004). Spotted Seatrout are batch spawners, meaning they can spawn multiple times in one season. The number of eggs produced within each batch also depends on age and length (Figure 4.2). Spotted Seatrout fecundity estimates specific to North Carolina and Virginia are not available at this time.

Theoretically, the ability of the Spotted Seatrout stock to recover faster after significant cold stun event, would be enhanced if larger females are protected. For example, if a slot limit with a trophy fish allowance is adopted for sustainable harvest (Appendix 3, this amendment), the slot limit could be temporarily narrowed and-or the trophy fish allowance could be temporarily removed. Reducing or narrowing the slot limit following a closure, whether by increasing the lower bound or decreasing the upper bound, would ensure more mature fish are available to spawn. Because larger females are more fecund, it may be more important to focus on their protection after a cold stun event. This could be achieved by removing any prospective trophy fish allowance and-or by decreasing the upper bound of the slot limit in response to a severe cold stun event. This temporary slot limit could be put into place until after the peak spawning season (July) or until after most of the spawning season (October).



Figure 4.2. Taken from Lowerre-Barbieri et al. (Lowerre-Barbieri et al., 2009). Batch fecundity as it relates to size at age of Spotted Seatrout. (A) Batch fecundity to total length, with the predicted linear relationship, and (B) individual batch fecundities and somatic weights plotted by age.

Bag and Trip Limits

The current Spotted Seatrout daily recreational bag limit is 4 fish, and the daily commercial trip limit is 75 fish. In response to a severe cold stun, temporarily lowering these limits when harvest reopens could potentially reduce overall harvest. This approach aims to increase the Spotted Seatrout spawning stock biomass available through the end of the spawning season. The effectiveness of temporarily reducing bag and trip limits depends on the specific management measures adopted in Amendment 1. For example, if management to extend the cold stun closure through the majority of Spotted Seatrout spawning season is adopted in this Amendment (Appendix 4: Options 1.b or 1.c), temporarily reducing bag and trip limits would likely be less effective in rebuilding the stock as the majority of spawning would occur prior to harvest reopening and a portion of harvest reduced by temporary reductions would likely be recouped prior to the next spawning season. Most recreational and commercial fishers do not harvest their daily bag

or trip limit (see Appendix 2) so a modest temporary reduction of bag and trip limits likely would not impact overall harvest. To achieve a reduction in harvest, the temporary reduction in bag and trip limits may need to be more substantial.

Temporary adjustments to bag and trip limits may not be the most effective strategy when applied solely as part of the standard cold stun closure. Instead, they are likely to be more impactful when integrated into an adaptive management framework used in the event of an especially severe cold stun. The adaptive management framework would allow for a more tailored response to address specific conditions that may arise in the event of a severe cold stun.

Area Closures

Historically, cold stun events have varied in their spatial impacts and have ranged from a few isolated creeks in one river system to multiple riverine and estuarine systems. Cold stun events can also occur over large areas of the state, causing more significant losses in all major systems.

Previous cold stun closures have closed the Spotted Seatrout fishery statewide. Tagging and genetics data suggest that Spotted Seatrout exhibit high site fidelity to their natal estuary with periods of greater movement during the spawning season (Ellis, 2014; O'Donnell et al., 2014; Ward et al., 2007). This, coupled with limited movement in the winter months, supports the idea that effects of a cold stun may vary regionally. Using available information about Spotted Seatrout temperature tolerances, mortality probabilities to sub-optimal temperature exposure, and available continuous water temperature monitoring, the division could potentially identify areas of concern when freezing temperatures are predicted to occur. However, the division does not have the ability to quantify or predict the severity of a cold stun event so selecting specific areas for closures would be difficult and may minimize the overall desired impact of maximizing spawning potential following a significant cold stun event.

A statewide closure encompasses all estuarine and riverine systems where Spotted Seatrout overwinter, protecting all Spotted Seatrout in North Carolina from fishing pressure. This ensures areas without documented kills or continuous water temperature monitoring are still protected and that remaining Spotted Seatrout will have the opportunity to spawn before being subject to harvest. However, this strategy will cause fishing opportunities to be lost in areas that may not be affected by cold stun conditions. However, a tradeoff would be that a statewide closure protects fish that may migrate into open areas during more active movement periods during the onset of the spawning period. A statewide closure will also aide Marine Patrol in enforcement of the closure and not burden fisherman with changing boundaries. Further, Spotted Seatrout are assessed and managed as a single stock in North Carolina. Simply closing a small area or region where a cold stun is observed will shift effort to surviving portions of the stock and potentially amplify the negative effects of a cold stun event.

Adaptive Management

The current adaptive management framework for cold stun events allows the Director to close the Spotted Seatrout fishery through June 15th following a significant cold stun event. Since the adoption of the original FMP in 2012 the Spotted Seatrout fishery has been closed twice due to cold stun events (2014 and 2018). The adaptive management framework for cold stun event closures can be refined to further aid in stock recovery following a cold stun event. Adaptive management may be used to temporarily adjust management measures such as size or slot limits, season closures, trip limits, bag limits, and gear requirements if it is determined that additional protections for the stock are needed after a significant cold stun event. Management needed will take into consideration factors such as the size and scope of the cold stun event, the rate of air and water temperature change, and the length of exposure to extreme temperatures. Below is an example of a revised adaptive management framework for cold stun events for consideration.

1) If a significant cold stun event occurs the Director will close the Spotted Seatrout fishery statewide through the date adopted in this amendment.
2) Temporary measures that may be implemented through adaptive management to aid in stock recovery after the standard closure period following a cold stun event include:
    a. recreational bag limit
    b. commercial trip limit
    c. size limit changes
    d. seasonal closure
    e. gill net yardage restrictions
    f. Use of adaptive management to further aid in stock recovery once the fishery reopens following a cold stun event is contingent on approval by the Marine Fisheries Commission.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Table 4.1. Cold stun management options for the Spotted Seatrout fishery. Options would likely provide benefits to the stock but are not able to be quantified.

Topic	Option	Description
Season closure	1.a	Status quo – fishery closed until June 15th following a cold stun
	1.b	Extend harvest closure until June 30th following a cold stun
	1.c	Extend harvest closure until October 15th following a cold stun
Size limits	2.a	Status quo – no size limit change following a cold stun
	2.b	Temporary adjustment of size and or slot limits following a cold stun
Bag and trip limits	3.a	Status quo – no bag/trip limit changes
	3.b	Temporary adjustment of bag and trip limits following a cold stun
Adaptive management	4	

RECOMMENDATIONS

Division Recommendation:

Option 1.b Extend harvest closure until June 30 following a cold stun

Option 4 Cold Stun Adaptive Management Framework

Advisory Committee Recommendations and Public Comment: see Appendix 8

NCMFC Selected Management Options:

Option 1.b Extend harvest closure until June 30 following a cold stun.

Option 4 Adopt Cold Stun Adaptive Management Framework.

Appendix 5: SPOTTED SEATROUT MANAGEMENT AND STOCK STATUS IN OTHER STATES

Table 5.1 Spotted Seatrout recreational regulations on the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico coast by state as of March 2023. In Florida, Spotted Seatrout are managed separately across five Management Regions (Northeast, Central East, South, Big Bend, and Western Panhandle).

State	Size Limit	Daily Bag Limit	Season	Supplemental Management
VA	14”-24” one >24”	5 fish	Open year round	
SC	14”	10 fish	Open year round	Hook/line & gig only
GA	14”	15 fish	Open year round	
FL				No captain/crew allowance, no trebles w/ live/natural bait
Northeast	15”-19” one >19”	5 fish	Open year round	
Central East	15”-19” one >19”	2 fish	Closed Nov 1-Dec 31	
South	15”-19” one >19”	3 fish	Open year round	
Big Bend	15”-19” one >19”	5 fish	Open year round	
W. Panhandle	15”-19” one >19”	3 fish	Closed Feb	
AL	15”-22” one >22”	6 fish	Open year round	
MS	15”	15 fish	Open year round	
LA	12”-20” two >20”	15 fish	Open year round	No captain/crew allowance
TX	15”-20” one >30”	3 fish	Open year round	

Table 5.2 Spotted Seatrout commercial regulations on the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico coast by state as of March 2023. In Florida, Spotted Seatrout are managed separately across five Management Regions (Northeast, Central East, South, Big Bend, and Western Panhandle).

State	Size Limit	Commercial Trip Limit/Quota	Season	Supplemental Management
VA	14”	51,104 lb annual quota	Sep 1-Aug 31 of following year	A daily incidental catch limit of 50 pounds per licensee aboard a vessel with a max limit of 100 pounds per vessel takes effect once the annual quota is caught.
SC	NA	NA	NA	Closed to commercial harvest
GA	14”	15 fish	Open year round	
FL				
Northeast	15”-24”	50 fish	Open Jun 1-Nov 30	Hook/line or cast net only
Central East	15”-24”	50 fish	Open May 1-Sep 30	Hook/line or cast net only
South	15”-24”	50 fish	Open Jun 1 – Oct 31	Hook/line or cast net only
Big Bend	15”-24”	50 fish	Open Jun 1 – Oct 31	Hook/line or cast net only
W. Panhandle	15”-24”	50 fish	Open Jun 1 – Oct 31	Hook/line or cast net only
AL	NA	NA	NA	Closed to commercial harvest
MS	15”	50,000 lb annual quota	Open year round until quota is met	
LA	14”	15	Jan 2-Dec 31 or until quota is met	No harvest on weekends, hook/line only
TX	NA	NA	NA	Closed to commercial harvest

Table 5.3 The stock status of Spotted Seatrout on the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico coast by state as of March 2023. Not all states manage their Spotted Seatrout stock using stock assessments, therefore a stock status is not available for all states. In FL Spotted Seatrout stocks are assessed separately across five Management Regions (Northeast, Central East, South, Big Bend, and Western Panhandle).

State	Stock Assessment – Year	Stock Status
VA	Yes - 2020	Overfishing occurring, not overfished
SC	No	Unknown
GA	No	Unknown
FL	Yes - 2017	
Northeast		Overfishing occurring, overfished status unclear
Central East		Overfishing occurring, overfished status unclear
South		Not overfishing, not overfished
Big Bend		Overfishing occurring, overfished status unclear
W. Panhandle		Overfishing occurring, overfished status unclear
AL	Yes - 2017	At 20% SPR: overfishing occurring, not overfished At 30% SPR: overfishing occurring, stock overfished
MS	Yes – 2019	Overfishing status unclear, stock overfished
LA	Yes - 2021	Overfishing occurring, stock overfished
TX	No	Stock status unknown but independent sampling indicates depleted stock

Appendix 6: RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Develop a juvenile abundance index to gain a better understanding of a stock recruitment relationship.
2. Research the feasibility of including measures of temperature or salinity into the stock recruitment relationship.
3. Determine batch fecundity estimates for North Carolina Spotted Seatrout.
4. Size specific fecundity estimates for North Carolina Spotted Seatrout.
5. Investigation of the relationship of temperature with both adult and juvenile mortality.
6. Incorporate cold stun event information into the modeling of the population.
7. Estimate or develop a model to predict the impact of cold stun events on local and statewide Spotted Seatrout abundance.
8. Integrate tagging data into stock assessment model so both tagging data and other data sources can work together to give a better picture of the population.
9. Obtain samples (length, age, weight, quantification) of the cold stun events as they occur.
10. Define overwintering habitat requirements of Spotted Seatrout.
11. Determine factors that are most likely to influence the severity of cold stun events in North Carolina and separate into low and high salinity areas.
12. Investigate the distribution of Spotted Seatrout in nursery and non-nursery areas.
13. Further research on the possible influences of salinity on release mortality of Spotted Seatrout.
14. Survey of fishing effort in creeks with conflict complaints.
15. Determine targeted species in nursery areas and creeks with conflict complaints.
16. Microchemistry, genetic, or tagging studies are needed to verify migration patterns, mixing rates, or origins of Spotted Seatrout between North Carolina and Virginia.
17. Tagging studies to verify estimates of natural and fishing mortality.
18. Tagging studies to determine if there are localized populations within the state of North Carolina (e.g., a southern and northern stock).
19. A longer time series and additional sources of fishery-independent information.

20. Increased observer coverage in a variety of commercial fisheries over a wider area.

21. Expand nursery sampling to include SAV bed sampling in high and low salinity areas during the months of July through September.

22. Evaluate the role of shell hash and shell bottom in Spotted Seatrout recruitment and survival, particularly where SAV is absent.

23. Evaluate the role of SAV in the spawning success of Spotted Seatrout.

24. Develop estimates of commercial discards for runaround nets.

25. Conduct a detailed analysis of the existing Program 915 data to determine the extent to which late fall and spring provide insights into overwinter changes in abundance; this analysis could also provide insights into the magnitude of cold-stun events, which could explain differences in the effects observed in tagging and telemetry studies versus survey and fishery monitoring.

26. Improve estimates of recreational discard mortality.

Appendix 7: SPOTTED SEATROUT FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORKSHOP SUMMARY

ISSUE

Summarize input received from stakeholders from Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan Advisory Committee Workshop.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF).

BACKGROUND

The Spotted Seatrout Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Advisory Committee (AC) met for a three-day workshop April 22, 23, and 24 at the N.C. Cooperative Extension – Craven County Center in New Bern. The purpose of the workshop was for the AC to assist DMF staff in evaluating management issues and options included in draft Amendment 1 to the Spotted Seatrout FMP and informing the public on the issues contained in draft Amendment 1, solicit comments from peers and bring comments back to the AC, and evaluate the impacts of management options on the resource and user groups. It is important to note the purpose of the AC Workshop was to receive input from committee members based on their various experiences, expertise, and sector relationships, not to build a consensus among committee members or to recommended specific management strategies.

Division staff presented overviews of the stock assessment, life history, and fishery characterization portions of draft Amendment 1, including the Small Mesh Gill Net Information Paper and the Cold Stun Management, Sustainable Harvest, and Supplemental Management issue papers. Each presentation was followed by an opportunity for the AC to ask clarifying questions and discuss the content and management options included in each paper or section of draft Amendment 1. The AC did not have any suggestions regarding the content or clarity of the informational sections of draft Amendment 1. A summary of the management options and ideas discussed for information and issue papers in draft Amendment 1 are included below. Discussion points are organized by information and issue paper and topic. These points represent the discussion that occurred and the management options or combinations of options the AC suggested the division explore. Division staff explored these options and incorporated them directly into the relevant information and issue paper as appropriate.

DISCUSSION

Small-Mesh Gill-Net Fishery

The AC suggested looking at the data further to see if there is a mesh size(s) that might work with a slot limit in the gill-net fishery. The AC also suggested adding a research recommendation to look at discard mortality from runaround gill nets and other commercial gears.

Sustainable Harvest

Generally, the AC asked the division to prioritize access to the fishery when considering management measures and preferred raising the minimum size limit to reducing the bag/trip limit and season closures. The AC asked the division to consider a 15” or 16” to 20” slot limit, with or without a trophy fish allowance. There was discussion about implementing a commercial harvest cap either at 350,000 or 600,000 lb, similar to how the commercial Red Drum fishery is managed. If a season closure is considered by the division, the AC wanted it to be as short as possible and to consider the number of trips affected by a season closure. The AC gave some ideas for possible winter and spawning season closure options and urged for any closure to be less than 90 days. The AC suggested the division consider several combination options that included raising the minimum size limit, with and without a slot, paired with either a season closure or reducing the bag limit. The AC advised there is a need to build adaptive management into the FMP related to sustainable harvest.

Supplemental Management

The AC did not like the idea of a vessel limit for Spotted Seatrout. AC members relayed there was some support among charter captains to remove the captain and crew limit for Spotted Seatrout but not for species with lower bag limits (e.g., Red Drum, southern flounder).

The AC discussed the possibility of a commercial hook-and-line fishery. Discussion largely centered on the need to limit participation (e.g., exclude recreational fishermen with commercial licenses, commercial fishermen with no history of harvesting Spotted Seatrout) and the need for commercial license reforms prior to allowing a fishery. There was discussion concerning whether the fishery should be allowed with or without gill nets as an allowable gear. They also noted that further outreach and feedback is needed from the public prior to allowing a commercial hook-and-line fishery.

The AC discussed gear requirements in the Spotted Seatrout recreational fishery. Discussion included requiring circle hooks when using natural bait, prohibiting the use of treble hooks when using natural bait, and prohibiting treble hooks on artificial lures. The AC advised that increased outreach regarding ethical angling practices will be needed before any gear changes are required.

The AC brought up the issue of live release fishing tournaments and their potential impact on Spotted Seatrout, particularly the perceived increase in the number of tournaments. There was discussion concerning recent research suggesting the mortality of Spotted Seatrout from live release tournaments is roughly three times higher than recreational release mortality. The AC advised that more information needs to be collected from fishing tournaments.

Cold Stun Management Issue Paper

The AC was receptive to extending the standard cold stun closure period through June 30 (inclusive). The AC did not like the idea of instituting size limit restrictions as part of

the standard cold stun management response. Instead, the AC preferred to use adaptive management to implement additional temporary management measures (e.g., size limit, bag limit, trip limit, closed season), with a defined end date, based on the severity of a cold stun. There was a general preference for reducing the bag/trip limit instead of extending the season closure beyond the standard cold stun closure period.

Appendix 8: SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT RECCOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENT

Table 8.1 Summary of management recommendations from NC DMF, the Northern, Southern, and Finfish Advisory Committees (AC).

	DMF	Northern AC	Southern AC	Finfish AC
Appendix 2: Sustainable Harvest				
Recreational	Option 5.i: 3-fish bag limit 14”-20” slot limit with allowance for one fish >26” January-February harvest closure *39.5% harvest reduction*	No quorum	Option 5.i: 3-fish bag limit 14”-20” slot limit with allowance for one fish > 26” January-February harvest closure *39.5% harvest reduction*	16”-20” slot limit with allowance for one fish > 24” Maintain 4-fish bag limit *33% harvest reduction*
Commercial	Option 2.c: Saturday-Monday harvest closure October-December, & January-February harvest closure 1.a no changes to commercial size limit Option 3.a: Maintain 75-fish trip limit (does not apply to stop nets and hook and line fisheries) *40.2% harvest reduction*	No quorum	January-February closure Option 3.a: Maintain 75-fish trip limit (does not apply to stop nets and hook and line fisheries) *21.6% harvest reduction*	Saturday-Monday closure October-December, & Saturday-Sunday harvest closure January-September *30.3% harvest reduction*
Stop Net	Option 4.b: Formalize management in FMP	No quorum	Option 4.a: Maintain status quo	Option 4.a: Maintain status quo
Adaptive Management	Adopt Adaptive Management Framework	No quorum	Adopt Adaptive Management Framework	
Appendix 3: Supplemental Management				
	Option 1.b: Eliminate captain/crew limit on for-hire trips	No quorum	Allow two trip limits on one boat with one set of gear and two license holders Option 1.b: Eliminate captain/crew limit on for-hire trips	Option 1.b: Eliminate captain/crew limit on for-hire trips
Appendix 4: Cold Stun Management				

	Option 1.b: Extend harvest closure until June 30th following a cold stun Adopt Cold Stun Adaptive Management Framework	No quorum	Option 1.b: Extend harvest closure until June 30th following a cold stun	Adopt Cold Stun Adaptive Management Framework

Online Spotted Seatrout Public Questionnaire

The online Spotted Seatrout Public Questionnaire opened on September 27, 2024, and closed October 16, 2024. In total, the questionnaire had 201 participants, 153 of which left comments in addition to their responses.

Of the open response comments received, 47 were generally negative toward commercial fishing with many of these comments explicitly advocating for an outright ban or additional limitations (e.g., slot limit) on inshore gill nets. Additionally, most comments advocating against gill nets also advocated for a ban on inshore trawling. It is important to note that many of these comments either overstated the contribution of commercial harvest to total Spotted Seatrout harvest (e.g., “netting is the problem”) or incorrectly blamed inshore trawling.

Twenty-four responders mentioned slot limits with several of these supporting a slot limit with no trophy allowance and one supporting a 25” trophy allowance. Of the suggested slot limits, there was nearly equal support between a 14-20” and a 16-20” slot limit.

Sixteen comments addressed season closures; however, the scope of these comments ranged from not supporting any season closure to supporting extending the winter closure into spring to supporting a spawning season closure. Two responders expressed support for an early spring to June or July season closure as opposed to a wintertime closure.

Eleven responders emphasized the need for stronger enforcement of existing regulations, noting that violations like over-limit trips go unchecked.

Additional responders commented on the importance of equitable management between sectors, the desire for no additional management, or were generally negative toward the entire amendment. Three comments discussed discard rates, suggesting the discard estimates are too high in the recreational fishery.

Two responders mentioned and suggested the elimination of tournaments, citing that too many are being held and that the practice of high grading puts too much pressure on larger fish.

REFERENCES

Ahrens, R. N. M., M. S. Allen, C. Walters, and R. Arlinghaus. 2020. Saving large fish through harvest slots outperforms the classical minimum-length limit when the aim is to achieve multiple harvest and catch-related fisheries objectives. Fish and Fisheries 21(3):483–510.

Anweiler, K. V., Arnott, S. A., & Denson, M. R. (2014). Low-temperature tolerance of juvenile Spotted Seatrout in South Carolina. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 143(4), 999–1010.

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 1984. Fishery management plan for Spotted Seatrout. ASMFC, Fishery Management Report No. 4, Washington, D.C. 101 p.

ASMFC. 2007. The importance of habitat created by molluscan shellfish to managed species along the Atlantic coast of the United States. Habitat Management Series No. 8. ASMFC, Washington, DC. 108 p.

ASMFC. 2012. Omnibus amendment to the interstate fishery management plans for Spanish Mackerel, Spot, and Spotted Seatrout. Page 161. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Baltz, D.M., C. Rakocinski, and J.W. Fleeger. 1993. Microhabitat use by marsh-edge fishes in a Louisiana estuary. Environmental Biology of Fishes 36:109–126.

Barneche, D. R., D. R. Robertson, C. R. White, and D. J. Marshall. 2018. Fish reproductive-energy output increases disproportionately with body size. Science 360(6389):642–645.

Barnette, M. C. 2001. A review of the fishing gear utilized within the Southeast Region and their potential impacts on essential fish habitat. St. Petersburg, Florida: National Marine Fisheries Service.

Barrios, A.T., G.H. Beckwith, Jr., and P.S. Rand. 2006. Identification of critical spawning habitat and male courtship vocalization characteristics of Red Drum, Sciaenops ocellatus, in the lower Neuse River estuary of North Carolina. Final Report 05-EP-05. North Carolina Sea Grant Fishery Research Grant Program. 39 p.

Berkeley, S. A., M. A. Hixon, R. J. Larson, and M. S. Love. 2004. Fisheries Sustainability via Protection of Age Structure and Spatial Distribution of Fish Populations. Fisheries 29(8):23–32.

Blanton, J. O., F. E. Werner, B. O. Kapolnai, D. Knott, and E. L. Wenner. 1999. "Wind-generated transport of fictitious passive larvae into shallow tidal estuaries." Fisheries Oceanography 8(2): 210-223.

Boucek, R.E., E. Leone, J. Bickford, S. Walters-Burnsed, and S. Lowerre-Barbieri. 2017. More than just a spawning location: examining fine scale space use of two estuarine fish species at a spawning aggregation site. Frontiers in Marine Science 4. 355 p.

Brown-Peterson, N. J., and J. W. Warren. 2001. The reproductive biology of Spotted Seatrout, Cynoscion nebulosus, along the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Gulf of Mexico Science 19(1).

Brown-Peterson, N. J., Peterson, M. S., Nieland, D. L., Murphy, M. D., Taylor, R. G., & Warren, J. R. (2002). Reproductive Biology of Female Spotted Seatrout, Cynoscion nebulosus, in the Gulf of Mexico: Differences among Estuaries? Environmental Biology of Fishes, 63(4), 405–415.

Burns, B. 1996. Life history and population dynamics of Spotted Seatrout (Cynoscion nebulosus) in North Carolina [Life History of Selected Marine Recreational Fishes in North Carolina Completion Report Grant F-43 Study 4]. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

Byrd, B. L., A. A. Hohn, G. N. Lovewell, K. M. Altman, S. G. Barco, A. Friedlaender, C. A. Harms, et al. 2014. "Strandings as indicators of marine mammal biodiversity and human interactions off the coast of North Carolina." Fishery Bulletin 112(1): 1-23.

Byrd, B. L., and A. A. Hohn. 2017. "Differential risk of bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) bycatch in North Carolina, USA." Aquatic Mammals 43(5): 558-569.

Byrd, Barbie L., and Aleta A. Hohn. 2010. "Challenges Documenting Tursiops truncatus Montagu (Bottlenose Dolphin) Bycatch in the Stop Net Fishery along Bogue Banks, North Carolina." Southeastern Naturalist 9(1): 47-62.

Churchill, J. H., F. E. Werner, R. Luettich, and J. O. Blanton. 1997. "Flood tide circulation near Beaufort Inlet, NC: implications for larval recruitment." Estuaries 22.

Coen, L.E., M.W. Luckenbach, and D.L. Breitburg. 1999. The role of oyster reefs as essential fish habitat: a review of current knowledge and some new perspectives. Pages 438–454 In: L.R. Benaka (ed.), Fish Habitat: Essential Fish Habitat and Rehabilitation. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 22, Bethesda, Maryland.

Cooke, S. J., C. D. Suski, B. L. Barthel, K. G. Ostrand, B. L. Tufts, and D. P. Philipp. 2003. Injury and Mortality Induced by Four Hook Types on Bluegill and Pumpkinseed. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 23(3):883–893.

Corbett, D. R., T. West, L. Clough, and H. Daniels. 2004. Potential impacts of bottom trawling on water column productivity and sediment transport processes. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant.

Daniel III, L.B. 1988. Aspects of the biology of juvenile Red Drum, *Sciaenops ocellatus*, and Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus* (Pisces: Sciaenidae). Master's thesis. College of Charleston, South Carolina. 116 p.

Darna, P. H. 2002. Reduction of seabird mortality in gill nets. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, FRG 01-FEG-17, Final Report.

Dubik, B. A., E. C. Clark, T. Young, S.B. J. Ziegler, M. M. Provost, M. L. Pinsky, and K. St. Martin. 2019. "Governing fisheries in the face of change: Social responses to long-term geographic shifts in a U.S. fishery." Marine Policy 99: 243-251.

Ellis, T. A. (2014). Mortality and movement of Spotted Seatrout at its northern latitudinal limits [Dissertation]. North Carolina State University.

Ellis, T. A. 2014. Mortality and movement of Spotted Seatrout at its northern latitudinal limits. Dissertation, North Carolina State Univeristy, Raleigh, NC.

Ellis, T. A., Buckel, J. A., Hightower, J. E., & Poland, S. J. (2017). Relating cold tolerance to winterkill for Spotted Seatrout at its northern latitudinal limits. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology, 490, 42–51.

Ellis, T. A., Hightower, J. E., & Buckel, J. A. (2018). Relative importance of fishing and natural mortality for Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) estimated from a tag-return model and corroborated with survey data. Fisheries Research, 199, 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2017.11.004

Evans, W. G. 2001. Size of flounder trapped in gill-nets of different mesh sizes and marketable and non-marketable bycatch (Red Drum). Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, FRG 98-FEG-50, Final Report.

Froese, R. 2004. Keep it simple: three indicators to deal with overfishing. Fish and Fisheries 5(1):86–91.

Gearhart, J. 2002. Interstate fisheries management program implementation for North Carolina. Study II: Documentation and reduction of bycatch in North Carolina fisheries. Job 3: Hooking mortality of Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*), Weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*), Red Drum (*Sciaenops ocellata*), and Southern Flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) in North Carolina. Page 30. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Completion Report for Cooperative Agreement No. NA 87FG0367/2.

Hare, J.A., J.A. Quinlan, F.E. Werner, B.O. Blanton, J.J. Govoni, R.B. Forward, L.R. Settle, and D.E. Hoss. 1999. Larval transport during winter in the SABRE study area: results of a coupled vertical larval behavior-three-dimensional circulation model. Fisheries Oceanography 8 (Suppl. 2):57–76.

Hettler Jr., W.F. 1989. Nekton use of regularly-flooded saltmarsh cordgrass habitat in North Carolina, USA. Marine Ecology Progress Series 56:111–118.

Holt, G.J., and S.A. Holt. 2003. Effects of variable salinity on reproduction and early life stages of Spotted Seatrout. Pages 135–145 In: S.A. Bortone (ed.), Biology of the Spotted Seatrout. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Hurst, T. P. (2007). Causes and consequences of winter mortality in fishes. Journal of Fish Biology, 71, 315–345.

James, J. T., G. W. Stunz, D. A. McKee, and R. R. Vega. 2007. Catch-and-release mortality of Spotted Seatrout in Texas: effects of tournaments, seasonality, and anatomical hooking location. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 27(3):900–907.

Jensen, C. C. 2009. Stock status of Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus*, in North Carolina, 1991-2008. Page 90. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC.

Kapolnai, A., R. E. Werner, and J. O. Blanton. 1996. "Circulation, mixing, and exchange processes in the vicinity of tidal inlets." Journal of Geophysical Research 101(14): 253-268.

Kimel, J. F., S. Corbett, and T. Thorpe. 2010. Effects on habitat when using bottom disturbing devices in the estuarine gill net fishery. Brunswick, New Hanover, and Pender Counties: North Carolina Sea Grant, 60 p.

Kimel, J., S. Corbett, and T. Thorpe. 2008. Selectivity of large mesh gillnets in the southeastern flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*) fishery. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 07-FEG-12, Final Report.

Kunkel, K. E., D. R. Easterling, A. Ballinger, S. Bililign, S. M. Champion, D. R. Corbett, K. D. Dello, et al. 2020. North Carolina climate science report. North Carolina Institute for Climate Studies.

Kupschus, S. 2004. A temperature-dependent reproductive model for Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) explaining spatio-temporal variations in reproduction and young-of-the-year recruitment in Florida estuaries. ICES Journal of Marine Science 61(1):3–11.

Lavin, C. P., G. P. Jones, D. H. Williamson, and H. B. Harrison. 2021. Minimum size limits and the reproductive value of numerous, young, mature female fish. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 288(1946):20202714.

Lowerre-Barbieri, S.K., N. Henderson, J. Llopiz, S. Walters, J. Bickford, and R. Muller. 2009. Defining a spawning population (Spotted Seatrout *Cynoscion nebulosus*) over temporal, spatial, and demographic scales. Marine Ecology Progress Series 394:231–245.

Luczkovich, J.J., H.J. Daniel III, and M.W. Sprague. 1999. Characterization of critical spawning habitats of Weakfish, Spotted Seatrout and Red Drum in Pamlico Sound using hydroplane surveys. Completion Report, F-62, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 128 p.

Luettich Jr., R.A., J.L. Hench, C.W. Fulcher, F.E. Werner, B.O. Blanton, and J.H. Churchill. 1999. Barotropic tidal and wind-driven larval transport in the vicinity of a barrier island inlet. Fisheries Oceanography 8 (Suppl. 2):190–209.

McConnaughey, J., J. Boyd, and L. Klibansky. 2019. Annual sea turtle interaction monitoring of the anchored gill-net fisheries in North Carolina for Incidental Take Permit Year 2018. Annual Completion Report for Activities under Endangered Species Act Section 10 Incidental Take Permit No. 16230. Morehead City, NC: North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, 58 p.

McDonald, D.L., B.W. Bumguardner, and M.R. Fisher. 2010. Winterkill simulation on three size classes of Spotted Seatrout. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Austin Texas, Management Data Series No. 259. 10 p.

McKenna, S., and J. T. Camp. 1992. An examination of the blue crab fishery in Pamlico River estuary. North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources Report 98-02:92.

McMichael Jr., R.H., and K.M. Peters. 1989. Early life history of Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus* (Pices: Sciaenidae), in Tampa Bay, Florida. Estuaries 12(2):98–110.

Mercer, L.P. 1984. A biological and fisheries profile of Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus*. Special Scientific Report No. 40. North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 87 p.

Mercer, L.P. 1984. A biological and fisheries profile of Spotted Seatrout, Cynoscion nebulosus. Special Scientific Report No. 40. North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 87 p.

Millard, M. J., J. W. Mohler, A. Kahnle, and A. Cosman. 2005. Mortality Associated with Catch-and-Release Angling of Striped Bass in the Hudson River. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 25(4):1533–1541.

Minello, T.J. 1999. Nekton densities in shallow estuarine habitats of Texas and Louisiana and the identification of Essential Fish Habitat. Pages 43–75 In: L.R. Benaka (ed.), Fish Habitat: Essential Fish Habitat and Rehabilitation. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 22, Bethesda, MD.

Minello, T.J., K.W. Able, M.P. Weinstein, and C.G. Hays. 2003. Salt marshes as nurseries for nekton: testing hypotheses on density, growth and survival through meta-analysis. Marine Ecology Progress Series 246:39–59.

Montgomery, G. 2001. By-catch comparison of flounder gill nets utilizing different denier webbing. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 99-FEG-36, Final Report.

Morley, J. W., R. L. Selden, R. J. Latour, T. L. Frolicher, R. J. Seagraves, and M. L. Pinsky. 2018. "Projecting shifts in thermal habitat for 686 species on the North American continental shelf." PloS one 13(5).

Moulton, L.D., M.A. Dance, J.A. Williams, M.Z. Sluis, G.W. Stunz, and J.R. Rooker. 2017. Habitat partitioning and seasonal movement of Red Drum and Spotted Seatrout. Estuaries and Coasts 40:905–916.

Murphy, M. D., Chagaris, D., & Addis, D. 2010. An assessment of the status of Spotted Seatrout in Florida waters through 2009.

Murphy, M. D., R. F. Heagey, V. H. Neugebauer, M. D. Gordon, and J. L. Hintz. 1995. Mortality of Spotted Seatrout released from gill-net or hook-and-line gear in Florida. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 15(4):748–753.

NCDEQ. 2016. North Carolina Habitat Protection Plan: Source Document. Morehead City, NC: Division of Marine Fisheries, 475 pp.

NCDMF. 2009. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery management plans: Spotted Seatrout brochure. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

NCDMF. 2012. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery management plan (p. 360). North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

NCDMF. 2015. Stock assessment of Spotted Seatrout, Cynoscion nebulosus, in Virginia and North Carolina waters, 2014 (SAP-SAR-2015-02; p. 142 p.). North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

NCDMF. 2012. North Carolina Spotted Seatrout fishery management plan (p. 360). North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

NCDMF. 2022. Stock assessment of Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus*, in Virginia and North Carolina waters, 1991-2019. Page 137 p. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, NCDMF SAP-SAR-2022-02, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2023. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries License and Statistics Section 2023 Annual Report (p. 607). North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

NCDWQ. 2000a. A citizen's guide to water quality management in North Carolina. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality, Planning Branch, Raleigh, North Carolina. 156 p.

NCDWQ. 2000b. DWQ Water quality citizen guide. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, North Carolina Division of Water Quality, 165 p.

NCDWQ. 2008. Supplemental guide to North Carolina's basinwide planning: Support document for the basinwide water quality plans, second revision. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, North Carolina Division of Water Quality, 211 p.

Nelson, T. R., C. L. Hightower, and S. P. Powers. 2021. Red Drum and Spotted Seatrout live-release tournament mortality and dispersal. Marine and Coastal Fisheries 13(4):320–331.

Nieland, D. L., R. G. Thomas, and C. A. Wilson. 2002. Age, growth, and reproduction of Spotted Seatrout in Barataria Bay, Louisiana. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 131(2):245–259.

NMFS. 2013. "Endangered Species; File No. 16230. Notice of permit issuance." Federal Registrar 78:57132-57133.—. 2014. "Endangered species; File No. 18102. Issuance of permit." Federal Register 79:43716-43718.

NMFS. 2014. Endangered species; File No. 18102. Issuance of permit. Federal Register 79:43716–43718.

Noble, E.B. and R.J. Monroe. 1991. Classification of Pamlico Sound Nursery Areas: Recommendations for Critical Habitat Criteria. A/P Project No. 89-09. North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 70 p.

O'Donnell, T. P., Denson, M. R., & Darden, T. L. (2014). Genetic population structure of Spotted Seatrout *Cynoscion nebulosus* along the south-eastern U.S.A.: Cynoscion nebulosus genetic population structure. Journal of Fish Biology, 85(2), 374–393.

Peterson, C. H., and N. M. Peterson. 1979. The ecology of intertidal flats of North Carolina: a community profile. Washington, DC: United States Fish and Wildlife Service, OBS-79/39, 73 p.

Peterson, G. W., and R. G. Turner. 1994. "The value of salt marsh edge vs. interior as a habitat for fish and decapod crustaceans in a Louisiana tidal marsh." Estuaries 17: 235-262.

Powers, J.P. 2012. Distribution patterns of juvenile Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) and Red Drum (*Sciaenops ocellatus*) along shallow beach habitats in Pamlico River, North Carolina. Master's thesis. East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina. 85 p.

Price, A. B., and J. Gearhart. 2002. Interstate fisheries management program implementation for North Carolina. Study II documentation and reduction of bycatch in North Carolina fisheries. Job 2: Small mesh (<= 4.5-inch) gillnet discard mortality of Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*), Weakfish (*Cynoscion regalis*), Southern Flounder (*Paralichthys lethostigma*), and Red Drum (*Sciaenops ocellata*) in Roanoke Sound, Core Sound, and the Neuse River, North Carolina. Page 30. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Completion Report for Cooperative Agreement NA 87FG0367 /1.

Purvis, C. 1976. Nursery area survey of northern Pamlico Sound and tributaries. Completion Report No. 2-230-R. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 62 p.

Rakocinski, C.F., D.M. Baltz, and J.W. Fleeger. 1992. Correspondence between environmental gradients and the community structure of marsh-edge fishes in a Louisiana estuary. Marine Ecology Progress Series 80:135–148.

Ricci, S.W., D.B. Eggleston, and D.R. Bohnenstiehl. 2017. Use of passive acoustic monitoring to characterize fish spawning behavior and habitat use within a complex mosaic of estuarine habitats. Bulletin of Marine Science 93(2):439–453.

Rogers, S. I., M. J. Kaiser, and S. Jennings. 1998. "Ecosystem effects of demersal fishing: a European perspective." An Effect of Fishing Gear on the Sea Floor of New England, by E. M. Doresy and J. Pederson, 160 p. Boston, Massachusetts: Conservation Law Foundation.

Rooker, J.R., S.A. Holt, M.A. Soto, and G.J. Holt. 1998. Post settlement patterns of habitat use by sciaenid fishes in subtropical seagrass meadows. Estuaries 21(2):318–327.

Rose, T. L. 2000. Migratory bird bycatch in submerged versus floating shad gill nets. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 99-FEG-34, Final Report, 53 p.

Rose, T. L. 2001. Migratory bird bycatch in submerged versus floating shad gill nets. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 00-FEG-22, Final Report, 54 p.

Rose, T. L. 2004. Migratory bird bycatch in submerged versus floating shad gill nets. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 01-FEG-04, Final Report, 62 p.

Ross, S.W., and S.P. Epperly. 1985. Utilization of shallow estuarine nursery areas by fishes in Pamlico Sound and adjacent tributaries, North Carolina. Pages 207–232 In: A. Yanez-Arancibia (ed.), Fish Community Ecology in Estuaries and Coastal Lagoons: Towards an Ecosystem Integration. DR (R) UNAM Press, Mexico.

Roumillat, W. A., & Brouwer, M. C. 2004. Reproductive dynamics of female Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*) in South Carolina. Fishery Bulletin, 102, 473–487.

Roumillat, W.A., S. Tyree, and G. Reikirk. 1997. Spawning times and locations of Spotted Seatrout in the Charleston Harbor estuarine system from acoustic surveys. Final Report to Charleston Harbor Project. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Marine Resources Research Institute, Charleston, South Carolina. 10 p.

Saucier, M.H., and D.M. Baltz. 1992. Hydrophone identification of spawning sites of Spotted Seatrout *Cynoscion nebulosus* (Osteichthys: Sciaenidae) near Charleston, South Carolina. Northeast Gulf Science 12(2):141–146.

Saucier, M.H., and D.M. Baltz. 1993. Spawning site selection by Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus*, and Black Drum, *Pogonias cromis*, in Louisiana. Environmental Biology of Fishes 36:257–272.

Skomal, G. B., B. C. Chase, and E. D. Prince. 2002. A comparison of circle hook and straight hook performance in recreational fisheries for juvenile Atlantic Bluefin Tuna. American Fisheries Society Symposium 30:57–65.

Stewart, C.B., and F.S. Scharf. 2008. Estuarine recruitment, growth, and first-year survival of juvenile Red Drum in North Carolina. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 137(4):1089–1103.

Stunz, G. W., and D. A. McKee. 2006. Catch-and-release mortality of Spotted Seatrout in Texas. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 26(4):843–848.

Tabb, D.C. 1958. Differences in the estuarine ecology of Florida waters and their effect on populations of spotted Weakfish, *Cynoscion nebulosus* (Cuvier and Valenciennes). Transactions of the 23rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference 23:392–401.

Tabb, D.C. 1966. The estuary as a habitat for Spotted Seatrout, *Cynoscion nebulosus*. American Fisheries Society Special Publication No. 3:59–67.

Thayer, G. W., W. J. Kenworthy, and M. S. Fonseca. 1984. The ecology of eelgrass meadows of the Atlantic coast; a community profile. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Thorpe, N. B., and D. Beresoff. 2005. Effects of gillnet tie-downs on fish and bycatch rates associated with American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*) and flounder (*Paralichthys spp.*) fisheries in southeastern North Carolina. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, Completion Report 04-FEG-03, 124 p.

Thorpe, T., D. Beresoff, and K. Cannady. 2001. Gillnet bycatch potential, discard mortality, and condition of Red Drum (*Sciaenops ocellatus*) in southeastern North Carolina. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 00-FEG-14, Final Report, 78 p.

Todd, V. L. G., I. B. Todd, J. C. Gardiner, E. C. N. Morrin, N. A. MacPherson, N. A. DiMarzio, F. Thomsen. A review of impacts of marine dredging activities on marine mammals. ICES Journal of Marine Science. 72 (2):328–340.

Vecchio, J. L., and C. A. Wenner. 2007. Catch-and-release mortality in subadult and adult Red Drum captured with popular fishing hook types. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 27(3):891–899.

Ward, R., Bowers, K., Hensley, R., Mobely, B., & Belouski, E. (2007). Genetic variability in Spotted Seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*), determined with microsatellite DNA markers. Fishery Bulletin, 105(2), 197–206.

White, R. R., and J. L. Armstrong. 2000. Survival of Atlantic sturgeon captured by flounder gill nets in Albemarle Sound. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, 98-FEG-39, Final Report.

Williams, V. G. 2000. Characterization of shallow water mullet gill net fisheries by species, by catch, and fishing method. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Sea Grant, FRG 97-FEG-37, Final Report, 74 p.

Wolff, M. 1976. Nursery area survey of the Outer Banks region. Completion report No. 2-222-R. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 47 p.

DECISION DOCUMENT

Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan
Amendment 5

This document was developed by the Division of Marine Fisheries to help the Marine Fisheries Commission track previous activity and prepare for upcoming actions for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5.

February 2025

Summary

At the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) business meeting in February 2025 business meeting, public comments, AC recommendations, and North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) final management recommendations for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 will be presented. At that meeting, the MFC will consider this input and select their preferred management options. The draft FMP will then be updated accordingly and sent out for review to the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Quality and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Agriculture and Natural and Economic Resources (N.C. General Statute § 113-182.1(e)).

Background

The Eastern Oyster FMP is undergoing its five-year review with focus on wild mechanical harvest, recreational harvest, and formalizing cultch planting as an integrated fishery management strategy. Since there is no stock assessment for status determination, the goal is to manage the resource to maintain species population to provide long-term harvest and continue to offer protection and ecological benefits to North Carolina estuaries. Only wild oyster harvest issues and management strategies are considered in Amendment 5 as current shellfish aquaculture methods have limited impacts on wild oyster stocks, and managing the private culture industry has grown beyond the scope of the FMP process.

A joint issue that will also be addressed in Amendment 3 of the Hard Clam FMP is recreational shellfish harvest. Recreational shellfish harvest does not require a license in NC, resulting in the inability of the DMF to adequately collect recreational landings data. This data gap has been cited as a major need in all past FMPs and needs addressed to account for all removals from the populations. These data are needed for future stock assessments of Hard Clams and Eastern Oysters. Additionally, shellfish harvest is subject to changing area closures due to human health and safety concerns. Without licensing or permitting requirements, the DMF is unable to ensure that every recreational harvester is informed of shellfish sanitation concerns. The draft FMP contains an issue paper outlining the broad need to capture recreational harvest sector information and have an effective means to provide health and safety information to all recreational shellfish harvesters.

Management strategies are divided regionally by Pamlico Sound (generally subtidal, mechanical harvest) and south of Core Sound (mixed subtidal and intertidal, hand harvest) populations. These strategies apply to both natural reefs and cultch reefs. Natural reefs formed with no human intervention and cultch reefs were built by DMF. Both types of reefs are colonized by wild oysters. Oyster reefs are highly susceptible to the effects of harvest, particularly mechanical, due to oysters being both a fishery resource as well as their own habitat needed to perpetuate their population.

Pamlico Sound is the only area where mechanical gears are allowed for oyster harvest. Mechanical harvest is managed through a sampling program that was designed to stop mechanical harvest in a management area when the percent legal oyster falls below 26% to reduce habitat impacts. The season duration for mechanical harvest for oysters in each management area can be highly variable and is affected by the amount of the oyster resource available and fishery effort. The current trigger monitoring approach, despite a large sampling effort from the DMF, does not provide fishery independent data suitable to create indices for a future stock assessment. Additionally, the current approach results in the DMF having to quickly issue proclamations to close management areas to mechanical harvest with short public notice. The draft FMP proposes a tiered approach to potential management aimed to balance both the habitat and fishery value of Pamlico Sound oysters. The proposed strategy would provide some certainty in season length for mechanical harvesters and utilize the DMF's extensive cultch planting program as a management tool.

South of Core Sound, only hand harvest occurs and accounts for most of the commercial oyster landings. The draft FMP contains an information paper outlining the decline in participation and landings in hand harvest after a management shift implemented in Amendment 4 reduced holders of a Shellfish License statewide to 2 bushels per day and no more than 4 bushels per vessel in Internal Coastal Fishing Waters. The DMF is investigating the use of a pilot oyster sentinel site monitoring program to collect fishery independent data for intertidal oyster reefs to potentially inform a future stock assessment and management decisions for the southern region.

Amendment Timing

(gray indicates completed step)

September 2023	DMF holds public scoping period
November 2023	MFC approves goal and objectives of FMP
December 2023 – June 2024	DMF drafts FMP
July 2024	DMF held workshop to review and further develop the draft FMP with the Oyster/Clam FMP Advisory Committee
August – November 2024	DMF updates draft plan
November 2024	MFC Reviews draft and votes on sending draft FMP for public and AC review
January 2025	MFC Regional and Standing Advisory Committees meet to review draft FMP and receive public comment
February 2025	**MFC selects preferred management options**
March – April 2025	DEQ Secretary and Legislative review of draft FMP
May 2025	MFC votes on final adoption of FMP
TBD	DMF and MFC implement management strategies

You are here

Goal and Objectives

The goal of the N.C. Eastern Oyster FMP is to manage the oyster resource in such a way as to maintain oyster populations that provide long-term harvest and continue to offer protection and ecological benefits to North Carolina's estuaries. To achieve this goal, it is recommended that the following objectives be met:

- Use the best available biological, environmental, habitat, fishery, social, and economic data to effectively monitor and manage the oyster fishery and its environmental role.
- Support and implement the restoration and protection of oyster populations as both a fishery resource and an important estuarine habitat through the actions of the Cultch Planting and Oyster Sanctuary programs.
- Coordinate with DEQ and stakeholders to implement actions that protect habitat and environmental quality consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) recommendations.
- Manage oyster harvesting gear use to minimize damage to habitat.
- Promote stewardship of the resource through public outreach to increase public awareness regarding the ecological value of oysters and encourage stakeholder involvement in fishery management and habitat enhancement activities.

Management Measures

Management Carried Forward in Amendment 5

There are management measures from the previous FMP to carry forward into Amendment 5 as listed below:

- A daily limit of two bushels of oysters per person with a maximum of four bushels of oysters per vessel off public bottom for Shellfish License holders statewide.
- A six-week opening timeframe for mechanical harvest in deep bays to begin on the Monday of the week prior to Thanksgiving week through the Friday after Thanksgiving. Reopen two weeks before Christmas for the remainder of the six-week season.
- A 15-bushel hand/mechanical harvest limit in Pamlico Sound mechanical harvest areas outside the bays, 10-bushel hand/mechanical harvest limit in the bays, and 10-bushel hand harvest limit in the Mechanical Methods Prohibited area along the Outer Banks of Pamlico Sound.

Management Options, Ordered by Issue

Recreational Harvest

Implementing a licensing or permitting requirement for recreational shellfish harvesters would give the DMF the opportunity to adequately collect recreational landings data needed for future stock assessments of Eastern Oysters and Hard Clams, and to inform participants of where to find information on harvest closure boundaries, where to sign up to receive polluted area proclamations or to access temporary closure maps, and where to find information on safe handling practices, particularly as it relates to *Vibrio* bacteria.

To pursue any of these solutions, significant time and effort will be needed to assess internal program and resource capabilities and limitations. Any legislative changes require a specific process and are ultimately out of NCDMF or MFC control. Given these constraints, NCDMF recommends exploring potential options and solutions outside of the FMP process.

Option 1: Recreational Harvest

(Refer to pp. 52-58 in the Draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 1 for additional details)

a. Status Quo

b. Support the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to estimate recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

Mechanical Harvest

The oyster resource in Pamlico Sound is unique in that the commodity is responsible for building the substrate of valuable subtidal habitat which supports rich biodiversity and provides vital ecosystem services. To continue to maintain harvestable oyster populations in Pamlico Sound, and to better balance the value of oysters as both a fishery resource and essential habitat, a three-tiered approach is proposed for the Pamlico Sound oyster mechanical harvest management:

1. Deep-Water Oyster Recovery Areas
2. Cultch Supported Harvest
3. Rotational Cultch Sites

Tier/Strategy 1, Deep-Water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs):

The remnant deep water natural oyster reefs in the Pamlico River and Neuse River have suffered mass mortality from water quality impacts. These oyster reefs need high vertical relief (height) to be resilient to negative water quality impacts from storm events. However, mechanical harvest reduces the ability of natural oyster reefs in deep water to gain and maintain height as dredging actively removes valuable shell bottom habitat. These reefs have likely not supported much fishery effort since 2018 and have had very few live or legal oysters sampled during DMF monitoring efforts. Past and present permit restrictions do not

allow for the enhancement of deep-water reefs in Pamlico Sound with cultch. However, if future permitting could be secured to enhance or restore these deep-water reefs, low-relief cultch plantings would likely not be sufficient to quickly restore the reef height needed, and large high relief materials would need to be employed. The use of large materials such as boulders may prevent any future mechanical harvest of these sites once restored. Proposed Deep-Water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs) would not open to the mechanical harvest of oysters to allow these reefs to accumulate shell material to gain the height necessary to be resilient to storm events. Reefs deeper than 5m have been identified to be most vulnerable to poor water quality events. Two DORAs (Pamlico and Neuse River) with options for varying sizes have been proposed by creating boundaries using existing navigational aids for ease of compliance and enforceability. Determination of successful recovery and developing sustainable harvest strategies would occur in a future FMP. Future sustainable harvest is defined as a level of harvest that would not result in a net loss of reef height through time and maintain reef height gained through DORA implementation.

Tier/Strategy 2, Cultch Supported Harvest:

The Cultch Supported Harvest strategy seeks to link mechanical oyster harvest management in Pamlico Sound to the DMF's extensive cultch planting effort. The primary changes from previous management in the proposed strategy are that season lengths will be predetermined and based on DMF pre-season sampling of the oyster resource in these areas, and the 10-bushel per day bays and 15-bushel per day open areas will be considered differently for each management area based on the pre-season sampling. This will eliminate the unpredictability experienced by harvesters of how long mechanical harvest will occur in a given season and consider differences in oyster mortality experienced at varying depths of Pamlico Sound. Season lengths will be predetermined based on pre-season sampling of oyster condition. Results of sampling data will be used to set season length as shown in the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper (Appendix 2). During the harvest season, in-season sampling will occur to determine if the initial season length should be extended. Harvesters will be encouraged to report productive sites, aiding in more accurate in-season assessments. The new approach aims to reduce unpredictability by setting season lengths based on oyster resource conditions and ensuring that harvesting does not overly damage oyster habitats. The goal is to balance sustainable oyster harvests with the preservation of habitat provided by cultch planting

Tier/Strategy 3, Rotational Cultch Harvest Sites:

The Cultch Planting Program has implemented a reef building strategy in Pamlico Sound to create large ~10-acre cultch planting sites in areas open to mechanical harvest, with the goal of having at least 16 sites planted by 2026. Within each of four management areas, there would be four cultch sites integrated into a rotational opening plan. These Rotational Cultch Sites would not be subject to the season lengths set for Cultch Supported Harvest. Instead, a subset of these large cultch sites would be open in each management area and their open/closure status would rotate between seasons. This strategy focuses on the fishery value of these reefs and gives harvesters relatively open access to these targeted cultch plantings. Formalizing a rotational strategy would also help to add statutory anchor

points for the Cultch Planting Program within the requirements of G.S. 113-182.1. This could be useful in pursuing additional and consistent funding for the program moving forward.

Adaptive Management:

The fixed mechanical season lengths for Cultch Supported Harvest were developed using fishery monitoring data for the five oyster mechanical harvest seasons between November 2018 and May 2023. Any large changes in effort could result in these fixed season lengths becoming either inadequate or too restrictive. The annual average number of participants with landings in the mechanical oyster fishery between 2018 and 2023 was 93. If the three-year running average of participants is less than 70 or greater than 116 (calculated during annual FMP Update), examination of oyster sampling data and potential adjustment to fixed season lengths for Cultch Supported Harvest is triggered.

Option 1: Mechanical Oyster Harvest – Deep-Water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs)

(Refer to pp. 59-90 in the Draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 2 for additional details)

a. Status Quo

b. Adopt the proposed Pamlico and Neuse River Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs), which are bound by existing navigational aids as presented to the NC MFC regional Advisory Committees, to protect deep subtidal oyster reefs from continued physical disturbance by mechanical gear. These areas will be closed to mechanical oyster dredging and monitoring efforts will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of closure within the next FMP amendment. The DORAs cover 681 acres of potential oyster habitat (500 acres in Pamlico River and 180 acres in Neuse River), which represents approximately 81% of the vulnerable deep-water oyster habitat.

c. Adopt smaller proposed Pamlico and Neuse River Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs), which are bound by existing navigational aids, to protect deep subtidal oyster reefs from continued physical disturbance by mechanical gear. These areas will be closed to mechanical oyster dredging and monitoring efforts will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of closure within the next FMP amendment. The smaller DORAs cover 271 acres of potential habitat (200 acres in Pamlico River and 71 acres in Neuse River), which represents only approximately 32% of the vulnerable habitat.

Option 2: Mechanical Oyster Harvest – Cultch Supported Harvest

(Refer to pp. 59-90 in the Draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 2 for additional details)

a. Status Quo

b. Adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy outlined in Appendix 2, which would set the season length based on pre-season sampling aided by industry input on sampling locations with the 10 bushel per day and 15 bushel per day areas considered separately.

Option 3: Mechanical Oyster Harvest – Rotational Harvest Cultch Sites

(Refer to pp. 59-90 in the Draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 2 for additional details)

a. Status Quo

b. Adopt the inclusion of Rotational Harvest Cultch Sites strategy outlined in Appendix 2. This strategy would create a rotating series of readily available cultch areas available to harvest for the full extent of the mechanical season length each year with the intent of reducing harvest pressure on natural reefs.

Option 4: Mechanical Oyster Harvest – Adaptive Management for Cultch Supported Harvest strategy

(Refer to pp. 59-90 in the Draft Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 2 for additional details)

a. Status Quo

b. Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework to allow for modification of set season length based on changes to participation in the fishery.

Division of Marine Fisheries Recommendations

A summary of the DMF's final recommendations can be found below.

Recreational Harvest

Support the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

Mechanical Harvest

To continue to maintain harvestable oyster populations and to better balance the value of oysters as both a fishery resource and essential habitat, the DMF recommends the following:

- Adopt the larger of the two proposed Pamlico and Neuse River DORAs, which are bound by existing navigational aids.
- Adopt the proposed Cultch Supported Harvest strategy as described in Appendix 2.
- Adopt the proposed Rotational Cultch Site strategy as described in Appendix 2.
- Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework for the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy.

Next Steps

Comments received during the comment period and AC recommendations, as well as the DMF's final management recommendations, will be presented to the MFC during their February 2025 business meeting. At that meeting, the MFC will consider this input and select their preferred management options. The draft FMP will then be updated accordingly and sent out for review to the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Quality and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Agriculture and Natural and Economic Resources (N.C. General Statute § 113-182.1(e)). After this final review, the MFC will vote on the final adoption of measures for the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 at their May 2025 business meeting.

EASTERN OYSTER FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT 5

North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street / P. O. Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557

This document may be cited as:

NCDMF (North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries). 2025. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan, Amendment 5. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 133 p.

Disclaimer: Data in this Fishery Management Plan may have changed since publication based on updates to source documents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Amendment 5 to the North Carolina (NC) Oyster Fishery Management Plan (FMP) was developed by the NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ), Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) under the auspices of the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) with the advice of the Shellfish Advisory Committee (AC). Deserving special recognition are the members of the Shellfish/Crustacean AC and the NCDMF Plan Development Team (PDT) who contributed their time and knowledge to this effort.

Shellfish Advisory Committee

Oyster/Clam Plan Development Team

Greg Allen	Brooke Anderson	Alan Bianchi
Jacob Boyd	Clay Caroon	Anne Deaton
Charlie Deaton	Lorena de la Garza (Clam Co-Lead)	Jeffrey Dobbs (Clam Co-Lead)
Joe Facendola (Oyster Co-Lead)	Corrin Flora	Daniel Ipock
Casey Knight	Cara Kowalchyk	Melinda Lambert
Christopher Lee	Chearin Lewis	Tina Moore (Mentor)
Doug Munroe	Sara Pace	Bennett Paradis (Oyster Co-Lead)
Lee Paramore	Blaine Parker	Jason Peters
Steve Poland	Jason Rock	Brandi Salmon
Catherine J Schlick	Chris Stewart	Andrew Valmassoi
Jason Walsh	Meredith Whitten	Abby Williams
Carter Witten	Dan Zapf	

The following Division staff were also invaluable in assisting with the development of this document: Kathy Rawls, Mike Loeffler, Catherine Blum, Laura Lee, and the many reviewers of the multiple drafts of this plan. Also grateful for the administrative support from Deborah Manley, Mike Griffin, and Patricia Smith.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*** This section is completed prior to final approval***

INTRODUCTION

This is Amendment 5 to the Oyster Fishery Management Plan (FMP). FMPs are the ultimate product that brings all information and management considerations into one document. The N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) prepares FMPs for adoption by the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) for all commercially and recreationally significant species or fisheries that comprise state marine or estuarine resources. The goal of these plans is to ensure long-term viability of these fisheries. By law, each FMP must be reviewed at least once every five years (G.S. 113-182.1). The NCDMF reviews each FMP annually and a comprehensive review is undertaken approximately every five years. The last comprehensive review of the plan (Amendment 4) was approved by the NCMFC in 2018. All management authority for the North Carolina Eastern Oyster fishery is vested in the State of North Carolina. The NCMFC adopts rules and policies and implements management measures for the Eastern Oyster fishery in Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters in accordance with G.S. 113-182.1. Until Amendment 5 is approved for management, Eastern Oysters are managed under Amendment 4 of the Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2018).

There are insufficient data to conduct a traditional stock assessment to determine population size and the rate of removals for the eastern oyster in North Carolina. Without a stock assessment, management is focused on habitat protection and enhancement measures that maintain harvestable oyster populations.

For more information about previous and current management, see the original Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2001) and the previous amendments, all of which are available on the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries Fishery Management website.

Fishery Management Plan History

Original FMP Adoption:	2001
Amendments:	Amendment 1 (2003) Amendment 2 (2008) Amendment 3 (2013) Amendment 4 (2017)
Revisions:	None
Supplements:	Supplement A (2010)

Information Updates:	None
Schedule Changes:	None
Next Comprehensive Review:	Five years after adoption of Amendment 5

Past versions or revisions of the Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2003, 2008, 2013, 2017) are available on the NCDMF website at: https://www.deq.nc.gov/about/Divisions/marine-fisheries/managing-fisheries/fishery-management-plans

Management Unit
The management unit of this FMP includes the Eastern Oyster *(Crassostrea virginica)* and its fisheries in all public coastal fishing waters of North Carolina. This FMP pertains only to oysters from wild stocks and does not address managing farmed oysters originating from private aquaculture leases and franchises.

Goal and Objectives
The goal of the N.C. Eastern Oyster FMP is to manage the oyster resource in such a way as to maintain oyster populations that provide long-term harvest and continue to offer protection and ecological benefits to North Carolina's estuaries. To achieve this goal, it is recommended that the following objectives be met:

- Use the best available biological, environmental, habitat, fishery, social, and economic data to effectively monitor and manage the oyster fishery and its environmental role.
- Support and implement the restoration and protection of oyster populations as both a fishery resource and an important estuarine habitat through the actions of the Cultch Planting and Oyster Sanctuary programs.
- Coordinate with DEQ and stakeholders to implement actions that protect habitat and environmental quality consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) recommendations.
- Manage oyster harvesting gear use to minimize damage to habitat.
- Promote stewardship of the resource through public outreach to increase public awareness regarding the ecological value of oysters and encourage stakeholder involvement in fishery management and habitat enhancement activities.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STOCK

Biological Profile

DISTRIBUTION

The Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) is an immobile filter feeding bivalve mollusk occurring naturally along the western Atlantic Ocean from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico (Figure 1; Bahr and Lanier 1981; Carlton and Mann 1996; Jenkins et al. 1997; MacKenzie et al. 1997). Recent research suggests several related oyster species are distributed throughout the Caribbean and coastal South America; however, the

Eastern Oyster's southern range extends only to the northern Yucatan Peninsula Caribbean (Gaffney 2005; Amaral and Simone 2014).

Initial molecular analysis indicates North Carolina's stock is part of the Atlantic coast stock, which extends from Maine to Key Biscayne, Florida (ASMFC 1988). Additional genetic analyses suggest a population division occurs in the Mid-Atlantic region, subdividing the Atlantic coast stock into northern and southern groups (Wakefield and Gaffney 1996; Hoover and Gaffney 2005; Varney and Gaffney 2008). North Carolina represents a transition zone within the Atlantic stock of Eastern Oyster, with a shift between northern and southern types occurring approximately at the southern boundary of the Pamlico Sound (Sackett 2002).

Figure 1. Distribution of the Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) represented by the red line (adapted from Bahr and Lanier 1981; Amaral and Simone 2014).

Eastern Oysters (hereafter, "oysters") inhabit waters across a wide range of temperatures (0 to 32°C; Butler 1954). Though oysters can also tolerate extreme salinities (as low as 5 ppt and as high as 40 ppt) depending on temperature, their optimum salinity range is 14 and 28 ppt (Galtsoff 1964; Wallace 1966; Shumway 1996; Loosanoff 1965; Rybovich 2014). The distribution and survival of oysters is further influenced by abiotic factors such

as oxygenation, flow, and tide (Stanley and Sellers 1986; Roegner and Mann 1995; Kennedy et al. 1996; Lenihan 1999), as well as biotic factors such as disease, bioeroders, and predation (Barnes et al. 2010; Johnson and Smee 2012; Pollack et al. 2012; Dunn et al. 2014). More information on the impacts of introduced pathogens and native bioeroders may be found in the Biological Stressors section.

North Carolina's oyster stocks are composed of both subtidal populations (below the mean low tide water level, up to 26 ft deep) and intertidal populations (between the mean high and low tide levels; MacKenzie et al. 1997). Throughout the Croatan, Roanoke, and Pamlico sounds, oyster resources are almost exclusively subtidal. This region is primarily influenced by wind-driven tides, with intertidal oysters found occasionally near the inlets. Scattered subtidal populations may be found in larger systems farther south (Newport, White Oak, and New River systems). Conversely, intertidal populations are predominantly observed south of Cape Lookout and throughout estuaries extending to the state’s southern border. The horse or crested oyster (*Ostrea equestris*) may be confused with small Eastern Oysters and can be locally abundant in both intertidal and subtidal habitats in southeastern North Carolina (Markwith et al. 2009).

MORPHOLOGY

Oyster bodies (meats) have a small foot, a relatively small adductor muscle, fillibranch gills with interlamellar junctions, and lack a siphon (Galtsoff 1964). The interior of the Eastern Oyster shell contains a purple-pigmented adductor muscle scar that does differentiate Eastern Oysters from other similar species within its range (Figure 2). The left valve is generally more cupped than the right that is normally found on top, and there is no gap between the shells when the valves are completely closed (Figure 2; Yonge 1960; Galtsoff 1964). Shell morphology can vary greatly depending on substrate and habitat conditions. For instance, oysters grown in subtidal and lower salinity environments tend to have thick, rounded shells with visible radial ridges (Stanley and Sellers 1986). In the presence of predators, oysters may allocate more energy to shell growth, resulting in thicker and heavier shells (Johnson and Smee 2012; Lord and Whitlatch 2012). Shell thickness has also been found to correlate with latitude and water temperature along the Atlantic coast, with warmer southern locations having oysters with thicker shells than colder northern locations (Lord and Whitlatch 2014).

Figure 2. Left and right valves of a subtidal Eastern Oyster from Stump Sound, North Carolina, illustrating the purple pigmented adductor muscle scar in the interior of the cupped left valve, and radial ridges on the exterior of the right valve.

REPRODUCTION AND RECRUITMENT

Oysters are typically hermaphroditic, as they first develop and spawn as males in the first few years and may ultimately develop as females as individuals get larger and older (Galtsoff 1964; Kennedy 1983). Oysters may change sexes once each year when the gonad is undifferentiated (Thompson et al. 1996). Research suggests natural oyster populations maintain balanced sex ratios (Kennedy 1983). However, certain environmental conditions, such as limited food availability and extreme salinity gradients, have been attributed to skewing sex ratios to high abundances of males (Bahr and Hillman 1967; Davis and Hillman 1971; Powell et al. 2013). The sex of nearby oysters may also influence individual oyster sex determination (Smith 1949; Menzel 1951). Age or size selective mortality (e.g., from disease or harvest pressure) can alter oyster population demographics and result in a local shift from male to female majority (Harding et al. 2012).

The formation of eggs and sperm is initially stimulated by increasing water temperatures during the spring (Galtsoff 1964; Kennedy et al. 1996). In North Carolina, oyster broadcast spawning peaks twice, once in June at 20°C, with a second spawning event in August at 25°C (Chestnut 1954). Salinities greater than 10 ppt are also typically required for mass spawning (Breuer 1962). Gonads may be developed in oysters at two to three months old, but most of these sub-adult oysters will not be sexually mature (Galtsoff 1964; Kennedy 1983). Fecundity estimates range from 2 million eggs for a 4-cm (1.5 in) oyster to 45 million for an oyster 7 cm (2.8 in) in length (Kennedy et al. 1996). These estimates range widely as oysters can spawn several times per season and gonads may expand

into other tissues (Kennedy et al. 1996). However, it's accepted that larger oysters allocate greater energy towards egg production and therefore have increased fecundity (Kennedy et al. 1996). For instance, oysters collected from North Carolina's no-take sanctuaries have demonstrated that fecundity increases exponentially with size, reaching the highest levels in May (Mroch et al. 2012; see Appendix 4 for further information on NC's Oyster Sanctuaries).

Under normal conditions, male oysters spawn first in response to various physical stimuli and environmental conditions. Female oysters are stimulated to spawn specifically by the presence of oyster sperm. Fertilization must take place shortly thereafter in the surrounding waters, or the unfertilized eggs lose their viability. Fertilized eggs develop into a free-swimming larva, which can migrate vertically in the water column in response to temperature and salinity changes (Hopkins 1931; Galtsoff 1964). Oyster larvae have also been documented to travel up to 30 miles, with dispersion strongly dependent on prevailing winds (Bahr and Lanier 1981; Andrews 1983). Patterns of larval distribution in North Carolina estuaries remain relatively unstudied; however, predictive models of Pamlico Sound larval dispersal from oyster sanctuaries have been developed (Haase et al. 2012).

An oyster larva may visit several sites before it cements itself to the substrate (Kennedy et al. 1996). Several environmental factors, including light, salinity, temperature, acoustic signature, and current velocity may influence the setting of larvae (Hidu and Haskins 1971; Lillis et al. 2013). Oyster larvae also respond positively to a protein on the surface of oyster shells as well as other recently set spat (Kennedy et al. 1996). Larval oysters tend to settle in the intertidal zone where salinities are above 20 ppt whereas in subtidal areas they settle when salinities are below 20 ppt (Mackin 1946; Loosanoff 1952; Menzel 1955). Generally, spatfall is higher in intertidal areas and in areas boasting salinities in the upper range of tolerance (Bahr and Lanier 1981).

Chestnut (1954) reported recruitment peaks generally occurring in June, the latter part of August, and possibly another peak in October. Ortega et al. (1990) found recruitment in western Pamlico Sound to be continuous, concentrated in one or two peaks depending on the year and location. Generally, peaks occurred in June (lesser) and September-October (greater). Munden (1975) reported that spat monitors located in Morehead City and Wilmington did not show a decline in availability of spat during the summer of 1972 until September.

GROWTH

Oyster growth is highest during the first six months after settling and gradually declines throughout the life of the oyster (Galtsoff 1964). Seasonally, adult oysters grow most rapidly during spring and fall in North Carolina. Shell growth was found to cease when water temperatures reached 28°C and slowed when temperatures decreased to 5°C (Chestnut 1954). Ortega et al. (1990) examined data from 1979-1989 and found that spat from western Pamlico Sound sites attained lengths of 10-40 mm during the first year and reached marketable size (76 mm) by the end of three years. Varying growth rates have been observed between and within different regions of North Carolina and under different

environmental conditions (Godwin 1981; Kennedy and Breisch 1981; Roegner and Mann 1995; Puckett and Eggleston 2012).

Stock Status

There are insufficient data to conduct a traditional stock assessment for oysters in North Carolina; therefore, population size and rate that oysters are removed from the population cannot be determined. Currently, the only long-term data representative of the stock are commercial landings and associated fishing effort. For information on the methodology used in previous stock assessment attempts, see Amendment 4 of the Oyster FMP.

While the oyster is managed by 18 other states along the Atlantic Coast and Gulf of Mexico, it is worth noting that only Louisiana, Maryland, and Virginia have complete stock assessments. In the absence of a formal stock assessment, Delaware and New Jersey use other metrics to inform their management strategies. Delaware conducts a population survey to set quotas; New Jersey does an annual assessment of Delaware Bay. Louisiana's most recent stock assessment in 2023 utilized 1,700 dredge samples and 1,000 diver quadrat samples collected during summer months. Their results suggested a 118% year-over-year increase in the stock of oysters, with most of the stock occurring in the west. Maryland conducts a stock assessment within the northern region of Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries (north of Smith Island, following the state-boundary); while Virginia's stock assessment of oysters includes the southern portion of the Chesapeake and its tributaries, including the James River.

Virginia Oyster Stock Assessment and Replenishment collects data during the fall using tongs to extract samples of one square-meter (VOSARA). Their most recent evaluation found the oyster stock in the southern Chesapeake was at its best condition in a generation, extending the fishery season for the first time since 1987. In addition to a stock assessment, Virginia employs a rotational harvest management system for the oyster. Maryland's stock assessment, which involves a stage-structured model integrated with various fishery-independent data, recently reported increases in their adult and spat populations but regional overfishing occurring within the fishery (MDDNR 2021). For more information on how other states manage their fisheries, see Appendix 5.

Researchers at North Carolina State University and The Nature Conservancy have partnered with NCDMF to design statistically robust fishery-independent population survey methodologies for oysters in North Carolina to inform a potential future stock assessment. While methods have been developed, NCDMF does not currently have the staff or equipment resources to implement the recommended sampling programs.

Stock Unit

For the purposes of this fishery management plan, the unit stock is considered to be all wild oysters occurring within North Carolina coastal waters, excluding oysters produced via private aquaculture leases or franchises.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERIES

Additional in-depth analyses and discussion of North Carolina's commercial oyster fishery can be found in earlier versions of the Oyster FMP, Revisions, Amendment 1, Amendment 2, Supplement 2A, Amendment 3, and Amendment 4 (NCDMF 2001, 2003, 2008, 2010, 2014, 2017); all FMP documents are available on the DMF Fishery Management Plans website and commercial landings can be found in the License and Statistics Annual Report (NCDMF 2022) produced by the DMF which can be found on the DMF Fisheries Statistics page (https://www.deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/marine-fisheries/science-and-statistics/fisheries-statistics).

Commercial Fishery

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The oyster fishery was the first regulated fishery in North Carolina, with laws limiting gear to hand methods only and prohibiting oysters from being sold out of state until 1872 (Thorsen 1982). Prior to 1880, New Bern and Wilmington were the state's major oyster markets, while Beaufort and Washington were also sites for significant oyster trade. Despite dredging methods being blamed for overharvesting in other states, North Carolina adopted a law in 1887 allowing oyster dredging in public bottom waters deeper than 8 ft throughout Pamlico and Roanoke sounds (Thorsen 1982). However, a loophole resulted in an influx of out-of-state fishers flocking to North Carolina in 1889. Consequently, increased exploitation of oyster stocks with dredges and mechanical tongs led to a conflict between resident and out-of-state oystermen known as the "Oyster Wars".

In response to the conflict, a law prohibiting oyster harvest by non-residents was passed and enforced in 1891. Attempts to return to hand-harvest-only management from 1892 to 1895 and to limit dredging in 1896 resulted in huge declines in oyster production and the subsequent closing of many oyster canneries. In 1897 the dredging law was amended, allowing limited dredging, a longer dredging season, and more law enforcement. These changes resulted in 677,239 bushels landed and the reopening of the canneries. Landings reached their highest level in 1902 at 806,363 bushels (Table 1).

However, oyster landings saw a drastic decline soon after the 1902 peak, reaching 171,090 bushels in 1918. Around this time, the state recognized the value of recycling shells for rebuilding oyster beds. From 1915 to 1920, the state began funding the Cultch Planting Program, resulting in 10,000-12,000 bushels of shell being planted each year for the aimed benefit of the fishery. After initial success and apparent rebound in harvest, additional state funding allowed the program to scale up and plant around 100,000 bushels of seed oysters and substrate in the early 1920s. Harvest statistics show a rebound in landings from 1923 to around 1931. For a more comprehensive history of the Cultch Program, see Appendix 1.

All oyster landings prior to 1931 were accomplished using hand methods and sail-powered oyster dredge boats. The 1940s saw restrictions on powerboats lifted, likely due to heightened demand and the price of oysters during World War II. The distinction between power and sailboat dredging disappeared altogether by 1955.

Throughout the remainder of the 20th century, oyster landings fluctuated between 650,000 to less than 50,000 bushels per year. Even with the switch from sailboat to power dredging, the overall trend of oyster landings in North Carolina was that of gradual decline through 2000 with a notable exception in 1987. There are several factors contributing to the continued decline in landings. For instance, taking oysters for personal consumption was allowed year-round until 1966, which may have been exacerbated by the fact that hand gear for oyster harvest has been largely unregulated in shallow subtidal (hand tongs) and intertidal areas (hand rakes and by hand). Furthermore, a lack of adequate enforcement seemed to allow the harvest and sale of undersize oysters; it was not until 1981 that the three-inch size limit was applied throughout the state (Chestnut 1951; Thorsen 1982). Modern commercial shellfishing continues in North Carolina and these fisheries include mechanical dredging and hand harvest methods, which are further detailed in the following sections. For a more thorough history of the oyster fishery including changes in regulations for commercial gear, length of seasons, and openings and closures of bays, refer to Amendment 4 of the Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2017).

MECHANICAL HARVEST METHODS

Harvest of oysters by mechanical methods is accomplished almost exclusively with oyster dredges in North Carolina (Figure 3). The dredge itself is a metal frame with a chain mesh acting as a net, collecting oysters or other shellfish while a boat tows it along the bottom. Other mechanical gear used for harvesting oysters include patent tongs and power rakes. NCDMF commercial fishery statistics indicate prior to 1960, most oyster landings were taken by dredge when compared to all hand methods (Figure 4). Chestnut (1955) reported that 90% of oysters landed in North Carolina prior to 1960 came from Pamlico Sound, suggesting that harvest in Pamlico Sound was largely dependent on dredging.

The current mechanical oyster fishery is limited to greater Pamlico Sound and adjacent bays and tributaries, including the Neuse and Pamlico rivers, with a maximum season beginning on the third Monday in November and running through March 31. Mechanical harvest gear is restricted to the deeper portions (more than 6 ft) of the Sound, including deeper areas of rivers and bays (see Appendix 2, Figures 2.8 and 2.9). There are currently four oyster management areas for mechanical harvest: Northern Dare, Northern Hyde, Pamlico River, and Neuse River (see Appendix 2, Figures 2.8 and 2.9). Throughout these areas, mechanical harvest is limited to 15 bushels per fishing operation in the open sound and the Neuse and Pamlico rivers. Conversely, mechanical harvest in some larger bays and tributaries is limited to 10 bushels per fishing operation. These areas and limitations are based on recommendations and criteria established in the original Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2001) and areas prohibited to take oysters by mechanical methods are designated in the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0108.

In-season openings and closures of these four areas are determined by management triggers. These triggers are management area specific and based on the percentage of legal sized oysters (≥3 in) from samples collected during NCDMF biweekly monitoring across the four management areas. Failure to meet the 26% legal-size threshold for two consecutive trigger sampling trips results in closure of an area. The specifics of the trigger sampling protocol are outlined in further detail in Supplement A to the Oyster FMP

(NCDMF 2010). The trigger sampling as it applies to the season length is further discussed in Appendix 2 (the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper).



Figure 3. Sketched illustration of a dredge used in North Carolina's mechanical oyster fishery (from Shefi 2007, adapted from Heddeen 1986).



Figure 4. Commercial oyster landings by gear, 1950-2022. Landings for both gear types include both public (wild) and private bottom (farmed oysters). Landings data for farmed oysters is included in this figure as historically it contributed an insignificant portion of the overall oyster landings, and prior to 2010 the distinction between wild and farmed was not recorded in landings data. (Sources: Chestnut and Davis 1975; National Marine Fisheries Service unpublished data; NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).

In areas open to mechanical harvest (see Appendix 2, Figures 2.8 and 2.9), oysters may be impacted by hurricanes, low dissolved oxygen events, or extreme temperatures. These impacts may only allow harvest for a few weeks before the management trigger is reached. Furthermore, poor water quality from storm events has disproportionately affected the deep-water oyster reefs in the Neuse River and Pamlico River areas of western Pamlico Sound. These reefs have suffered large die offs compared to oyster reefs in the shallow bays or the eastern portion of Pamlico Sound, closer to Oregon Inlet. These reefs have been in poor condition since 2017 and have likely not supported any significant mechanical harvest.

Research has shown oyster reefs need high vertical relief (height) in these deep areas to be resilient to negative water quality impacts from storm events (Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Lenihan 1999). However, mechanical harvest reduces the ability of natural oyster reefs in deep water to gain and maintain height as dredging actively removes valuable shell bottom habitat (see Threats and Alterations for further information). As a result of these influences affecting oyster condition within the fishery and current trigger sampling protocol, the actual mechanical harvest season for oysters is highly variable. This variability in season length and area openings is often viewed negatively by commercial harvesters.

Table 1. North Carolina commercial oyster landings in pounds of meat and bushels (Bu.), 1880-2022. (Source: Chestnut and Davis 1975; National Marine Fisheries Service unpublished data; NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).

Year	Pounds	Bu. (x1,000)	Year	Pounds	Bu. (x1,000)	Year	Pounds	Bu. (x1,000)
1880	938,400	134	1959	1,311,000	287	1992	293,956	50
1887	1,175,650	168	1960	1,216,200	289	1993	223,136	35
1888	1,129,960	161	1961	1,209,100	233	1994	183,704	35
1889	5,528,942	790	1962	961,400	192	1995	220,661	42
1890	4,456,075	637	1963	694,000	133	1996	210,931	40
1897	4,740,675	677	1964	727,700	153	1997	218,970	41
1902	5,645,928	807	1965	863,700	166	1998	224,214	42
1908	4,159,320	594	1966	626,200	119	1999	216,831	41
1910	1,834,058	262	1967	514,900	98	2000	203,427	38
1918	1,197,630	171	1968	402,600	84	2001	258,086	49
1923	3,089,146	441	1969	370,300	80	2002	243,775	46
1927	2,397,750	343	1970	382,500	79	2003	261,043	49
1928	2,286,610	327	1971	423,400	88	2004	367,961	70
1929	2,828,420	404	1972	470,112	103	2005	378,014	71
1930	2,205,674	537	1973	548,351	112	2006	447,889	85
1931	1,500,571	353	1974	558,821	109	2007	441,415	83
1932	1,201,356	275	1975	424,831	84	2008	466,176	88
1934	1,160,700	271	1976	333,315	61	2009	573,630	108
1936	2,480,500	651	1977	365,714	69	2010	1,040,407	197
1937	1,940,900	457	1978	449,544	84	2011	800,543	151
1938	1,426,900	334	1979	665,439	132	2012	440,063	83
1939	1,055,600	313	1980	723,099	139	2013	586,625	111
1940	690,400	204	1981	550,502	119	2014	727,775	138
1945	1,707,100	586	1982	611,998	155	2015	648,444	123
1950	1,322,100	238	1983	724,509	123	2016	668,423	126
1951	1,531,900	253	1984	724,557	128	2017	852,848	161
1952	1,620,900	331	1985	545,439	100	2018	625,278	118
1953	1,525,300	310	1986	745,548	120	2019	832,708	157
1954	998,400	210	1987	1,425,584	226	2020	829,106	157
1955	731,000	150	1988	913,100	157	2021	1,227,347	232
1956	1,318,000	285	1989	529,858	92	2022	1,142,911	216
1957	1,086,500	239	1990	328,850	52			
1958	1,041,500	228	1991	319,040	48			

Recent Changes to Mechanical Harvest Methods

The most recent changes in mechanical harvest gear management included closing off 30,000 acres to mechanical gear by closing the upper portions of the Pamlico Sound bays and part of Roanoke Sound. The closures were accomplished under a framework established in the original Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2001). Another change was reduction of the mechanical harvest limit to match the hand harvest limit set in the remaining areas of Pamlico Sound as outlined in Amendment 2 (NCDMF 2008).

Supplement A to the Eastern Oyster FMP established a trigger-monitoring system for determining the closure of mechanical harvest areas and changed the management strategy for mechanical harvest limits to allow up to 20 bushels to be harvested per commercial fishing operation per day (NCDMF 2010). The bays around Pamlico Sound can be opened for a potential maximum six-week season beginning mid-November with a 10-bushel-per-commercial-fishing-operation-per-day harvest limit as adopted in the original Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2001).

From 2009 to 2012, many inexperienced oyster dredgers came into the fishery and several new restrictions were required to maintain traditionally accepted harvest and culling techniques. One of these restrictions was a 2 PM time limit on dredging; this limit resulted in harvesters culling their entire catch after 2 PM rather than on-site, often depositing cultch where it could no longer function as oyster habitat. Additionally, during this time, many vessels were not rigged with towing points over the side of the vessel that work best for circular dredging patterns or for short tows. As a result, restrictions were put in place between the Adoption of Supplement A and before the development of the Oyster FMP Amendment 3 in 2014. The purpose of these restrictions was to encourage circular dredging patterns which are viewed as less damaging to oyster reef habitat, and shorter tows which encourage culling onsite and between each deployment of the gear. These restrictions include the following: 1) It is unlawful for the catch container (bag, cage) attached to a dredge to extend more than 2 ft in any direction from the tooth bar; and 2) it is unlawful to tow a dredge unless the point where the tow line or cable is in the water is on the port or starboard side of the vessel forward of the transom. The North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission established additional measures in place to further protect oyster habitat, such as Rule 15A NCAC 03K .0202, which requires that oysters be culled on site. As a result of this rule, it is unlawful to possess more than five bushels of unculled catch onboard a vessel. Only material on the culling tray is exempt from culling restrictions. It is unlawful to possess unculled catch or culled cultch material while underway and not engaged in mechanical harvesting.



Figure 5. Mechanical harvest oyster landings on public bottom by season 2008-09 through 2022-23. A monitoring system for determining the closure of mechanical harvest areas began in the 2010-11 season (Source: NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).

Trends and Impacts to Mechanical Harvest

In the past two decades the mechanical oyster fishery has experienced two relative peaks—the 2009-2010 and 2014-2015 seasons (Figure 5). During the 2009-2010 mechanical harvest oyster season, the Great Island Narrows area between Great Island and mainland Hyde County experienced intensive oyster harvest. NCDMF staff observed approximately 50 oyster dredge boats intensively working in this small area with some returning with new crews to fish the 15-bushel limit twice in one day. Further investigation indicated substantial shell damage was occurring to the remaining oysters and the area was closed after six weeks of harvest. Deeper waters of western Pamlico Sound and areas of Middle Ground also contributed to increased landings in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 seasons.

Fishing effort in 2010 was influenced by an increase in market demand as a result of the closure of oyster harvest areas in the Gulf of Mexico following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. In response to this market demand, the North Carolina's mechanical harvest season opened earlier than usual, on November 1, 2010. Supplement A to the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 2 (adopted November 3, 2010) provided for a variable mechanical harvest limit of up to 20 bushels per day from November 18-24, 2010, and March 16-31,

2011, which likely increased landings. The Neuse River area was closed to dredging from January 7 to February 14, 2011, because samples failed to meet the minimum 26% legal size criterion set in Supplement A (NCDMF 2010). Effort in the Neuse River area appeared to be much lower after the re-opening of the area to oyster harvest in February 2011.

In August 2011, Hurricane Irene had major impacts on mechanical harvest areas. Sedimentation or strong currents likely buried or displaced oyster resources on the Middle Ground following the storm. Many of the deeper water oyster resources located near Brant Island Shoal also suffered significant damage caused by detritus covering and killing oyster beds. Oysters in the Neuse and Pamlico rivers did not show any of the typical growth patterns in the following months, which likely had a pronounced effect on the mechanical harvest season in 2011-2012. The mechanical harvest area in western Pamlico Sound was closed on January 2, 2012.

Prior to the 2012-2013 mechanical harvest season, NCDMF oyster sampling indicated an apparent severely low dissolved oxygen event in the Neuse River that caused virtually 100 percent mortality of the oyster resources at 18 ft or greater depths. A few oyster rocks in shallower waters between Maw Point Shoal and Light House Shoal were spared as well as some NCDMF oyster habitat enhancement projects in other shallow areas. The Pamlico River area also had not recovered from the effects of Hurricane Irene at this time. The Neuse River area was available for mechanical harvest until the adjacent bays closed on December 21 although there was no harvest activity in the river during the time it was open. The Pamlico River area closed to mechanical harvest on February 1 based on failure to meet the 26% trigger although effort was much reduced since early January. The 2012-2013 mechanical harvest oyster landings declined further to 23,566 bushels (Figure 5).

There was little evidence of recovery of the Neuse River oyster resources prior to the 2013-2014 season but the Pamlico River area appeared to be recovering, and growth indicators were good during the season. The Dare County area in northern Pamlico Sound also supported some significant mechanical harvest activity throughout the season. When oyster harvests began to decline in the western sound in early February, 20 to 25 boats moved to Dare County to finish the season. The remaining productive areas in the Neuse River closed on February 28 and most of the harvesters left the Pamlico River area by mid-February. Mechanical harvest in Dare County continued until the season ended on March 31. The overall result was a notable increase in mechanical harvest oyster landings with 64,274 bushels for the season.

After the peak in 2013-2014, mechanical oyster harvest declined steadily, reaching lows reminiscent of the mid-1990s. Hurricane Florence in 2018 severely damaged coastal infrastructure, vessels, and habitat. These impacts, along with the world-wide COVID pandemic, are likely responsible for low harvest between 2018 and 2020. Since then, mechanical harvest landings have rebounded slightly to 11,061 bushels in the 2022-2023 season (Figure 5).

Overall, participation in the mechanical oyster fishery has declined rapidly since 2010 according to trip ticket data (Figure 6). There was a high of 503 participants in 2010, wherein 74.8% of landings (bushels) were brought in by the top quartile (25%) of participants (Figures 6 & 7). Between 2012 and 2016, participation declined and fluctuated around 200 fishers (Figure 6). During the same period, the top quartile of participants contributed 62-70% of total landings (Figure 7). However, in the last five years (2018-2023) there were 60 or fewer participants in the mechanical oyster fishery, and the top quartile of participants contributed 48-61% of bushels landed (Figures 6 & 7).



Figure 6. Participation in North Carolina's wild oyster fisheries between 1994 and 2023. Two separate fisheries are distinguished by the two types of gear that may be used to harvest oysters from wild populations – mechanical (dredge) and hand gear (rakes, tongs, etc.). For additional data, see NCDMF License and Statistic's Annual Report.



Figure 7. Relative contribution to annual landings from public bottom (wild harvest) by the top quartile of participants in North Carolina's mechanical oyster fishery, 2010-2023 (Source: NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).

HAND-HARVEST METHODS

In North Carolina, hand harvest methods include hand tongs, hand rakes, and by hand (Figure 8). Hand tongs are generally used in shallow subtidal areas. Hand rakes and actual picking up by hand are normally used in intertidal areas. Some specialized uses of rakes and modified tongs occur in subtidal areas. Hand-harvest methods are allowed in all areas found suitable for shellfish harvest by the Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section of the NCDMF.

The hand-harvest season for commercial and recreational harvest begins on October 15 each year with commercial harvest limited to Monday through Friday each week. The season typically continues until closed by rule on March 31, although some locations may close early due to perceived excessive harvest or pollution concerns. Brunswick County is the only area that frequently closes early due to excessive harvest and typically is closed by proclamation on March 15 annually.



Figure 8. An illustration of several different designs for hand tongs and rakes that may be used for harvesting oysters (from Shafi 2007, reproduced from von Brandt 1964).

Since the 1990s, hand harvest has accounted for most of the commercial landings each season and has been the dominant harvest gear for oysters in North Carolina (See Appendix 3: Intertidal Oyster Harvest Management Information Paper). This trend may be the result of hand harvest landings being less variable than mechanical harvest landings. For instance, southern intertidal oyster resources did not suffer the same long-term mortality from Dermo, an easily transmittable parasitic disease, that affected subtidal oyster beds in the northern part of the state (for more information, see Biological Stressors section).

These higher and more consistent hand-harvest landings come primarily from intertidal oyster reefs between Core Sound and the North Carolina-South Carolina state line (Coastal Fishing Waters in Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender, Onslow, and portions of Carteret counties). This trend is despite the fact that this southern portion of the coast only accounts for five percent of the total area open to shellfish harvest in the state. Additionally, the harvest limit in this area is five bushels per person per day, not exceeding 10 bushels per vessel per day for Standard and Retired Commercial Fishing License holders.

Oyster harvest areas north of Core Sound also operated under the 5 bushels per person per vessel (not to exceed 10 bushels per vessel) per day limit until the 2009-2010 season. At that time, Amendment 2 to the Eastern Oyster FMP changed the limit in that area to 10 bushels per fishing operation in typical hand-harvest waterbodies including bays, small rivers, and shallow sounds designated by proclamation. A 15-bushel limit has since been specified for Pamlico Sound, Neuse and Pamlico rivers, and Croatan Sound, but oysters in these areas are seldom harvested by hand methods. The practical application of the 10-bushels-per-fishing-operation limit results in hand harvesters working alone with the opportunity to take 10 bushels each day. The rationale for the change was to encourage hand harvesting by making mechanical and hand-harvest limits the same in areas where they overlap. The increased limit was justified because hand-harvest oyster resources in

the northern area are widely dispersed and much more difficult to locate than in the southern area making excessive harvest less likely.

Hand-harvest oyster landings from areas north of Core Sound accounted for less than 2% of total hand-harvest landings prior to 2005 (Figure 9). In 2005, the percentage began to climb, reaching a peak near 11% in 2009. The highest percentages occurred in 2015 and 2017, with landings north of Core Sound reaching almost 20% of the total hand-harvest landings. Since 2019, the percentage has remained under 5%.

Across the state, hand-harvest oyster landings generally increased from 1994 to 2017 (Figure 10). This is likely due to increased effort as reflected by the number of trips, mirroring the trend in landings (Figure 9). Hand harvest landings peaked in 2017 at 61,574 bushels, and despite some decline, have remained steady around 41,000 bushels since 2017.

In response to the concern of increasing participation and declining bushels landed per trip in the hand harvest oyster fishery, the Marine Fisheries Commission limited Shellfish License holders to two bushels of oysters per person per day and no more than four bushels per vessel statewide as part of Amendment 4 in October 2017. After Amendment 4 implementation, participation and landings in the hand harvest fishery declined.



Figure 9 Public bottom commercial hand harvest oyster landings north of Core Sound as a percentage of total public bottom hand harvest oyster landings, 1994-2022 (Source: NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).



Figure 10 Commercial oyster hand harvest landings and number of dedicated trips in public bottom waters of North Carolina, 1994-2022. (Source: NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).

Recreational Fishery

Oysters are commonly harvested recreationally in North Carolina from October to March by hand, rake, and hand tongs. The limit allowed for personal consumption is one bushel of oysters per person per day, not to exceed two bushels per vessel with a minimum shell length of 3-inches. The NCDMF has limited data on recreational oyster fishing, including the number of participants and the extent of their economic activity. Efforts to accurately quantify the impact of recreational fishing on shellfish (mollusks and crustaceans) have been met with limited success in North Carolina. The NCDMF collects data on recreational fishing in conjunction with the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP). However, MRIP collects information on finfish only. The Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS) which was a survey used prior to 2008, reported that more than one million recreational fishing trips targeted shellfish in 1991 in the state; however, estimates of shellfish harvest were not reported.

Based on recommendations by the original Eastern Oyster and Hard Clam FMPs, House Bill 1427 was introduced before the general assembly in 2004 to establish a recreational shellfish license on a three-year trial basis (NCDMF 2001). However, House Bill 1427 was not passed. In the same year, House Bill 831 sought to create a saltwater fishing license requiring individuals recreationally fishing for finfish and shellfish to obtain a license, but this bill did not pass. The state legislature revisited the issue in 2005 and

passed a bill to create the Coastal Recreational Fishing License (CRFL). When CRFL was implemented in 2007, it was only required when harvesting finfish and did not include shellfish.

NCDMF implemented a shellfish survey during November 2010 to collect monthly data on the harvest of crabs, oysters, clams, and scallops from the CRFL license pool. The survey sample is made up of approximately 650 randomly selected CRFL holders that held a valid license for at least one day during the survey period and answered “yes” to the harvest of at least one of the following species: crabs, oysters, clams, or scallops. The selected CRFL holders are sent a letter explaining the survey along with a web address and accompanying PIN to complete the survey online. Those that do not use the web-based method to respond are sent a paper version of the survey 10-14 days later. This survey obtains information on the number of trips taken during the survey period, average length of the trip, average party size, number of species kept and discarded, gear used, location information (water access), waterbody, and county of harvest. Data from this survey are limited in scope but could potentially be used to estimate catch and effort in the recreational shellfish fishery for those people who purchased a CRFL license. While data from this survey could be of potential use for estimating recreational catch and effort of shellfish, there are limitations. For instance, the supplementary CRFL survey does not include individuals who fish exclusively for shellfish as they would not need to purchase a CRFL.

Furthermore, some recreational fishers may purchase a commercial shellfish license over a CRFL because the license is easy to obtain (available to any NC resident), is relatively inexpensive ($50), and allows fishers to harvest more shellfish than the recreational limits allow. Additionally, the Recreational Commercial Gear License (RCGL) allows recreational fisherman to use limited amounts of commercial gear to harvest seafood for personal consumption. In both cases for commercial license holders and RCGL holders, shellfish that are kept for personal consumption and not sold to a seafood dealer will not be captured in landings data recorded by the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program (NCTTP).

With the limited data collected from the optional CRFL survey, some pieces of information about recreational effort have been captured. For instance, recreational oyster harvest was reported from 92 waterbodies throughout coastal North Carolina, with Topsail Sound, Pamlico Sound, Bogue Sound, and Masonboro Sound including more than 100 reported trips. The same survey revealed 70% of reported oyster harvesting effort originated from private residence, private boat ramp, or shore. Given only 28% of reported effort originated at public access locations, intercept-oriented surveys are less than ideal. Recreational oyster harvesting effort and catch were both concentrated between October and March, accounting for over 84% of reported trips. Conversely, some individuals reported recreational harvest of oysters during summer months despite state-imposed restrictions on harvest during this time. This suggests unfamiliarity with state regulations.

Given North Carolina’s shellfish fisheries are exclusively under state jurisdiction, a lack of recreational shellfish harvest data makes it extremely difficult to address potential

management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions for this fishery. There are currently no data on demographics, perceptions, or expenditures of recreational oyster harvesters in the state. Consequently, there are no data available to conduct an economic impact assessment of recreational oyster harvesting. Due to the widespread accessibility of intertidal oysters along North Carolina's coast, the potential impact of recreational harvest on stock status could be significant. Furthermore, collecting recreational data would fill data gaps that may be necessary for completion of a comprehensive stock assessment. For additional background regarding this issue, please refer to Appendix 1.

Private Culture

In North Carolina, a shellfish lease or franchise are mechanisms through which individuals or entities can gain exclusive rights to grow and harvest shellfish from designated areas of public trust waters. Today some shellfish leases are held by commercial fishers to supplement their income from public harvest areas. Other shellfish leases are held by individuals and corporations looking to augment other sources of income; to be engaged in a sustainable business opportunity; or to maintain an attachment to cultural maritime heritage. The NCDMF does not differentiate between clam, oyster, bay scallop, and mussel leases, thereby allowing shellfish growers to grow out multiple species simultaneously as their efforts and individual management strategy allows. Oysters commercially landed from shellfish leases or franchises (designated as private bottom landings) are considered by the NCDMF as farm raised.

Landings from farmed raised oysters have shown a consistent upward trend since around 2014, surpassing wild harvest landings since 2017 (Figure 11). This shift marked a notable change in the primary methods and scale of production, with farm-raised oysters becoming a dominant component of overall oyster landings in the state. This growth was facilitated by advancements in aquaculture technology, increased investment in oyster farming infrastructure, and favorable market conditions for farmed oysters. Additionally, initiatives supporting aquaculture and the expansion of shellfish leasing programs further contributed to the industry's expansion during this period.

Since 1994, North Carolina has seen a significant increase in private shellfish aquaculture participation. Additionally, changes to common practices among private oyster cultures and the termination of the relay program have reduced reliance on wild shellfish among private leases. As such, addressing issues specific to aquaculture has expanded beyond the intended scope of the Fishery Management Plan. Therefore, Amendment 5 of the Oyster FMP will only focus on managing wild oyster populations. For additional details on private culture of shellfish, including the application process, statutes, rules, proclamations, contact, and other helpful resources, please visit the Shellfish Lease and Franchise program website (https://www.deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/marine-fisheries/licenses-permits-and-leases/shellfish-lease-and-franchise#ShellfishLeaseApplications-4100).



Figure 11. Annual commercial landings of wild harvest and farm-raised (aquaculture) oysters in North Carolina. Wild harvest includes oysters landed by either mechanical (dredge) or hand (e.g. tong, rakes) methods on public bottom.

Summary of Economic Impact

In 2022, oysters were the third most commercially important species in the state (NCDMF 2022). As a species landed primarily during the winter months, oysters provide income to commercial fishers at a time when other species may not be present in harvestable amounts. The expenditures and income within the commercial fishing industry as well as those by consumers of seafood create additional indirect economic benefits throughout the state. Each dollar earned and spent generates additional impact by stimulating other industries, fostering jobs, income, and business sales. The NCDMF estimates the extent of these impacts using a commercial fishing economic impact model that uses information from socioeconomic surveys of commercial fishers and seafood dealers in North Carolina, economic multipliers found in *Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2020,* and IMPLAN economic impact modeling software. In 2022, the wild harvest commercial oyster fishery in North Carolina supported an estimated 636 full-time and part time jobs, $3.5 million in income, and $7.7 million in sales impacts (Table 2).

Table 2. A summary of the economic impact of the commercial wild harvest oyster fishery on public bottom over the last ten years in North Carolina, 2013-2022. (Source: NCDMF Fisheries Economics Program)

			Estimated Economic Impacts			
Year	Trips[1]	Bushels landed[1]	Ex-vessel value (in thousands)[1]	Jobs[2,3]	Income impacts (in thousands)[3]	Sales impacts (in thousands)[3]
2022	11,620	54,342	$2,574	636	$3,526	$7,666
2021	10,328	50,416	$2,516	612	$3,459	$8,474
2020	9,831	44,080	$2,211	611	$3,400	$7,336
2019	11,190	44,567	$2,261	635	$3,651	$8,384
2018	9,880	41,611	$2,105	671	$3,282	$7,190
2017	14,985	73,809	$3,776	923	$5,587	$12,417
2016	14,295	68,573	$3,618	957	$5,315	$11,577
2015	15,748	91,689	$4,222	1,008	$6,061	$13,587
2014	18,951	116,330	$5,058	1,158	$7,562	$17,375
2013	17,013	96,258	$3,817	1,031	$5,533	$12,502

[1]As reported by the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) Trip Ticket Program.
[2]Represents both full-time and part-time jobs.
[3]Economic impacts calculated using the NCDMF commercial fishing economic impact model.

RECENT ECONOMIC TRENDS

The inflation-adjusted value of North Carolina oysters increased in the early 2010s, reaching a peak of about $6.7 million in 2010. Since then, the value of the wild oyster fishery has trended downwards (Figure 12). The nominal ex-vessel price per bushel for oysters exhibited an overall steady increase from 1994 to 2022. When corrected for inflation the price per bushel for oysters has increased by $10 over the last thirty years.

In the 2000s the proportion of landings by mechanical versus hand harvest was consistent before reaching a peak in 2010 when it made up 74% of landings (Figure 13). Since then, mechanical harvest has steadily decreased, comprising a small percentage of total landings. This decrease in mechanical landings is likely a result of changes in licensing requirements for mechanical harvest and waterbody closures from management actions, as well as greater participation in the private lease aquaculture program. While many water bodies have accounted for a steady portion of the overall harvest value, the oyster fishery in Pamlico Sound has decreased in market share from 34% in 2004 down to 16% in 2022. Conversely, Topsail Sound, Masonboro Sound, and Newport River have increased their market shares in the same time span.



Figure 12. Annual ex-vessel value within North Carolina's wild oyster fisheries, 1994-2022. Inflation adjusted values are in 2023 dollars (Source: NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).



Figure 13. Annual percent of total landings value by gear types used in North Carolina's hand and mechanical oyster fisheries, 2004-2022 (Source: NCDMF Trip Ticket Program).

The NCDMF tracks commercial catches of all fishers in the state when the catch is sold to a commercial seafood dealer. Data suggests the oyster fishery expanded from 2004 to 2010, when it peaked at 1,148 participants. However, between 2010 and 2018 there was a significant decrease in participation, but the number of participants has been relatively consistent since 2018. The number of commercial hand harvest and mechanical harvest trips landing oysters exhibited decreasing trends since 2017 with a large decrease in trips in the last year of the data set. Mechanical harvest has seen a considerable downward trend since 2014 and has stayed consistently low since 2018.

As is the case in all commercial fisheries in the state, oyster fishers may only sell their catch to licensed seafood dealers. From 2004 to 2022, the number of seafood dealers who deal in oysters fluctuated between 120 and 170, with a decreasing trend in the last few years. Many seafood dealers are likely oyster fishers who also hold a dealer license, who can vertically integrate their commercial fishing business by both catching and selling a seafood product to wholesalers or consumers.

SOCIAL IMPORTANCE OF THE FISHERY

The NCDMF Fisheries Economics Program has conducted a series of in-depth interview-style surveys with commercial fishers along the coast since 1999. This information is used for fishery management plans, tracking the status of the industry, and informing management of fisher perceptions on potential management strategies. The most recent surveys were collected in 2017. For an in-depth look into responses, see Amendment 4 of the Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2017). A summary of survey responses from 168 commercial fishers active in the oyster fishery across 58 different communities along North Carolina's coast is provided in this Amendment.

As of the 2017 survey, the greatest number of commercial oyster fishers lived in Sneads Ferry, followed by Newport, Beaufort, and Wilmington. Active participants in the oyster fishery were characterized as white males, with an average age of 50 and 28 years of commercial fishing experience. On average, commercial fishing accounted for 68% of the personal income for these fishers, and 46% reported commercial fishing was their sole source of personal income. Most (77%) commercial fishers that targeted oysters fished year-round. Respondents indicated commercial fishing held extremely high historical and economic importance within their communities.

The most important issue to these fishers was low prices for seafood, which is also related to competition from imported seafood. Another key issue for oyster fishers was coastal development. With several areas of coastal North Carolina having undergone intense development in recent decades, associated water quality impairments have often impacted opening/closure of shellfish areas. Additionally, coastal development is associated with losing working waterfronts, another top five concern of respondents. Conversely, the bottom ranked issues according to 168 commercial oyster harvesters were keeping up with rule changes/proclamations, overfishing, bag limits, size limits and quotas.

ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND IMPACT

This section primarily focuses on the role of oysters as habitat, though it also addresses the impacts of the fishery on habitat and other ecosystem services of oyster reefs. The benefits and impacts discussed below refer to "shell bottom" and "oyster reefs" interchangeably, and includes both intertidal and subtidal habitats, consisting of fringing or patch oyster reefs, surface aggregations of living shellfish, and/or shell accumulations. This section includes overviews of the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) and NCDMF's Habitat & Enhancement Shellfish Rehabilitation Programs, both of which aim to protect and enhance oyster reef habitat throughout the state.

Coastal Habitat Protection Plan

In the 1990s, addressing habitat and water quality degradation was recognized by resource managers, fishers, the public, and the legislature as a critical component for improving and sustaining fish stocks, as well as the coastal ecosystem. When the Fisheries Reform Act (FRA) of 1997 (G.S. 143B-279.8) was passed, it required developing Coastal Habitat Protection Plans (CHPPs). The legislative goal of the CHPP is "…the long-term enhancement of coastal fisheries associated with coastal habitats." The FRA specifies the CHPP will identify threats and recommend management actions to protect and restore coastal habitats critical to NC's coastal fishery resources. The plans are updated every five years and must be adopted by the NC Coastal Resources Commission (CRC), the NC Environmental Management Commission (EMC), and NCMFC to ensure consistency among commissions as well as their supporting DEQ agencies. The 2021 CHPP Amendment is the most recent update to the CHPP, building upon the 2016 CHPP source document.

The NCMFC's CHPP includes four overarching goals for the protection of coastal habitat: 1) improve the effectiveness of existing rules and programs protecting coastal fish habitats; 2) identify and delineate strategic coastal habitats; 3) enhance habitat and protect it from physical impacts; and 4) enhance and protect water quality. The CHPP is an interagency plan with its goals and actions carried out by several state agencies. For instance, while NCDMF has the capacity to recommend management decisions towards meeting the goals described above pertaining to coastal habitat, the Division of Water Quality enforces policies concerning water quality issues described in the CHPP. Overall, achieving the goals set by the CHPP to protect North Carolina's coastal resources involves managers and policy makers from several state agencies making recommendations and enforcing regulations.

The CHPP identifies bottom disturbing fishing gear, including oyster dredges, as having the potential to be highly destructive towards oyster reefs. As such, the NCMFC has recommended the following actions: protect habitat from adverse fishing gear effects and protect and restore important fish habitat functions from damage associated with activities such as dredging (NCDEQ 2016). This recommendation is cited as a specific objective within this Amendment of the Eastern Oyster FMP, and is explored further in Appendix 2, the Mechanical Oyster Harvest Issue Paper. Furthermore, the complexity of managing the oyster resource as both a fishery and essential estuarine habitat is reason for

establishing an ongoing and sustained interconnectedness between the Eastern Oyster FMP and the CHPP.

ESSENTIAL HABITAT

In estuarine ecosystems worldwide, oyster reefs play a vital role in creating habitat for diverse communities in estuarine habitats. As prolific filter feeders, dense oyster assemblages can affect phytoplankton dynamics and water quality, which in turn aids submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) and reduces excessive nutrient loading that could otherwise lead to hypoxic conditions (Thayer et al. 1978; Newell 1988; Everett et al. 1995; Newell and Koch 2004; Carroll et al. 2008; Wall et al. 2008). Such an impact on water quality also provides direct and indirect benefit to humans in the form of ecosystem services. For instance, oyster reefs serve as habitat for a variety of economically important species while also stabilizing sediment along coastlines. With successive generations building upon shells left by their predecessors, oyster reefs add spatial complexity to the benthos, creating colonization space, refuge, and foraging substrate for many species (Arve 1960; Bahr and Lanier 1981; Zimmerman et al. 1989; Lenihan and Peterson 1998). As water quality and healthy, diverse oyster reefs benefit coastal communities, NCDMF recognizes the economic importance of oyster reef habitat. Combining the ecosystem services provided by oysters, the estimated value of North Carolina's oyster reefs is $2,200 to $40,200 per acre annually (Grabowski et al. 2012).

Studies have shown shell bottom supports a greater abundance and/or diversity of finfish and crustaceans than unstructured soft bottom (Grabowski and Peterson 2007; Nevins et al. 2013). The structural complexity and emergent structure of these reefs offer various benefits to inhabitants, including refuge and foraging opportunities (Coen et al. 1999; Grabowski et al. 2005; Lenihan et al. 2001; Peterson et al. 2003). The reef structures themselves impact the flow of currents, thereby offering enhanced deposition of food for benthic fauna (Grabowski 2002; Kelaher 2003). Additionally, tertiary production of nektonic organisms is found to be more than double on oyster reefs than from *Spartina* marshes, soft bottom, and SAV, indicating the importance of this habitat for higher order consumers (English et al. 2009).

In North Carolina, over 70 species of fish and crustaceans have been documented using natural and restored oyster reefs (Table 3; ASMFC 2007; Coen et al. 1999; Grabowski et al. 2005; Lenihan et al. 2001; Peterson et al. 2003). The list includes 12 Atlantic State Marine Fisheries Commission-managed and seven South Atlantic Fishery Management Council-managed species, highlighting the importance of this habitat for recreational and commercial fisheries. Many of the state's economically important fishery species are estuarine dependent at some point in their life cycles as oyster reefs serve as nursery habitat for numerous marine and estuarine species during key phases of their life cycles (Ross and Epperly 1985; Pierson and Eggleston 2014). Estuarine fish can be grouped into three categories: estuary-dependent species, permanent resident species, and seasonal migrant species (Street et al. 2005; Deaton et al. 2010). The most abundant species on oyster reefs are estuary-dependent, inhabiting the estuary as larvae. This group includes species that spawn offshore as well as species that spawn in the estuary.

Oyster reefs also host large abundances of small forage fishes and crustaceans, such as pinfish, gobies, grass shrimp, and mud crabs, which are important prey for larger recreationally and commercially important fishes (Minello 1999; Posey et al. 1999; Plunket and La Peyre 2005; ASMFC 2007). The structural complexity of oyster reefs provides safe refuge from disturbance events, thereby offering stability to both shell-bottom and soft-bottom habitats. A diversity of invertebrates and microalgae that have key food web roles inhabit these microenvironments. Soft bottoms offer refuge for clams and polychaete worms while larger, mobile invertebrates such as horseshoe crabs, whelks, tulip snails, moon snails, shrimp and hermit crabs live on the surface of soft bottoms. Most soft bottom species listed above also inhabit shell bottoms; however, shell bottom supports additional benthic macroinvertebrates, including mud crabs, pea crabs, barnacles, soft-shelled clams, mussels, anemones, hydroids, bryozoans, flatworms, and sponges (Street et al. 2005; Deaton et al. 2010). Fiddler crabs use intertidal flats and submerged flats, and shallow bottoms support blue crab and other crustaceans and shellfish.

An in-depth discussion of fish species' usage of oyster reef habitats is available in Amendment 4 to the Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2017) and Chapter 3 of the 2016 CHPP (NCDEQ 2016).

WATER QUALITY

Oyster habitat offers a variety of direct and indirect ecosystem services related to water quality. The filtering activities of oysters and other suspension feeding bivalves remove particulate matter, phytoplankton, and microbes from the water column (Prins et al. 1997; Coen et al. 1999; Wetz et al. 2002; Cressman et al. 2003; Nelson et al. 2004; Porter et al. 2004; Grizzle et al. 2006; Coen et al. 2007; Wall et al. 2008). Adult oysters have been reported to filter as high as 10 L per hour per gram of dry tissue weight (Jordan 1987). Because non-degraded oyster reefs contain high densities of filter-feeding bivalves, they can modify water quality in shallow waters by their intense filtration. Even small-scale additions of oysters to tidal creeks can reduce total suspended solids (TSS) and chlorophyll-a concentrations downstream of transplanted reefs (Nelson et al. 2004).

Oyster reefs also provide a key ecosystem service by removing nutrients, especially nitrogen, from the water column (Piehler and Smyth 2011; Kellogg et al. 2013). Nitrogen (N) and phosphorous (P) in biodeposits can become buried or removed via bacterially mediated nitrification-denitrification (Newell et al. 2002; Porter et al. 2004; Newell et al. 2005). In North Carolina, Smyth et al. (2013) found that rates of denitrification by oyster reefs were like that of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) and marsh, and highest in the summer and fall when oyster filtration is greatest. The dollar benefit of the nitrogen removal service provided by oyster reefs was estimated to be $2,969 per acre per year (2011 dollars; $4,135 per acre per year in 2023 dollars).

Habitat and Enhancement Programs

In 2007, a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration biological review team found that current east coast oyster harvest is 2 percent of peak historical volume, and

suggested oyster restoration and enhancement efforts are “necessary to sustain populations” (EOBRT 2007). One example in North Carolina is the Neuse River Estuary, which has experienced widespread loss of oyster habitat, as oyster beds have been “displaced downstream roughly 10-15 miles” since the late 1940s (Jones and Sholar 1981; Steel 1991). Natural expansion of healthy oyster reefs is not expected in this area because adjacent bottom lacks attachment substrate, and any shell that is sloughed from an existing reef might be subject to deep water hypoxia and sediment burial, where reef establishment is unlikely (Lenihan 1999; Lenihan and Peterson 1998).

Table 3. A summary of the economic impact of the commercial wild harvest oyster fishery on public bottom over the last ten years in North Carolina, 2013-2022. (Source: NCDMF Fisheries Economics Program)

Common name	Scientific name	Common name	Scientific name
Anchovy, Bay	*Anchoa mitchilli*	Mullet, Striped *†‡	*Mugil spp.*
Bass, Striped *†‡	*Morone saxatilis*	Needlefish, Houndfish	*Tylosurus crocodilus*
Blenny, Feather	*Hypsoblennius hentz*	Perch, Sand	*Diplectrum formosum*
Blenny, Striped	*Chasmodes bosquianus*	Perch, Silver	*Bairdiella chrysoura*
Bluefish **	*Pomatomus saltatrix*	Pigfish	*Orthopristis chrysoptera*
Bumper, Atlantic	*Chloroscombrus chrysurus*	Pinfish	*Lagodon rhomboides*
Butterfish	*Peprilus triacanthus*	Pinfish, Spottail	*Diplodus holbrooki*
Clam, Hard	*Mercenaria mercenaria*	Pompano	*Trachinotus carolinus*
Cobia **	*Rachycentron canadum*	Sea Bass, Black **	*Centropristis striata*
Crab, Blue *†‡	*Callinectes sapidus*	Sea Bass, Rock	*Centropristis philadelphica*
Crab, Florida Stone	*Menippe mercenaria*	Searobins, Prionotus	*Prionotus spp.*
Crabs, Spider	*Majidae spp.*	Seatrout, Spotted *‡	*Cynoscion nebulosus*
Croaker, Atlantic **	*Micropogonias undulatus*	Shad, Threadfin	*Dorosoma petenense*
Dogfish, Smooth	*Mustelus canis*	Shark, Atlantic Sharpnose	*Rhizoprionodon terraenovae*
Dogfish, Spiny **	*Squalus acanthias*	Shark, Blacktip	*Carcharhinus limbatus*
Drum, Black **	*Pogonias cromis*	Shark, Finetooth	*Carcharhinus isodon*
Drum, Red *	*Sciaenops ocellatus*	Sheepshead *	*Archosargus probatocephalus*
Eel, American **†	*Anguilla rostrata*	Shrimp, Palaemonidae *	*Palaemonetes spp.*
Eel, Conger	*Conger oceanicus*	Shrimp, Penaeidae *	*Farfantepenaeus spp.* *Litopenaeus spp.*
Filefish, Planehead	*Stephanolepis hispidus*	Silverside, Atlantic	*Menidia menidia*
Filefish, Pygmy	*Monacanthus setifer*	Silverside, Inland	*Menidia beryllina*
Flounder, Gulf	*Paralichthys albigutta*	Silverside, Rough	*Membras martinica*
Flounder, Southern *†‡	*Paralichthys lethostigma*	Skate, Clearnose	*Raja eglanteria*
Flounder, Summer **‡	*Paralichthys dentatus*	Skilletfish	*Gobiesox strumosus*
Goby, Naked	*Gobiosoma bosc*	Snapper, Grey	*Lutjanus griseus*
Grouper, Gag	*Mycteroperca microlepis*	Spadefish, Atlantic	*Chaetodipterus faber*
Harvestfish	*Peprilus alepidotus*	Spot **	*Leiostomus xanthurus*
Herring, Atlantic Thread	*Opisthonema oglinum*	Stingray, Bullnose	*Myliobatis freminvillei*
Herring, Blueback*†	*Alosa aestivalis*	Stingray, Cownose	*Rhinoptera bonasus*
Jack, Bar	*Caranx ruber*	Stingray, Southern	*Dasyatis americana*
Jack, Crevalle	*Caranx hippos*	Tarpon	*Megalops atlanticus*
Killifish	*Fundulus spp.*	Tautog **	*Tautoga onitis*
Lizardfish, Inshore	*Synodus foetens*	Toadfish, Oyster	*Opsanus tau*
Lookdown	*Selene vomer*	Triggerfish, Grey	*Balistes capriscus*
Mackerel, Spanish**	*Scomberomorus maculatus*	Weakfish **	*Cynoscion regalis*
Menhaden, Atlantic **	*Brevoortia tyrannus*		

*NCDMF state managed species
** ASMFC federally managed species
† Most recent stock assessment suggests population is overfished as of 2025
‡ Most recent stock assessment suggests overfishing is occurring as of 2025

To improve and preserve the diverse ecosystem functions provided by oyster reef habitat, restoration is essential in North Carolina. In recognition of this need, NCDMF's Habitat and Enhancement Section coordinates ongoing habitat enhancement activities to improve statewide oyster populations and subsequently enhance the ecosystem services they provide. These efforts began with the Cultch Planting program in 1915 with the goal to rebuild oyster beds on public bottom by planting shells for substrate, thereby creating state-subsidized harvest areas for the fishery. Since the 1980s, over 2,000 cultch sites have been planted throughout North Carolina's coastline, with each area ranging in size from 0.5 to 10 acres. Estimates by NCDMF biologists indicate that each acre of cultch material can support and yield 368 bushels of oysters.

Additionally, NCDMF's Habitat & Enhancement Section oversees the construction of no-take reserves with the goal of creating and maintaining a self-sustaining network of subtidal oyster reefs. Protected oyster sanctuaries have the potential to supply approximately 65 times more larvae per square meter than non-protected reefs (Puckett and Eggleston 2012; Peters et al. 2017). This heightened reproductive output potential further benefits naturally occurring reefs and cultch sites as wind patterns distribute oyster larvae to historical oyster fishing areas for grow-out and future harvest (Haase et al. 2012; Puckett et al. 2014). A 20-acre protected oyster reef could provide an annual commercial fish value of $33,370 and have a larval oyster supply functionally equivalent to 1,300 acres of non-protected oyster reef (adapted from Grabowski et al. 2012; Peters 2014; Peters et al. 2017). Oyster Sanctuaries also provide recreational hook-and-line fishing and diving opportunities for the public. Sanctuary and cultch sites are planned with the aim of improving larval connectivity within the network of restoration sites. To date there are 17 sanctuaries (Figure 4.2), and a total of 789 acres of protected habitat placed in effect by proclamation (see Appendix 4 for more information on Enhancement Programs).

Secondary to improving oyster populations, enhancement programs also provide valuable reef habitat for many estuarine species (Table 3). Both cultch sites and sanctuaries offer oysters and other species refuge from hypoxia events via the construction of high relief habitat using alternative substrates. Additionally, artificial reefs may serve as nursery habitat to commercially valuable finfish. The estimated commercial fish value supported by a hectare of oyster reef is $4,123 annually (Grabowski et al. 2012). Peterson et al. (2003) conducted a meta-analysis that indicated every 10 m^2 of newly constructed oyster reef in the southeast United States is expected to yield an additional 2.6 kg of fish production per year for the lifetime of the reef.

For a more comprehensive history of NCDMF's oyster habitat enhancement efforts and detailed methodologies employed by the cultch and sanctuary programs (site selection, monitoring, and analysis), please refer to Appendix 4.

Threats and Alterations

Oysters are unique in their status as an ecosystem engineer in that they not only have a disproportionate impact on their surrounding environment, but they are also a global

commodity. Declining oyster populations have been observed, especially on sub-tidal reefs along the US East Coast (Rothschild et al. 1994; Hargis and Haven 1988; NCDMF 2001). In 2007, a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration biological review team found that current east coast oyster harvest is two percent of peak historical volume (EOBRT 2007). Oyster harvest in North Carolina has shown a similar trend of decline (Street et al. 2005; Deaton et al. 2010).

The primary threats to oyster habitat in North Carolina are physical disturbance (e.g., harvesting) and water quality degradation (e.g., bacterial contamination and eutrophication). Other potential threats such as sedimentation, and in-water development have the potential to impact oyster habitat, and those threats are discussed in Amendment 4 to the Eastern Oyster FMP (2017) and in the CHPP (2016), but they are omitted here to provide a focus on the most widespread and long-term threats to oyster habitat across North Carolina. Notably, of these threats, only hand-harvest and bottom-disturbing gear are directly within the control of the NCMFC. However, the NCMFC can encourage progress on other issues through collaboration with the EMC and CRC through its role in developing the CHPP.

PHYSICAL DISTURBANCE FROM HARVEST METHODS

Of the factors affecting the condition and distribution of oyster habitat, oyster harvest has had the greatest impact. Winslow (1889) and Chestnut (1955) reported finding formerly productive areas in Pamlico Sound where intensive oyster harvesting made further harvest and recovery of the oyster rocks impossible. Heavily fished oyster reefs lose vertical profile and are more likely to be affected by sedimentation and anoxia, which can suffocate live oysters and inhibit recruitment (Kennedy and Breisch 1981; Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Lenihan et al. 1999). Anecdotal accounts also indicate significant negative impacts occurred to oyster rocks in areas before they were closed to mechanical harvest of clams. In fact, current fisheries regulations prohibit the use of mechanical gear for the harvest of shellfish in SAV beds, Primary Nursery Areas, and live oyster beds outside of designated mechanical harvest areas because of the destructive capacity of the gear. Further discussion of the impacts of mechanical harvest is included in [Appendix 2].

Intensive hand harvest methods can also be destructive to oyster rocks. The harvest of clams or oysters by tonging or raking on intertidal oyster beds causes damage to not only living oysters but also the cohesive shell structure of the reef (Lenihan and Peterson 1998). This destruction has been an issue where oysters and hard clams co-exist, primarily around the inlets in the northern part of the state and on intertidal oyster beds in the south (DMF Oyster FMP 2001). Studies by Noble (1996) and Lenihan et al. (1999) quantified the effects of oyster and clam harvesting on oyster rocks, finding that the density of live adult oysters was significantly reduced where clam harvesting occurred, but that oyster harvesting had little effect on clam populations. Further discussion of the impacts of hand harvest is included in Appendix 3.

BIOLOGICAL STRESSORS

Introduced Species

Nuisance and non-native aquatic species have been accidentally or intentionally introduced to North Carolina waters through river systems, created waterways like the Intracoastal Waterway (IWW), discharged ballast water, out-of-state vessels, and the sale of live fish and shellfish for bait or aquaculture. Oysters were impacted by the introduction of the Dermo parasite and the pathogen *Haplosporidium nelson* (MSX) via introduced Pacific oysters in 1988 (*Crassostrea gigas*; NCDMF 2001). However, infection rates of MSX within oysters have drastically declined since 1989 and further sampling for MSX was discontinued in 1996 (for more information, please see Amendment 4). Intentional introductions of non-native species are covered under state laws and rules of several commissions. Permits are required for introducing, transferring, holding, and selling as bait any imported marine and estuarine species. Applicants must provide certification to ensure the organisms being moved are disease free and no additional macroscopic or microscopic organisms are present. The Fisheries Director may hold public meetings concerning these applications to help determine whether to issue the permit.

There is much debate and uncertainty regarding the introduction of non-native oysters for the purpose of rebuilding complex reef habitat, enhancing water filtration, and preserving the fishery (Andrews 1980; NCDMF 2001; Richards and Ticco 2002). Concerns of introduction include long-term survival of introduced species, competition with native oysters, unknown reef-building attributes, cross-fertilization reducing larval viability, and unintentional introduction of non-native pests (NCDMF 2008). Testing of the Pacific oyster and the Suminoe oyster (*Crassostrea ariakensis*) was carried out by researchers in North Carolina to assess their potential use (NCDMF 2008). Pacific oysters were found to be too thin to resist predation by native oyster drills and boring worms and Suminoe oysters were found to be susceptible to a parasitic protist in high salinities (DeBrosse and Allen 1996; Richards and Ticco 2002). In 2009, the US Army Corps of Engineers issued a Record of Decision to disallow the introduction of the Suminoe oyster and instead encouraged enhanced restoration and aquaculture using native oysters.

Dermo Disease

The oyster parasite (*Perkinsus marinus)*, also known as Dermo disease, is a protist that causes tissue degradation resulting in reduced growth, poor condition, diminished reproductive capacity, and ultimately mortality resulting from tissue lysis and occlusion of hemolymph vessels in infected oysters (Ray and Chandler 1955; Haskin et al. 1966; Ford and Figueras 1988; Ford and Tripp 1996). Oysters become more susceptible to parasitism and disease during extended periods of high salinity and temperature (VIMS 2002; La Peyre et al. 2006; NCDMF 2008), dissolved oxygen, sediment loading, and anthropogenic pollution (Barber 1987; Kennedy et al. 1996; Lenihan et al. 1999).

Research on experimental subtidal oyster reefs in the Neuse River estuary found oysters located at the base of reefs had the highest Dermo prevalence, infection intensity, and mortality, while oysters located at the crest of reefs were much less susceptible to

parasitism and Dermo-related mortality (Lenihan et al. 1999). Dermo infection was responsible for large-scale oyster mortalities in North Carolina during the late 1980s to mid-1990s (NCDMF 2008).

In 1989, the NCDMF began diagnosing Dermo infections and by 1991, a formal annual monitoring program was in place. Samples with moderate and high categories of infection intensity are expected to have mortality rates that considerably affect harvest if optimum conditions for parasitic growth and dispersal continue to persist. Results of the NCDMF monitoring program indicated that North Carolina appears to have some overwintering infections during mild years, although few samples were taken during winter months. Infection levels were high in the early 90s, and mortality of a smaller size class of oysters was observed. Infection intensity dropped between the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s.

Staff observed in southern estuaries during late summer months that moderate and high Dermo infection levels did not reduce oyster populations. It is suspected that small, high salinity estuaries may inhibit mortality by flushing out parasites at a higher rate or by exceeding the salinity tolerance of the Dermo parasite, allowing for a higher survival rate compared to Pamlico Sound. The link between low dissolved oxygen, increased availability of iron, and increased parasite activity may also be a factor in the different mortality rates as the smaller, high salinity estuaries are less prone to low dissolved oxygen events than Pamlico Sound (Leffler et al. 1998). Dermo infection intensity levels since 2005 have remained low and have likely not resulted in large scale mortality events, resulting in NCDMF discontinuing the routine annual monitoring program in 2017 (NCDMF unpublished data).

Other Harmful microbes

In addition to Dermo, there are various environmental pathogens that can impact shellfish and those that consume shellfish. Pathogens of most notable concern are *Vibrio* and Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning (NSP). Although the pathogen, *Haplosporidium nelson* (MSX), can also be of concern, infection rates of MSX in North Carolina oysters have drastically declined since 1989 and are currently not considered a major concern (for more information, please see Amendment 4 (NCDMF 2017).

Vibrio spp. are salt-loving bacteria that inhabit coastal waters throughout the world and can be ubiquitous in areas open to shellfish harvest. *Vibrio* can be found in North Carolina's coastal waters year-round but are more abundant during the warmer summer months (Pfeffer et al. 2003; Blackwell and Oliver, 2008). While they are not usually associated with pollution that typically triggers shellfish closures, filter-feeders can accumulate high concentrations of *Vibrio*. These bacteria can pose a public health risk as they may cause gastrointestinal illness from the consumption of raw or undercooked shellfish. People with underlying health conditions such as liver disease, diabetes, cancer, or weakened immune systems are at a higher risk of infection and can potentially experience life-threatening illness from *Vibrio*. For this reason, it is not advised to consume raw shellfish in the warm-water months. Humans can also contract *Vibrio* infections through open wounds on the skin and contact with brackish or saltwater.

Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning is a disease caused by consumption of molluscan shellfish contaminated with brevetoxins primarily produced by the dinoflagellate, *Karenia brevis*. Blooms of *K. brevis*, sometime referred to as Florida red tide, occur frequently along the Gulf of Mexico (Watkins et al. 2008). Red Tide events have been documented to cause impacts to shellfish fisheries in North Carolina (NCDMF 2001a).

For more detailed information on these environmental pathogens, see Amendment 2 of the Hard Clam FMP (NCDMF 2017). The NCDMF has a contingency plan in place as required by the FDA, including a monitoring program and management plan. The purpose is to ensure quick response to any harmful algal species within State waters that may threaten the health and safety of shellfish consumers. The plan also details the system to provide early warning of any potential issues, actions to be taken to protect public health and steps to reopen areas to harvest (Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section Marine Biotoxin Contingency Plan 2022).

Boring Sponge

The boring sponge (*Cliona spp.*) is a bioeroder of calcified skeletons such as corals and oyster reefs. These sponges can chemically etch out canal systems within oyster reefs, as well as incrust and smother them which can cause mortality by weakening the shell. Once the oyster reef has been compromised, there is a loss of substrate, reduction in vertical relief, and loss of structural integrity. Boring sponges are linked to salinity gradients with some species found in high salinity waters while other species are found in low to mid-range salinities but typically are not found in waters with less than 10 ppt salinity. Intertidal oysters have some refuge from boring sponges.

Lindquist et al. (2012) examined the distribution and abundance of oyster reef bioerosion by *Cliona* in North Carolina. The study examined levels of boring sponge infestations across salinity gradients in multiple oyster habitats from New River through the southern portions of Pamlico Sound, finding that higher salinity areas, with a mean salinity of 20 ppt or greater, were infested by the high salinity tolerant boring sponge *Cliona celata*. As salinities increased, infestations increased and subtidal reefs disappeared (Lindquist et al. 2012), and freshets that occurred in White Oak River and New River prior to initial surveys demonstrated resilience of boring sponges to low salinity events. Sample sites in both areas had no active infestations but gemmules were observed; sampling seven to eight months later found moderate to high levels of active sponge infestation. Bioeroding polychaete *Polydora* worms were also more abundant in lower salinity areas and less abundant in higher salinities (Lindquist et al. 2012).

WATER QUALITY THREATS

Marine bivalves, including oysters, have been shown to accumulate chemical contaminants, such as hydrocarbons and heavy metals, in high concentrations. Reductions in growth and increased mortality have been observed in soft-shelled clams (*Mya arenaria*) following oil spill pollution events (Appeldoorn 1981). Impaired larval development, increased respiration, reduction in shell thickness, inhibition of shell growth, and general emaciation of tissues have been attributed to adult bivalve exposure to heavy

metal contamination (Roesijadi 1996). High concentrations of organic contaminates also result in impairment of physiological mechanisms, histopathological disorders, and loss of reproductive potential in bivalves (Capuzzo 1996). As shellfish can easily accumulate chemical pollutants in their tissues, consumption of impaired shellfish creates a health risk. Subsequently, shellfish closures occur due to chemical contamination, commonly associated with industry, marinas, and runoff.

Delivery of inorganic pollutants, organic contaminants, and harmful microbes to waterways occurs via both point and non-point sources. Accumulation of harmful agents in the water column subjects oyster populations to the adverse effects listed above. Point sources have identifiable origins and include the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) wastewater discharges. Although wastewater discharges are treated, mechanical failure allows contaminated sewage to reach shellfish growing waters triggering an area to be closed to harvest.

Non-point sources of microbial contamination include runoff from animal agriculture operations and urban development. Animal agriculture produces waste with fecal bacteria, runoff from pastures, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), and land where CAFO waste has been applied as manure, all of which can be transported to surface waters and subsequently lead to shellfish restrictions (Burkholder et al. 2007; Wolfson and Harrigan 2010; Hribar 2010). Impervious surfaces (e.g., roads, roofs, parking lots) facilitate runoff and microbe transportation, facilitating significant water quality degradation in neighboring watersheds (Holland et al. 2004). For instance, in New Hanover County, an analysis of the impact of urban development showed that just 10-20% impervious cover in an area impairs water quality (Mallin et al. 2000). In North Carolina, CAFOs primarily house swine and poultry with a majority located in the coastal plain portions of the Cape Fear and Neuse basins; however, both occur in all basins across the coastal plain (NCDWR 2023a).

Low Oxygen

Point and non-point sources (developed and agricultural lands) are also sources of increased nutrient loads, which fuel phytoplankton growth and increase the strength and frequency of algal blooms. The eventual bacterial decomposition of these blooms results in depletion of dissolved oxygen to levels that can be dangerous to shellfish, particularly in warm, deep waters. Increased eutrophication leads to decreased oxygen levels (hypoxia and anoxia), which North Carolina's estuaries are already prone to because of salinity stratification and high summertime water temperatures (Buzzelli et al. 2002). Low-oxygen events degrade the usability of subtidal oyster reef habitats for fish (Eby and Crowder 2002) and cause high rates of oyster mortality in the deeper (4-6 m) estuarine waters (Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Powers et al. 2009; Johnson et al. 2009). State action to limit nutrient loading from urban and agricultural lands is critical for reducing hypoxia impacts to estuarine habitat and resources, including oysters and the reefs they create (DWR 2023b).

Shellfish Sanitation

North Carolina is part of the National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP). The NSSP is administered by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The NSSP is based on public health principles and controls and is designed to prevent human illness associated with the consumption of shellfish. Sanitary controls are established over all phases of the growing, harvesting, shucking, packing and distribution of fresh and fresh-frozen shellfish. Shellfish Sanitation and Marine Patrol are the primary Sections of NCDMF responsible for North Carolina's compliance with the NSSP.

The Shellfish Sanitation Section classifies shellfish growing areas and recommends closures and re-openings to the Director that are implemented by proclamation. The entire North Carolina coast is divided into a series of management units referred to as Growing Areas. Each Growing Area is individually managed to determine which portions of the area are suitable for shellfish harvest, and which need to be closed to harvest. Data collected and used in classifying Growing Areas includes actual and potential pollution sources, rainfall and runoff impacts, physical hydrodynamic patterns, and bacteriological water quality.

Shellfish growing waters can be classified as "Approved", "Conditionally Approved", "Restricted", or "Prohibited". Approved areas are consistently open to harvest, while Prohibited areas are off limits for shellfish harvest. Conditionally Approved areas can be open to harvest under certain conditions, such as dry weather when stormwater runoff is not having an impact on surrounding water quality, and Restricted waters can be used for harvest at certain times as long as the shellfish are subjected to further cleansing before they are made available for consumption. For a map of both temporary and permanent closures, please visit the Interactive Shellfish Closure Map on NCDMF's Shellfish Sanitation website. Additional information can be found under Current Polluted Area Proclamations.

Climate Change

Along the southeastern coastline, models suggest the intensity of hurricanes is likely to increase with warming temperatures, which will result in increased heavy precipitation from hurricanes (Kunkel et al. 2020). Additionally, it is likely the frequency of severe thunderstorms and annual total precipitation in North Carolina will increase. The expected increase in heavy precipitation events will lead to increased runoff, which will result in an increase in chemical and microbial pollutants transferred to oyster habitats. Recent research has provided evidence that negative impacts from increased precipitation and pollutant delivery to estuaries have already begun in North Carolina (Paerl et al. 2019; Kunkel et al. 2020).

For instance, Paerl et al. (2020) investigated the impact of tropical cyclones on nutrient delivery and algal bloom occurrences in the Neuse River Estuary and Pamlico Sound. They found high-discharge storm events, such as high-rainfall tropical cyclones, can double annual nutrient loadings to the estuary, leading to increased nutrients and

dissolved organic carbon. Phytoplankton response to moderate storm events is immediate, while during high-rainfall events like Hurricanes Floyd (1999), Matthew (2016), and Florence (2018), phytoplankton growth is diverted downstream to Pamlico Sound, where it can persist for weeks. Additionally, increased organic matter and phytoplankton biomass from heavy rainfall events contribute to oxygen depletion, exacerbating hypoxic and anoxic conditions in the Neuse River and Pamlico Sound.

Additionally, warming water temperatures caused by climate change may benefit growth rates for pathogens that can negatively impact oyster resources. For instance, increased water temperatures have been linked to increasing abundance of *Vibrio* over the past 60 years and may increase in frequency and length as temperatures rise (Vezzulli et al. 2016). Rising water temperatures threaten to increase this risk, potentially through longer periods of the year.

To reduce the negative impacts of climate change on the oyster fishery, it will be important for state agencies to implement policies that encourage the use of agriculture, forestry, and urban stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to reduce the amount of runoff reaching North Carolina's estuaries. This need, among others, has been emphasized in the CHPP as recommended actions to improve water quality (NCDEQ 2016, 2021). While the MFC has little direct control over such actions to mitigate the impacts of increased runoff, it can continue to support them through its role in developing and approving the CHPP.

Protected Species

A "protected species" is defined as any organism whose population is protected by federal or state statute due to the risk of extinction. In North Carolina, these species are primarily protected by the following federal statues: the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The primary marine mammal that occurs in North Carolina estuaries is the common bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*; Hayes 2018) though the West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*) seasonally occurs during warm water months (Cummings et al. 2014). The NMFS has designated oyster fisheries as Category III, with no known gear interactions with marine mammals. More information on the MMPA List of Fisheries and fisheries categorizations can be found on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) MMPA website.

North Carolina estuaries are also home to multiple ESA-listed species including the Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*), Leatherback Sea Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), Hawksbill Sea Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata)*, Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*), Shortnose Sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*), and five species of sea turtle. These species are unlikely to be impacted as harvest methods employed largely exclude any potential for direct interactions. Due to the lack of recorded interactions and the unlikelihood of any interactions between these ESA-listed species and the oyster industry,

it can be assumed any potential impacts of oyster harvest on protected species populations would be indirect and at the ecosystem-level.

North Carolina is home to a diverse array of migratory bird species (Potter et al. 2006). Little evidence exists to suggest birds are directly impacted by oyster harvest. However, as oysters are a primary prey species of the American Oystercatcher (*Haematopus palliatus;* Tuckwell and Nol 1997), oyster harvest may result in secondary interactions with the species. For example, overharvest of oyster reefs has been found, in some cases, to contribute to a decrease in overall reproductive success of nearby nesting Oystercatchers (Thibault et al. 2010).

FINAL AMENDMENT 5 MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

****Section will be completed when the MFC selects preferred management and prior to DEQ secretary and legislative committees review****

RESEARCH NEEDS

The research recommendations listed below are offered by the NCDMF to improve future management strategies for the Eastern Oyster fishery. They are considered high priority as they will help to better understand the oyster fishery and meet the goal and objectives of the FMP. A more comprehensive list of research recommendations is provided in the Annual FMP Review and NCDMF Research Priorities documents.

- Improve the reliability of estimating recreational harvest.
- Develop regional juvenile and adult abundance indices or methods to monitor abundance of the oyster population (fisheries-independent).
- Establish and monitor sentinel sites for shell bottom habitat condition; develop shell bottom metrics to monitor.
- Develop a program to monitor oyster reef height, area, and condition.
- Explore water quality data sources (e.g.., NOAA, U.S. Geological Survey, FerryMon, Shellfish Growing Areas and Recreational Water Quality programs, meteorology sources) and their use in analyses that incorporates environmental variables that can impact regional population dynamics.

MANAGEMENT FROM PREVIOUS PLANS

The following management measures from the previous FMP are carried forward into Amendment 5.

- A daily limit of two bushels of oysters per person with a maximum of four bushels of oysters per vessel off public bottom for Shellfish License holders statewide.
- A six-week opening timeframe for mechanical harvest in deep bays to begin on the Monday of the week prior to Thanksgiving week through the Friday after Thanksgiving. Reopen two weeks before Christmas for the remainder of the six-week season.

- A 15-bushel hand/mechanical harvest limit in Pamlico Sound mechanical harvest areas outside the bays, 10-bushel hand/mechanical harvest limit in the bays, and 10-bushel hand harvest limit in the Mechanical Methods Prohibited area along the Outer Banks of Pamlico Sound. Areas as defined and adopted in Amendment 2 of the Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2008).

LITERATURE CITED

Amaral, V. S. D., and L. R. L. Simone. 2014. Revision of genus *Crassostrea* (Bivalvia: Ostreidae) of Brazil. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom. 94: 811-836.

Andrews, J. D. 1980. A Review of Introductions of Exotic Oysters and Biological Planning for New Importations.

Andrews, J. D. 1983. Minchinia nelsoni (MSX) infections in the James River seed-oyster area and their expulsion in spring. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 16(3):255–269.

Appeldoorn, R. S. 1981. Response of Soft-Shell Clam (Mya arenaria) Growth to Onset and Abatement of Pollution. Journal of Shellfish Research. 1(1): 41-49.

Arve, J. 1960. Preliminary report on attracting fish by oyster-shell plantings in Chincoteague Bay, Maryland. *Chesapeake Science* 1(1):58-65.

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 1988. A procedural plan to control interjurisdictional transfers and introductions of shellfish. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, D.C. 58 p.

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 2007. The importance of habitat created by shellfish and shell beds along the Atlantic coast of the U.S. Prepared by Coen LD, Grizzle R, with contributions by Lowery J, Paynter KT Jr. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, DC, p 1–116

Bahr, L. M., and R. E. Hillman. 1967. Effects of repeated shell damage on gametogenesis in the American oyster *Crassostrea virginica* (Gmelin). Proceedings of the National Shellfisheries Association. 57:59-62.

Bahr, L. M., and W. P. Lanier. 1981. The ecology of intertidal oyster reefs of the South Atlantic Coast: a community profile. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, D.C. FWS/OBS-81/15,105 p.

Barber, B. J. 1987. Influence of stress on disease susceptibility. p. 82-85 in Fisher, W. S. and Figueras (eds.), A. J. Marine Bivalve Pathology. Maryland Sea Grant, College Park, MD.

Barnes, B. B., M. W. Luckenbach, and P. R. Kingsley-Smith. 2010. Oyster reef community interactions: The effect of resident fauna on oyster (Crassostrea spp.) larval recruitment. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 391(1–2):169–177.

Blackwell, K. D., and J.D. Oliver. 2008. The ecology of *Vibrio vulnificus, Vibrio cholerae*, and *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* in North Carolina Estuaries. *J Microbiol.* 46, 146–153.

Breuer, J. P. 1962. An ecological survey of the lower Laguna Madre of Texas, 1953-1959. Publications of the Institute of Marine Science, University of Texas. 8(15): 3-183.

Burkholder, J. M., G. M. Hallegraeff, G. Melia, A. Cohen, H. A. Bowers, D. W. Oldach, M. W. Parrow, M. J. Sullivan, P. V. Zimba, E. H. Allen, C. A. Kinder, and M. A. Mallin. 2007.

Phytoplankton and bacterial assemblages in ballast water of U.S. military ships as a function of port of origin, voyage time, and ocean exchange practices. *Harmful Algae* 6(4):486–518.

Butler, P. A., 1954. Summary of our knowledge of the oyster in the Gulf of Mexico. *Fishery Bulletin of the Fish and Wildlife Service* 55:479-489.

Buzzelli, C. P., R. A. Luettich, Jr., S. P. Powers, C. H. Peterson, J. E. McNinch, J. L. Pinckney, and H. W. Paerl 2002. Estimating the spatial extent of bottom-water hypoxia and habitat degradation in a shallow estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 230:103-112.

Capuzzo. J. M. 1996. Biological Effects of Contaminants on Shellfish Populations in Coastal Habitat: Case History of New Bedford, MA. In: Sherman, K. (ed.). Marine Ecosystem Management: The Northeast Shellfish. Blackwell Science. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Carlton, J. T. and R. Mann, 1996. Transfers and worldwide distributions. In: Kennedy, V.S., R.I.E. Newell, and A.F. Eble (eds). The Eastern Oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*. Maryland Sea Grant Publication. pp. 691-706.

Carroll JC, Gobler CJ, Peterson BP (2008). Resource limitation of eelgrass in New York estuaries; light limitation and nutrient stress alleviation by hard clams. Marine Ecology Progress Series 369: 39–50.

Chestnut, A. F. 1951. The oyster and other molluscs in North Carolina. p. 141-190. In Taylor, H. F. Survey of Marine Fisheries of North Carolina. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC, 555 p.

Chestnut, A. F. 1954. A preliminary report of the mollusc studies conducted by the University of North Carolina Institute of Fisheries Research, 1948-1954. University of North Carolina, Institute of Fisheries Research. 39 p.

Chestnut, A. F. 1955. A report of the mollusc studies conducted by the University of North Carolina Institute of Fisheries Research, 1948-1954. University of North Carolina, Institute of Fisheries Research, 66 p.

Chestnut, A. F., and H. S. Davis. 1975. Synopsis of Marine Fisheries of North Carolina. Part I: Statistical Information, 1880-1973. University of North Carolina Sea Grant Publication, UNC-SG-75-12, 425 p.

Coen, L. D., M. W. Luckenbach, and D. L. Breitburg. 1999. The Role of Oyster Reefs as Essential Fish Habitat: A Review of Current Knowledge and Some New Perspectives. In: Benaka, L. R. (ed.). Fish Habitat: Essential Fish Habitat and Rehabilitation. American Fisheries Society. Bethesda, Maryland. Symposium. 438-454.

Coen L.D., R.D. Brumbaugh, D. Bushek, R.Grizzle, M.W. Luckenbach, M.H. Posey, et al. 2007. Ecosystem services related to oyster restoration. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 341, 303–307.

Cressman, K.A., M.H. Posey, M.A. Mallin, L.A. Leonard, T.D. Alphin. 2003. Effects of oyster reefs on water quality in a tidal creek estuary. Journal of Shellfish Research 22: 753-762.

Cummings, E. W., D. A. Pabst, J. E. Blum, S. G. Barco, S. J. Davis, V. G. Thayer, N. Adimey, and W.A. McLellan. 2014. Spatial and temporal patterns of habitat use and mortality of the Florida manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*) in the mid-Atlantic states of North Carolina and Virginia from 1991 to 2012. Aquatic Mammals 40(2):126–138. https://doi.org/ 10.1578/AM.40.2.2014.126

Davis, N. W., and R. E. Hillman. 1971. Effect of artificial shell damage on sex determination in oysters (Abstract). Proceedings of the National Shellfisheries Association. 61: 2.

Deaton, A.S., W. S. Chappell, K. Hart, and J. O'Neal, B. Boutin. 2010. North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Division of Marine Fisheries, North Carolina. 639 pp.

DeBrosse, G. A., and K. S. Allen. 1996. The suitability of land-based evaluations of Crassostrea gigas (Thunberg, 1793) as an indicator of performance in the field. Journal of Shellfish Research 15: 291-295

Dunn, R. P., D. B. Eggleston, and N. Lindquist. 2014. Effects of substrate type on demographic rates of Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*). Journal of Shellfish Research. 33(1): 177-185.

Division of Water Resources (DWR)(a). Animal Operation Permits Map. 2019. Raleigh, North Carolina. N.C. Department of Environmental Quality. Raleigh, NC.

Division of Water Resources (DWR)(b). Nonpoint Source Planning Branch (2023). 20-Year Neuse and Tar-Pamlico Nutrient Management Strategy Retrospective: An Analysis of Implementation and Recommendations for Adaptive Management. N.C. Department of Environmental Quality. Raleigh, NC.

Eby, L.A., and L.B. Crowder. 2002. Hypoxia-based habitat compression in the Neuse River Estuary: context-dependent shifts in behavioral avoidance thresholds. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 59: 952–965.

English, E. P. P., Charles H.; Voss, Christine M. 2009. Ecology and Economics of Compensatory Restoration.

EOBRT (Eastern Oyster Biological Review Team). 2007. Status review of the Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*). Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office.

Everett, R. A., G. M. Ruiz, and J. T. Carlton. 1995. Effect of oyster mariculture on submerged aquatic vegetation: An experimental test in a Pacific Northwest estuary. Marine ecology progress series. Oldendorf 125 (1-3): 205-217.

Ford, S. E. and A. J. Figueras. 1988. Effects of sublethal infection by the parasite *Haplosporidium nelsoni* (MSX) on gametogenesis, spawning, and sex ratios of oysters in Delaware Bay, USA. Diseases of Aquatic Organisms 4(2): 121-133.

Ford, S. E. and M.R. Tripp. 1996. Diseases and defense mechanisms. p. 581-660 in Kennedy, V. S., Newell, R. I. E., and Eble (eds.), A. F. The Eastern Oyster *Crassostrea virginica*. Maryland Sea Grant, College Park, MD.

Gaffney, P. M. 2005. Congressional hearing testimony and personal communication to Eastern Oyster Biological Review Team 8/9/05.

Galtsoff, P. S. 1964. The American oyster, *Crassostrea virginica* (Gmelin). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fishery Bulletin 64: 1-480.

Godwin, W. F. 1981. Development of a mechanical seed oyster relaying program in North Carolina. N. C. Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, Division of Marine Fisheries, Special Scientific Report No. 35. 91 p.

Grabowski, J. H. 2002. The influence of trophic interactions, habitat complexity, and landscape setting on community dynamics and restoration of oyster reefs. PhD Thesis. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Grabowski, J. H., and Peterson, C. H. 2007. Restoring oyster reefs to recover ecosystem services. *Ecosystem engineers: plants to protists.* 4: 281-298.

Grabowski, J.H., A.R. Hughes, D.L. Kimbro, M.A. Dolan. 2005. How habitat setting influences restored oyster reef communities. Ecology 86:1926–1935.

Grabowski, J.L., R.D. Brumbaugh, R.F. Conrad, A.G. Keeler, J.J. Opaluch, C.H. Peterson, M.F. Piehler, S.P. Powers, A.R. Smyth. 2012. Economic Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Oyster Reefs. BioScience 62(10): 900-909.

Grizzle, R.E., J.K. Greene, M.W. Luckenbach, L.D. Coen. 2006. A new in-situ method for measuring seston uptake by suspension-feeding bivalve molluscs. Journal of Shellfish Research 25: 643-650.

Haase, A. T., D. B. Eggleston, R. A. Luettich, R. J. Weaver, B. J. Puckett. 2012. Estuarine circulation and predicted oyster larval dispersal among a network of reserves. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science. 101: 33–43.

Harding, J. M., E. N. Powell, R. Mann, and M. J. Southworth. 2012. Variations in Eastern Oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) sex-ratios from three Virginia estuaries: protandry, growth and demographics. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom. 92: 1-13.

Hargis, W.J. Jr., D.S. Haven. 1988. The imperiled oyster industry of Virginia: a critical analysis with recommendations for restoration. Special report 290 in applied marine science and ocean engineering. Virginia Sea Grant Marine Advisory Services, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, VA.

Haskin, H. H., L.A. Stauber, and G. Mackin. 1966. Minchinia nelsoni n. sp. (*Haplosporida, Haplosporidiidae*): causative agent of the Delaware Bay oyster epizootic. Science 153: 1414-1416.

Hayes, S. A., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, and Rosel. 2018. US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments - 2017: (second edition). National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-245, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. 378 p.

Hidu, H., and H. H. Haskin. 1971. Setting of the American oyster related to environmental factors and larval behavior. Proceedings of the National Shellfisheries Association, 61: 35-50.

Hedeen, R.A. 1986. *The Oyster: The Life and Lore of the Celebrated Bivalve.* Tidewater Publishers. Centreville, Maryland.

Holland, A. F., D. M. Sanger, C. P. Gawle, S. B. Lerberg, M. S. Santiago, G. H. M. Riekerk, L. E. Zimmerman, and G. I. Scott. 2004. Linkages between tidal creek ecosystems and the landscape and demographic attributes of their watersheds. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 298:151-178.

Hoover, C. A., and P. M. Gaffney. 2005. Geographic variation in nuclear genes of the Eastern Oyster, *Crassostrea virginica* Gmelin. Journal of Shellfish Research. 24(1): 103-112.

Hopkins, A. E. 1931. Factors influencing the spawning and setting of oysters in Galveston Bay, Texas. Bulletin of the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. 47(3): 57-83.

Hribar, C. 2010. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations and Their Impact on Communities.

Jenkins, J. B., A. Morrison, and C. L. MacKenzie, Jr. 1997. The molluscan fisheries of the Canadian Maritimes. In `The History, Present Condition, and Future of the Molluscan Fisheries of North and Central America and Europe, Vol. 1. Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. (ed.) MacKenzie et al. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Report NMFS. pp 15-44.

Johnson K. D., and D. I. Smee. 2012. Size matters for risk assessment and resource allocation in bivalves. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 462: 103–110.

Jones, R.A., T.M. Sholar. 1981. The effects of freshwater discharge on estuarine nursery areas of Pamlico Sound. N.C. Department of Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Completion Rep. Proj. CEIP 79-11. NC.

Jordan, S.J. 1987. Sedimentation and remineralization associated with biodeposition by the American oyster *Crassostrea virginica* (Gmelin). Doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland, College Park, pp. 200.

Kelaher, B.P., 2003. Changes in habitat complexity negatively affect diverse gastropod assemblages in coralline algal turf. *Oecologia*, *135*, pp.431-441.

Kellogg, L. M., Jeffrey C. Cornwell, Michael S, Owens, Kennedy T. Paynter. 2013. Denitrification and nutrient assimilation on a restored oyster reef. Marine Ecology Progress Series 480(April 22):1-19.

Kennedy, V. S. and L. L. Breisch. 1981. Maryland's Oysters: Research and Management. University of Maryland Sea Grant Program. College Park, Maryland. UM-SG-TS-81-04.

Kennedy, V.S. 1983. Sex ratios in oysters, emphasizing *Crassostrea virginica* from Chesapeake Bay, Maryland. Veliger 25: 329-338.

Kennedy, V. S., R. I. E. Newell, and A. F. Ebele (editors). 1996. The Eastern Oyster, *Crassostrea virginica*. Maryland Sea Grant College, College Park, MD, USA.

Kunkel, K.E., Karl, T.R., Squires, M.F., Yin, X., Stegall, S.T. and Easterling, D.R., 2020. Precipitation extremes: Trends and relationships with average precipitation and precipitable water in the contiguous United States. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, *59*(1), pp.125-142.

La Peyre, M., S. Casas, and J. La Peyre. 2006. Salinity effects on viability, metabolic activity and proliferation of three Perkinsus Species. Diseases of Aquatic Organisms 71(1): 59-74.

Leffler, M., J. Greer, G. Mackiernan, and K. Folk. 1998. Restoring Oysters to U.S. Coastal Waters: A National Commitment. UM-SG-TS-98-03, www.mdsg.umd.edu/MDSG/ or VSG-98-05, www.people.Virginia.EDU/~gmsc-web/. 21p.

Lenihan, H. S. 1999. Physical-biological coupling on oyster reefs: how habitat structure influences individual performance. Ecological Monographs. 69(3): 251-275.

Lenihan, H.S. and C.H. Peterson. 1998. How habitat degradation through fishery disturbance enhances impacts of hypoxia on oyster reefs. Ecological Applications. 8: 128-140.

Lenihan, H. S., F. Micheli, S.W. Shelton, and C. H. Peterson. 1999. The Influence of Multiple Environmental Stressors on Susceptibility to Parasites: An Experimental Determination with Oysters. Limnology and Oceanography. 44: 910-924.

Lenihan, H. S., C.H. Peterson, J.E. Byers, J.H. Grabowski, and G.W. Thayer. 2001. Cascading of habitat degradation: oyster reefs invaded by refugee fishes escaping stress. Ecological Applications 11(3): 764-782.

Lillis, A., D. B. Eggleston, and D. R. Bohnenstiehl. 2013. Oyster larvae settle in response to habitat-associated underwater sounds. PLoS ONE 8(10): e79337.

Lindquist, N., A. Tyler, D. Cessna, and S Fegley. 2012. Quantifying boring sponge abundance, biomass and bioerosion rates in North Carolina oyster reefs. NC Sea Grant, Raleigh, NC.

Loosanoff, V. L. 1952. Behavior of oysters in water of low salinity. Proceedings of the National Shellfish Association, 1952 Convention Addresses, pp. 135-151.

Loosanoff, V. L. 1965. The American or Eastern Oyster. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Circular 205.

Lord, J. P., and R. B. Whitlatch. 2012. Inducible defenses in the Eastern Oyster Crassostrea virginica (Gmelin) in response to the presence of the predatory oyster drill *Urosalpinx cinerea* (Say) in Long Island Sound. Marine Biology. 159(6): 1177-1182.

Lord, J. P., and R. B. Whitlatch. 2014. Latitudinal patterns of shell thickness and metabolism in the Eastern Oyster Crassostrea virginica along the east coast of North America. Marine Biology. 161(7): 1487-1497.

MacKenzie, C. L. Jr., V. G, Burrell, Jr., A. Rosenfield, and W.L. Hobart (eds.). 1997. The history, present condition, and future of the molluscan fisheries of North and Central America and Europe. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS 127.

Mackin, J. G. 1946. A study of oyster strike on the seaside of Virginia. Commission of Fisheries, Virginia, No. 25.

Mallin, M. A., K. E. Williams, E. C. Esham, and R. P. Lowe. 2000. Effect of Human Development on Bacteriological Water Quality in Coastal Watersheds. Ecological Applications. 10(4): 1047-1056.

Markwith, A. L., M. H. Posey, and T. D. Alphin. 2009. Distribution and life history characteristics of *Ostreola equestris*. Journal of Shellfish Research. 28(3): 713.

Menzel, R. W. 1955. Some phases of the biology of *Ostrea equestris* and a comparison with *Crassostrea virginica* (Gmelin). Publications of the Institute of Marine Science, University of Texas, 4: 69-153.

Menzel, R. W. 1951. Early sexual development and growth of the American oyster in Louisiana waters. Science.113: 719-721.

Minello, T.J., 1999. Nekton densities in shallow estuarine habitats of Texas and Louisiana and the identification of essential fish habitat. In *American Fisheries Society Symposium.* Vol. 22, pp. 43-75.

Mroch R. M. III, D. B. Eggleston, and B. J. Puckett. 2012. Spatiotemporal variation in oyster fecundity and reproductive output in a network of no-take reserves. Journal of Shellfish Research. 31(4): 1091-1101.

Munden, F. H. 1975. Rehabilitation of Pamlico Sound oyster producing grounds damaged or destroyed by Hurricane Ginger. N.C. Dept. of Natural and Economic Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Special Scientific Report No. 27, 34 p.

NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality) (2016). North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan Source Document. Morehead City, NC. Division of Marine Fisheries. 475p.

NCDMF. 2001a. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2001b. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2008. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2010. Supplement A to Amendment 2 of the NC Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2013. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2017. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 4. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

Nelson, K.A., L.A. Leonard, M.H. Posey, T.D. Alphin, M.A. Mallin. 2004. Using transplanted oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) beds to improve water quality in small tidal creeks: a pilot study. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 298: 347-368.

Nevins, J., J. Pollack, and G. Stunz. 2013. Characterizing the pristine oyster reef community of Sabine Lake estuary relative to surrounding marsh edge and non-vegetated bottom habitats. 22nd Biennial Conference of the Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation (CERF 2013).

Newell, R.I. E. 1988. Ecological changes in the Chesapeake Bay: are they the result of overharvesting the American oyster? P.536-546 in M.P. Lynch and E.C. Krome (eds.). Understanding the estuary: advances in Chesapeake Bay research. Chesapeake Bay Research Consortium, Baltimore, Md. Publication 129.

Newell R.I.E. and Koch E.W. 2004. Modeling seagrass density and distribution in response to changes in turbidity stemming from bivalve filtration and seagrass sediment stabilization. Estuaries 27: 793–806.

Newell, R. I. E., J.C. Cornwell, and M.S. Owens. 2002. Influence of simulated bivalve biodeposition and microphytobenthos on sediment nitrogen dynamics: a laboratory study. Limnology and Oceanography 47(5): 1367-1379.

Newell, R. I. E., T. R. Fisher, R. R. Holyoke, and J. C. Cornwell. 2005. Influence of eastern oysters on nitrogen and phosphorus regeneration in Chesapeake Bay, USA. Pages 93-120 in R. D. a. S. O. (eds.), editor. The comparative roles of suspension feeders in ecosystems, volume 47. Springer, The Netherlands.

Noble, E. 1996. Report to the Oyster, Clam, and Scallop Committee on Ward Creek Field Investigation by Resource Enhancement Staff. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Division of Marine Fisheries, Unpub. Report. 8 pp.

Ortega, S., J. P. Sutherland and C. H. Peterson. 1990. Environmental determination of oyster success in the Pamlico Sound. Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study, North Carolina

Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources and United States Environmental Protection Agency. Report 90-08, 29p.

Paerl, H.W., Hall, N.S., Hounshell, A.G., Luettich Jr, R.A., Rossignol, K.L., Osburn, C.L. and Bales, J., 2019. Recent increase in catastrophic tropical cyclone flooding in coastal North Carolina, USA: Long-term observations suggest a regime shift. *Scientific reports*, *9*(1), p.10620.

Paerl, H.W., Hall, N.S., Hounshell, A.G., Rossignol, K.L., Barnard, M.A., Luettich, R.A., Rudolph, J.C., Osburn, C.L., Bales, J. and Harding, L.W., 2020. Recent increases of rainfall and flooding from tropical cyclones (TCs) in North Carolina (USA): implications for organic matter and nutrient cycling in coastal watersheds. *Biogeochemistry*, *150*, pp.197-216.

Peters J.W. 2014 Oyster Demographic Rates in Sub-Tidal Fished Areas: Recruitment, Growth, Mortality, and Potential Larval Output. MS Thesis. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

Peters JW, Eggleston DB, Puckett BJ, Theuerkauf SJ (2017). Oyster demographic in harvested reefs vs. no-take reserves: implications for larval spillover and restoration success. Frontiers in Marine Science 4:326.

Peterson, C.H., J.H. Grabowski, and S.P. Powers. 2003. Estimated enhancement of fish production resulting from restoring oyster reef habitat: Quantitative valuation. Marine Ecology Progress Series 264:249–264.

Pfeffer, C.S., Hite, M.F. and Oliver, J.D., 2003. Ecology of Vibrio vulnificus in estuarine waters of eastern North Carolina. *Applied and environmental microbiology*, *69*(6), pp.3526-3531.

Piehler, M.F. and Smyth, A.R., 2011. Habitat-specific distinctions in estuarine denitrification affect both ecosystem function and services. *Ecosphere*, *2*(1), pp.1-17.

Pierson, K.J., D.B. Eggleston. 2014. Response of estuarine fish to large-scale oyster reef restoration. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 143(1): 273-288.

Plunket, J. and La Peyre, M.K., 2005. Oyster beds as fish and macroinvertebrate habitat in Barataria Bay, Louisiana. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, *77*(1), pp.155-164.

Pollack, J., S. M. Ray., B. Lebreton, B. Blomberg, and S. Rikard. 2012. Patchiness of dermo (*Perkinsus marinus*) disease foci in the Aransas - Copano, Texas estuarine system. Journal of Shellfish Research 31: 333.

Porter, E.T., J.C. Cornwell, L.P. Sanford. 2004. Effect of oysters Crassostrea virginica and bottom shear velocity on benthic-pelagic coupling and estuarine water quality. Marine Ecology Progress Series 271: 61-75.

Posey, M.H., T.D. Alphin, C.M Powell, and E. Towsend. 1999. Use of oyster reefs as habitat for epibenthic fish and decapods. P. 229-238 in M.W. Luckenbach, R. Mann and J.A. Wesson eds. Oyster Reef Habitat Restoration: A Synopsis and Synthesis of Approaches. Virginia Institute of Marine Science Press, Gloucester Point, VA.

Potter, E. F., J. F. Parnell, R. P. Teulings, and R. Davis. 2006. Birds of the Carolinas. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Powell, E., J. M. Morson, K. A. Ashton-Alcox, and Y. Kim. 2013. Accommodation of the sex-ratio in Eastern Oysters Crassostrea virginica to variation in growth and mortality across the estuarine salinity gradient. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom. 93: 533-555.

Powers, S.P., C.H. Peterson, J.H. Grabowski, H.S. Lenihan. 2009. Success of constructed oyster reefs in no harvest sanctuaries: implications for restoration. Marine Ecology Progress Series 389: 159-170.

Prins, T.C., A.C. Smaal, R. Dame. 1997. A review of the feedbacks between bivalve grazing and ecosystem processes. Aquatic Ecology 31: 349-359.

Puckett, B. J. and D. B. Eggleston. 2012. Oyster demographics in a network of no-take reserves: recruitment, growth, survival, and density dependence. Marine and Coastal Fisheries. 4(1): 605-627.

Puckett, B.P., D.B. Eggleston, P.C. Kerr, R.A. Luettich Jr. 2014. Larval Dispersal and population connectivity among a network of marine reserves. Fisheries Oceanography 23(4): 342-361.

Ray, S. M. and A.C. Chandler. 1955. Parasitological reviews: *Dermocystidium marinum*, a parasite of oysters. Experimental Parasitology 4: 172-200.

Richards, W.R and P.C. Ticco. 2002. The Suminoe oyster, *Crassostrea ariakensis*. Virginia Sea Grant/University of Virginia - Charlottesville, Charlottesville, VA, VSG-02-23, 6p.

Roegner, G. C., and R. Mann. 1995. Early recruitment and growth of the American oyster *Crassostrea virginica* with respect to tidal zonation and season. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 117: 91-101.

Roesijadi, G. 1996. Metallothionein and Its Role in Toxic Metal Regulation. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. 113(2): 117-123.

Ross, S.W., S.P. Epperly. 1985. Utilization of shallow estuarine nursery areas by fishes in PS and adjacent tributaries, North Carolina, p. 207-232 in A. Yanez-Arancibia, ed. Fish community ecology in estuaries and coastal lagoons: towards an ecosystem integration. Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico Press, Mexico City.

Rothschild, B.J., J.S. Ault, P. Goulletquer, M. Héral. 1994. Decline of the Chesapeake Bay oyster population: a century of habitat destruction and overfishing. Marine Ecology Program Series 111:29−39.

Rybovich, M. M. 2014. Growth and mortality of spat, seed, and market-sized oysters (*Crassostrea virginica*) in low salinities and high temperatures. A thesis submitted to Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College in The School of Renewable Natural Resources. 65 p.

Sackett, R. E. 2002. Characterization of North Carolina *Crassostrea virginica* population structure based on mtDNA haplotype variation. M.S. Thesis. University of North Carolina at Wilmington. 57 p.

Shefi, D. 2007. The development of cutters in relation to the South Australian oyster industry: an amalgamation of two parallel developing industries. Department of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide, South Australia.

Shumway, S. E. 1996. Natural environmental factors. In: V.S. Kennedy, R.I.E. Newell and A.F.Eble, editors. The Eastern Oyster *Crassostrea virginica*. Maryland Sea Grant College, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. pp. 467-513.

Smith, R. O. 1949. Summary of oyster farming experiments in South Carolina 1939-1940. U.S. Fish Wild. Serv. Spec. Sci. Rep. 63: 1-20.

Smyth, A.R., Geraldi, N.R. and Piehler, M.F., 2013. Oyster-mediated benthic-pelagic coupling modifies nitrogen pools and processes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *493*, pp.23-30.

Stanley, J. G. and M. A. Sellers. 1986. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Gulf of Mexico) – American oyster. U.S. Fish Wild. Serv. Biol. Rep. 82(11.64). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, TR EL-82-4. 25 pp.

Steel, J. 1991. Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine System, Technical Analysis of Status and Trends. APES Report No. 90-01. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, NC.

Street, M. W., Anne S. Deaton, William S. Chappell, Peter D. Mooreside (2005). North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, North Carolina. 656 pp.

Thayer, G.W., Stuart, H.H., Kenworthy, W.J., Ustach, J.F., Hall, A.B. (1978). Habitat values of salt marshes, mangroves, and seagrasses for aquatic organisms. Pages 235–247 in Greeson, P.E., Clark, J.R., Clark, J.E., eds. Wetland Functions and Values: The State of Our Understanding. American Water Resource Association.

Thibault, J.M., Sanders, F.J. and Jodice, P.G., 2010. Parental attendance and brood success in American Oystercatchers in South Carolina. *Waterbirds*, *33*(4), pp.511-517.

Thompson, R. J., R. I. E. Newell, V.S. Kennedy and R. Mann. 1996. Reproductive processes and early development. Pages 335-370 in V.S. Kennedy, R.I.E. Newell and A.F. Eble, editors. The Eastern Oyster *Crassostrea virginica*. Maryland Sea Grant College, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Thorsen, B. D. 1982. Origins and early development of the North Carolina Division of Commercial Fisheries 1822-1925. MS thesis, East Carolina University, Greenville, N.C., 151 p.

Tuckwell and Nol 1997. Foraging behaviour of American oystercatchers in response to declining prey densities. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 75(2): 170-181. https://doi.org/10.1139/z97-024

Varney, R. L. and P. M. Gaffney. 2008. Assessment of population structure in *Crassostrea virginica* throughout the species range using single nucleotide polymorphisms. J. Shellfish Res. 27:1061.

Vezzulli, L., Grande, C., Reid, P.C., Hélaouët, P., Edwards, M., Höfle, M.G., Brettar, I., Colwell, R.R. and Pruzzo, C., 2016. Climate influence on Vibrio and associated human diseases during the past half-century in the coastal North Atlantic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(34), pp. E5062-E5071.

VIMS (Virginia Institute of Marine Science). 2002. Oyster Diseases of the Chesapeake Bay: Dermo and MSX Fact Sheet. 4 p.

Von Brandt, A. 1964. *Fishing Catching Methods of the World.* Fishing News Books Ltd. Surrey, England.

Wakefield J. R., and P. M. Gaffney. 1996. DGGE reveals additional population structure in American oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) populations. J. Shellfish Res. 15:513.

Wall, C. C., B. J. Peterson, and C. J. Gobler. 2008. Facilitation of seagrass Zostera marina productivity by suspension-feeding bivalves. Marine Ecology Progress Series 357:165-174.

Wallace, D. H. 1966. Oysters in the estuarine environment. A symposium of estuarine fisheries. Amer. Fish. Soc., Spec. Pub. 3: 68-73.

Watkins, S. M., A. Reich, L. E. Fleming, and R. Hammond. 2008. Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning. Marine Drugs 6(3):431-455.

Wetz, M. S., A. J. Lewitus, E. T. Koepfler, and K. C. Hayes. 2002. Impact of the Eastern oyster Crassostrea virginica on microbial community structure in a salt marsh estuary. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 28:87-97.

Winslow, F. 1889. Report on the sounds and estuaries of North Carolina, with reference to oyster culture. United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bulletin No. 10, 135 p. federal laws. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 106 p.

Wolfson, L. and Harrigan, T., 2010. Cows, Streams, and E. Coli: What everyone needs to know. *Michigan State University Extension E*, *3101*.

Yonge, C. M. 1960. Oysters. Willmer Brothers and Haran, Ltd., Birkenhead, England.

Zimmerman, R., Minello, T.J., Baumer, T., and Castiglione, M. 1989. Oyster reef as habitat for estuarine macrofauna. Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-249. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D.C., US.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Recreational Shellfish Harvest Issue Paper

ISSUE

The number of recreational shellfish harvesters in North Carolina is currently unknown, which prevents reliable estimates of total recreational harvest of shellfish. Additionally, commercial harvesters are provided with human health and safety information regarding shellfish harvest when acquiring their license; however, there is currently no mechanism for reaching and educating recreational harvesters.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) Oyster/Clam Plan Development Team (PDT).

BACKGROUND

Despite the importance of the commercial shellfish fisheries (molluscan and crustacean) to the state, limited data exist on recreational shellfish harvest. Currently, the NCDMF has limited data on recreational shellfish harvesting, including the number of participants and the extent of their economic activity. Collection of recreational shellfish harvest data, in addition to existing commercial landings data available through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program (NCTTP) would provide a better estimate of total fishing mortality, relative abundance, and improve knowledge of variation in abundance caused by a combination of fishing effort and environmental changes. A more accurate account of landings allows managers to examine the proportional harvest of recreational and commercial fisheries to make better decisions on management strategies for both harvest sectors. It is imperative to collect high quality recreational harvest data to address potential management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions. Collection of this data is crucial to completing a stock assessment and moving to stock level management of Oyster and Hard Clam.

Efforts to accurately quantify the impact of recreational fishing on shellfish have had limited success in North Carolina. The NCDMF collects data on recreational fishing in conjunction with the federal government's Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP). However, MRIP collects information on finfish only.

Participation in recreational shellfishing in North Carolina has not been assessed for over 30 years. In 1991, a phone survey was conducted by the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), precursor to the MRIP, and it indicated that 3% of households in coastal North Carolina participated in recreational shellfishing, compared to an average of approximately 7% for finfish at that time (D. Mumford, NCDMF, personal communication). In 1991, MRFSS reported that in the state more than one million recreational fishing trips targeted shellfish. However, data on actual shellfish harvest estimates were not reported. The current extent of coastal households in North Carolina that recreationally harvest shellfish is unknown at this time.

The Marine Fisheries Commission in the original Bay Scallop, Hard Clam, and Oyster FMPs recommended developing a mechanism to obtain data on recreational harvest of shellfish (DMF 2007). The need for a mechanism to be able to accurately quantify recreational effort and harvest has been a consistent area of concern in all subsequent North Carolina shellfish and crustacean FMPs. The Hard Clam Fisheries Management Plan FMP (NCDMF 2001a) and Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2001b) supported adoption of a mechanism to provide data on recreational shellfish harvest. As a result, House Bill 1427 was introduced before the General Assembly in 2003 to establish a recreational shellfish license. This license would have been for shellfish only and would have been instituted on a trial basis for three years. However, the bill was never passed. In 2004, House Bill 831 did pass a saltwater fishing license mandating those individuals recreationally fishing for both finfish and shellfish to obtain a license. However, the state legislature revisited the issue in 2005 and replaced the saltwater fishing license with the Coastal Recreational Fishing License (CRFL).

The CRFL, which was implemented January 1, 2007, is only required when targeting finfish. When the CRFL legislation was originally drafted in 2007, it also included shellfish. However, the inclusion of shellfish was removed from the draft bill was removed before it was finally legislated. To fill this data gap, a survey of shellfish harvesting participation was added to the CRFL in November 2010 to collect monthly data on the harvest of crabs, oysters, clams, and scallops from the CRFL pool. The survey sample is made up of approximately 650 randomly selected CRFL holders that hold a valid license for at least one day during the survey period and answer “yes” to the harvest of at least one of the following species: crabs, oysters, clams, or scallops. In September 2014, the sample size was doubled to approximately 1,300 CRFL holders to increase the number of responses and precision of estimates. The selected CRFL holders are sent a letter explaining the survey along with the survey itself. Those that have not responded by the end of the month are sent a second copy of the survey. This survey obtains information on the number of trips taken during the survey period, average length of the trip, average party size, number of species kept and discarded, gear used, location information (water access), waterbody, and county of harvest. The mail survey estimates are a useful representation of shellfish harvest by CRFL holders but are limited in that they do not cover the entire population of potential recreational shellfish harvesters and probably represent a minimum estimate of effort and harvest. Despite good response rates, few responses contain oyster and clam activity.

The Fisheries Reform Act of 1997 (FRA) created a Recreational Commercial Gear License (RCGL) to allow recreational fisherman to use limited amounts of commercial gear to harvest recreational limits of seafood for personal consumption; however, shellfish gear (including hand, rakes, and tongs) was not authorized under this license. Since these gears are not covered by RCGL, recreational shellfishers can use these gears to harvest recreational bag limits of oysters and clams without a license. Therefore, recreational harvest data are not captured by past RCGL surveys.

Some recreational fishers may purchase a commercial shellfish license rather than a CRFL because the license is easy to obtain (available to any NC resident), is relatively

inexpensive ($50.00), and allows fishers to harvest more shellfish than allowed under recreational limits. The Trip Ticket Program only captures landings from fishers who sell their catch to certified seafood dealers. Identifying and surveying individuals who purchase a commercial shellfish license but do not have any record of landings within the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program could be used to determine if the license is indeed being used for recreational purposes. This is also true for fishers who buy a Standard Commercial Fishing License (SCFL) with a shellfish endorsement but do not have any reported landings of shellfish. Even though this approach limits the sampling universe to only recreational fishers who bought a commercial license, it would provide some information on recreational shellfish harvest occurring that is not constrained by recreational limits. The shellfish harvest survey provides the ability to characterize recreational shellfish harvest but still has limitations for estimating the total recreational harvest of shellfish.

With the limited data collected from the optional CRFL survey, some pieces of information about recreational effort have been captured. For instance, recreational oyster harvest was reported from 92 waterbodies throughout coastal North Carolina, with Topsail, Pamlico, Bogue, and Masonboro sounds all including more than 100 reported trips. The same survey revealed 70% of recreational oyster harvest effort originated from private residences, private boat ramps, or from shore. Given only 28% of reported effort originated at public access locations, intercept-oriented surveys are less than ideal. Recreational oyster harvest effort and catch were concentrated between October and March, accounting for over 84% of reported trips. Conversely, some individuals reported recreational harvest of oysters during summer months despite state-imposed restrictions on harvest during this time. This suggests unfamiliarity with state regulations such as season and area closures.

Another concern of not having a license requirement for recreational shellfish harvest is the inability to easily communicate health and safety concerns of this harvest to recreational participants. The Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section (SSRWQ) within the NCDMF is responsible for ensuring all shellfish (oysters, clams, mussels) harvested or processed within North Carolina are safe for human consumption. To ensure shellfish are being harvested from areas free of contaminants, the SSRWQ conducts pollution source assessments around shellfish growing areas, direct water quality sampling, hydrographic studies at point source discharges of pollution, and studies of the impacts of stormwater runoff on water quality. The SSRWQ also conducts inspections and certifications of shellfish dealer facilities, as well as providing training for commercial harvesters and dealers, to ensure that shellfish are handled, stored, processed, and transported in a manner that keeps them safe for consumption.

To help keep the public informed of safe harvest areas and safe harvesting and handling practices, the SSRWQ produces several publicly available informational resources, including the following:

> Prohibited Shellfish Harvest Boundaries – SSRWQ establishes permanent closure boundaries that prohibit the harvest of shellfish in areas where there may be

consistent contamination exceeding the standards for safe human consumption. These permanently closed areas are described and established via proclamation.

Polluted Area Proclamations and Temporary Closure Maps – In addition to the permanently closed areas described above, studies have found that water quality in certain areas can be negatively impacted by stormwater runoff, and shellfish can become temporarily unsafe for harvest under certain conditions. SSRWQ has developed management plans describing rainfall thresholds that can generate negative impacts and require temporary closures of these impacted areas. Temporary closures are put in place via proclamation and shown visually on the Division website through a web map updated as closed areas change.

Articles and Fact Sheets on Safe Handling Practices – Temperature abuse or improper handling practices can render shellfish unsafe to eat. To provide the public with information on how to safely store and handle shellfish, SSRWQ has prepared articles, fact sheets, and pamphlets available through the Division website.

Information on *Vibrio* Bacteria – *Vibrio* bacteria are naturally occurring bacteria that can be found in North Carolina waters and can cause severe illness in certain susceptible populations if consumed or through exposure to open wounds. Notably, these bacteria can proliferate within harvested shellfish even after they've been removed from the water, if the shellfish are held in warm/hot temperatures for extended periods of time. Proper handling/cooling of harvested shellfish is a critical step towards avoiding illness. SSRWQ has made available pamphlets and articles describing risks associated with these types of bacteria, and best practices for shellfish handling.

Although commercial harvesters, dealers, and shellfish lease/franchise holders are provided with all this information when acquiring their license, getting their dealer certification, or acquiring/renewing their lease, there is no mechanism for reaching and educating recreational harvesters unless they actively seek out information.

AUTHORITY
N.C. General Statute

113-134	Rules.
113-169.2	Shellfish license for NC residents without a SCFL.,
113-174.2	Coastal Recreational Fishing License.
113-182	Regulation of fishing and fisheries.
113-182.1	Fishery Management Plans.
113-201	Legislative findings and declaration of policy; authority of Marine Fisheries Commission.
113-221.1	Proclamation; emergency review.
143B-289.52	Marine Fisheries Commission – powers and duties.

Session Law 2023-137

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission Rule (15A NCAC)

03O.0101	PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS TO OBTAIN LICENSES, ENDORSEMENTS AND COMMERCIAL FISHING VESSEL REGISTRATION
03O.0107	LISENCE REPLACEMENT AND FEES
03O.0501	PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS TO OBTAIN PERMITS
03O.0502	PERMIT CONDITIONS; GENERAL
03O.0506	SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT PURPOSES

DISCUSSION

Given North Carolina's shellfish fisheries are exclusively under state jurisdiction, lack of recreational shellfish harvest data makes addressing potential management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions difficult. There are no data on demographics, perceptions, or expenditures of recreational shellfish harvesters in the state. Consequently, there is no data available to conduct an economic impact assessment of recreational oyster harvesting. Due to widespread accessibility of intertidal oysters and clams along North Carolina's coast, the potential impact of recreational harvest could be significant.

Table 1.1. Recreational shellfish harvest license requirements for east coast states.

State	License Requirements
Maine	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits
New Hampshire	State license
Massachusetts	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits
Rhode Island	Required for non-residents
Connecticut	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits
New York	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits, also has residency requirements
New Jersey	State license
Delaware	State license
Maryland	None, must be state resident
Virginia	None
North Carolina	None
South Carolina	State license
Georgia	State license and free permit
Florida	State license

License requirements for recreational shellfish harvesting varies by state along the United States east coast (Table 1.1). Most states require some type of license while in Maine, Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut individual towns and cities require a license to recreationally harvest shellfish. North Carolina and Virginia are the only states without some form of license, local permitting, or residency requirements.

There are multiple avenues the NCDMF and MFC could pursue to better assess the population of recreational shellfish harvesters. One solution is to include shellfish as part of the CRFL. This can be accomplished by three different methods. The first is to require the existing CRFL to recreationally harvest both finfish and shellfish. The second would be to create a separate shellfish only CRFL. This license would only give a recreational angler access to the allowed shellfish species and would exclude finfish harvest. This would allow fishery access to recreational anglers who are only interested in harvesting shellfish, and the cost could be set at a lower price than a standard CRFL. The third option would be to require the existing CRFL and create an additional recreational shellfish endorsement. The endorsement would be applied to the CRFL and would indicate the angler is licensed to recreationally harvest both finfish and shellfish. One drawback to these three options is it would require legislation to change the CRFL.

Another solution is to develop a recreational shellfish permit. The MFC has the authority to implement a permit to help manage estuarine and coastal resources and can set a maximum fee of up to $100 (although most permits are free of charge). A permit could function similar to a license. Recreational anglers would be required to have the permit to participate in the recreational shellfish fishery. A nominal fee for the permit would discourage participants from only obtaining the permit because it was free, helping to constrain the sampling universe.

Creating a specific CRFL, as outlined above, or a recreational shellfish permit would provide NCDMF with a complete pool of recreational shellfish harvesters. That list could then be used as a survey frame to help estimate effort and harvest in the fishery. Having a list of the population of recreational shellfish harvesters is useful for distributing shellfish area closure proclamations and maps. If shellfish species are added to the existing CRFL, the activity survey conducted during CRFL sale would still be needed to identify fishers who are involved in recreational shellfishing. These fishers would then receive additional surveys to estimate effort and harvest in the recreational shellfish fishery.

Although creating a specific type of CRFL, adding shellfish under the existing CRFL, or developing a recreational shellfish permit would be the most efficient mechanisms to determine effort in the fishery, another way to obtain these data would be to capture this activity in MRIP. The MRIP does capture some non-finfish activity, but those data are broad and not available to shellfish at the species level and MRIP agents rarely encounter those types of recreational fishing trips. Most recreational shellfishing effort is by coastal residents using private docks and access points as opposed to public access points. Because MRIP is a nationwide program, any changes to methodology designed to intercept more recreational shellfishing activity would need to undergo extensive review process and if implemented could take away from intercepts in other target fisheries.

Personal consumption by participants holding commercial fishing licenses (either a SCFL with a shellfish endorsement or a Shellfish license without a SCFL) would not be covered under any type of recreational shellfish license or permit. In the fall of 2023, the North Carolina General Assembly passed Session Law 2023-137. Section 6 of this legislation requires anyone holding a commercial fishing license who is engaged in a commercial fishing operation to report all fish (including shellfish) harvested to NCDMF, regardless of

if the fish are sold or kept for personal consumption. Currently, this legislation is effective December 1, 2025. The NCDMF is working on draft rules to implement this law and to develop the reporting mechanism for these participants. Implementation of this law should fill this data gap.

Implementing a licensing or permitting requirement for recreational shellfish harvesters would give the NCDMF the opportunity to inform participants of where to find information on harvest closure boundaries, where to sign up to receive polluted area proclamations or to access temporary closure maps, and where to find information on safe handling practices, particularly as it relates to *Vibrio* bacteria.

To pursue any of these solutions, significant time and effort will be needed to assess internal program and resource capabilities and limitations. Any legislative changes require a specific process and are ultimately out of NCDMF or MFC control. Given these constraints, the NCDMF recommends exploring potential options and solutions outside of the FMP process.

Option 1: Recreational Harvest

a. Status Quo
    - Does not provide reliable estimates of recreational shellfish harvest or effort.
    - Does not provide a mechanism to ensure recreational shellfish harvesters are provided with SSRWQ health and safety information and links to harvest area closures.

b. Support the NCDMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to estimate recreational shellfish participation and landings, with the intent to move towards a stock assessment and stock level management for both hard clams and oysters; and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The DMF Supports the NCDMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, with the intent to move towards a stock assessment and stock level management for both hard clams and oysters; and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

LITERATURE CITED

NCDMF. 2001a. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2001b. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

Appendix 2: Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper

ISSUE

Addressing management for the mechanical fishery for subtidal oyster stocks in Pamlico Sound, North Carolina.

ORIGINATION

The Coastal Habitat Protection Plan as adopted by the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission, and the Division of Marine Fisheries.

BACKGROUND

The North Carolina Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 5 focuses on management of wild oyster stocks, and this issue paper does not include farm raised or private cultured oysters.

North Carolina's wild oyster stocks are composed of both intertidal (exposed to air during portions of the tidal cycle) and subtidal (continuously submerged) populations. In North Carolina, commercial oyster harvest through mechanical means is primarily achieved using oyster dredges and is limited to subtidal oyster reefs in specific areas of Pamlico Sound and adjacent bays and tributaries. Although some hand harvest of subtidal oysters does occur, the primary harvest method for oysters in these areas has been mechanical gear (Figure 2.1). While mechanical harvest gear like oyster dredges may offer an efficient means of harvesting oysters, their use requires careful management and consideration of their potential negative impacts on both oyster stocks and habitat. The North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission's (NCMFC) Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) identifies bottom disturbing fishing gear, including oyster dredges, as having the potential to be highly destructive towards oyster reefs. The NCMFC has set a goal to “Enhance and protect habitats from adverse physical impacts” and recommended the following actions: protect habitat from adverse fishing gear effects and protect and restore important fish habitat functions from damage associated with activities such as dredging (NCDEQ 2016).

Currently, large scale abundance estimates or a traditional stock assessment for the Eastern Oyster in North Carolina is not possible. Without a stock assessment he NCMDF is unable to assign a stock status or determine sustainable harvest limits. Oysters pose a unique management problem as they are simultaneously a stock that is harvested as a fishery resource, and the essential habitat for that same fishery resource. Oysters need suitable hard substrate (cultch) for juvenile oyster (spat) to settle on and grow. Shells of living or dead oysters provide the appropriate hard substrate for juvenile oysters to settle on, creating self-sustaining oyster reefs. If living oysters or dead shell material is removed from a reef through fishery effort at a rate faster than it can naturally replenish, both the oyster resource and habitat required for oysters to successfully reproduce will eventually disappear. An approach to manage oyster fisheries that considers this balance of shell gain and loss (Shell Budget Model) has been developed and employed in the Gulf of Mexico (Soniat et al. 2022; Soniat 2016).

The current mechanical oyster fishery is limited to only the subtidal open water regions of the greater Pamlico Sound as well as specified subtidal regions of its surrounding bays. A key component for mechanical oyster harvest management is to balance the value of utilizing oysters as a fishery resource while maintaining their role as an essential habitat for themselves and a wide range of estuarine species. To minimize damage to oyster habitat from mechanical harvest, decreases in bushel limits and larger area or seasonal closures implemented via fishery monitoring have been established through time. Dredges are subject to weight and size restrictions and are required to be towed from the side of the vessel to mitigate habitat impacts by not removing excess cultch material and sub-legal oysters from their areas of origin. To limit excessive effort impacts, mechanical harvest is only allowed from sunrise to 2:00 PM Monday through Friday. To ensure excess reef material and undersized oysters are not removed from their respective reefs, culling of cultch material and undersized oysters must occur at the harvest location with a 5% culling tolerance. Additionally, extensive cultch planting efforts have occurred in mechanical harvest areas to mitigate harvest impacts to oyster reefs by adding cultch material.

The first oyster harvest limits for the mechanical fishery were introduced in 1947 at 75 bushels per vessel per day, remaining in effect until 1984. From then until 1989, the daily limit was lowered to 50 bushels per vessel. In 1989, the daily limit for commercial operations was capped at 50 bushels per vessel, but with added flexibility for the director to set lower limits as needed. In 1990, the bushel limit was dropped to 20 then further reduced to 15 bushels due to declining populations attributed to Dermo disease. The 2001 Eastern Oyster FMP changed the criteria for where mechanical harvest would be allowed in the bays of Pamlico Sound (NCDMF 2001). The 2008 Amendment 2 to the Eastern Oyster FMP outlined a strategy for Pamlico Sound and its tributaries, setting a 15-bushel limit per commercial fishing operation in open waters of the sound, and limiting harvest in the bays to a six total possible week season with a daily limit of 10 bushels per vessel (NCDMF 2008). In 2010, Supplement A to Amendment 2 of the Oyster FMP established the trigger for closing areas to mechanical harvest when sampling indicates the number of legal-sized oysters in the area has declined below the threshold (NCDMF 2010). Additionally, this management strategy was re-adopted in Amendment 4 in 2016 (NCDMF 2016). Beginning in 2017, the six-week open period for bays was split into two potential open periods. The first begins on the Monday of the week prior to Thanksgiving and runs through the Friday after Thanksgiving. The second opening of the bays could begin two weeks before Christmas and remain open for the remaining four weeks. For more detailed information on the management history of the Pamlico Sound mechanical oyster fishery see the previous Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan, Amendments, and Supplement.

The mechanical harvest season has the potential to occur between the third Monday in November to 31 March in areas designated open to mechanical harvest; however, the actual season length is ultimately determined by a harvest monitoring program. In bays where harvest is allowed, the season is capped to a total of six possible weeks. If the area in which the bay is located is closed due to harvest monitoring the season may be shorter than six weeks.

Annual landings from mechanical harvest in North Carolina have declined significantly since a peak in 2010. The 2010-2011 landings peak reflects the highest participation and landings in the mechanical oyster fishery between 1994 and 2021. During the 2010-2011 oyster season, high market demand caused by the closure of harvest areas in the Gulf of Mexico from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill drew a large amount of effort and participation into the North Carolina mechanical harvest oyster fishery. Landings in this fishery are strongly tied to participation and effort, and declining trends in participation mirror landings trends (Figures 2.1 and 2.2). Prior to 2012, mechanical harvest of oysters only required a Shellfish Commercial License. This license is not capped to a total number of participants, unlike the Standard/Retired Commercial Fishing License (SCFL/RSCFL) and is potentially available at a relatively low cost to all residents of the state. The large and rapid increase in effort in the mechanical fishery observed leading up to the 2010-2011 harvest season was primarily driven by new entrants into the fishery obtaining a Shellfish Commercial License. In response to this, a SCFL/RSCLF has been required to participate in this fishery since the 2011-2012 season.

Weather and water quality events have also directly influenced effort and landings in the mechanical oyster fishery. After major hurricanes, low dissolved oxygen events, or extreme temperature events, the oyster resource in the mechanical harvest areas may only sustain harvest for a few weeks before NCDMF closes areas to mechanical harvest. The actual length of time mechanical harvest for oysters can occur each year in North Carolina is determined by the monitoring program and is variable depending on the status of the oyster resource and fishery effort.

The current harvest monitoring program which serves as a habitat protection framework to manage fishery effort in the Pamlico Sound mechanical oyster fishery was developed as Supplement A to Amendment 2 of the Oyster FMP and has been in place since 2010. In this framework, the sound is divided into four Management Areas based on geographic region: the Neuse River Area, Pamlico River Area, Northern Hyde Area, and Northern Dare Area (Figure 2.3). The NCDMF samples oyster reefs in each management area once before the opening of the mechanical harvest season, and then biweekly once mechanical harvest is open. Sampling sites are chosen based on the current (or previously known) presence of commercial harvesting in the area. Areas are selected where commercial harvest occurs with the goal of assessing localized depletion and addressing habitat protection concerns. A threshold of 26% legal-size live oysters (3 inches shell length or greater) in pooled samples for each sampling event and Management Area was established as the management trigger. In developing this management framework, the effect of the effort required to harvest a limit of legal oysters on reef habitat was considered. When an area oyster population reaches 26% or lower legal oysters, it was determined that impacts to reef habitat through the removal of shell material outweighed the fishery benefit from harvest. If the pooled samples collected across a management area for a sampling event show 26% or less legal oysters, the management trigger is tripped for that area. If two consecutive sampling events result in the management trigger being tripped, the entire management area is closed to

mechanical harvest. An area may re-open if two additional consecutive sampling events show above 26% legal oysters.

There is no minimum threshold for percent legal in the initial opening of an area to mechanical harvest. A management area will open even if pre-season sampling shows the area is below the 26% legal threshold. Biweekly sampling begins the first week of the mechanical harvest season, meaning areas that start below the 26% legal threshold can take three weeks to trip the management trigger twice before closing.



Figure 2.1. Commercial landings of wild oysters from Greater Pamlico Sound, adjacent bays and tributaries in North Carolina from 2000 to 2022, showing annual landings in bushels harvested by hand gear (rakes, tongs, hand) as dark gray bars and mechanical gear (dredges) as white bars.



Figure 2.2. Annual number of participants with landings of wild oyster using mechanical gear, 2000-2022.



Figure 2.3. Pamlico Sound Oyster Mechanical Harvest Management Areas from south to north: the Neuse River Area, Pamlico River Area, Northern Hyde Area, and Northern Dare Area.

Oyster mortality from Hurricane Irene in 2011 and a low dissolved oxygen event in 2012 resulted in the 2012-2013 mechanical harvest season being closed by the management trigger months shorter than in previous seasons. In 2018, Hurricane Florence caused significant damage to the Pamlico Sound oyster resource, and Hurricane Dorian in 2019 further impacted oysters in Western Pamlico Sound. Over the last five years since these storm events, the mechanical harvest trigger has taken on average three weeks into the mechanical harvest season to be tripped across all management areas (Table 2.1). As the oyster resource recovered, mechanical harvest closures have occurred later in the potential season for the Neuse and Pamlico River Management Areas in recent years. The longer time taken to trip the management trigger in the Neuse and Pamlico River Areas is driven by higher populations of oysters in the 10 bushel-per-day bays, which are capped at a six-week total possible season. While the deep-water regions and bays of a Management Area are not treated separately for the calculation of the management trigger, the deep-water reefs (>5m) sampled in the Pamlico and Neuse River Areas were found to have very few legal sized oysters during harvest monitoring in recent years.

When the bays are examined separately from the deep waters, they have averaged above the management trigger (Table 2.2).

Table 2.1. The number of open weeks into the mechanical harvest season before the 26% legal management trigger tripped for each Mechanical Harvest Management Area by oyster season years.

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Dare Management Area	1	10	3	3	2
Hyde Management Area	4	1	3	3	3
Pamlico Management Area	1	2	6	6	6
Neuse Management Area	1	1	6	6	6

Table 2.2. Percentage of legal sized (3-inch shell length or greater) live oysters sampled during the first harvest monitoring program sampling event each year for the Pamlico and Neuse Management Areas by deep-water areas (>5m) and bays.

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Pamlico Management Area Deep	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pamlico Management Area Bays	44%	45%	49%	18%	41%
Neuse Management Area Deep	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neuse Management Area Bays	8%	26%	33%	28%	39%

The NCDMF has one of the longest running and expansive oyster restoration and enhancement programs in the United States. North Carolina's Cultch Planting Program began in 1915 to replace shell material removed by harvest. Since its inception, over 21 million bushels of cultch material have been planted in the form of small-scale, low-relief, harvestable oyster reefs. Today, the NCDMF Cultch Planting Program creates oyster reefs that provide both habitat restoration and alleviation of public harvest pressure from natural reefs. Over the last ten years, 624 acres of harvestable oyster reefs have been created on public bottom through this program, with the ongoing goal of creating an additional 50 acres per year into the future. In addition, 789 acres of protected oyster reef have been permitted and constructed across 17 separate no-take Oyster Sanctuaries in Pamlico Sound. For more detailed information about these two programs see Appendix 4: Habitat Enhancement Programs. In areas open to mechanical harvest, cultch planting efforts have been focused primarily in the bays of the Neuse and Pamlico River Areas as well as in the eastern portion of the sound in the Dare and Hyde areas (Figure 2.4). Between 2000 and 2022, a total of 2,167,638 bushels of cultch material were planted in the mechanical harvest areas of Pamlico Sound, and 452,112 bushels of oyster were mechanically harvested. This resulted in 4.8 times more bushels of cultch being planted than oysters mechanically harvested over this time. Since 2018, 36 times more bushels of cultch have been planted compared to bushels of oysters commercially harvested and removed (Figure 2.5). The return in commercial harvest per unit of cultch planted in North Carolina remains unknown and likely varies across different planting sites. The impact of

cultch plantings on oyster landings is not immediate, as it typically takes between one and three years after planting for new cultch material to yield legal-sized oysters. While some cultch planting sites have relatively short lifespans, others have been observed to continue yielding harvests for decades. Current management of oyster harvest in North Carolina does not distinguish between harvest from constructed cultch planted reefs and wild naturally occurring reefs.



Figure 2.4. Map of cultch planting sites in the greater Pamlico Sound, 1981 to present.



Figure 2.5. Annual bushels of cultch planted (shown as light gray bars) and bushels of oysters mechanically harvested (shown as black line) from the mechanical harvest areas of Pamlico Sound.

AUTHORITY

N.C. General Statute

113-134 Rules.
113-182 Regulation of fishing and fisheries.
113-182.1 Fishery Management Plans.
113-201 Legislative findings and declaration of policy; authority of Marine Fisheries Commission.
113-221.1 Proclamation; emergency review.
143B-289.52 Marine Fisheries Commission – powers and duties.

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission Rules (15A NCAC)

03K .0201 Oyster Harvest Management

DISCUSSION

The existing mechanical harvest management strategy for oysters in Pamlico Sound aims to monitor in real time the habitat conditions of oyster reefs where mechanical harvest is actively occurring, and then close broad management areas once the condition of the oyster resource reaches a point where the effort required to harvest legal oysters causes excessive damage to the reef habitat. When this reactive management strategy was developed and adopted in 2010, participation in this fishery was approximately five times greater than participation has been in recent years. This drop in participation has often made it problematic for NCDMF staff to find areas where there is active fishing activity to sample, particularly in the bays of the Neuse and Pamlico River Areas. When active mechanical harvest areas are not encountered by staff, knowledge of past harvesting areas or localized areas of current oyster abundance are chosen for trigger sampling locations using their best judgment. Additionally, during pre-season sampling events, or when areas are either closed due to the management trigger being tripped or the break in the 6-week season for the bays and there is no mechanical harvest occurring, staff are again required to make judgment call decisions on where to sample. Given the sometimes-varying conditions between oyster reefs in the region, mechanical harvesters may view sampling locations selected by the NCDMF as not representative of areas they fish.

While the potential mechanical harvest season for oyster could run from November through March, the actual season length allowed in each Management Area is ultimately dictated by results of the trigger sampling and opened or closed via proclamation. With fluctuations in the oyster resource due to storm events, the season length for a given area may vary widely between years. If sampling indicates the management trigger has tripped, a proclamation is issued closing that area effective no sooner than 72 hours from issuance. After impacts from multiple hurricanes, the mechanical harvest season in the Pamlico and Neuse River Management Areas was only open to mechanical harvest for 10 days in the 2019-2020 season, yet in the 2021-2022 season it was open eight weeks. At the opening of each mechanical harvest season, harvesters are unaware of how long each area will be open and rely on monitoring proclamations for closures. This uncertainty and variability in season length is often viewed unfavorably by harvesters.

The current management trigger uses the percentage of live legal sized oysters as a metric to determine fishery effort impact on oyster reef habitat. While this has been a proactive approach to close mechanical harvest at a point which ensures cultch material and live oysters remain on reefs, it does not consider oyster abundance when triggering area openings or closures. If an area that was being sampled had very few (low oyster abundance) but very large (high percent legal) oysters, the management trigger would not be tripped and remain open to harvest. However, with such a low abundance of oysters, this area may be vulnerable to overharvesting, and damage to the habitat from the effort required to harvest would be high. Conversely, if an area has a healthy and abundant mature oyster population that is experiencing a period of high recruitment (heavy spat set), the relatively high number of spat counted in the live oyster sample would drive down the percentage of legal live oysters and trip the management trigger. The trigger sampling program is designed to monitor impacts from the mechanical fishery

as a habitat protection measure and does not currently allow for the estimation of oyster population or abundance.

The Neuse River, Pamlico River, and Northern Hyde Management Areas all contain bays that are capped at a total possible six-week season and are limited to 10 bushels per vessel a day. The condition of the oyster resource in the bays is often significantly different than what is found in the deep open water areas of the management area. The bays and deep portions of the management areas are not considered separately during calculation of the management trigger, or during management area closures from the results of trigger sampling. In recent years, bays in the Pamlico and Neuse River Management Areas have had oyster resources to sustain the full six-week possible season, while there have been few legal oysters found in the deeper areas. The entire management area remained open due to the greater abundance of legal oysters in the bays, leaving the deeper portions of the management area vulnerable to damage from potential dredge effort. The deep-water reefs and shallow reefs in the bays were likely impacted differently from storm events, with oysters in the bays not suffering the mass mortality observed in those found in deeper portions of western Pamlico Sound (Table 2.2).

Historically deep-water reefs of western Pamlico Sound were reported to reach up to 13 feet (4 m) in height. In the Neuse River, high relief deep-water oyster reefs were shown to suffer mass mortality at water depths greater than 16.4 ft (below 5 meters) due to low oxygen, while low relief reefs in shallow waters (between 9.8 to 13 ft in depth) did not experience such die offs (Lenihan and Peterson 1998). The historical mounded structure of reefs in Pamlico Sound provided increased habitat complexity for a wide variety of invertebrates and fish and the upper portion of the mounds provided refuge for benthic organisms when lower portions of the reef were hypoxic. Research has shown that oysters at the base of subtidal reefs have a greater proportion of oyster mortality, significantly lower abundance of organisms, and higher incidence of disease occurrence, compared to the crest of reefs (Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Lenihan et al 1999). The survival and recovery of deep-water oyster reefs is contingent on their ability to gain vertical height.

Mechanical oyster harvest using dredges significantly impacts subtidal oyster reefs by reducing their vertical relief, which leads to several negative habitat effects (Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Lenihan et al. 1999). This harvest method causes the scattering of shells and oysters into less suitable substrates, destabilizing the reef structure and increasing its vulnerability to storm damage. The process also decreases the reef's resistance to disease. The removal of live and dead oysters, along with portions of the upper shell layers, leads to a reduction in the potential number of spawning adults (spawning stock biomass) and diminishes the area available for oyster larvae settlement. Furthermore, newly settled oysters are subjected to lower oxygen levels and increased sedimentation due to the reduced depth in the water column. Additionally, it reduces the availability of small spaces within the reef that serve as crucial refuge and foraging areas for juvenile fish. For more information on the ecosystem importance of oyster reefs see the Ecosystem Protection and Impact section of this current FMP, Amendment 4 to the Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2017) and Chapter 3 of the 2016 CHPP (NCDEQ 2016).

To investigate the impacts of mechanical harvest methods on oyster reef heights, NCDMF and the University of North Carolina Institute of Marine Science researchers created restored reefs in the Neuse River in 1993, which were experimentally harvested in 1995 and 1996 (Lenihan and Peterson 1998, 2004). The 1995 experimental dredge harvest (designed to approximate the minimum seasonal dredge effort a reef would experience) removed an average of 11.4 inches of height from the 3.28-foot-tall reefs (Lenihan and Peterson 1998). The 1996 experimental harvest included dredge, tong, and diver hand harvest methods, which reduced the heights of the 3.28-foot-tall reefs by averages of 13.2 inches, 9 inches, and 2.4 inches, respectively, illustrating that dredge harvest has the greatest impact to reef height out of the harvest methods examined (Lenihan and Peterson 2004). While oyster growth rates can vary based on site conditions, Oysters monitored by NCDMF cultch planted reefs in the Greater Pamlico Sound take approximately three years to reach 3 inches in shell length. Considering this observed oyster growth rate, it could take approximately 12 years for an oyster reef in this area to re-grow 1 foot of height.

In Pamlico Sound, changes in abundance of historic oyster reefs since the 1880s were documented by Ballance (2004). Using new technologies to locate subtidal reefs reported by Winslow (1889), Ballance (2004) found many formerly productive high-profile reefs now consisting of low-profile shell rubble, low density reefs, or buried reefs. Ballance (2004) also found the larger shallow reefs had less live oysters, which he attributed to the ease of locating those reefs by fishers. Similarly, Lenihan and Peterson (1998) re-surveyed natural oyster reefs in the deeper (>16.4 ft depth) portions of the Neuse River Estuary that had been marked in an 1868 US Coast and Geodetic Survey, finding that reefs that were 5.9 to 7.87 feet tall in 1868 were only 1 to 3 feet tall in 1993, and that no reefs in the 1993 survey were taller than 4 feet. Lenihan and Peterson (1998) reported that it was “probable that reduction in reef heights in the Neuse River estuary is due to decades of fishery-related disturbances caused by oyster dredging” and suggested reefs in heavily fished North Carolina waters would need to be restored every 3-4 years.

The NCDMF oyster restoration and enhancement program has focused significant effort into creating cultch reefs in areas open to mechanical oyster harvest in Pamlico Sound, with the volume of cultch material planted into the sound greatly exceeding the volume of oysters commercially harvested. Cultch plantings form low relief harvestable reefs and are not planted over areas of existing oyster to prevent the destruction of present natural populations of shellfish. No cultch planting or oyster restoration has been documented in the deeper portions of the sound to restore the historic high-relief reefs found at the mouth of the Pamlico and Neuse rivers. The NCDMF cultch planting efforts have been focused in the bays surrounding the western Pamlico Sound and the area between Stumpy Point and Oregon Inlet and have likely supported a significant portion of the fishery effort. While landings from cultch planted reefs are not currently separated from wild reefs in Trip Ticket landings, NCDMF sampling and harvester feedback indicates cultch reefs are used for harvest areas. Since 2018, 36 times more bushels of cultch have been planted compared to bushels of oysters commercially harvested and removed. Given this large disparity and the distribution of cultch planting sites in Pamlico Sound, the current harvest management

approach, which does not differentiate between cultch and wild reefs, is not best using the cultch planting program.

To maintain long-term harvestable oyster populations in Pamlico Sound, a three-tiered approach is proposed for Pamlico Sound oyster mechanical harvest management to balance the value of oysters as both a fishery resource and essential habitat. Tier 1 of this approach is to protect highly degraded and threatened oyster habitats by establishing Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs). Meanwhile, Tiers 2 and 3 modify current management strategies that place equal or greater value on the oyster resource with continued Cultch Supported Harvest and the creation of a series of Rotational Cultch Sites, respectively.

Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (Tier 1)

The remnant deep-water natural oyster reefs in the Pamlico and Neuse rivers have been recognized by the NCMFC as a habitat requiring protection due to their ecological importance and vulnerability. These reefs have suffered from excessive historical harvest, disease outbreak, and mass mortality from water quality impacts. Sites which contain these deep-water natural oyster reefs have been nominated by the NCMFC as Strategic Habitat Areas for the Pamlico Sound System (Figure 2.6) (NCDMF 2011). Strategic Habitat Areas (SHAs) are priority habitats identified for protection because of their exceptional condition or the imminent threats to their ecological functions, which support estuarine and coastal fish and shellfish species. Additionally, the NCMFC has directed the NCDMF to develop habitat protection measures through the adoption of the CHPP. Goal 3 of the 2016 CHPP is to “enhance and protect habitats from adverse physical impacts”, which includes reducing the impacts of mobile bottom disturbing fishing gear, the negative effects of which are described in Section 8.1.1 of the 2016 CHPP. Under Goal 3, the relevant recommended actions are 3.3 “Protect habitat from adverse fishing gear effects through improved compliance” and 3.8 “Develop coordinated policies including management adaptations and guidelines to increase resiliency of fish habitat to ecosystem changes." (NCDEQ 2016)

Monitoring of the oyster resource in this area suggests that these reefs have likely not supported much fishery effort between the 2018-19 and 2023-24 oyster seasons, due to few live or legal oysters sampled during NCDMF efforts. Past and present permit restrictions do not allow for the enhancement of deep-water reefs in Pamlico Sound with cultch. However, if future permitting could be secured to enhance or restore these deep-water reefs, low-relief cultch plantings would likely not be sufficient to quickly restore the reef height needed, and large high relief materials would need to be employed. The use of large materials such as boulders may prevent any future mechanical harvest of these sites once restored. To meet the NCMFC goals adopted in the CHPP and recognize the nomination of these areas as SHAs, Tier 1 proposes Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs) where mechanical harvest would not be opened. The long-term goal of DORAs would be to allow deep-water oyster reefs to grow and accumulate living oysters and dead shell material to gain the height necessary to better function as habitat and therefore be resilient to low dissolved oxygen events. Mechanical harvest can quickly remove oysters

and shell material at a much faster rate than it can naturally replenish, potentially resulting in no net vertical growth of any mechanically harvested reefs in these areas.

Oyster habitat in Pamlico Sound, including both cultch planting sites and natural shell bottom, has been mapped across a long time period. Potential oyster habitat has been identified in areas deeper than 16.4 feet (5 meters), which is the depth at which oyster reefs are known to suffer mortality during low-oxygen events (Figure 2.7).

Using existing navigation aids (such as lights, buoys, and beacons) as boundary reference points for ease of compliance and enforcement, a total of 91,158 acres of deep-water area have been identified where oyster reefs are vulnerable to low-oxygen events. This area is divided into 29,561 acres in the Pamlico River and 61,597 acres in the Neuse River. However, within these larger areas, only about 845 acres represent potential oyster habitat—600 acres in the Pamlico River and 245 acres in the Neuse River—making up just 0.9% of the total identified deep-water area (2% in Pamlico River, 0.4% in Neuse River).

To protect the identified deep-water oyster reefs while minimizing areas that do not contain potential oyster habitat, two options are proposed for Designated Oyster Restoration Areas (DORAs) in both the Pamlico River and Neuse River (DORA options 1 and 2, Figures 2.8 and 2.9). The two proposed DORA options do not include any known cultch planting sites and cover oyster reefs deeper than 16.4 feet (5 meters) that have successfully re-grown oysters since the 2018-19 low-oxygen mortality event. These reefs are monitored by NCDMF and have oysters documented during the 2024-25 oyster season with shell lengths of at least 3 inches.

The larger DORA options (Management Option 1.b) cover 681 acres of potential oyster habitat (500 acres in Pamlico River and 180 acres in Neuse River), which represents approximately 81% of the vulnerable deep-water oyster habitat. The smaller DORA options (Management Option 1.c) cover 271 acres of potential habitat (200 acres in Pamlico River and 71 acres in Neuse River), which represents only approximately 32% of the vulnerable habitat.

The strategy of Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas prioritizes the habitat value of these oyster reefs over the potential fishery resource they could provide, allowing reefs to not lose any gained shell volume and vertical height to fishery effort. The structural relief provided by oyster reefs plays a crucial role in the estuarine ecosystem. As the deep-water reefs located in DORAs recover, they would increase in habitat complexity from gaining height and more interstitial spaces. This complexity allows the reefs to function better as habitat for oysters and the numerous other commercially important species which rely on them. Oysters are viewed as ecosystem engineers, and for a more complete review on the significant role oyster reefs play in enhancing estuarine biodiversity, supporting fish production, improving water quality, and influencing hydrodynamic processes, see Chapter 3 of the 2016 CHPP (NCDEQ 2016).

Harvest may be allowed in the future if reefs recover to a point which a regulated harvest can be sustained. Subsequent Oyster FMPs can evaluate the success of the DORA approach by monitoring reef metrics such as height, rugosity, total area, and oyster demographics. Determination of successful recovery and developing sustainable harvest strategies would occur in a future FMP. Future sustainable harvest is defined as a level of harvest that would not result in a net loss of reef height through time and maintain reef height gained through DORA implementation.

The Cultch Planting Program operates under the US Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide 27 permit. Currently, this permit is renewed every five years and grants the state 200 acres combined of acceptable inland water for oyster restoration. This permit restricts reef material to low relief sites, and from being planted in areas with existing natural shellfish populations to prevent destruction of important established habitat. For more information on the cultch planting program See: Appendix 4: Habitat & Enhancement Oyster Programs Information Paper. Past and present permit restrictions do not allow for the enhancement of deep-water reefs in Pamlico Sound with cultch. However, if future permitting could be secured to enhance or restore these deep-water reefs, low-relief cultch plantings would likely not be sufficient to quickly restore the reef height needed, and large high relief materials would need to be employed. The use of large materials such as boulders may prevent any future mechanical harvest of these sites once restored.



Figure 2.6. NCMFC nominated Strategic Habitat Areas (SHAs) for the Pamlico Sound Watershed (SHA Region 2), note the SHA areas in the mouth of the Neuse and Pamlico Rivers which encompass deep-water oyster reefs. (from NCDMF 2011).

Cultch Supported Harvest (Tier 2)

Significant cultch planting effort has gone into creating harvestable reefs and replenishing cultch material lost in areas open to mechanical harvest in Pamlico Sound. Cultch planting has been central to Pamlico Sound oyster management, with some planted reefs over 40 years old and still producing harvestable oysters. Over time, extensive cultch planting initiatives have blurred the distinction between 'natural' reefs and those created by the NCDMF. The proposed Cultch Supported Harvest strategy would cover the portions of the Neuse and Pamlico River Management Areas not designated as DORAs, the entire Northern Dare and Northern Hyde Management Areas (Figure 2.3) and exclude rotational cultch areas proposed under Tier 3. Cultch planting effort will continue in these areas as long as the cultch planting program remains funded and operational. Cultch Supported Harvest Areas will be subject to the previously established bushel limits (15 bushels per day open water, 10 bushels per day bays; Figures 2.10 and 2.11) and the bays will continue to be capped to a total six-week possible season. This strategy would replace the current reactive approach of the mechanical harvest monitoring program established in 2010. The primary changes from previous management to the proposed strategy are that season length will be predetermined and based on NCDMF pre-season sampling of

the oyster resource in these areas, and the 10-bushel per day bays and 15-bushel per day deep areas will be considered differently for each management area. This change eliminates the unpredictability in mechanical harvest season length experienced by harvesters and considers differences in oyster mortality experienced at varying depths of Pamlico Sound.

Past trigger sampling data can be used to analyze the relationship between the condition of the oyster resource during pre-season sampling and the number of weeks of mechanical harvesting that occurred before the sampling reached the management trigger, which is defined as two consecutive sampling events with less than 26% legal-sized oysters. Harvest rates are driven by effort in the fishery, and steep declines have been observed since implementation of the trigger sampling program in 2010. Effort after the 2016-2017 season has stabilized at a relatively low level, and data from that point forward can be considered representative of the current mechanical fishery. Any significant changes in effort and/or participation in the future would require adaptive management to address.

Using trigger sampling data from the oyster mechanical harvest seasons between November 2017 and March 2023, the pre-season condition (percent legal oyster) of each management area was compared to the number of weeks it took for the management trigger to trip and close mechanical harvest in that area (Figure 2.12). This relationship was used to assign potential season lengths for starting conditions by area (10-bushel bays, 15-bushel deep). The two samples with the lowest percent legal oyster per management area were dropped before calculating the overall percentage legal, then compared to how long it took for two consecutive sampling events to be at 26% legal or less (current trigger to close a management area; Table 2.4). Dropping the sites in poorest condition, which may not have been used by harvesters, prevents those sites from impacting the overall area pre-season condition. However, the typical difference when these sites were dropped was an increase of less than five percent for legal oysters. Proposed maximum season lengths in the 10-bushel per day bays reflect that these areas are capped to a six-week possible season, and 18 total possible weeks for the 15-bushel per day areas to reflect the end of the possible mechanical harvest season on 31 March.

The proposed season lengths underestimated the actual time it took to trip the current management trigger two times by an average of two days across the entire period examined (Figure 2.13). The proposed season lengths have a minimum threshold for opening of 10% legal; if an area is less than 10% legal, mechanical harvest will not open. Using a minimum threshold of 10% would have resulted in openings not occurring in two areas under current management between 2017 and 2023.

Table 2.3. Proposed weeks of oyster mechanical harvest for 10-bushel and 15-bushel limit management areas based on the starting condition percentage of live legal oysters calculated from pre-season samples.

	Weeks of Mechanical Harvest Season	
Starting Condition	10 bushel per day bay areas	15 bushel per day areas
<10%	0	0
10-14%	2	2
15-19%	3	3
20-24%	4	4
25-29%	5	5
30-34%	6	6
35-39%	6	8
40-44%	6	10
45-49%	6	13
50-54%	6	16
>55%	6	18

Pre-season sampling would occur prior to the mechanical harvest season for all four management areas. At least ten sites would be sampled per management area (with potentially more if resources allowed). As with previous trigger sampling, the percentage of legal live oysters for each management area would be calculated for samples pooled for each management area, with the 10 bushel per day and 15 bushel per day areas considered separately. The bottom 20% of sites sampled with the lowest percent legal for each management area would be dropped from calculating the pre-season percentages. This would prevent errant sites with poor oyster resources that would likely not be fished by mechanical harvesters from impacting potential season length.

Once pre-season sampling occurred, the season length for each management area for the 10 bushel per day and 15 bushel per day areas would be determined by using Table 2.3, which shows the corresponding number of weeks of mechanical harvest to be allowed based on pre-season conditions present in each area. Any areas in the 10-bushel bays would continue to follow the split open period of the six-week possible season (the first opening on Monday of the week prior to Thanksgiving through the Friday after Thanksgiving, and the second opening on the Monday two weeks before Christmas) as adopted in Amendment 4 of the Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2017).

Better sampling of mechanical harvest areas that fishers actively oyster or plan to oyster, encourages participation from the industry to direct division staff to sampling locations used to determine season length. Currently, the Cultch Planting Program mails out an annual survey to commercial license holders who have had oyster landings over the past three years to solicit feedback and input on cultch planting locations. Part of this proposed management strategy would include a dedicated e-mail address or phone line for harvesters to report sites they feel are productive and likely to be fished in the upcoming season. Participation from commercial stakeholders will be critical for the implementation of this strategy. Without input from mechanical harvesters, the division will rely on knowledge of prior fishing activity and known locations of oyster resources. As a result,

pre-season sampling locations may not be representative of potential in-season harvest locations.

After initial season lengths have been determined, a proclamation will be issued establishing the mechanical season length by area. After the mechanical harvest season begins, one in-season sampling event will occur to potentially extend mechanical harvest for each area. Harvesters will be encouraged to report areas they are actively harvesting to the dedicated e-mail address or phone line mentioned above to inform in-season sampling locations. In-season sampling will occur prior to the midpoint of the proclaimed season for all four management areas. At least ten sites will be sampled per management area. Like the pre-season sampling, the percentage of legal live oysters for each management area will be calculated for samples pooled for each management area, with the 10 bushel per day and 15 bushel per day areas considered separate. The bottom 20% of sites sampled with the lowest percent legal for each management area would be dropped from calculating the pre-season percentages.

Once in-season sampling occurs, Table 2.3 would again be used to determine if the initial fixed season would be extended via proclamation. First, the number of weeks left in the initial fixed season for an area would be calculated. Next, Table 2.3 would be consulted using the in-season sampling to determine the potential number of weeks to extend the season. The number of weeks left in the proclaimed season at the time of sampling would be subtracted from the number of weeks identified based on oyster condition in Table 2.3. If the number of weeks is greater than zero, that number of weeks would be added to the mechanical harvest season, and an additional proclamation extending the mechanical harvest season for that area would be issued. Mechanical harvest in the 10-bushel bay areas is capped at a total possible six weeks, so the season cannot be extended in these areas beyond a total of six weeks. Mechanical harvest in the 15-bushel areas cannot be extended past March31. See Table 2.4 for steps and examples.

If pre-season sampling results in a management area not opening to mechanical harvest due to not meeting the 10% legal oyster threshold for opening, in-season sampling would still occur by January 15 of that mechanical harvest season. Any additional industry input received from harvesters would be used to inform sampling locations. If the in-season sampling event results in a percent legal of 10% or above, Table 2.3 would be used to determine the number of weeks of mechanical harvest allowed via proclamation.

In summary, the Cultch Supported Harvest Areas strategy places equal value on the fishery and habitat value of oysters in these areas. The amount of cultch material planted in these areas has exceeded the amount of oyster harvested since 2010, and many of these plantings have formed oyster reefs that have persisted for decades. Given the long history of cultch planting in North Carolina, many older cultch plantings in Pamlico Sound are considered “naturalized” and may be hard to distinguish from wild reefs. The purpose of setting season lengths in these areas is to protect oyster habitat from excessive damage caused by harvest, and to maintain substrate for juvenile oysters to recruit. The cultch planting program will continue to supplement oyster populations in these areas by providing hard substrate.

Rotational Cultch Sites (Tier 3)

The Cultch Planting Program has implemented a reef building strategy in Pamlico Sound to create large 10-acre cultch planting sites in areas open to mechanical harvest, with the goal of having at least 16 sites planted by 2026. These sites are distributed across the sound with four planned for each management area. As of 2024, 13 large sites have been constructed (Figure 2.14). To improve access to consistent oyster resources, a new fishery management approach is proposed for these large cultch sites. Currently, cultch sites are available to harvest as soon as they are planted, but typically it takes three years for a new cultch site to produce legal oysters, The proposed management strategy for a Rotational Cultch Site is to not allow harvest for three years post-construction, and then open harvest on the fourth year. After one season of harvest, the site would then be closed for the following three years. Immediately after the harvest season, the site would be evaluated by the division to determine if additional cultch material is needed. Sites would open and close via proclamation on a four-year rotational schedule. With at least 16 sites constructed, the goal would be to have at least one large rotational cultch site open per management area each season. Rotational Cultch Sites would not be subject to the season lengths set for Cultch Supported Harvest Areas. The large open sites in a management area would open to mechanical harvest on the third Monday of November, and close on May 31. Rotational Cultch Sites would be limited to 10 or 15 bushels per day per vessel based on the harvest limit in the waterbody that each site is located within. This strategy focuses on the fishery value of these reefs and gives harvesters relatively open access to these cultch plantings.

Without a stock assessment or metrics of abundance for oysters in Pamlico Sound, management focuses on protecting oyster habitat and cultch planting to restore hard substrate ensures ongoing populations of harvestable oysters. The proposed three tier approach seeks to balance the habitat and fishery values of oysters in Pamlico Sound. Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (Tier 1) protect reefs where continued shell loss prevents remnant natural reefs from recovering. The habitat value of these areas is prioritized over their potential function as a harvestable fishery resource. Cultch Supported Harvest Areas (Tier 2) aim to allow harvest but prevent damage to oyster habitat through excessive removal of cultch material. Effort is limited by setting season lengths by management area according to conditions of the oyster resource. Additionally, cultch planting in these areas helps mitigate substrate loss via oyster harvest. Rotational Cultch Sites (Tier 3) are constructed with the goal of supporting the mechanical harvest oyster fishery. The fishery value of these sites is prioritized. Sites will be evaluated at the end of the harvest season and replenished with cultch before being allowed to re-grow harvestable sized oysters. The division will modify sampling and data collection protocols to better incorporate an abundance of indices into future management to be addressed in a subsequent fishery management plan.

Adaptive management

The fixed mechanical season lengths for Cultch Supported Harvest developed in this issue paper used fishery monitoring data for the five oyster mechanical harvest seasons between November 2018 and March 2023. On average, 93 participants landed oysters with mechanical gear between 2018 and 2023. Any large changes in effort would potentially result in fixed season lengths becoming either inadequate to provide protection to the oyster resource with increased participation in the fishery, or too restrictive with decreased fishery participation. If the three-year running average of participants in the mechanical oyster fishery changes by more than 25% (i.e., less than 70 or more than 116 participants), adaptive management would be triggered to re-evaluate the fixed season lengths outlined in Table 2.3. Effort and landings data as well as division mechanical harvest season sampling data will be used to assess the effectiveness of adopted fixed season lengths in relation to the condition of the oyster resource. If adaptive management is triggered, season lengths may be lengthened, shortened, or maintained as previously adopted. For example, if participation dropped to a 3-year average of 65 participants and in-season sampling of management areas consistently results in 2 additional weeks of mechanical harvest being added to the initial proclaimed season length, Table 2.3 can be modified to extend the season length to reflect this change.

Adaptive Management Framework

A Three-year running average of the number of participants with landings in the wild mechanical oyster fishery of less than 70 or greater than 116 (calculated during annual FMP Update), triggers the examination of oyster sampling data and potential adjustment to fixed season lengths (Table 2.3) for Cultch Supported Harvest management strategy.

Table 2.4. Steps used to determine mechanical harvest season lengths in the proposed Cultch Supported Harvest management strategy. Examples are provided to demonstrate how the initial proclaimed season length may be extended (Example 1) or how the initial proclaim proclaimed season may remain the same (Example 2).

Step		Example 1	Example 2
1.	**Pre-season Industry Reports**	*Receive reports from fishers about locations of sites in the 10-bushel areas of Pamlico Management Area*	*Receive reports from fishers about location of sites in the 15-bushel area of Dare Management Area*
2.	**Pre-season Sampling**	*Division sampling including areas reported by fishers. Pre-season condition 25% legal.*	*Division sampling including areas reported by fishers. Pre-season condition 40% legal.*
3.	**Set Season Length** *(See Table 2.3)*	*25% legal = 5 weeks. Mechanical harvest season set via proclamation for 5 weeks in 10 bushel/day areas of Pamlico Management Area*	*40% legal = 10 weeks. Mechanical harvest season set via proclamation for 10 weeks in 15 bushel/day area of Dare Management Area*
4.	**In-season Industry Reports**	*Reports from fishers about specific locations in the 10 bushel/day areas.*	*No additional reports from fishers*
5.	**In-season Sampling**	*Division in-season sampling occurs 2 weeks into the proclaimed 5-week season targeting areas reported by fishers. In-season condition = 20%*	*Division in-season sampling occurs 5 weeks into the proclaimed 10-week season using initial fisher reports and prior experience. In-season condition = 24%*
6.	**Evaluate Season Length** *(See Table 2.3)*	*20% legal = 4 weeks* *4 weeks - 3 weeks (amount of season left) = 2 additional weeks* *In-season sampling shows 2 additional weeks may be added to the initial 5 week proclaimed season for this area for a total of 7 weeks.* *The 10-bushel areas are capped to a total possible season of 6 weeks, limiting the extension of the season to 1 additional week.*	*24% legal = 4 Weeks* *4 weeks – 5 weeks (amount of season left) = -1 weeks.* *The number of additional weeks from the in-season evaluation is less than 0.* *No additional weeks will be added or removed for this area.* *Season length is not modified.*
7.	**Modify Season** *(If needed)*	*New proclamation issued to extend the initial set harvest season by 1 week.*	*The initial proclaimed harvest season remains. No change.*



Figure 2.7. All known potential subtidal oyster habitat, including natural shell (red), and cultch planted sites (green), in western Pamlico Sound. All available historic and current data sources were used to illustrate potential locations for oyster reefs. Existing navigational markers were used to create boundaries around nearly all of the identified vulnerable deep-water oyster habitat (blue polygons).



*DORA Option 1 represents Management Option 1.b and Dora Option 2 represents Management Option 1.c in this appendix

Figure 2.8. Two potential options for DORAs containing documented potential oyster habitat (natural and cultch sites) in the mouth of the Pamlico River.



*DORA Option 1 represents Managment Option 1.b and DORA Option 2 represents Management Option 1.c in this appendix

Figure 2.9. Two potential options for DORAs containing documented potential oyster habitat (natural and cultch sites) in the mouth of the Neuse River. The 5-meter contour line is shown to illustrate areas of oyster habitat located at this depth or below and vulnerable to low oxygen events.



Figure 2.10. Bushel limits for bays and deep-water areas of western Pamlico Sound.



Figure 2.11. Bushel limits for bays and deep-water areas of eastern Pamlico Sound.



Figure 2.12. Pre-season condition (percent legal) of oysters in management areas sampled during mechanical harvest monitoring compared to the number of weeks it took for the management trigger to trip in that area from 2017 to 2023. The management trigger is 26% legal or less for two consecutive sampling events (26% 2x). The two lowest percent legal samples per area were dropped before calculating the pre-season condition of that area.



Figure 2.13. Pre-season condition (percent legal) of oysters in management areas sampled during mechanical harvest monitoring compared to the number of weeks it took for the management trigger to trip in that area from 2017 to 2023. The management trigger is 26% legal or less for two consecutive sampling events (26% 2x). The two lowest percent legal samples per area were dropped before calculating the pre-season condition of that area. The light gray line shows the proposed season length for the 10 bushel/day areas, and the dashed black line shows the proposed season length for the 15 bushel/day areas.



Figure 2.14.Locations of Rotational Cultch Sites that were constructed through 2024.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Option 1: Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs)

a. Status Quo (do not support)
   - Does not protect any deep-water (>5m) oyster reefs in Pamlico Sound from mechanical harvest methods which reduce reef height.
   - Does not allow deep-water (>5m) oyster reefs in Pamlico Sound to gain height and resiliency from negative water quality impacts.

b. Adopt Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs Option 1)
   - Protects 81% of identified deep-water (>5m) oyster reefs in Pamlico Sound from mechanical harvest methods which reduce reef height.
   - Allow protected deep-water (>5m) oyster reefs in Pamlico Sound to gain height and resiliency from negative water quality impacts.
   - Does not allow harvest in all areas of western Pamlico Sound which may periodically have harvestable oyster resource.

c. Adopt reduced area Deep-water Oyster Recovery Areas (DORAs Option 2)
    - Protects 32% of identified deep-water (>5m) oyster reefs in Pamlico Sound from mechanical harvest methods which reduce reef height.
    - Allow deep-water (>5m) oyster reefs in Pamlico Sound to gain height and resiliency from negative water quality impacts.
    - Does not allow harvest in all areas of western Pamlico Sound which may periodically have harvestable oyster resource.
    - Allows for harvest in areas of western Pamlico Sound which may periodically have harvestable oyster resource

Option 2: Cultch Supported Harvest

a. Status Quo (maintain current trigger sampling approach)
    - Uncertainty and variability in season length annually.
    - Does not provide a standardized opportunity for industry to provide input into management sampling locations.
    - Maintains current habitat protection measures in the mechanical oyster fishery.

b. Adopt Proposed Cultch Supported Harvest Strategy
    - Provides more certainty in annual season length by area.
    - Incorporates industry input into management sampling locations for pre and in-season sampling.
    - Provides habitat protection measures in the mechanical oyster fishery.

Option 3: Rotational Cultch Sites

a. Status Quo (maintain current cultch site management)
    - All cultch planting sites are open to harvest of legal-size oysters.
    - No differentiation in management of wild and cultch planting sites.
    - Does not formalize Division cultch planting efforts into an adopted fishery management strategy.

b. Adopt Rotational Cultch Site Strategy
    - Some cultch sites would be closed to harvest on a rotational schedule.
    - The fishery value of these cultch planting sites is prioritized.
    - Formalizes Division cultch planting efforts into an adopted fishery management strategy.

Option 4: Adaptive Management

a. Do not support Adaptive Management
    - Does not allow for changes in set season length based on changes in fishery participation.

b. Adopt Adaptive Management (only applies if the proposed Cultch Supported Harvest Strategy is adopted)
    - Allows for modification of set season length based on changes to fishery participation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The DMF recommends;

- Option 1.b, the proposed Pamlico and Neuse River DORAs which are bound by existing navigational aids
- Option 2.b, the proposed Cultch Supported Harvest strategy as described in the Issue Paper.
- Option 3.b, the proposed Rotational Cultch Site strategy as described in the Issue Paper.
- Option 4.b, the proposed adaptive management framework.

LITERATURE CITED

Ballance, E. S. 2004. Using Winslow's 1886 NC oyster bed survey and GIS to guide future restoration projects. North Carolina Sea Grant.

Lenihan, H. S. 1999. Physical-biological coupling on oyster reefs: how habitat structure influences individual performance. Ecological Monographs. 69(3): 251-275.

Lenihan, H. S. and C. H. Peterson. 2004. Conserving oyster reef habitat by switching from dredging and tonging to diver-harvesting. Fishery Bulletin 102(2).

NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality) (2016). North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan Source Document. Morehead City, NC. Division of Marine Fisheries. 475p.

NCDMF. 2001. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2008. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2010. Supplement A to Amendment 2 of the NC Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2011. Strategic Habitat Area Nominations for Pamlico Sound System, North Carolina (Region 2). North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2013. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2017. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 4. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

Soniat, T. M. (2016). Synopsis of the fifth annual Louisiana oyster stock assessment workshop. New Orleans, LA: University of New Orleans.

Soniat, T. M., Powell, E. N., Cooper, N. A., Pace, S. M., & Solinger, L. K. (2022). Predicting oyster harvests at maximum sustained yield: application of cultch and stock benchmarks to depleted public oyster reefs in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Journal of Shellfish Research, 40(3), 429-449.

Winslow, F. 1889. Report on the sounds and estuaries of North Carolina, with reference to oyster culture. United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bulletin No. 10, 135 p. federal laws. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, 106 p.

Appendix 3: Intertidal Oyster Harvest Management Information Paper

ISSUE
Addressing management needs for intertidal oyster stocks in North Carolina.

ORIGINATION
The Division of Marine Fisheries and the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) selected management strategies from the Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 4.

BACKGROUND
The North Carolina Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 is focused on management of wild oyster stocks, and this information paper does not pertain to farm raised or private cultured oysters.

North Carolina's wild oyster stocks are composed of both intertidal (exposed to air during portions of the tidal cycle) and subtidal (continuously submerged) populations. Oyster populations in the southern region of the state (Onslow, Pender, New Hanover, and Brunswick counties) are primarily intertidal reefs. There is currently not a stock assessment or fishery independent sampling program for intertidal oysters in the state.

Commercial harvest of oysters in North Carolina requires a Standard or Retired Commercial Fishing License (SCFL, RSCFL) with a shellfish endorsement, or a commercial Shellfish License. The number of SCFL/RSCFL available within the state is capped, limiting the total potential participation from these license holders. The commercial Shellfish License, however, is not limited to a maximum number of participants and is available at a much lower cost than the SCFL or RSCFL to any resident of the state. Harvest is limited to hand methods from Core Sound south to the NC/SC state line, with harvesters walking onto exposed oyster reefs to manually collect legal sized (3 in shell length or greater) oysters. Exposed intertidal oyster reefs are easily accessible to harvest by hand and are vulnerable to impacts from harvest pressure.

The southern region of North Carolina contributes consistently to the overall public landings of oysters within the state (Figure 3.1).. From 1994 to 2022, the southern region produced 51% of the state's total wild oyster landings, accounting for between 20% and 91% of the annual harvest. Although this region covers only 5.7% of the state's total coastal waterbody area, it has contributed more than half of the total oyster landings since 1994.

The North Carolina Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 4 examined increasing landings and participation from commercial Shellfish License holders with decreasing catch per unit effort (average bushels landed per trip), and the potential of effectively open entry on a finite fishery resource via the commercial Shellfish License as management issues (NCDMF 2017). For more information see the following issue papers in Amendment 4 of the Eastern Oyster FMP: Assessing and Mitigating Harvest Effort Impacts on Oyster Resources in the Southern Region and Consider Elimination of the Shellfish License and

Require All Shellfish Harvesters to Have a SCFL or RSCFL. To address these concerns, the Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) adopted specific management strategies. One of these strategies was the reduction of the daily oyster harvest limit for commercial Shellfish License holders from five bushels to two. This strategy was implemented in October of the 2017-2018 season with an allowance for up to four bushels per vessel per day if two or more Shellfish License holders were on board the vessel. In Amendment 4 of the Eastern Oyster FMP, the NCMFC also recommended excluding oysters harvested from public bottoms as eligible for harvest with the commercial Shellfish License. The elimination of oysters from the commercial Shellfish License requires legislative action and has yet to occur . They also proposed the development of a fishery independent sampling program for intertidal oysters in the southern region.



Figure 3.1. Commercial landings of oysters from public bottom in North Carolina from 1994 to 2022, showing annual landings in bushels from the southern region (waterbodies south of Bogue Sound; gray bars) and the northern region (white bars).

Commercial oyster fishery effort in the southern region experienced a period of growth between 2000 and 2014, with the total amount of trips nearly doubling during that time (Figure 3.2). The increase in participation was primarily driven by increasing participation from harvesters with commercial Shellfish Licenses, with a 388% increase in trips by commercial Shellfish License holders over that period. The number of trips made by

Shellfish License holders declined sharply in 2018. This coincides with NCDMF enacting the bushel reduction limit for Shellfish License holders as recommended by the MFC.



Figure 3.2. Commercial oyster fishing effort in trips for the southern region (waterbodies south of Bogue Sound) from 2000 to 2022, showing trips made by Shellfish License holders (white bars) and SCFL/RSCFL holders (gray bars).

Because there is currently no independent sampling or stock assessment for intertidal oysters in the southern region of North Carolina, one way to gauge the health of the oyster stocks is by assessing the average catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) of commercial fishing trips. This is measured by the average annual number of bushels landed per fishing trip, as recorded in the NC Trip Ticket Program (NCTTP). Since 1994, all commercially harvested oysters in North Carolina must be reported through the NCTTP. However, it is important to interpret CPUE data from commercial fisheries cautiously because factors like regulations, market demand, and weather all influence fishing behavior and catch levels. In the case of oysters, if declines in average number of bushels landed while fishers are expending the same amount of effort (trips) are observed, this may indicate that the resource cannot sustain the amount of harvest pressure occurring. However, without fisheries independent data to provide information about oyster abundance or

population structure, it is impossible to verify if trends in fisheries dependent data are reflective of the oyster population.



Figure 3.3. The catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) for oyster commercial harvest in the southern region (waterbodies south of Bogue Sound) from 2000 to 2023. The black line represents the average annual bushel amount landed per trip by SCFL/RSCFL holders.

From 2000 to 2006, the average number of bushels landed per trip by SCFL/RSCFL holders in the southern region remained relatively close to the trip limit of five bushels, averaging 4.6 bushels per trip (Figure 3.3). However, starting in 2007, the average annual bushel amount landed per trip began to decline, reaching 3.7 bushels per trip by 2010. Between 2008 and 2017, the average annual bushel amount fluctuated but remained below four bushels per trip. Beginning in 2018 after the bushel limit for Shellfish License holders was reduced by management action implemented via Amendment 4, there was an increase in the average annual bushels per trip, reaching an average of 4.6 bushels per trip by 2023.

Four waterbodies, Lockwood Folly River, Shallotte River, Masonboro Sound, and Topsail Sound contributed 68% of the region's total commercial oyster landings from public

bottom since 1994 and are representative of the intertidal hand harvest fishery in the region. Since 2000, landings trends from these areas fluctuated annually. Topsail and Masonboro sounds showed increasing landings until a decline in 2014; however, Lockwood Folly and Shallotte rivers were more variable. (Figures 3.4 – 3.7). Yearly changes in landings from these water bodies generally reflect the number of participants in the fishery (Figures 3.4 – 3.7). Like the rest of the southern region, generally increasing numbers of Shellfish License holders participated in the fishery until 2018. Despite variation in participation and landings across the region, the number of bushels landed per commercial trip decreased between 2000 and 2010. This decrease in CPUE was concurrent with the overall increase in participation and effort in the oyster fishery for these waterbodies, with lowest average bushels per trip landed during periods of highest participation (Figures 3.4 – 3.8). Lockwood Folly and Shallotte rivers both showed an increased annual average bushels per trip in recent years as participation decreased, while Masonboro and Topsail Sounds showed relatively flat trends in bushels per trip.

The NCDMF Shellfish Rehabilitation Program conducts annual efforts to plant cultch (material suitable for oyster spat settlement, such as oyster shell or limestone marl) in coastal waterbody areas across the state. Cultch reefs are created in waters open to shellfishing to improve oyster recruitment and increase biomass in areas where suitable substrate is otherwise limited. For more information on the NCDMF's cultch planting program see Appendix 4: Habitat Enhancement Programs. The quantity of material planted each year varies considerably based on availability and funding. Between 2000 and 2022, a total of 1,054,243 bushels of cultch material were planted, and 744,311 bushels of oyster were commercially harvested across the entire southern region of the state (Figure 3.9). The return in commercial harvest per unit of cultch planted remains unknown and likely varies across different planting sites. The impact of cultch plantings on oyster landings is not immediate, as it typically takes between one and three years after planting for new cultch material to yield legal-sized oysters. While some cultch planting sites have relatively short lifespans, others have been observed to continue yielding harvests for decades.

The existing management strategy in the southern region relies on the NCDMF Director's authority to close the oyster season before March 31 by proclamation. In the Pamlico Sound mechanical oyster fishery, a mechanical harvest monitoring program is used to regulate fishing activity to protect oyster habitat during the harvest season. For additional information see Appendix 2: Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper. Currently, no harvest monitoring program or closure trigger exists for hand harvest areas. In Brunswick County, waterbodies close to oyster harvest on March 15 due to concerns stemming from excessive harvest pressure in past years.

Intertidal oyster reefs in the southern region are also readily accessible to recreational harvesters. However, the extent of recreational shellfish harvesting compared to commercial harvesting is currently unknown. There is no established mechanism for accurately quantifying the number of recreational shellfish harvesters in North Carolina, which limits the NCDMF's ability to estimate total recreational shellfish harvest in the

southern region. For further details, please refer to Appendix 1: Recreational Shellfish Harvest Issue Paper.

In 2024, the NCDMF implemented a pilot fishery independent sampling program to monitor the intertidal oyster resource. Fifteen sentinel sites have been proposed across the southern region of the state to represent the intertidal oyster population. Sites include areas both open and closed to shellfish harvest. These sentinel sites will be surveyed using UAS (uncrewed aerial systems; drones), allowing for high-resolution repeated mapping, as well as traditional sampling for biological and water quality data. Sampling is planned to occur before and after the open harvest season, allowing development of fishery independent indices and assessment of fishing impacts on the oyster resource.



Figure 3.4. (A) Annual number of participants with oyster landings for Lockwood Folly River, from 2000 to 2022, by license type for Shellfish Licenses (white bars) and SCFL/RSCFL (gray bars). (B) Annual commercial landings of oysters in bushels for the Lockwood Folly River from 2000 to 2022.



Figure 3.5. (A) Annual number of participants with oyster landings for Shallotte River, the entire bar height shows total number of participants, with the proportion of participants with Shellfish Licenses shown as white, and the proportion with SCFL/RSCFL shown as grey. (B) Total commercial landings of oyster in bushels by year for the Shallotte River.



Figure 3.6. (A) Annual number of participants with oyster landings for Masonboro Sound, the entire bar shows total number of participants, with the proportion of participants with Shellfish Licenses shown as white, and the proportion with SCFL/RSCFL shown as grey. (B) Total commercial landings of oyster in bushels by year for Masonboro Sound.



Figure 3.7. (A) Annual number of participants with oyster landings for Topsail Sound, the entire bar height shows total number of participants, with the proportion of participants with Shellfish Licenses shown as white, and the proportion with SCFL/RSCFL shown as grey. (B) Total commercial landings of oyster in bushels by year for Topsail Sound.



Figure 3.8. The catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) for oyster commercial harvest in Lockwood Folly River, Shallotte River, Masonboro Sound, and Topsail Sound from 2000 to 2022. The black line represents the average annual bushel amount landed per trip for SCFL/RSCFL hold holders, separated by waterbody into individual panels.



Figure 3.9. Annual bushels of cultch planted (gray bars) and commercially harvested oysters (as black line) for the southern region (waterbodies south of Bogue Sound).

AUTHORITY

N.C. General Statute

113 134	Rules
113 182	Regulation of fishing and fisheries
113-201	Legislative findings and declaration of policy; authority of Marine Fisheries Commission.
113221.1	Proclamations; emergency review
143B-289.52	Marine Fisheries Commission – powers and duties.

N.C. Rule

North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission Rules (15A NCAC)

03K .0201	Open Season and Possession Limit
03K .0202	Size Limit and Culling Tolerance

DISCUSSION

Landings in the intertidal hand harvest commercial oyster fishery in the southern region of North Carolina tend to generally follow trends in effort/participation, with periods of higher participation resulting in greater landings. Without fishery independent indices of oyster abundance, it is unclear whether fluctuations in oyster abundance influence or are influenced by effort in the fishery. Trends in CPUE indicate that periods of greater effort/participation result in lower annual average bushels landed per trip (Figures 3.2 and 3.3). This may be interpreted as when the oyster resource can support the amount of harvest pressure exerted, fishers are able to easily land a full limit of oysters each trip. As the oyster resource becomes impacted by additional harvest pressure, it becomes harder for all fishers to land a full limit each trip, and the average number of bushels landed per trip decreases. Because exposed intertidal oysters are relatively easy to find and harvest, reefs in the southern region are at risk of suffering impacts due to harvest pressure. To prevent excessive damage to these reefs, a minimum size limit of 3 inches was established. This rule ensures smaller mature oysters are left unharvested and can remain as breeding stock or sites for future oyster recruitment. As reefs become depleted of legal sized oysters during the harvest season and greater effort is required to find legal oysters, fishers generally move to more productive areas. As participation in the fishery increases, harvesters may have trouble finding areas with legal oysters and be willing to exert more effort to thoroughly harvest one reef, causing greater damage to the resource.

Considering the rising effort and declining CPUE observed in the southern region before development of the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 4 in 2015, the MFC chose management strategies focused on curbing the increase in effort from Shellfish License holders. This sector of the oyster fishery is potentially open to all state residents and was experiencing rapid growth. To limit landings and effort from the Shellfish License holders, in October of 2017 the bushel limit was reduced from five bushels per day to two only for those license holders. After this was implemented, the number of trips made by Shellfish License holders in the region quickly dropped, resulting in a lower overall effort (Figure 3.2). Some Shellfish License holder participants transitioned to a SCFL, resulting in a slight increase in average SCFL/RSCFL trips and participants from 2018 onward when compared to years prior to the limit reduction. In all four waterbodies examined, number of participants with Shellfish Licenses dropped notedly after 2017 (Figures 3.4 – 3.7). This management approach appeared to have the desired effect on the region, decreasing overall commercial oyster effort (Figure 3.2). Additionally, CPUE for the region increased in the years following 2017 (Figure 3.3). When CPUE is examined on a waterbody scale, Lockwood Folly and Shallotte Rivers show increasing trends, while CPUE in Masonboro and Topsail Sounds has remained relatively consistent (Figure 3.8), indicating effort may remain elevated despite some reduction in participation.

In the southern region, 1.42 times more bushels of cultch material have been planted compared to bushels of oysters commercially harvested between 2000 and 2022. While the cultch planting program in this region is not designed to function as direct replacement for oysters harvested in this region, the goal is to at least mitigate the amount of shell removed by commercial harvest and provide adequate substrate for oyster spat to settle. On a regional scale, the cultch planting program has been able to keep up with or exceed

the amount of shell removed from the system via harvest overall. However, due to logistical constraints the cultch material is not distributed across all waterbodies, creating localized cultch surpluses and deficits when compared to harvest amounts. Recent cultch planting locations in the southern region have been limited to areas near one of two current cultch stockpile locations, Mile Hammock Bay (Onslow County), or Morris Landing (Onslow County). With deployment of the R/V Oyster Creek for the 2024 cultch planting season, cultch planting efforts in the southern region can be extended to sites in Pender, New Hanover, and Brunswick counties. Cultch planting efforts statewide are reliant on continued funding.

With implementation of the fishery independent sentinel site monitoring program for intertidal oysters in the southern region, the NCDMF will be able to use trends in oyster abundance and changes in demographics to inform future management options. This program will need several years of data collection before indices can be created and trends can be used to inform management decisions. Management strategies informed by this new program can be developed in a future amendment to the Eastern Oyster FMP.

LITERATURE CITED

NCDMF. 2017. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 4. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

Appendix 4: Habitat & Enhancement Oyster Programs Information Paper

ISSUE

Provide further context behind current shellfish rehabilitation programs to be used in leveraging management strategies regarding subtidal oyster stocks in Pamlico Sound, North Carolina.

ORIGINATION

The Blue-Ribbon Advisory Council on Oysters (BRACO, 1995), the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) Oyster/Clam Plan Development Team (PDT).

BACKGROUND

The North Carolina Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 is focused on management of wild oyster stocks, and this information paper does not pertain to farm raised or private cultured oysters.

Oyster reefs can be likened to coral reefs as successive generations build on top of the calcium carbonate remains left by their predecessors. This process adds spatial complexity to the oyster reef habitat, creating colonization space, refuge, and foraging substrate for many economically important fishes and invertebrates in these estuarine environments (Arve 1960; Bahr and Lanier 1981; Zimmerman et al. 1989; Lenihan and Peterson 1998). Furthermore, as prolific filter feeders, reefs with dense oyster assemblages can affect phytoplankton dynamics and water quality, which can be beneficial to submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) and reduces excessive nutrient loading that could otherwise lead to hypoxic conditions (Thayer et al. 1978; Newell 1988, Everett et al. 1995; Newell and Koch 2004; Carroll et al. 2008; Wall et al. 2008). Oyster reefs may also offer a degree of shoreline stabilization, protecting coastline habitats such as marshes (Coen et al. 2007). In sum, oyster reefs offer an array of ecosystem services that directly benefit the coastal communities living alongside them. The annual value of the services provided by oyster reefs has been estimated to be between $10,325 and $99,421 per hectare (Grabowski et al. 2012).

However, as a result of heightened demand, decades of intensive pressure from harmful fishing practices diminished oyster habitat, resulting in an 85% loss of oyster reef habitat worldwide (Rothschild et al. 1994; Lenihan and Peterson 1998). Additional anthropogenic stressors including increased nutrient runoff, declining water quality, and increased sediment loads have exacerbated the decline of oyster reefs (Lenihan and Peterson 1998). In North Carolina, historical data show a decline in oyster stocks and decreased water quality following the introduction of the oyster dredge (Marshall 1995). Such harvesting practices result in the removal of vital oyster shell substrate, which serves as the foundation for subsequent generations, leaving many remaining populations functionally extinct (Gross and Smyth, 1946; Rothschild et al. 1994; Kirby 2004; Beck et al. 2011). As subtidal oyster populations have declined, so has the quality and availability of shell and hard bottom substrate, limiting the ability of oyster larvae to settle and build upon degraded reefs.

In response to rapid global declines and subsequent low harvest rates, resource managers and researchers identified habitat restoration as the best management practice to combat reef loss from harmful harvesting practices (Brown et al. 2013). Subtidal oyster restoration often involves replenishing settlement substrate removed during harvest, or protection of broodstock from harvest (e.g., no-take reserves), or a combination of both (Coen and Luckenbach 2000; Powers et al. 2009; Schulte et al. 2009).

In North Carolina, state officials recognized early on the importance of restoration in the face of a declining fishery. In response to rapidly declining harvests, the Fisheries Commission Board began the Cultch Planting Program in 1915 to rebuild oyster stocks by planting shells for substrate (cultch) and seed oysters on sites that would later be available for harvest. The North Carolina's Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) oversees the Cultch Planting Program as it continues today as one of the oldest and most extensive oyster restoration efforts in the country.

In 1996, the NCDMF sought to integrate no-take reserves into restoration efforts via establishment of the Oyster Sanctuary Program. The primary goal was to improve oyster sustainability by developing a large, self-sustaining network of no-take reserves that support oyster brood stock and ultimately supply wild harvest reefs and cultch sites with viable larvae. North Carolina has 17 protected oyster reefs encompassing 789 acres within the Oyster Sanctuary Network throughout Pamlico Sound. The goal of creating a self-sustaining network of oyster larvae "sources" and "sinks" illustrates how NCDMF's Sanctuary and Cultch Programs serve as complements to one another in its shellfish rehabilitation strategy.

Among the management strategies implemented within the oyster fishery, NCDMF also recognizes the effectiveness and importance of continued habitat restoration efforts. Today these supplementary strategies are carried out by NCDMF's Habitat and Enhancement Section. Together the Cultch and Sanctuary programs help NCDMF achieve its goal of promoting sustainable fisheries by creating oyster habitat. The benefits of these programs are multifaceted as they not only promote an improved oyster stock, but also restore vital ecosystem services including water filtration, increased fish and macroinvertebrate habitat provisions, and food web diversity (Peterson et al. 2003). The Cultch and Sanctuary programs use data-driven approaches to determine subsequent enhancement projects with the aimed benefit of improving oyster habitat throughout North Carolina's estuaries. This information paper provides detailed information on the history and current methodologies for site selection and monitoring protocols for both programs.

Terminology

While the state of North Carolina has been creating artificial reefs since the 1970s, not all reefs serve the same purpose. Of the 72 artificial reefs, only 17 are oyster sanctuaries. It is important to distinguish that while all artificial reef habitat is considered "reef," not all reefs are considered "sanctuary." The term "oyster sanctuary" refers to reefs protected from oyster harvest and some bottom disturbing gears through North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) rule 15A NCAC 03K .0209. It is also important to

consider that created habitat within sanctuary boundaries always exists as a collection of separate reef habitat patches. Therefore, sanctuaries are sometimes referred to as reef sites. In most cases concerning reef sites managed by the Oyster Sanctuary Program, the entire reef site authorized by state and federal permits is protected from oyster harvest. Therefore, the terms “reef,” “sanctuary,” and “reef site” are often used interchangeably. Conversely, the term “cultch site” refers to any site where a thin layer of material (recycled shell or marl limestone #4) has been laid out with the intention of creating oyster habitat open to harvest.

Site Selection Methodology

The NCDMF’s Shellfish Rehabilitation program aims to incorporate sound science into both the Cultch and Sanctuary programs to maximize cost-effectiveness of material acquisition and oyster production. Data from shellfish monitoring efforts and historical environmental data are incorporated into the site selection process. This approach utilizes a habitat suitability index (HSI) model, which considers several environmental variables that influence oyster survivability.

When building an HSI model for Pamlico Sound, for instance, the waterbody is divided into approximately 6,000 individual one square kilometer squares. Each square receives a value for the variables used in the model. The variables are weighted and averaged to calculate a total score which indicates the relative habitat suitability for oysters. Variables may either be “exclusionary” or “threshold” layers. Exclusionary variables are binary (the square may be assigned a 0 or 1) and include variables such as depth, shellfish lease areas, and military exclusion zones. Threshold variables are scaled on an optimum and include salinity, dissolved oxygen, and larval dispersal patterns. For more information on the methodology used in the first iteration of the HSI for Pamlico Sound, refer to Puckett et al. (2018).

The HSI is used in tandem with a broadscale multiyear permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers (Nationwide 27). The Nationwide 27 (NW 27) is renewed every five years and grants the state 200 acres combined of acceptable inland water for oyster restoration. This permit restricts reef material from being planted in areas with Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) or existing natural shellfish populations to prevent destruction of important established habitat. Desirable areas found within the constraints of the NW 27 and HSI are then considered depending on logistic variables such as distance from cultch material stockpile sites. Staff further ground-truth proposed sites to ensure permit compliance and physical suitability for cultch planting. Surveys are also sent to commercial fishers to solicit public input and comment.

CULTCH PLANTING PROGRAM

For over a century, NCDMF has worked to create cultch reefs to alleviate fishing pressure on North Carolina’s natural oyster reefs. Research has demonstrated the ability of cultch planted reefs to support significant oyster densities over time, with cultch sites hosting 9.6 times more oysters than natural subtidal reefs found throughout Pamlico Sound (Peters

et al. 2017). Perhaps even more indicative of their effectiveness as a fisheries management strategy, North Carolina's cultch reefs were found to have 4.5 times more legal sized oysters than on natural oyster reefs (Peters et al. 2017). Since its inception, over 21 million bushels of cultch material have been planted in the form of small-scale, low-relief, harvestable oyster reefs (Figure 4.1). The program has been a longstanding collaboration between state government and local oyster harvesters to ensure cultch reefs are built in the best available locations for oyster recruitment.

Program History: The First 100 years of Cultch Planting

The Cultch program began with state funding to plant up to 12,000 bushels of shell each year from 1915 to 1920. After initial success and apparent rebound in harvests, additional state funding allowed the program to scale up and plant around 100,000 bushels of seed oysters and substrate in the early 1920s. Harvest statistics show a rebound in landings from 1923 to 1931 with landings ranging from 326,659 to 441,307 bushels. However, harvest numbers began to decline between 1932 and 1934, reaching a low of 271,192 bushels. The state then doubled down on its efforts, planting 825,000 bushels of seed oysters and 78,567 bushels of shell in the largest oyster enhancement project at the time. These planted areas were closed until 1936. Upon reopening those areas, oyster harvest more than doubled to 651,050 bushels in 1936.

However, in the following decade, no significant investments were made to rebuild oyster stocks with the events of World War II. During this period, harvest declined significantly until the end of the War in 1945. Soon after, Governor Cherry created a special oyster commission in 1946. The legislation resulting from the commission's recommendations contained landmark changes in oyster management, including appropriated funds and several provisions for supporting the renewed oyster enhancement effort—the Shellfish Rehabilitation Program (later named the Cultch Planting Program). Among these provisions were: 1) a continuation of large-scale planting shell and seed oyster planting efforts; 2) an oyster tax to support the program; 3) a requirement that 50% of the shell from shucking operations be contributed to the program; and 4) a $0.50 per bushel tax on shell stock shipped out-of-state. The first ten years of the program saw 838,000 bushels of shell and 350,734 bushels of seed oysters planted.



Figure 4.1. Map of cultch reefs planted between 1981-2022 from Dare County to the South Carolina border.

However, by the mid-1950s, appropriated funds had been exhausted while the shell tax collection had not increased. Furthermore, up until this point fishers had been employed to carry out enhancement activities, putting additional financial stress on the program. All the while, harvest numbers fluctuated from 149,489 to 331,472 bushels during this time. To alleviate costs, the state purchased a 40-foot wooden barge and began deploying material on its own in 1954. In 1956, a request for an $80,000 annual appropriation was approved by the N.C. General Assembly, allowing oyster enhancement efforts to increase to 500,000 bushels per year. Oyster harvest remained greater than 200,000 bushels each year until 1962. A state report would later conclude that fluctuating harvest numbers were likely the result of repeated severe hurricanes, which would have negated most oyster rehabilitation efforts conducted since 1947 (Munden 1981).

In the 1970s, new approaches and strategies to rebuild oyster stocks were undertaken with the state budget increasing appropriations for enhancement activities several times throughout the decade. For instance, the Cultch program began acquiring its own barges and equipment and hired support staff for the next few decades. Additionally, the program received a grant from the Coastal Plains Regional Commission in 1980 along with state

appropriations that allowed it to pay for its operations, including the procurement of two large surplus military landing crafts that were repurposed to deploy shells. In the following two years, more than 700,000 bushels of substrate were planted. During this period, oyster harvest peaked in 1987 at 226,283 bushels before declining significantly, not exceeding 100,000 bushels through 2008. Meanwhile, continued state appropriations allowed the program to deploy 250,000 bushels of substrate each year until 1997.

In 1998, the legislature revised the Cultch Program, namely by appropriating an annual budget of approximately $300,000 for purchasing and transporting cultch material. This equated to planting 30-40 acres of harvestable oyster reefs each year. In fiscal year 2015-2016, funds for cultch increased to approximately $600,000; then increased again in fiscal year 2016-2017 to $900,000. In recent years, annual appropriations for the program have increased to over $1 million in some years to cover the cost of substrate, staffing, and vessels. Increases in appropriations resulted in substantial increases in annual deployments and investments in much needed modernization and improved efficiencies of fleet equipment.

The approach and methodology used by managers for cultch planting have remained consistent since 1998. Planting sites were selected based on input from local fishers, historical production, and environmental criteria (bottom substrate type, salinity, currents, & historical production). These variables were used to weigh possible effects of fishing operations in the area before deciding on a new cultch planting site. While NCDMF vessel crews typically deploy shell and small marl limestone (4) rock, other methods were explored with varying levels of success, such as hiring fishers to gather and transplant seed oysters and hiring marine contractors for deployments. Additionally, managers experimented with site size in an effort to maximize deployment efficiency and fishery impact. The result meant fewer total sites planted per year but saw an improvement in integrity and effectiveness of cultch reefs as large as 10 acres.

Monitoring efforts to quantify the performance of cultch sites was typically limited to a three-year period post-construction. NCDMF would survey each cultch planting site to observe trends in population demographics (annual recruitment, size frequency, and population density). However, monitoring of cultch planting sites beyond three years was not conducted due to resource limitations. Initial cultch reef sampling was conducted using imperfect methodology, including small sample sizes, variable sampling intervals, and uncertain area estimates covered by the dredge, all of which made estimating densities and size class distribution difficult and not standardized.

Modern Cultch Planting Program: 2020 – Present

The goals defined by internal Cultch Planting Program documentation are as follows: 1) to provide suitable substrate for the attachment of natural oyster larvae, and 2) to increase oyster production. The Cultch Planting Program relieves harvest pressure from degraded natural reefs by developing permanent and routinely managed areas. In 2020, NCDMF hired the first biologist dedicated solely to the Cultch Planting Program with an objective to update and standardize site selection and sampling processes. The NCDMF currently

plants between 300,000 and 400,000 bushels of cultch material annually, covering over approximately 40 acres of undeveloped inshore bottom (Table 4.1).

Data from the Cultch Program are divided into three monitoring programs: P600 (cultch planting), P610 (spatfall evaluation), and P627 (trigger sampling). P600 records location, type, and amount of material planted annually across the state. This is used to update the public facing interactive cultch map, allowing commercial oystermen to find cultch reefs. The current Nationwide 27 Permit limits materials that can be used for cultch planting to oyster shell, crushed concrete, and limestone marl. Of these materials, limestone marl is readily available and cheapest.

Recycled oyster shells are a well-known valuable resource for oyster restoration but remain in short supply in the state. Other states, including Virginia and Maryland, have legislative-backed shell recycling programs that offer tax credits and incentives to businesses in exchange for oyster shells. Growing demand has increased the price of oyster shell and subsequently resulted in shell being exported out of North Carolina. Without sufficient incentives or funding, shell has become a rare resource for restoration efforts, further limiting cultch planting efforts to marl and concrete materials.

P610 monitors cultch enhanced reefs for three years post-planting. Hydraulic tongs are used to collect random point samples within a cultch site. The oysters are counted and measured to determine spat recruitment rates and mortality metrics. The data collected under P610 provides insight into oyster spat recruitment and once analyzed could be incorporated into a future state oyster stock assessment.

Peer-reviewed research has also independently quantified oyster recruitment on cultch sites. For instance, cultch reefs successfully hosted 4.5-times more legal oysters than natural reefs where no restoration effort had occurred (Peters et al. 2017). On average, cultch sites had 27 legal oysters (≥3 inches) per square meter (Peters et al. 2017). With 27 legal oysters/m^2 on cultch material, a conservative estimate suggests that one acre of harvestable cultch reef should yield approximately 368 bushels of legal oysters (300 oysters/bushel).

P627 trigger sampling occurs in the fall and lasts the duration of the commercial oyster mechanical harvest season. Pre-season sampling serves as a baseline for mechanical harvest areas in the Pamlico Sound. Once the season is open, monitoring occurs throughout the season to ensure the legal catch does not fall below an allowable threshold. For further details on P627 (trigger sampling), refer to Supplement A and Appendix 2 (Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper). Methodology for P627 is subject to change regardless of selected management strategies following adoption of Amendment 5 to the Eastern Oyster FMP.

Cultch for Future Management

Throughout the course of the Cultch Program's history, the acquisition and deployment of materials has been limited by funding, which has been inconsistent. Yet, with growth of the program in the last decade, there is potential for the Cultch Program to become an integral strategy to meet the goal and objectives of the Eastern Oyster FMP. An example strategy for the Cultch Program is further outlined in Appendix 2: Mechanical Oyster Harvest Management Issue Paper, specifically with a proposed rotational harvest management plan. It is worth noting that Virginia utilizes a rotational harvest system as a management strategy in tandem with oyster restoration efforts.

Additionally, with monitoring of cultch sites post-construction, useful oyster metrics can be analyzed and used for development of a stock assessment in the future. However, the utility of data collected from cultch sites can be further maximized if harvest locations on trip tickets are categorized as cultch or natural reefs. However, consistent funding is required to effectively integrate and anchor the Cultch Program as an effective long-term management strategy.

OYSTER SANCTUARY PROGRAM

Overview

The 1995 Blue-Ribbon Advisory Council on Oysters highlighted the importance of restoring North Carolina's oyster population in Pamlico Sound. Accordingly, NCDMF responded by incorporating no-take marine reserves into its oyster restoration efforts with the creation of the Oyster Sanctuary Program. No-take marine reserves support increased size and density of target species—for oysters a larger size equates to greater reproductive output (Duran and Castilla 1989; Coen et al. 2007; Lester et al. 2009). The aim of NCDMF's protected subtidal oyster sanctuaries is to supplement larvae to decimated natural oyster reefs and cultch sites throughout Pamlico Sound via the "spillover effect" created by these protected areas with heightened reproductive output (Peters et al. 2017). Secondary objectives of the sanctuaries are to increase the impact of environmental services provided by oysters, and to provide North Carolina residents with relatively accessible recreational fishing and diving opportunities.

The creation and preservation of oyster sanctuaries represent both a long-term, large-scale ecological restoration project as well as a long-term fisheries investment to the state of North Carolina. The network of sanctuaries provides ecosystem services that improve the quality of habitat throughout Pamlico Sound. Sanctuary sites offer nursery habitat for other species, increasing their abundance for commercial and recreational fishing; provide refuge and forage habitat for marine life; form travel corridors for transient finfish; and increase water filtration, reducing turbidity and excess nutrients in the estuary. The impacts of sanctuary sites expand far beyond their boundaries as brood stock populations supplement the growth of natural reefs and cultch sites. Furthermore, the necessity of oyster sanctuary construction falls within Recommendation 3.1 in the NC Coastal Habitat Protection Plan – "Greatly expand habitat restoration, including creation of subtidal oyster reef no-take sanctuaries."

Table 4.1. Bushels (bu.) and acres planted per year by county for the cultch program from 2010 to 2022.

County		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	Total
Brunswick	bu.	3,447	24,509	6,294	9,403	4,991	4,053	5,470	-	-	-	-	-	-	58,167
	acres	0.3	0.9	0.7	1.8	1.0	0.7	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.5
Carteret	bu.	53,741	5,470	93,943	23,440	43,756	48,889	81,725	-	35,234	46,112	88,857	70,576	13,276	593,909
	acres	17.8	2.7	20.1	5.4	11.5	10.5	13.6	-	5.9	12.0	11.4	7.3	1.0	119.2
Dare	bu.	41,501	71,226	39,156	37,856	32,428	22,829	48,251	70,516	43,257	80,342	50,359	55,057	71,120	663,898
	acres	2.8	7.0	4.2	2.7	3.8	2.5	4.7	6.0	4.2	8.0	4.1	9.8	10.0	69.8
Hyde	bu.	32,104	44,071	62,324	46,908	108,261	48,889	114,583	73,832	21,179	76,992	85,423	62,100	79,863	856,529
	acres	6.2	9.1	6.3	9.5	10.8	5.7	12.8	7.9	1.8	8.4	9.9	6.7	10.0	105.1
New Hanover	bu.	2,611	2,244	-	8,385	-	4,059	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17,299
	acres	1.2	0.4	-	5.2	-	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.6
Onslow	bu.	65,176	21,198	50,960	19,800	14,119	27,073	82,996	109,634	56,444	40,696	49,524	64,916	90,767	692,300
	acres	48.7	2.0	32.5	12.7	8.1	11.6	41.3	24.2	12.6	23.6	7.2	9.0	11.0	244.5
Pamlico	bu.	14,372	35,738	22,002	11,885	28,863	54,479	91,815	79,331	38,676	47,696	80,162	84,656	53,625	643,300
	acres	4.8	8.3	5.1	2.6	3.7	8.0	12.9	10.1	6.7	6.2	9.9	6.7	10.0	95.0
Pender	bu.	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,687	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,687
	acres	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.6
Total	bu.	212,952	204,456	274,679	157,677	232,418	210,271	428,527	332,313	183,680	291,838	354,322	337,305	308,651	**3,529,089**
	acres	81.8	30.4	68.9	39.9	38.9	41.8	90.1	48.2	31.2	58.2	42.5	39.5	42.0	**653.4**

Various research projects and analyses have been conducted to quantify the intended performance of North Carolina's oyster sanctuaries as larvae production sites and their overall economic benefit to the state. It has been estimated that one out of every four larvae settled on commercially harvested oyster reefs (natural or cultch) in Pamlico Sound originated from an oyster sanctuary (Peters et al. 2017). Furthermore, an independent economic analysis estimated that for every dollar invested in oyster sanctuaries, there was $4 return in the form of economic opportunity or ecosystem services (RTI International 2016). By 2026, the Oyster Sanctuary Program will be comprised of 17 sanctuary sites, totaling 789 permitted acres. With an additional 140,000 tons of marl limestone and granite planned for deployment at Maw Point and Brant Island combined, there will be over 373,000 tons of aggregate material used for the creation of protected oyster reef habitat in Pamlico Sound by 2026 (Figure 4.2; Table 4.2).

Legislation and Rules

As part of the 2008 Oyster Fishery Management Plan Amendment 2, the NCMFC moved the protection of oyster sanctuaries from proclamation into rules 15A NCAC 03K .0209 and 03R .0117, Oyster Sanctuaries, which in effect prohibits the harvest of oysters and use of trawls, long haul seines, and swipe nets in sanctuary boundaries, thereby promoting growth and enhancing survivability of large oysters within the sanctuary sites. Oyster sanctuaries under construction but not yet incorporated into 15A NCAC 03R.0117 can be protected under Rule 15A NCAC 03H .0103 and 03K. 103 through proclamation authority.

In the 2014 legislative session, the North Carolina General Assembly established the Senator Jean Preston Oyster Sanctuary Network (Figure 4.2). This was done "to enhance shellfish habitats within the Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds and their tributaries to benefit fisheries, water quality, and the economy…achieved through the establishment of a network of oyster sanctuaries, harvestable enhancement sites, and coordinated support for the development of shellfish aquaculture."



Figure 4.2. Jean Preston Oyster Sanctuary Network, Pamlico Sound, NC.

Table 4.2. A comprehensive list of North Carolina's Oyster Sanctuaries found throughout Pamlico Sound. Permit area refers to the total protected boundary area delineated by rule or proclamation. Developed habitat area includes material footprints and surrounding unconsolidated soft bottom, whereas habitat footprint area- refers to the cumulative total area of reef patches only, not to include unconsolidated soft bottom. For example, Croatan Sound Oyster Sanctuary has 3.10 acres of habitat within the overall boundary of 7.73 acres, meaning 4.63 acres of the site do not have habitat material present, but harvest is prohibited within the entire site.

OS Name	Permit Area (Acres)	Developed Habitat (Acres)	Habitat Footprint (Acres)	Aggregate Material (Tons)	Year Established	Most Recent Addition	Materials
Croatan Sound	7.73	7.73	3.10	2,093	1996	2013	Marl, Reef Balls, Clam Shell, Oyster Shell
Deep Bay	17.20	17.20	4.15	1,749	1996	2014	Marl, Reef Balls, Clam Shell, Oyster Shell
West Bay	6.57	6.57	2.27	2,329	1996	2014	Marl, Reef Balls
Crab Hole	30.52	30.52	13.26	36,489	2003	2009	Marl
Middle Bay	4.59	4.59	0.27	900	2004	2004	Marl
Neuse River	11.21	11.21	3.55	7,357	2005	2008	Marl
West Bluff	29.42	9.97	2.82	10,162	2005	2013	Marl, Reef Balls
Gibbs Shoal	54.69	54.69	8.19	22,447	2009	2013	Marl, Reef Balls
Long Shoal	10.01	6.79	1.13	2,173	2013	2013	Reef Balls
Raccoon Island	9.97	9.97	1.61	1,824	2013	2016	Crushed Concrete, Consolidated Concrete, Reef Balls
Pea Island	46.36	33.9	2.62	3,420	2015	2015	Crushed Concrete, Consolidated Concrete, Reef Balls
Little Creek	20.71	20.71	6.14	5,700	2016	2016	Marl, Crushed Concrete, Basalt, Reef Balls, Granite, Consolidated Concrete
Swan Island	80.32	62.6	10.93	55,000	2017	2021	Marl, Granite
Cedar Island	75.01	70.32	12.43	51,800	2021	2022	Marl, Crushed Concrete
Gull Shoal	158.40	TBD	TBD	36,000	2022	TBD	TBD
Maw Point	126.66	TBD	TBD	TBD	2024	2024	Marl
Brant Island	99.26	TBD	TBD	TBD	2024	2024	Crushed Concrete, Granite
Total	**788.63**	**346.77**	**72.47**	**239,443**			

Funding History

Initially, oyster sanctuaries were built by NCDMF's Artificial Reef Program, which provided funding for materials, and the Shellfish Program, which deployed materials. In 2002, relief money was available from a National Marine Fisheries Service Grant (NMFS) for Hurricane Floyd damages. NCDMF has continued to expand the Oyster Sanctuary Program via funding and collaboration with the North Carolina General Assembly, The Nature Conservancy, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Estuarine Counsel, Coastal Recreational Fishing Licenses, North Carolina Coastal Federation, and other mitigation sources. These funds have been used to cover material purchasing and deployment costs.

Beginning in 2017, and still in effect through 2026, NCDMF entered a partnership agreement with North Carolina Coastal Federation (NCCF) to significantly increase funding availability and deployment efficiency for the construction of multi-year sanctuary projects. From 2017 to 2020, Swan Island (OS-15) was constructed in southern Pamlico Sound encompassing 80 acres. In 2021, NCDMF and NCCF began construction of Cedar Island (OS-16) within a 75-acre site. The most recent plans for further construction include two large sites, both 100+ acres – Maw Point (OS-18) and Brant Island Shoal (OS-19). Funding for these two sites was acquired through a successful NOAA proposal submitted by NCCF.

Additionally, North Carolina's Division of Mitigation Services undertook the task of funding, planning, and constructing an oyster sanctuary site at Gull Shoal (OS-17). Details of this project do not fall under NCDMF supervision; however, it will be incorporated into the OS Network and NCDMF plans to take over monitoring efforts after five years of post-construction.

Sanctuary Site Selection

Historically, oyster sanctuary construction and site selection were largely dependent upon where historic oyster reefs once existed. By 2014 the Program placed greater emphasis on establishing a connected oyster network in Pamlico Sound, stemming from research and hydrological models on currents and wind patterns that drive distribution of oyster larvae (Xie & Eggleston 1999; Puckett et al. 2014). To ensure larval connectivity and to further safeguard subtidal oyster populations, new sanctuary sites are selected based on a habitat suitability index (HSI) model for Pamlico Sound. This model weights environmental and biological variables, including dissolved oxygen, salinity, bottom substrate type, tidal flow, larval transport, wave action, and prevailing wind data to determine ideal locations conducive to building long-lasting and effective sanctuaries (Puckett et al. 2018). Planning and logistic constraints are also considered to narrow down potential sites. After determining several areas with high suitability scores, site investigations ground-truth bathymetric and environmental conditions and check for existing oysters or SAV.

Reef Design & Construction

The Oyster Sanctuary Program has utilized various materials to create artificial subtidal oyster reefs, including marl limestone rock, crushed concrete, crushed granite, reef balls, recycled concrete pipe, basalt, and a variety of recycled shell materials. Aggregate materials (marl, concrete, granite, basalt) are large in diameter to deter attempts to illegally dredge sanctuary reefs. Material selection for new sanctuary mounds is both opportunistic and cost dependent. Materials are secured by program staff or by outside partnerships. Environmental factors are taken into consideration for material selection as well. For instance, higher salinity sites may be built with granite or crushed concrete as these materials may be less susceptible to “pest” species such as boring sponge, which may otherwise inhibit sustained oyster growth.

NCDMF oyster sanctuary reefs have been constructed with the goal of providing vertical relief and structural complexity to oyster populations. Vertical relief and structural complexity contribute to increased flow speed, which enhances mixing of the water column and thus food availability for oysters (Butman et al. 1994). Conversely, oysters on low vertical relief reefs are exposed to greater sedimentation and increased exposure to low dissolved oxygen events (Lenihan and Peterson, 1998; Lenihan 1999). Up until 2017, sanctuaries were designed with clusters of high-relief mounds 3-6 ft in height. More recently, Swan Island, Cedar Island, Maw Point, and Brant Island oyster sanctuaries were designed with parallel ridges arranged in a grid-like pattern. These ridges are approximately 200-250 ft long, 30-40 ft wide, with a height of 4-6 ft (Figure 4.3). This approach increases the efficiency of the permitted areas and may improve the long-term integrity of reef habitat.

Sanctuary material deployments are designed around project objectives and vary widely according to project specifics, such as material type and size, site location, material quantity, funding, sea conditions, etc. As of 2017, reef enhancements are completed by Habitat and Enhancement staff using NC state vessels and with the assistance of contractors. All reef construction activities are subject to local, state, and federal permitting agencies. Any deployment activity must fall within permitted boundaries and environmental restrictions.

Monitoring and Analyses

Each year biologists and technicians conduct SCUBA surveys at each Sanctuary across Pamlico Sound to quantify the performance of each site and the materials used in construction. Performance metrics include the following: 1) oyster population and density metrics; 2) material performance as bottom substrate; and 3) material stability over time. Annual monitoring efforts began in 2007, and apart from a few data gaps, have yielded a rare long-term data set on a large scale, long-term ecological restoration project.

Measuring oyster density and size frequencies are some of the most effective ways to assess oyster reef performance (Baggett et al. 2015). NCDMF divers collect random samples for each material type within each sanctuary to measure density and population

structure. Insights from oyster population metrics provide insight into material selection and improve site selection for future projects. Side scan sonar of sanctuaries every few years provides further insight into the stability of deployed materials at each sanctuary. For instance, reefs built with recycled shell can persist if heavily colonized by oysters, and oyster growth and recruitment rates exceed mortality and shell degradation. However, constructed shell reefs rapidly degrade if not heavily colonized by oysters and are prone to being displaced in areas of heavy currents (Powell et al. 2006). Heavier and larger materials offer several advantages including long-term persistence and cost-effectiveness.



Figure 4.3. The side scan view of Cedar Island Oyster Sanctuary located in Pamlico Sound, North Carolina. The construction of the sanctuary began in 2021, using marl limestone rip rap and crushed concrete in a grid design with parallel ridges.

Data from sanctuary monitoring in 2023 suggests North Carolina's oyster sanctuaries had an average total density of 1,333 oysters/m^2 and an average legal density of 127 oysters/m^2. These estimates, along with those from independent peer-reviewed studies, verify and quantify the effectiveness of the Sanctuary Program. For instance, total oyster density at sanctuary sites was 72 times greater than natural reefs open to harvest, and 7.5 times higher than restored harvested (cultch) areas (Peters et al. 2017). This trend

extended to legal oyster density (>75mm), as sanctuary sites demonstrated 27 times greater density than natural harvested reefs and six times greater density than restored harvested reefs (Peters et al. 2017). The potential larval output per m^2 of sanctuary sites was significantly higher than at natural reefs (700 times greater) and cultch areas (four times), illustrating the high potential for larval spillover as intended in the design of the Oyster Sanctuary Network (Peters et al. 2017).

LITERATURE CITED

Arve R (1960). Preliminary report on attracting fish by oyster-shell plantings in Chincoteague Bay, MD. Chesapeake Science 1:58-65.

Baggett LP, Powers SP, Brumbaugh RD, Coen LD, Deangelis BM, Greene JK, et al. (2015). Guidelines for evaluating performance of oyster habitat restoration. Restor. Ecol. 23, 737–745.

Bahr LM, Lanier WP (1981). The ecology of intertidal oyster reefs of the south Atlantic coast: a community profile. FWS/OBS/81.15. US Fish & Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.

Beck MW, Brumbaugh RD, Airoldi L, Carranza A, Coen LD, Crawford C, Defeo O, Edgar GJ, Hancock B, Kay MC, Lenihan HS, Luckenbach MW, Toropova CL, Zhang G, Guo X. (2011). Oyster reefs at risk and recommendations for conservation, restoration, and management. BioScience. 61: 107-116.

Brown, L. A., Furlong, J. N., Brown, M. K., Peyre K. 2013. Oyster reef restoration in the northern Gulf of Mexico: effect of artificial substrate and age on nekton and benthic macroinvertebrate assemblage use. Restoration Ecology, 22(2):214-222.

Carroll JC, Gobler CJ, Peterson BP (2008). Resource limitation of eelgrass in New York estuaries; light limitation and nutrient stress alleviation by hard clams. Marine Ecology Progress Series 369: 39–50.

Coen LD, Brumbaugh RD, Bushek D, Grizzle R, Luckenbach MW, Posey MH, et al. (2007). Ecosystem services related to oyster restoration. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 341, 303–307.

Duran, L. R., and Castilla, J. C. (1989). Variation and persistence of the middle rocky intertidal community of central Chile, with and without human harvesting. Marine Biology. 103, 555–562.

Everett RA, Ruiz GM, Carlton JT. (1995). Effect of oyster mariculture on submerged aquatic vegetation: An experimental test in a Pacific Northwest estuary. Marine Ecology Progress Series 125: 205–217.

Grabowski JH, Brumbaugh RD, Conrad RF, Keeler AG, Opaluch JJ, Peterson CH, Piehler MF, Powers SP, Smyth AR (2012). Economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by oyster reefs. BioScience. 62: 900-909.

Gross F and Smyth JC (1946). The decline of oyster populations. Nature 147, 540–542.

Kirby MX (2004). Fishing down the coast: historical expansion and collapse of oyster fisheries along continental margins. PNAS USA. 101, 13096–13099.

Lenihan HS and Peterson CH (1998). How habitat degradation through fishery disturbance enhances impacts of hypoxia on oyster reefs. Ecological Applications 8: 128–140.

Lester, S. E., Halpern, B. S., Grorud-Colvert, K., Lubchenco, J., Ruttenberg, B. I., Gaines, S. D., et al. (2009). Biological effects within no-take marine reserves: a global synthesis. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 384, 33–46.

Marshall, M. D. 1995. North Carolina Oyster Restoration and Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries and the North Carolina Blue Ribbon Advisory Council on Oysters, Morehead City, N.C.116p.

Munden, F. H. 1981. A review of the North Carolina Oyster Rehabilitation Program. In Proceedings of the North American Oyster Workshop, Special Publication No. 1, Louisiana State University, p. 138-152.

Newell, R. I. E. 1988. Ecological changes in the Chesapeake Bay: are they the result of overharvesting the American oyster? P.536-546 in M.P. Lynch and E.C. Krome (eds.). Understanding the estuary: advances in Chesapeake Bay research. Chesapeake Bay Research Consortium, Baltimore, Md. Publication 129.

Newell RIE and Koch EW (2004). Modeling seagrass density and distribution in response to changes in turbidity stemming from bivalve filtration and seagrass sediment stabilization. Estuaries 27: 793–806.

Peters JW, Eggleston DB, Puckett BJ, Theuerkauf SJ (2017). Oyster demographic in harvested reefs vs. no-take reserves: implications for larval spillover and restoration success. Frontiers in Marine Science 4:326.

Powell EN, Kraeuter JN, Ashton-Alcox, KA. (2006). How long does oyster shell last on an oyster reef? Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science. 69:531–542.

Powers, S.P., C.H. Peterson, J.H. Grabowski, H.S. Lenihan. 2009. Success of constructed oyster reefs in no harvest sanctuaries: implications for restoration. Marine Ecology Progress Series 389: 159-170.

Puckett BJ, Eggleston DB, Kerr PC, and Luettich R (2014). Larval dispersal and population connectivity among a network of marine reserves. Fisheries Oceanography. 23, 342-361.

Puckett BJ, Theuerkauf SJ, Eggleston DB, Guajardo R, Hardy C, Gao J, Luettich RA (2018). Integrating larval dispersal, permitting, and logistical factors within a validated habitat suitability index for oyster restoration (2018). Frontiers of Marine Science 5:76.

Rothschild BJ, Ault JS, Goulletquer P, Héral M. 1994. Decline of the Chesapeake Bay oyster population: A century of habitat destruction and overfishing. Marine Ecology Progress Series 111: 29–39.

Schulte, D. M., Burke, R. P., and Lipcius, R. N. 2009. Unprecedented restoration of native oyster metapopulation. Science: 325, 1124–1128.

Thayer GW, Stuart HH, Kenworthy WJ, Ustach JF, Hall AB. (1978). Habitat values of salt marshes, mangroves, and seagrasses for aquatic organisms. Pages 235–247 in Greeson PE, Clark JR, Clark JE, eds. Wetland Functions and Values: The State of Our Understanding. American Water Resource Association.

Wall CC, Peterson BJ, Gobler CJ (2008). Facilitation of seagrass Zostera marina productivity by suspension-feeding bivalves. Marine Ecology Progress Series 357: 165–174.

Xie L and Eggleston DB (1999). Computer simulation of wind-induced estuarine circulation pattern and estuary-shelf exchange processes: the potential role of wind forcing on larval transport. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science. 49, 221–234.

Zimmerman R, Minello TJ, Baumer T, and Castiglione M (1989). Oyster reef as habitat for estuarine macrofauna. Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-249. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, D.C., US.

Fishery type is categorized as either recreational (Rec.') or commercial (Com.'); Mechanical gear type abbreviated as 'Mech.'; bushels abbreviated as 'bu.'.

Appendix 5: Eastern Oyster Management & Stock Status in Other States. Fishery type is categorized as either recreational (Rec.') or commercial (Com.'); Mechanical gear type abbreviated as 'Mech.'; bushels abbreviated as 'bu.'.

State	Fishery	License Issued by	Gear	Daily Trip Limit	Season	Size Limit	Stock Assessment	Management
ME	Rec.	Town	Hand	1 peck/person	Nov 1 - Apr 30	2.5"	No	Co-managed towns may further restrict harvest via shellfish control ordinance. Oyster habitat restoration program.
	Com.	State	-	-				
NH	Rec.	State (resident only)	Hand	0.2 bu./person	1 Sep - Jun 30	None	No	Managed by towns and municipalities.
	Com.	No Wild Harvest	-	-				
MA	Rec. & Com.	Town	Hand	Consult Town Regs	Consult Town Regs	3"	No	Managed by towns and municipalities.
RI	Rec.	License for Non-residents	Hand	0.5 - 1 peck (varies by area)	15 Sep- 15 May	3"	No	Managed in state shellfish management areas and closed spawner sanctuaries. Habitat restoration program.
	Com.	State	Hand	3 bu./person, 6 bu./vessel	Fixed Season Varies by Management Area			
CT	Rec.	Town	Hand	Between 24 oysters to 0.5 bu./person (varies by town)	Year round, exceptions by town	3"	No	Habitat restoration. Allows seed oyster harvest for relay and sale.
	Com.	State	Hand, Mech.	Seed Oyster Harvest Fishery Only	20 Sep - 20 Jul			
NY	Rec.	Town	Hand, Sail power	0.5 bu.	1st Monday Nov - 31 Mar	3"	No	Habitat restoration.
	Com.	State	Hand, Sail power	None				

State	Fishery	License Issued by	Gear	Daily Trip Limit	Season	Size Limit	Stock Assessment	Management
NJ	Rec.	State	Hand	150 (total mollusks)	Year round (no Sunday harvest)	3"	Yes (Delaware Bay Only)	Annual assessment for Delaware Bay. Quota set by dredge survey of six management areas. 2024 stock status, thresholds and reference points from times series 1989 onward. 224 grids sampled to determine 2023 stock status. >100sq miles of area. Partnership with Rutgers.
	Com.	State	Tong, Dredge	Quota for Delaware Bay (Direct Market Fishery)	Apr - Nov			
DE	Com.	State	Dredge	Quota set by Dept Fish & Wildlife (split between license holders)	Set by Dept Fish & Wildlife (2024 split: 1 Apr - 31 May & 2 Sep - 31 Dec)	2.75"	Population Survey	Survey used to set landings quota. 2% of population as target set in 2018. Limited entry into oyster fishery. Rec harvest prohibited.
MD	Rec.	None (resident only)	Hand	100 oysters	1 Oct - 31 Mar (M-Sat, before noon)	3"	Yes	Stage-structured model with various integrated sources (buy ticket data, MDDNR surveys, oyster/shell planting data, bottom mapping, etc.) to estimate sustainable fishing reference points. MD area of Chesapeake ~1,500 sq miles.
	Com.	State	Hand	12 bu./person, 24 bu./vessel	1 Oct - 31 Mar (M-F)			
			Power Dredge	10 bu./person, 20 bu./vessel	1 Nov - 31 Mar (M-F)			
			Sail Dredge	100 bu./person, 100 bu./vessel				
VA	Rec.	None	Hand	1 bu./vessel	1 Oct - 31 Mar (M-F until 3:00 pm)	3"	Yes	Virginia Oyster Stock Assessment and Replenishment. Partnership with VIMS and VMRC. Assessment Program and

State	Fishery	License Issued by	Gear	Daily Trip Limit	Season	Size Limit	Stock Assessment	Management
	Com.	State	Hand	8 bu./person, 16 bu./vessel	Season length varies by areas, time allowed to fish varies by season			Restoration activities for Chesapeake Bay. Managed and surveyed by individual public oyster reefs. Virginia Public Oyster Grounds, 243,000 acres (380 sq miles) Fishing mortality limited by area using season length and fishing times.
			Hand Tong	14 bu./person, 28 bu./vessel				
			Mech.	8 bu./person, 16 bu./vessel				
NC	Rec.	None	Hand	1 bu.	1 Oct - 31 Mar	3"	No	Oyster restoration and enhancement programs in closed sanctuaries and public shellfish grounds. Mechanical harvest monitoring to close harvest when trigger falls below 26% legal by area.
	Com.	State	Hand	3-15 bu. (varies by license, area)	1 Oct - 31 Mar (Brunswick Co., Mar 15) (Mon-Sat)			
			Mech.	10 or 15 bu. (varies by area)	3rd Monday in Nov until closure by management trigger (M-F)			
SC	Rec.	State	Hand	2 bu., no more than 4 bu. per seven-day pd.	1 Oct - 27 May	None	No	Restoration and enhancement on public shellfish grounds.
	Com.	State	Hand, Mech.	None				
GA	Rec.	State	Hand	2 bu./person, 6 bu./vessel	1 Oct - 27 May	3"	No	Restoration and enhancement.
	Com.		Hand	None		2"		

State	Fishery	License Issued by	Gear	Daily Trip Limit	Season	Size Limit	Stock Assessment	Management
FL	Rec.	State	Hand	120 lbs. per person/vessel	1 Sep - 31 May or 1 Oct - Jun 30, depending on County	3"	No	Restoration and enhancement.
	Com.		Hand Tong	1200 lbs. per person/vessel				
AL	Rec.	None	Hand	100 oysters	1 Oct - 30 April (M-F until 2 pm)	3"	No	Reefs are assessed annually by divers to determine if management changes are needed. Enhancement program funded by the sale of oyster tags.
	Com.	State	Hand, Mech.	6 sacks				
MS	Rec.	State	Hand	3 sacks per week	1 Oct - 31 Mar	3"	No	Restoration and enhancement.
	Com.	State	Hand, Mech.	15 sacks, quotas by area				
LA	Rec.	State	Hand	2 sacks	Wed after Labor Day to 30 Apr	3"	Yes	over 1,700 dredge samples and 1,000 diver quadrat samples used to inform fishery independent portion of stock assessment. 2,656 sq. miles of oyster ground. Shell Recycling and restoration and enhancement programs.
	Com.	State	Hand, Mech.	5 - 30 sacks per vessel (varies by region)				
TX	Rec.	State	Hand	220 lbs.	1 Nov - 30 April	3"	No	Restoration and enhancement. Area and season closures determined by monitoring and a traffic light approach.
	Com.	State	Hand, Mech.	330 lbs.	1 Nov - 30 April (M-F until 3:30 pm)			

Appendix 6: Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan Advisory Committee Workshop Summary

ISSUE
Summarize input received from stakeholders from the Oyster & Clam Fishery Management Plans Advisory Committee Workshop.

ORIGINATION
The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF).

BACKGROUND
The Oyster and Clam Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) Advisory Committee (AC) met for a three-day workshop on July 15, 16, and 17, 2024, at Craven Community College in New Bern. As these two fisheries share considerable overlap in their ecology and management, the FMPs are being revised simultaneously though written separately. The purpose of the workshop was for the AC to assist NCDMF staff in evaluating management issues and options included in the draft documents of Amendment 5 to the Eastern Oyster FMP and Amendment 3 to the Hard Clam FMP. The NCDMF sought to solicit feedback and input on the impacts of management options on the oyster and clam resources and user groups. It is important to note the aim of the AC workshop was to receive input from committee members based on their experiences, expertise, and sector relationships, not to build a consensus among AC members or to recommend specific management strategies.

For the Eastern Oyster FMP, NCDMF staff presented overviews of the base plan (life history, stock assessment, description of the fisheries, habitat impacts), Habitat and Enhancement information paper, intertidal hand harvest information paper, mechanical harvest issue paper, and the recreational shellfish harvest issue paper. Each presentation was followed by an opportunity for the AC to ask clarifying questions and discuss the content and management options presented. Below is a summary of the input and subsequent discussions for each of the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 information and issue papers. These ideas represent the management options the AC suggested be considered. NCDMF staff explored these options and incorporated many of them directly into the relevant information and issue papers.

DISCUSSION
Base Plan

AC members suggested adding more information to the stock assessment section within the base plan. Discussion revolved around comparing management of Eastern Oysters in other states along the Atlantic coast and Gulf of Mexico. At the time of the workshop, a table summarizing management strategies, gear, season length, limits, and stock assessment status of other states was available as an appendix. However, members of the AC expressed their interest in having a paragraph summary of information pertaining to the status of stock assessment completion in other states, including methodologies and findings.

In the description of the fishery, the AC brought up that on many trip tickets, oysters may be an opportunistically harvested species rather than the target. To this point, the AC suggested including an economic analysis of the landings brought in by the top 30 participants compared to all other participants. The AC was curious about discerning where the fishing effort of full-time oystermen is directed. Furthermore, the AC suggested an economic analysis of landings from specific areas would better contextualize the potential impact of large-scale closures as suggested in the initial draft of the mechanical harvest issue paper.

An analysis of trip ticket data was added to the base plan illustrating relative landings contribution of the top 25% of participants in the oyster mechanical fishery. These data, along with the number of participants from 2010 to 2023, were added to the Mechanical Harvest section. It is important to note that Trip Ticket data are assigned to major water bodies (e.g., Pamlico Sound, Neuse River), but not at a finer detail to allow for spatial analysis on fishing effort by top contributors.

The AC emphasized the importance of water quality and its importance to the oyster fishery. Because water quality issues are explored extensively in the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan and enforced by the Division of Water Resources, the AC suggested strengthening the tie to the CHPP in the base plan. The AC also brought up the difficulty of reporting shellfish die-offs. AC members from the commercial shellfish sector expressed interest in developing a mechanism for anonymous reporting of observed die-offs. Currently, there is a way to report fish kills, but no easy, online mechanism to report shellfish die-offs.

The AC suggested the table of fish species found on oyster reefs should include the current stock status of each species to further stress the indirect benefits of oyster reefs on other fisheries.

Throughout the workshop, the importance of geospatial data was highlighted. Members of the AC wished to see all available historical and modern mapping data of naturally occurring oyster reefs. When discussing the cost of resources needed to map Pamlico Sound, the AC recommended that exploring novel mapping methods should be added to the list of research needs.

Habitat and Enhancement Programs

The AC suggested including more information on the weighting and scaling of variables used in the Habitat Suitability Index model to clarify why certain areas scored higher when planning cultch and sanctuary sites. On this topic, the AC sought more detail on the Army Corps permit used for planning cultch planting as it constrains where material can be planted.

As it pertains to the cultch planting program, the AC suggested elaborating on the status of the state's shell supply, including why the resource might be shipped to other states. AC members highlighted that further detail on this topic would lay out the framework put in place by other states for keeping shell resources in-state.

The cultch planting program also conducts monitoring of oyster spat recruitment on newly constructed reefs. The AC emphasized the importance of this dataset and its potential contribution to a future stock assessment. The AC expressed interest in that dataset being analyzed and reported within the next FMP iteration.

Mechanical Oyster Harvest

For areas in Pamlico Sound that are subject to in-season management triggers, the AC felt strongly about including more information about current trigger sampling methods. The NCDMF plans to revamp trigger sampling methodology regardless of which management strategies are selected in Amendment 5. To this end, the AC supported revisiting the trigger sampling procedure, though they were made aware that this effort was not tied to adoption of Amendment 5.

As it pertains to the large-scale, rotational harvest site proposed in this issue paper, AC members were largely supportive of formalizing the cultch program as a management strategy and expressed the desire for increased planting efforts.

Additionally, during discussion of cultch sites, the AC pointed out there is currently no easy way to distinguish where oysters had been harvested in landings data. The AC expressed interest in assigning location codes to harvest areas and including a field for reporting if oysters were harvested at a cultch site or natural reef as part of data collection efforts.

Another approach outlined in this issue paper was to establish deep-water closure areas. AC members recognized the importance of vertical relief for the growth of oyster reefs, however, there was no consensus for the recommended extent of these closure areas. While some believed these deep-water areas are still harvestable, albeit about once every eight years, others believed extensive closures are necessary to counter the impacts of mechanical gear on natural reefs.

Intertidal Oyster Harvest

No proposed management changes to the intertidal oyster hand harvest industry were brought to the AC workshop. Rather the draft of this information paper further highlighted the same data gaps described in other Amendment 5 issue papers. Currently, there is no approved methodology for assessing important oyster metrics along intertidal habitats, which prevents completion of a stock assessment. Members of the AC recognized the importance of filling current data gaps related to North Carolina's oyster resource. As fishery independent data is required for a stock assessment, the AC emphasized the importance of researching intertidal sentinel sites. Currently, the NCDMF is working to

establish and monitor sentinel sites to estimate oyster metrics in intertidal areas in the southern part of the state. Additionally, the AC suggested another research priority in southern cultch sites whereby alternative materials be tested for oyster recruitment as marl limestone has demonstrated limited recruitment for commercial oyster harvest. Due to limited shell availability, other materials besides marl should be considered for future cultch planting efforts.

Recreational Shellfish Harvest

AC members recognized the potential widespread impact of recreational shellfish collection, particularly with high tourism occurring along the coast and harvest efforts have mostly been undocumented. The AC workshop further highlighted the importance of understanding this impact as recreational harvest estimates would be necessary for completion of a stock assessment. AC members recognized the potential scale of recreational harvest and the importance of filling the data gap. As such, the AC voiced their support for taking steps to collect these data, either through a survey or temporary permit, until a recreational license could be put in place. Additionally, the AC identified having such a system in place would improve public education of safe harvest practices and reduce consumption during warm months. Listing public health as a concern furthered the discussion on the potential economic impact Vibrio cases might have on North Carolina's shellfish fisheries. Ultimately, the AC agreed that a nominal permit would be a great step before a license to promote education and to collect recreational data.

Appendix 7: SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT RECCOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENT

Table 7.1. Summary of management recommendations from NCDMF, the Northern, Southern, Shellfish & Crustacean, and Habitat & Water Quality Advisory Committees (AC).

	NCDMF	Northern AC	Southern AC	Shellfish & Crustacean AC	Habitat & Water Quality AC
Appendix 1: Recreational Shellfish Harvest					
Recreational License or Permit for Shellfish	Support the MFC to task the DMF with exploring options outside of the FMP process for developing a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to create a mechanism for providing recreational participants with SSRWQ health and safety information.	Support the MFC to task the DMF with exploring options outside of the FMP process for developing a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to create a mechanism for providing recreational participants with SSRWQ health and safety information.	Support the MFC to task the DMF with exploring options outside of the FMP process for developing a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to create a mechanism for providing recreational participants with SSRWQ health and safety information.	Support the MFC to task the DMF with exploring options outside of the FMP process for developing a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to create a mechanism for providing recreational participants with SSRWQ health and safety information.	Support the MFC to task the DMF with exploring options outside of the FMP process for developing a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to create a mechanism for providing recreational participants with SSRWQ health and safety information.
Appendix 2: Mechanical Oyster Harvest					
Deep Water Recovery Areas (DORAs)	Adopt the proposed Pamlico and Neuse River DORAs which are bound by existing navigational aids as presented to the regional ACs.	Recommended maintaining status quo and did not support adopting DORAs as a management strategy because of the unknown advantages and known disadvantages to the commercial industry.	Supported a significantly narrower approach to DORAs with the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the closures before considering closing the majority of the area.	Recommended maintaining status quo and did not support adopting DORAs as a management strategy.	Adopt the proposed Pamlico and Neuse River DORAs which are bound by existing navigational aids as presented to the regional ACs.

Cultch Supported Harvest	Adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy outlined in the issue paper.	Adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy outlined in the issue paper. with the intent to streamline and adapt the trigger sampling procedure.	Adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy outlined in the issue paper.	Adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy outlined in the issue paper.	Adopt the Cultch Supported Harvest strategy outlined in the issue paper.
Adaptive Management to Cultch Supported Harvest	Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework.	Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework.	Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework.	Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework.	Adopt the proposed adaptive management framework.
Rotational Harvest Cultch Sites	Adopt the inclusion of Rotational Harvest Cultch sites as a management strategy as described in the issue paper.	Adopt the inclusion of Rotational Harvest Cultch sites as a management strategy as described in the issue paper.	Adopt the inclusion of Rotational Harvest Cultch sites as a management strategy as described in the issue paper.	Adopt the inclusion of Rotational Harvest Cultch sites as a management strategy as described in the issue paper.	Adopt the inclusion of Rotational Harvest Cultch sites as a management strategy as described in the issue paper.

Online Eastern Oyster Amendment 5 Public Questionnaire

The online Eastern Oyster Amendment 5 Public Questionnaire opened on December 11, 2024, and closed January 15, 2025. In total, the questionnaire had 8 participants, 6 of which left comments pertaining specifically to the draft of Amendment 5 to the Eastern Oyster Fishery Management Plan.

Comments to the open response questionnaire were mixed when it came to implementing deep water recovery areas (DORAs) in Pamlico Sound. Three responders voiced their opposition to closure areas. Both cited that die-offs occur in these areas as a result of hurricanes and water quality issues, and that oyster production in is cyclical in these areas. One additional commentor also advocated against closure of large areas but suggested being amenable to a smaller closure area. One of these responders requested additional cultch planting and suggested improved involvement of local oystermen for future site selection.

One responder for both plans suggested stocking clams and oysters to help rebuild natural populations while allowing for continued traditional harvest methods. The same responder also expressed opposition to further public water leases and advocated for stricter labeling of farmed shellfish.

Another responder expressed the need for regulations that promote sustainable practices, specifically aquaculture and protecting wild shellfish populations from bottom disturbing gear.

DECISION DOCUMENT

Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan
Amendment 3

This document was developed by the Division of Marine Fisheries to help the Marine Fisheries Commission track previous activity and prepare for upcoming actions for the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3.

February 2025

Summary

At the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) business meeting in February 2025, public comments, AC recommendations, and North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) final management recommendations for the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3 will be presented. At that meeting, the MFC will consider this input and select their preferred management options. The draft FMP will then be updated accordingly and sent out for review to the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Quality and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Agriculture and Natural and Economic Resources (N.C. General Statute § 113-182.1(e)).

Background

The Hard Clam FMP is undergoing its five-year review. Since there is no stock assessment for status determination, the goal is to manage the resource to maintain the species population to provide long-term harvest and continue to offer protection and ecological benefits to North Carolina estuaries. Only wild clam harvest issues and management strategies are considered in Amendment 3.

A joint issue that will also be addressed in Amendment 5 of the Eastern Oyster FMP is recreational shellfish harvest. Recreational shellfish harvest does not require a license in NC, resulting in the inability of the DMF to adequately collect recreational landings data. This data gap has been cited as a major need in all past FMPs and needs to be addressed to account for all removals from the populations. These data are needed for future stock assessments of Hard Clams and Eastern Oysters. Additionally, shellfish harvest is subject to changing area closures due to human health and safety concerns. Without licensing or permitting requirements, the DMF is unable to ensure that every recreational harvester is informed of shellfish sanitation concerns. The draft FMP contains an issue paper outlining the broad need to capture recreational harvest sector information and have an effective means to provide health and safety information to all recreational shellfish harvesters.

The mechanical clam fishery is highly managed to very specific areas for operation during a season opening in early December through March. Over time, some of the mechanical clam harvest areas have been encroached by SAV and oyster rocks. Since the last amendment in 2017, modifications to the mechanical clam harvest areas have occurred in Core Sound and North River, along with discontinued use in Bogue Sound. Historically, the use of mechanical gear to harvest clams made up an important portion of total clam harvest. However, mechanical clam harvest fishery from public bottoms has sharply declined since the 1990s, reaching historic lows in both participation and landings.

The Hard Clam FMP Amendment 2 included a management strategy to allow harvesters access to clams before maintenance dredging. This allowance continues through Rule 15A NCAC 03K .0301 (b); and through communication with the US Army Corps of Engineers on

their schedule to ensure timely notification of dredging activities. This activity has not occurred since 2007.

Historically significant, the mechanical clam fishery has seen substantial reductions due to habitat impacts, pollution, market changes, and environmental events. With significant habitat concerns regarding SAV and oyster beds, diminishing economic value, and high management costs, management options for the fishery's future are provided.

Amendment Timing

(gray indicates completed step)

September 2023	DMF holds public scoping period
November 2023	MFC approves goal and objectives of FMP
December 2023 – June 2024	DMF drafts FMP
July 2024	DMF held workshop to review and further develop the draft FMP with the Oyster/Clam FMP Advisory Committee
August – November 2024	DMF updates draft plan
November 2024	MFC Reviews draft and votes on sending draft FMP for public and AC review
January 2025	MFC Regional and Standing Advisory Committees meet to review draft FMP and receive public comment
February 2025	**MFC selects preferred management options**
March – April 2025	DEQ Secretary and Legislative review of draft FMP
May 2025	MFC votes on final adoption of FMP
TBD	DMF and MFC implement management strategies

You are here

Goal and Objectives

The goal of the Hard Clam FMP is to manage the Hard Clam resource to provide long-term harvest and continue to offer protection and ecological benefits to North Carolina's estuaries. To achieve this goal, it is recommended that the following objectives be met:

- Use the best available biological, environmental, habitat, fishery, social, and economic data to effectively monitor and manage the Hard Clam fishery and its environmental role.
- Manage Hard Clam harvesting gear use to minimize damage to the habitat.
- Coordinate with DEQ and stakeholders to implement actions that protect habitat and environmental quality consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) recommendations.

- Promote stewardship of the resource through public outreach to increase public awareness regarding the ecological value of Hard Clams and encourage stakeholder involvement in fishery management and habitat enhancement activities.

Management Measures

Management Carried Forward in Amendment 3

There are management measures from the previous FMP to carry forward into Amendment 3 unless otherwise changed in Amendment 3. Management measures related to mechanical clam harvest would only be carried forward if the MFC selects the option of status quo for that fishery under Option 2 in the next section of this Decision Document. The remaining management measures from the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 2 that will be carried forward into Amendment 3 are listed below:

- Daily harvest limit for recreational purposes is 100 clams per person per day not to exceed 200 per clams per vessel per day.
- Implement shading requirements for clams on a vessel, during transport to a dealer, or storage on a dock during June through September. These requirements would be implemented as a public health protection measure under 15A NCAC 03K .0110.
- Maintain management of the Ward Creek Shellfish Management Area as described in the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 1.
- Maintain current daily mechanical Hard Clam harvest limits by waterbody (**Error! Reference source not found.**).
- Discontinue the mechanical clam harvest rotation between Pamlico Sound and Core Sound.
- Institute a resting period within the mechanical clam harvest area in the northern part of Core Sound.
- Take latitude/longitude coordinates of the poles marking the open mechanical clam harvest area boundary in the New River, still with the flexibility to move a line to avoid critical habitats.
- Maintain management of the mechanical clam harvest in existing areas from Core Sound south to Topsail Sound, including modifications to the mechanical clam harvest lines to exclude areas where oyster habitat and SAV habitat exist based on all available information.

Management Options, Ordered by Issue

(Options recommended by DMF are outlined in blue)

Recreational Harvest

Implementing a licensing or permitting requirement for recreational shellfish harvesters would give the DMF the opportunity to adequately collect recreational landings data needed for future stock assessments of Hard Clams and Eastern Oysters, and to inform participants of where to find information on harvest closure boundaries, where to sign up to receive polluted area proclamations or to access temporary closure maps, and where to find information on safe handling practices, particularly as it relates to *Vibrio* bacteria.

To pursue any of these solutions, significant time and effort will be needed to assess internal program and resource capabilities and limitations. Any legislative changes require a specific process and are ultimately out of DMF or MFC control. Given these constraints, DMF recommends exploring potential options and solutions outside of the FMP process.

Option 1: Recreational Harvest

(Refer to pp. 68-75 in the Draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3, Appendix 2 for additional details)

a. Status Quo

b. Support the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to estimate recreational shellfish participation and landings, with the intent to move towards a stock assessment and stock level management for both hard clams and oysters; and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

Mechanical Clam Harvest

Due to the requirements of G.S. 113-221 (d), it is unlikely that the mechanical clam harvest fishery could be ended immediately upon adoption of this amendment. An immediate closure of this fishery could "result in severe curtailment of the usefulness or value of equipment in which fishermen have any substantial investment" as outlined in statute. This would require "a future effective date so as to minimize undue potential economic loss to fishermen". As such, the DMF did not develop the immediate end to the mechanical clam harvest fishery. Other possible management options include, but are not limited to, status quo, further limiting mechanical clam harvest areas, and phasing out the fishery. These management options would only affect mechanical clam harvest from public bottom and would not affect their use on private bottom.

Status quo would allow the fishery to continue to operate as it currently does. The fishermen currently operating in the fishery could continue, and new harvesters could join. The cost to the state for demarcation and enforcement would remain the same, making up a significant cost compared to the total value of the fishery. Concerns about effects of bottom disturbing gears on structured habitats would not be addressed

Mechanical clam harvest areas could be further limited to create boundaries that are more easily enforceable that also create buffers around critical habitat to protect them from sedimentation associated with bottom disturbing gears, as was done in the North River (See Figure 22 in the draft FMP). To improve enforceability the boundaries would be based on permanent structures or known geographic features, be rectangular or rhomboid in shape without zig-zagging lines and have complete line of sight visibility. As with status quo, fishermen currently operating in the fishery could continue, and new harvesters could join. The cost to the state for demarcation would be reduced, but the resources required for enforcement would likely remain the same, making up a significant cost compared to the total value of the fishery. This would help address habitat concerns, but sedimentation would still occur from mechanical harvesting operations.

The mechanical clam harvest fishery could be phased out over a set timeframe, as was done with the shellfish relay program. This option would allow fishermen currently operating in the fishery to continue during the phase out period but would discourage new participants. The phase out period would allow current mechanical harvesters time to get rid of gear and transition to other clam harvesting methods or fisheries. This option would address habitat concerns, as well as cost concerns with demarcation and enforcement. This option is consistent with G.S. 113-221 (d), as it gives "a future effective date so as to minimize undue potential economic loss to fishermen".

After hearing concerns from the FMP Advisory Committee about participants wanting the ability to re-enter the fishery, the DMF developed an option for a phase out timeframe of three years from adoption of this amendment unless minimum participation and landings increases occur in the fishery in any year prior to 2027. This increase in participation and landings would show the fishery is no longer diminishing. Historical fisheries data were examined to develop potential thresholds for the minimum participation and landings that would signal renewed participation in the fishery. A reasonable threshold for participants in the mechanical clam harvest fishery on public bottom is ten participants. Ten participants have not been active in a single year in the fishery since 2017 and is over three times the number of active participants in 2022 (three participants), but still less than a tenth of the peak participation in 1996 (132 participants). A reasonable threshold for landings in the mechanical clam harvest fishery on public bottom is one-million clams. The fishery has not landed over one million clams since 2014 (1.5 million clams) and the threshold is over six times the number landed in 2022 (less than 200,000 clams), but still less than an eighth of the peak landings in 1995 (8.2 million clams). In this option, if both thresholds are met in any single year prior to January 2027, the issue would be brought back to the MFC for consideration at their next business meeting. The MFC would decide whether to move forward with phase out of the fishery. This timing ensures that if the phase out continues as planned, fishermen would still have three years to sell their gear and exit the fishery before the phase out is complete and the fishery closes in 2028, which would be consistent with G.S. 113-221 (d).

There is a potential that setting participation and landing thresholds that trigger reconsideration by the MFC for phasing out the fishery may have an unintended consequence. Fishermen may re-enter this fishery in the near term in an effort to maintain it as an option in the long term. Based on the habitat degradation effects of mechanical clam harvest, along with the aforementioned DMF resources needed for demarcation and enforcement of management areas, the DMF recommends the phasing out of this gear within three years without triggers for reconsideration of the phase out.

Discontinuing the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging could also be considered. This would end a program that has not been utilized since 2007. This option could be pursued on its own, or in conjunction with a closure or phase out of the whole fishery. This would require a change to rule 15A NCAC 03K .0301 (b). ending the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging activities.

Option 1: Mechanical Clam Harvest

(Refer to pp. 55-67 in the Draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3, Appendix 1 for additional details)

a. Status Quo
b. Further limit mechanical clam harvest areas to improve enforceability and protect habitat
c. Phase out mechanical clam harvest in three years (May 2028) to be consistent with G.S. 113-221 (d) unless two metrics are met that signify increased participation and landings in the fishery
d. Phase out mechanical clam harvest in three years (May 2028) to be consistent with G.S. 113-221 (d)

Option 2: Mechanical Clam Harvest in Conjunction with Maintenance Dredging

(Refer to pp. 55-67 in the Draft Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3, Appendix 1 for additional details)

a. Status Quo
b. Discontinue allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging upon adoption of this plan

Division of Marine Fisheries Recommendations

A summary of the DMF's final recommendations can be found below.

Recreational Harvest

Support the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality (SSRWQ) health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

Mechanical Clam Harvest

The DMF recommends a phase out to be completed three years from the adoption of this plan. The DMF also recommends the immediate end to the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging.

Next Steps

Comments received during the comment period and AC recommendations, as well as the DMF's final management recommendations, will be presented to the MFC during their February 2025 business meeting. At that meeting, the MFC will consider this input and select their preferred management options. The draft FMP will then be updated accordingly and sent out for review to the Secretary of the Department of Environmental Quality and the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Agriculture and Natural and Economic Resources (N.C. General Statute § 113-182.1(e)). After this final review, the MFC will vote on the final adoption of measures for the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3 at their May 2025 business meeting.

HARD CLAM
FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN
AMENDMENT 3

North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality
North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street / P. O. Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557

This document may be cited as:

NCDMF (North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries). 2025. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 84 p.

Disclaimer: Data in this Fishery Management Plan may have changed since publication based on updates to source documents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Amendment 3 to the North Carolina (NC) Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan (FMP) was developed by the NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ), Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) under the auspices of the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) with the advice of the Shellfish Advisory Committee (AC). Deserving special recognition are the members of the Shellfish AC and the NCDMF Plan Development Team (PDT) who contributed their time and knowledge to this effort.

Fishery Management Plan Advisory Committee

	Thomas Edward Newman III
Barry Martee Hodowanic	Brandon Joel Puckett
Perry Allen McMahon	Abby Elizabeth Williams
Brassai Marie Mustin	Herman (Wayne) Dunbar

Oyster/Clam Plan Development Team

Greg Allen	Casey Knight	Jason Peters
Brooke Anderson	Cara Kowalchyk	Steve Poland
Alan Bianchi	Melinda Lambert	Jason Rock
Clay Caroon	Christopher Lee	Brandi Salmon
Anne Deaton	Chearin Lewis	Catherine J Schlick
Charlie Deaton	Tina Moore (Mentor)	Chris Stewart
Lorena de la Garza (Clam Co-Lead)	Doug Munroe	Andrew Valmassoi
Jeffrey Dobbs (Clam Co-Lead)	Sara Pace	Jason Walsh
Joe Facendola (Oyster Co-Lead)	Bennett Paradis (Oyster Co-Lead)	Meredith Whitten
Zach Harrison	Lee Paramore	Carter Witten
Daniel Ipock	Blaine Parker	Dan Zapf

The following Division staff were also invaluable in assisting with the development of this document: Kathy Rawls, Mike Loeffler, Catherine Blum, and the many reviewers of the multiple drafts of this plan. Also grateful for the administrative support from Deborah Manley, Michelle Brodeur, and Patricia Smith.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*** added before secretarial review**

INTRODUCTION

This is Amendment 3 to the Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan (FMP). FMPs are the ultimate product that brings all information and management considerations into one document. The N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) prepares FMPs for adoption by the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC) for all commercially and recreationally significant species or fisheries that comprise state marine or estuarine resources. The goal of these plans is to ensure long-term viability of these fisheries. By law, each FMP must be reviewed at least once every five years (G.S. 113-182.1). The NCDMF reviews each FMP annually and a comprehensive review is undertaken approximately every five years. The last comprehensive review of the plan (Amendment 2) was approved by the NCMFC) in 2017. All management authority for the North Carolina Hard Clam fishery is vested in the State of North Carolina. The NCMFC adopts rules and policies and implements management measures for the Hard Clam fishery in Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters in accordance with G.S. 113-182.1. Until Amendment 3 is approved for management, Hard Clams are currently managed under Amendment 2 (NCDMF 2017).

The status of the Hard Clam stock in North Carolina is unknown due to data limitations preventing the NCDMF from conducting a Hard Clam stock assessment and calculating sustainable harvest metrics. Data available for the stock are commercial landings, data collected from fish houses, and an annual recreational survey. Data is obtained from the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program, where catch rates are estimated for both hand and mechanical harvest. Landing trends will reflect population abundance to an extent, but other factors like market demand, regulations, changes in effort and gear technology also affect trends (NCDMF 2017).

For more information about previous and current management, see the original Hard Clam FMP (NCDMF 2001) and the previous amendments, all of which are available on the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries Fishery Management website.

Fishery Management Plan History

Original FMP Adoption:	2001
Amendments:	Amendment 1 (2008)
	Amendment 2 (2017)
Revisions:	None
Supplements:	None
Information Updates:	None
Schedule Changes:	None
Next Comprehensive Review:	Five years after adoption of Amendment 3

Past versions or revisions of the Hard Clam FMP (NCDMF 2001, 2008, 2017) are available on the NCDMF website: Fishery Management Plans | NC DEQ

Management Unit

Includes the Hard Clam, *Mercenaria mercenaria*, and its fisheries in all Coastal and Joint Fishing Waters of coastal North Carolina. G.S. 113-221.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of the N.C. Hard Clam FMP is to manage the Hard Clam resource to provide long-term harvest and continue to offer protection and ecological benefits to North Carolina's estuaries. To achieve this goal, it is recommended that the following objectives be met:

- Use the best available biological, environmental, habitat, fishery, social, and economic data to effectively monitor and manage the Hard Clam fishery and its environmental role.
- Manage Hard Clam harvesting gear use to minimize damage to the habitat.
- Coordinate with DEQ and stakeholders to implement actions that protect habitat and environmental quality consistent with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) recommendations.
- Promote stewardship of the resource through public outreach to increase public awareness regarding the ecological value of Hard Clams and encourage stakeholder involvement in fishery management and habitat enhancement activities.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STOCK

Biological profile

General life history

DISTRIBUTION

The Hard Clam, *Mercenaria mercenaria*, is a large bivalve distributed along the east coast of North America from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada to the central coast of eastern

Florida (Harte 2001, Abbott 1986, Mackenzie et al. 2002). This species has been transplanted in the northwest Pacific (Crane et al. 1975, Carlton 1992, Chew 2001), Puerto Rico, Europe (Heppell 1961, Chew 2001), China (Chavanich et al. 2010), and Japan (Hiwatari et al. 2006). Another species, *M. campechiensis*, also known as the Southern Quahog, inhabits ocean waters off North Carolina and occurs mainly from North Carolina to Florida (Hadley and Coen 2006). The Hard Clam is not native to the Gulf of Mexico (Abbott 1986); however, a subspecies, *M. mercenaria texana*, and *M. campechiensis* inhabit the Gulf Coast and have been mistaken for *M. mercenaria* (Dillon and Manzi 1989a,b).

Common names for *M. mercenaria* include Hard Clam, Quahog, Quahaug, Northern Quahog, Littleneck Clam, and Cherrystone Clam. Hard Clams occur throughout the south Atlantic region in estuaries from the intertidal zone to depths exceeding 18 m (Abbott 1974; Eversole et al. 1987). In North Carolina, Hard Clams are most abundant in higher salinity waters inside the barrier islands from Ocracoke southward to the South Carolina border (NCDMF shellfish bottom mapping data, unpublished). Hard Clams are found near Oregon and Hatteras inlets and the western side of Pamlico Sound, but are much less abundant compared to clams that inhabit waters inside and south of Ocracoke Island.

HABITAT PREFERENCES AND TOLERANCES

Hard Clams occupy mostly shallow, estuarine environments and can inhabit a variety of sediment types, including sand or muddy sediments, bare, course substrates, as well as seagrass and near oyster beds (Wells 1957, Roegner and Mann 1991, Harte 2001). Localized adult population densities can vary considerably, ranging from small patches to extensive beds, and density is dependent on many environmental factors, including organic content and composition of sediment and localized flow (Fegley 2001). Experimental and field studies have shown that areas with heterogeneous substrate mixtures of sand or mud with shell or gravel often support more clams than homogeneous substrates as the larger substrate can act as a spatial predator refuge (Anderson et al. 1978, Arnold et al. 1984). Increased densities and survivorship have also been observed for Hard Clams that inhabit seagrass beds (Peterson et al. 1984; Peterson 1986b).

Hard Clams have a wide temperature and salinity tolerance which likely contributes to their extensive species range and successful transplantations worldwide. Adult Hard Clams can tolerate temperatures between -6 and 35°C (21.2 and 95°F; Stanley and Dewitt 1983); below freezing temperatures, subtidal clams have a higher survival rate than those exposed in the intertidal areas (Eversole et al. 1987). Growth rates of Hard Clams are most favorable at water temperatures around 20°C (68°F) and growth ceases at 9°C (48.2°F) and 31°C (87.8°F; Ansell 1968; Eversole et al. 1986). Hard Clams have been found in waters with salinity ranging from 4 to over 35 parts per thousand (ppt) but cannot survive extended periods in salinities less than about 12 ppt. Growth is optimal at salinities from 24 to 28 ppt for adults (Chestnut 1951a) and 26 to 27 ppt for larval growth and survival to settlement (Davis 1958, Davis and Calabrese 1964). Hard Clams cease siphoning water below 15 and above 40 ppt (Hamwi 1968), or below about 4°C (39.2°F; Loosanoff 1937) and above 34°C (93.2°F; Roegner and Mann 1991), and will close their

valves tightly during periods of stress and respire anaerobically to reduce mortality (Eversole et al. 1987).

Adequate water circulation is essential for successful growth and recruitment of Hard Clams. Water currents move food, maintain water quality, remove waste, and transport eggs and larvae in the water column (Eversole et al. 1986). Hard Clams obtain food by filtering suspended particulate matter and absorbing dissolved organics directly from the water. Larvae and adult Hard Clams can select their food and regulate the quality and quantity of food they consume. Hard Clams adapt well to a changing food supply, but are sensitive to the presence or absence of particular algal species that can affect growth (Eversole et al. 1986; Eversole et al. 1987). More detailed habitat and water quality information is available in the Environmental Factors section.

REPRODUCTIVE BIOLOGY

The gametogenic and spawning cycle of the Hard Clam varies with latitude (Eversole et al. 1984; Eversole et al. 1987). Spawning occurs in North Carolina from spring through fall, when water temperatures reach 20°C (68°F; Loosanoff and Davis 1950; Porter 1964). Spawning clams release eggs and sperm through the exhalent siphon into the water where fertilization occurs and rapid development begins. The first larval stage is the trochophore stage that lasts about a day, followed by several veliger/pediveliger stages that last approximately 20 days. Juvenile clams (spat) settle along edges of sandbars and channels where varying water currents occur (Carriker 1959). Hard Clams will also settle in substrates with shell and subtidal vegetation. These substrates appear to have better conditions for spat survival than unstructured substrates because they offer protection from predators (Kerswill 1941; Wells 1957; MacKenzie 1977; Peterson 1982).

Precursors to both male and female sex cells are found in the gonads of juveniles (Eversole 2001). During the juvenile stage, gonadal cells differentiate and clams develop predominately as males. As adults, many clams transform into females. The sex ratio of adult clams is approximately 1:1 across its geographical range (Eversole 2001).

Sexual maturity in Hard Clams tends to be a function of size not age, therefore maturity is dependent on growth. Sexual maturity is usually reached during the second to third year at a shell length of 1.3 inches (33 mm), but faster growing clams may mature at an earlier age (Eversole et al. 1987). The legally harvestable size of one-inch thick (25.4 mm) is typically reached by age two to five with three as a reasonable average expectation in North Carolina (C. Peterson, UNC Institute of Marine Science, personal communication).

Although estimates vary, fecundity depends on size and condition (Ansell and Loosmore 1963). Several studies have found that fecundity increased with shell length (Bricelj and Malouf 1980; Peterson 1983; Eversole et al. 1984; Peterson 1986a). Reproductive senescence is often common in long-lived species but there is no evidence that reproductive production declines with age in Hard Clams (Peterson 1983; Peterson 1986a). Hard Clams occur in aggregations over a wide area, and close proximity of adults is important for successful reproduction to occur in organisms that spawn in the water column (Peterson 2002). Because Hard Clams have limited mobility, spawning efficiency could be reduced in areas where harvest has caused a significant decrease in number

and size of Hard Clams within these aggregations. Reduced spawning efficiency could affect future recruitment in Hard Clam populations (Fegley 2001; Peterson 2002).

SIZE STRUCTURE, AGE, AND GROWTH

Hard Clam populations exhibit a wide size range of individuals (Fegley 2001). Growth rates of Hard Clams are highly variable and depend on water temperature, habitat, food availability, and genetics (Ansell 1968; Pratt and Campbell 1956; Chanley 1958; Peterson et al. 1983; Peterson et al. 1985; Arnold et al. 1991). Shell growth is greatest during the first year after which growth decreases as age increases (Eversole et al. 1986; Eversole et al. 1987).

Age can be determined by direct examination of annual growth lines within the shell. Age frequency distributions differ widely among sites within and between regions (Fegley 2001). There is also variation in the age of similar-sized clams even within the same habitat (Peterson et al. 1984; Rice et al. 1989; Fegley 2001). The maximum age seen in North Carolina is 46 years old (Peterson 1986a); however, the maximum life span of this species can exceed 100 years (Ridgway et al. 2011).

Shell growth patterns vary by latitude. North Carolina shell growth follows a southern growth pattern where light bands form during the winter months when animals are growing the fastest and dark band form during the late summer to fall months when growth is slowest, resulting in annual banding patterns (Peterson et al. 1983; Jones et al. 1990; Arnold et al. 1991, Goodwin et al. 2021). The opposite shell pattern growth is observed in northern latitudes (i.e., Connecticut to Massachusetts and England) where a dark band forms during the colder winter months, and a light band forms during the warmer months. At the middle part of the geographical range (i.e., New Jersey) shell pattern banding follows the “northern” banding pattern during the first several years of growth and then takes on a more “southern” banding pattern as they age (Fritz 2001). Unlike in other areas of their geographic range where growth ceases during certain times of the year, mature Hard Clams in North Carolina are capable of depositing shell material throughout the entire year, suggesting the species may serve as an important sclerochronological archive, documenting some of the most complete records of intra-annual environment conditions in their shells (Goodwin et al. 2021).

BIOLOGICAL STRESSORS

Few data are available on direct predation rates on larval Hard Clams (Kraeuter 2001), but high natural mortality in the larval stages suggest predation is probably high during this life stage. Newly set or juvenile Hard Clams (<1 mm shell length) are vulnerable to many predators. Primary predators of juvenile Hard Clams include Snapping Shrimp (*Alpheus heterochaelis*), Mud Crab (*Dyspanopeus sayi*), and Blue Crab (*Callinectes sapidus*; Beal 1983; Kraeuter 2001). Stone Crabs (*Menippe mercenaria*) are effective predators of both juvenile and adult Hard Clams, capable of opening large Hard Clams (30-60 mm shell length) that typically cannot be preyed on by Blue Crabs, and the abundance of Stone Crabs in North Carolina has been increasing since 2000 (Wong et al. 2010). Several types of snails (*Urosalpinx* sp*., Polinices* sp.), whelks (*Busycon* sp.), Cownose Rays (*Rhinoptera bonasus*), and various birds feed on adult Hard Clams

(Kraeuter and Castagna 1980; Kraeuter 2001). As Hard Clams grow the number of potential predators is reduced (Kraeuter 2001). Hard Clam survival from predation is affected by sediment characteristics such as presence of shell fragments and seagrasses, and presence of other prey species (Peterson 1982; Peterson 1986b; Kraeuter 2001).

Infectious diseases can result in devastating losses of wild populations of some mollusks but Hard Clams appear to be relatively disease free and studies of captive populations show that non-predation losses are typically only 5% to 10% per year (Eldridge and Eversole 1982; Eversole et al. 1987; Bower et al. 1994). QPX (Quahog Parasite X = Unknown) is a parasite found in Hard Clams along the eastern coast of North American from Atlantic Canada to Virginia (Smolowitz et al. 1998; Dahl et al. 2011). QPX disease has not been identified in Hard Clams south of Virginia (Dahl et al. 2011) and a 2011 study confirmed QPX disease is a cold-water infection and not likely to occur in North Carolina because of warmer waters that impedes development of this disease in Hard Clams (Dahl et al. 2011).

Many large-scale Hard Clam mortalities along the northeastern United States and Canada are related to air exposure during extreme cold events and negative impacts from stress associated with parasites (Smolowitz et al. 1998). Diseases in larval and juvenile Hard Clams held in culture conditions are often caused by bacteria, fungi, and viruses that are common in the cultured bivalves and are associated with opportunistic invaders of animals under stress in high-density culture situations (Ford 2001).

Anthropogenic activities can also affect Hard Clam populations. Physical disturbances including bulkhead and dock construction, boat scarring, and dredging, can disrupt the sediment and increase turbidity (Bricelj et al. 2017), which can negatively impact Hard Clam feeding and growth. Additionally, extensive dredging can change bottom topography and flow patterns (Bricelj et al. 2017), which can alter food availability and larval distribution. Propeller wash from boat traffic may also displace sediment that can expose clams and increase their vulnerability to predators, and clam larvae that go through the propeller and engine cooling system are at risk of damage. Furthermore, toxic compounds from pressure-treated wood used to construct new docks, piers, and bulkheads leach into the water and accumulate in the sediment (Weis and Weis 1996). New construction often occurs in the spring, coinciding with Hard Clam spawning ,which can expose Hard Clam larvae to toxic leachates (Bricelj et al. 2017).

Stock Unit

The unit stock is considered all Hard Clams occurring within North Carolina coastal waters.

Assessment Methodology

Data are not available to perform a traditional assessment, so it was not possible to estimate population size or fishing mortality rates.

Stock Status
Data limitations prevent the NCDMF from conducting a Hard Clam stock assessment and calculating sustainable harvest metrics. Currently, the only data available for the stock in most areas are commercial landings, fishery dependent data, and the annual recreational harvest survey. Amendment 2 of the FMP recommends the status continue to be defined as unknown due to the continued lack of data needed to conduct a reliable assessment of the stock. The statutory obligation to manage Hard Clams according to sustainable harvest cannot be met until the appropriate data are collected.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FISHERY

Additional analyses and discussion of North Carolina's commercial and recreational Hard Clam fisheries can be found in earlier versions of the Hard Clam FMP (NCDMF 2001, 2008, and 2017); all FMP documents are available on the NCDMF Fishery Management Plans website. Commercial and recreational landings can be found in the License and Statistics Annual Report (NCDMF 2022) on the NCDMF Fisheries Statistics website.

Discussion of socio-economic information (NCDMF 2022) describes the fishery as of 2021 and is not intended to be used to predict potential impacts from management changes. This and other information pertaining to FMPs are included to help inform decision-making regarding the long-term viability of the state's commercially and recreationally significant species and fisheries. For a detailed explanation of the methodology used to estimate economic impacts, please refer to the NCDMF License and Statistics Section Annual Report (NCDMF 2022).

Commercial Fishery
Since the inception of the Trip Ticket Program (TTP) in 1994, Hard Clam data collection has continuously improved. Hard Clam landings come from both public harvest and private production, which are managed under different regulations, therefore trip numbers, landings, and effort cannot be compared between public harvest and private production. Since 2003, approximately 1% of the annual landings cannot be identified as either public harvest or private production. Much of the improvement has been from better recording and editing requirements, and from the new licensing system. In the following sections the different gear types in the fishery are separated into either public harvest or private production. Because there are some trips that could not be differentiated in the database, they were excluded from analyses.

The Hard Clam industry has provided a way to make a living and food for coastal communities along the entire Atlantic East Coast from the Canadian maritime region to Florida. Fluctuations in commercial landings are common along the Atlantic East Coast with a general trend of decline through time (Figure 1). A large part of the decline in Atlantic Coast landings occurred in the 1970's as a result of overfishing in New York and closure of shellfish beds due to bacterial pollution (MacKenzie et al. 2002). For more information on environmental pathogens, see Environmental Factors, Threats, and Alterations section.



Figure 1. Commercial Hard Clam landings (number of clams, using a conversion factor of 0.32 oz per individual; ASFMC 1992) along the Atlantic East Coast (Maine south to Florida east coast), 1950-2022. Source: NMFS commercial fisheries landings database, except for NC landings from 1994 to 2022 using TTP.

Gear Types

HAND HARVEST

The hand harvest fishery for Hard Clams is year-round in North Carolina. Hand harvesting methods include signing (spotting siphon holes), treading, hand raking, hand tonging, and bull raking. Clams are taken by hand and rake in shallow water, up to 4 feet deep (≤1.2 m) while hand tongs and bull rakes are used in deeper water up to 20 feet deep (1.2 to 12.2 m; Cunningham et al. 1992). Bull rakes have been used to exploit clam populations in New River, White Oak River, Bogue Sound, Newport River, North River, and the Intracoastal Waterway channel of Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender, and Onslow counties. Many subsistence fishermen use bull rakes in the southern area of the state.

MECHANICAL HARVEST

The two types of mechanical harvest gear currently used in North Carolina are the hydraulic escalator dredge and the clam trawl or “clam kicking” vessel. The hydraulic escalator dredge has an escalator or conveyor located on the side of the vessel. A sled is connected to the front end of the escalator. When the front end of the escalator is lowered to the bottom, the sled glides over the bottom. A blade on the sled penetrates the bottom to a depth of about four inches (10 cm) and collects the clams as they are forced from the bottom by water pressure (Cunningham et al. 1992). In clam trawling or “kicking”, clams are dislodged from the bottom with propeller backwash and a heavily chained trawl with a cage attached at the cod end towed behind the boat gathers the clams. Kick boats are generally 20 to 30 ft long and can operate in depths from 3 to 10 feet (1.0 m to 3.05

m). The propeller is usually positioned 12 to 15 inches above the bottom and extra weight can be added to the stern to improve the angle and height above the bottom. For better efficiency in varying water depths, boats include a winged rudder, which has two iron plates welded on either side of the rudder to deflect water downward (Cunningham et al. 1992). One person operates smaller kick boats, while larger boats may have a crew of two or three (Guthrie and Lewis 1982).

Historical Public Harvest Fishery

North Carolina Hard Clam harvest has fluctuated historically, often in response to changes in demand, improved harvesting techniques, and increases in polluted shellfish area closures. Hand harvest accounted for all recorded landings prior to the mid-1940s, when early forms of mechanical harvest were developed. Hand harvest is currently allowed year-round with daily harvest limits. A daily harvest limit of 6,250 clams per fishing operation from public waters was established in 1986 by proclamation and has remained in effect since (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03K .0301 (a)).

The first mechanical method for harvesting Hard Clams was known as dredging. This gear allowed fishermen to remain on board and enabled them to work in poor weather (Guthrie and Lewis 1982). Trawls were first used to harvest clams in 1968 and remain in use today in a technique known as “kicking” (Guthrie and Lewis 1982). Increased market demand and more efficient gear soon led to increased landings around the 1970s (Figure 2). Another major development in the fishery occurred in 1968 with the advent of hydraulic dredges. This gear used jets of water from a high-pressure pump to displace bottom sediments covering the clams and a conveyor carried the catch up to the vessel. Hard Clam landings remained stable through the 1960s and 1970s. Since the late 1980s, Hard Clam landings have declined. This decline may be the result of decreased abundance, increasing closures of shellfish waters from pollution, changing market demand, and storm events.

Allocation conflicts did not occur in the Hard Clam fishery until the late 1980’s as more management measures were put in place to reduce habitat impacts causing harvesters to compete more for the limited resource. Mechanical harvest methods can negatively impact submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) and oyster rocks (Peterson et al. 1987). Regulations to protect habitats from mechanical harvest methods have been in place since 1977 and mechanical harvest has largely been confined to deeper waters of the sounds and rivers. A rotation scheme for White Oak River and New River, including a portion of the Intracoastal Waterway (IWW), has been implemented annually by proclamation since the early 1980s. The intent was to prevent overharvesting of the clam stocks, discourage violations by mechanical harvesters who cross the lines in search of more lucrative clam quantities, and prevent the taking of undersized clams, or “buttons”. The NCDMF also allows harvest of clams by mechanical means in some navigational channels before maintenance dredging activities performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). For a thorough history of the Hard Clam fishery including overall history, historic landings and trends, management changes for mechanical commercial gear, length of seasons, and openings and closures of bays, please refer to Amendment 2 of the Clam FMP.

Present Public Harvest Fisheries

The current minimum size limit for clams is 1-inch thickness (width). The current daily hand harvest limit is 6,250 clams and the fishery is open year-round. Current public mechanical harvest limits vary by waterbody. In some instances, mechanical harvest areas are rotated (alternately open and closed) with other areas (Table 1). Since 2008, upon adoption of Amendment 2 to the Hard Clam FMP, Core Sound has been divided into two areas and the northern area is open every other year while the southern area is opened annually. In 2017 there were modifications to the areas in Core Sound and North River, and use of mechanical methods was prohibited in Bogue Sound due to SAV encroachment.

Table 1. Current daily mechanical Hard Clam harvest limits by waterbody.

Waterbody	Daily harvest limit (Number of clams)	Additional information
Northern Core Sound	5,000	Rotates one year open and one year closed opposite the open/close rotation of the New River
Southern Core Sound	5,000	Open annually
North River	3,750	Open annually
Newport River	3,750	Open annually
White Oak River	6,250	Rotates one year open and one year closed opposite the open/close rotation of the New River
New River	6,250	Rotates one year open and one year closed opposite the open/close rotation of Northern Core Sound, the White Oak River, and the IWW in the Onslow/Pender counties area
New River Inlet	6,250	Open annually from Marker 72A to the New River Inlet
IWW Onslow/Pender counties area	6,250	Intracoastal Waterway (maintained marked channel only) from Marker #65, south of Sallier's Bay, to Marker #49 at Morris Landing. All public bottoms within and 100 feet on either side of the Intracoastal Waterway from Marker #49 at Morris Landing to the "BC" Marker at Banks Channel. Open every other year when the New River is closed.

Annual Landings, Trips, Participation, And Market Grades

Separating Hard Clam landings data into public harvest and private production is inexact prior to 1994 because landings information was collected on a voluntary basis. Since 1994, about 88% (1994-2013 combined estimates) of the total commercial Hard Clam harvest came from public harvest areas in North Carolina. The annual number of Hard Clams from public bottom averaged 19.6 million from 1994 to 2022, but landings have

steadily declined through time. Annual landings averaged 11.7 million from 2012-2022 (Figure 2).

There are year-to-year fluctuations in the number of trips harvesting Hard Clams. The annual number of trips has declined during the time series (1994-2022), with the highest number of trips in 1994 (Figure 3). Adverse weather conditions (e.g., hurricanes, and heavy rain events) can impact the annual landings. Freshwater runoff after storm events often causes shellfish harvest area closures and therefore reduces Hard Clam harvest effort for short time periods.



Figure 2. Hard Clam landings (number of clams) from public harvest and private production showing the average annual landing trends (solid line) for specific time periods,1950-1976, 1977-1990, 1991-2004, 2005-2018, 2019-2022. TTP.



Figure 3. North Carolina annual commercial Hard Clam landings (number of clams) and trips from public harvest, 1994-2022. TTP.

New River and Core Sound are the top two waterbodies where Hard Clams are harvested from public harvest areas, accounting for 50% of the landings from 1994 to 2022 (Figure 4). Landings in the southern part of the state, including the areas of Stump Sound, Lockwood Folly, Topsail Sound, Masonboro Sound, Cape Fear River, Shallotte River and the Inland Waterway, accounted for an additional 25% of the public Hard Clam landings from 1994 to 2022.



Figure 4. Commercial Hard Clam landings (percent of total landings) by waterbody from public harvest 1994 to 2022 combined. TTP.

Clam fishery participation has declined by about 82% over the last twenty years (Figure 5). There was an increase in participation in the hand harvest fishery from 2013-2015, then a decline from over 600 participants in 2015 to less than 280 participants in 2022 (Figure 5). Hand gears have had an order of magnitude more participants across the entire time series (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Participant and trip count by gear category for Hard Clam harvest, 1994-2022. (A) mechanical gear and (B) hand gears. Data provided by the NCDMF TTP.

Hard Clam harvest is sorted by thickness (shell width) into various market grades when purchased by the seafood dealer. A mixed or unclassified market grade is the most common Hard Clam size category from public harvest and comprised 79% of the total landings from 1994 to 2022 (Figure 6a). Little neck, which consists of the smallest clams typically measuring between 1-inch (25 mm) to 1 ¼-inch (32 mm) in thickness, is the second most dominant market category of Hard Clam from public harvest (Figure 6b). Top neck is the next largest market category in size with individuals ranging from 1 ¼-inch (32 mm) to 1 ⅝-inch in thickness (41 mm). The proportion of Hard Clams graded as top necks from public harvest has remained about the same throughout the time series (6% on average; Figure 6b). Hard Clams in the cherry and top cherry market grades have a shell thickness that ranges between 1 ⅝-inch (41 mm) to 2 ¼-inches (57 mm). These two market categories have not shown much change in proportion to the total Hard Clam public harvest from 1994 to 2022, although the cherry market grade began to see a slight increase in 2017 (Figure 6b). Chowder Hard Clams are the largest market category by size and are any Hard Clams greater than 2 ¼-inch shell thickness (Figure 6b).



A.



B.

Figure 6. Annual landings (percent of total annual landings) of Hard Clams from public harvest by market grade, 1994-2022 combined. A. Mixed grade only; B. All other market grades. TTP.

HAND HARVEST

Hand harvest from public areas is a year-round fishery and has average landings of 16,274,336 clams per year (1994-2022). Most hand harvest occurs in the spring and summer when warm water is conducive to wading (Figure 7). Annual public harvest and the number of hand harvest trips per year for Hard Clams has declined overall from 1994

to 2022, except for a moderate increase from 2012 to 2014 (Figure 8). The annual catch per unit effort (CPUE; number of clams per trip) from public area hand harvest also reflects this increase from 2012 to 2014 but has subsequently dropped back down to around 600 clams per trip (Figure 9).



Figure 7. Average Hard Clam landings (number of clams) and average number of trips by month from public harvest using hand gears, 1994-2022. TTP.



Figure 8. Annual Hard Clam landings (number of clams) and trips from public harvest using hand gears, 1994-2022. TTP.



Figure 9. Annual catch per unit effort (CPUE; number of clams per trip) of hand harvest from public areas, 1994-2022. TTP.

MECHANICAL HARVEST

Mechanical harvest season usually begins the second Monday in December and extends through the week of March 31. Harvest is allowed only from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday until before the Christmas holiday and then Monday through Wednesday after December 25 for the remainder of the open harvest season.

Hard Clam landings from public harvest, using mechanical methods, has average landings of 3,319,605 clams each fishing year (1994/95 to 2021/2022). The mechanical clam harvest season usually has the highest landings at the beginning of the fishing season in December and declines as the season progresses (Figure 10). Landings outside of the usual mechanical clam harvest season are from temporary openings for the maintenance of channels and temporary openings in Core Creek when bacteriological levels are at acceptable levels to harvest clams. Hard Clam landings and trips fluctuate from fishing year to fishing year and appear to be greatly influenced by harvest from the New River mechanical harvest area (Figure 11). Mechanical clam landings have remained below 1,000,000 clams per season since 2016/2017.



Figure 10. Average Hard Clam landings (number of clams) and average number of trips by month from public harvest using mechanical gears, 1994/95-2022/March 2023. TTP.



Figure 11. Hard Clam landings (number of clams) and trips from public harvest using mechanical gears by fishing year (Dec-Nov), 1994/95-2021/2022. TTP.

Private Shellfish Culture: Shellfish Leases and Franchises

This plan does not focus on management of private shellfish culture through shellfish leases and franchises; however, detailed information on the history and management of private shellfish culture can be found in Amendment 2 of the Hard Clam FMP. It should also be noted that there is only one seed distributer in North Carolina, which hinders the growth of private shellfish culture for clams in the state.

Recreational Fishery

Hard Clams are commonly harvested recreationally year-round in North Carolina by hand and rakes. The recreational bag limit is currently 100 clams per person per day with no more than 200 clams per vessel at a minimum size of 1-inch thick.

Recreational fishing data are collected by the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP), but the survey excludes recreational shellfish data. In addition, because any North Carolina resident can purchase a low cost commercial shellfish license to take shellfish in commercial quantities for recreational purposes, harvest from a commercial shellfish license used for recreational purposes does not get recorded because it is not sold to a seafood dealer.

The NCDMF is required by the FRA to prepare an FMP for all commercially and recreationally significant species. Given North Carolina's shellfish fisheries are exclusively under state jurisdiction, a lack of recreational shellfish harvest data makes it difficult to address potential management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions for this fishery.

The recreational harvest of Hard Clams in North Carolina does not require a fishing license, thus, the total amount of recreational landings cannot be estimated and remains unknown. However, a mail survey has been used since 2010 to estimate harvest from Coastal Recreational Fishing License (CRFL) holders. This population of recreational harvesters makes up an unknown proportion of total recreational harvest, but still provides insight into catch rates, harvest trends, and scale of harvest by CRFL holders. In 2010, surveys were only mailed out in November and December, so harvest and effort estimates are very low (Table 2). Harvest and catch rate have been declining since 2013 (Figure 12). In 2022, recreational harvest was roughly one half of that in 2020 and only 30% of the time series average.

Recreational effort for clam harvest was reported from 60 waterbodies throughout coastal North Carolina. Overall survey results demonstrate a distinct seasonality for the recreational harvest of clams, with peak activity observed during the summer months. This, coupled with the highest concentrations of clamming activity being observed within Pamlico, Bogue, and Masonboro Sounds and during the summer months, suggests coastal tourism may significantly impact recreational clam harvest. More background and history on recreational shellfish harvest can be found in the Recreational Harvest Issue Paper.

Table 2. Estimated number of trips, number of Hard Clams harvested, and catch rate (clams per trip) per year of Coastal Recreational Fishing License holders, 2010–2022.

Year	Number Trips	Clam Harvest	Catch Rate
2010*	528	8,731	18.4
2011	6,350	127,597	22.9
2012	6,726	146,151	27.3
2013	8,644	191,842	26.2
2014	6,325	162,656	28.8
2015	7,637	166,419	27.4
2016	8,456	84,199	12.3
2017	3,435	75,171	21.8
2018	2,362	26,769	11.3
2019	5,088	114,042	22.4
2020	6,557	62,164	9.5
2021	1,765	15,471	8.8
2022	6,628	28,241	4.3

*Partial year of sampling



Figure 12. Annual recreational Hard Clam landings (number of clams) in North Carolina, 2010-2022. Data from 2010 represent a partial year of sampling.

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC IMPACT

Economic Aspects of the Fishery

EX-VESSEL VALUE AND PRICE

The value of Hard Clams to the North Carolina seafood industry has fluctuated over time. Before the mid-1970s, their economic contribution was relatively small, representing no more than 1-2% of the total value of landed seafood in the state. In 2013, clams were the sixth most economically important commercial seafood species in North Carolina. Landings of clams accounted for 4.7% of the total value of commercial non-finfish landings and 2.9% of the total value of all commercial seafood landings in the state.

The real value (the value that is adjusted for inflation) of North Carolina Hard Clam landings on public bottom has generally declined over the last twenty years peaking at just under $9 million in 1995 and declining until 2011 where ex-vessel value increased yearly until it peaked in 2015 at about $6 million before declining again in the last 7 years. When adjusted for the effects of inflation, 2021 saw the lowest landings value in the time series since 1994, then landings started increasing in 2014 and 2015, which then continued declining year over year to 2022 (Figure 13). The decline in total value is largely driven by a decrease in catch described in the previous section (Figure 11).



Figure 13. Annual ex-vessel value of Hard Clams in North Carolina, 1994-2022. Inflation adjusted values are in 2022 dollars. NCDMF TTP.

The average price per clam stayed constant from 1994-2014 before increasing dramatically in 2015, followed by a drop in 2016, and then a consistent increase from 2017-2022 (Figure 14). When adjusted for 2022 dollars, the average price per clam from 1994 to 2022 peaked in 2015 at $0.31 and had the lowest average value in 2012 at $0.14 In the last five years clam values have increased from $0.19 in 2018 to $0.21 in 2021 and $0.27 in 2022.



Figure 14. Annual average nominal and inflation adjusted price per clam harvested on public bottom in North Carolina 1994-2022. Data provided by the NCDMF TTP.

From 2004 to 2019 the value of all clam grades was stable and did not have much variation across grades. In 2020, there was a large spike in little neck prices and then a sharp decrease in 2021 before coming back up to $0.52 in 2022. This market volatility could have been influenced by outside market drivers such as the COVID-19 pandemic.



Figure 15. Annual average ex-vessel grade prices of Hard Clams in North Carolina, 2013-2022. Data provided by the NCDMF TTP.

Most water bodies account for a constant amount of the clam harvest value over time (Figure 16). Notably, the New River has seen a decrease in the market share of landed clams in the last two years. Clam landings from public bottom in New River fell from 65% of the market share in 2014 to 9% in 2022. Core Sound and Bogue Sound have made up more of the landed clams in the last 5 years making up a combined 43% of clams landed from public bottom in 2022.



Figure 16. Percent of total annual commercial Hard Clam harvest value by waterbody, 2013-2022. Data provided by the NCDMF TTP.

GEAR

From 2004 to 2022, hand harvest dominated the percent of total ex-vessel value of clam landings. The percentage of mechanical harvest value saw a decrease over that period from a peak of 24% in 2003 to a low of 13% in 2015. As a proportion of clam harvest on public bottom, mechanical harvest has oscillated around 20% of market share for most of the time series with high yearly fluctuations from 2011-2016. From 2018 to 2022 hand harvest made up at least 86% of the harvest (Figure 17). Since 2016 mechanical harvest has accounted for between 20% and 24% of landings (Figure 17).



Figure 17. Annual percent of total landings value by gear type used to harvest Hard Clams,2013-2022. Data provided by the NCDMF TTP.

PARTICIPATION AND TRIPS

The NCDMF tracks commercial landings of shellfish in the state through the Trip Ticket Program. Among the variables collected, number of participants, number of trips, gear types, location of landings and harvest, and number of dealers are categorized and summarized in this section.

In the last 20 years, 97% of clammers have recorded landings worth under $25,000 with 43% of clammers landing clams worth $500 or less a year. This indicates most participants use clamming as a supplement to their income.

Those participating in hand harvest were primarily in the 50-59 year old age group, with participation of individuals < 49 years old declining over time (Figure 18).



Figure 18. Age group demographics for Hard Clam hand harvest, 2013 – 2022 Data provided by the NCDMF TTP.

As is the case in all commercial fisheries in North Carolina, clam fishers may only sell their catch to licensed seafood dealers. The number of dealers reporting landings of clams has declined since a high of 94 in 2013. The number of dealers purchasing clams fell to 47 in 2019. Since 2019 the annual number of dealers participating in the purchase of clams and has been stable with 26 in 2022.

Economic Impact of the Commercial Fishery

The expenditures and income within the commercial fishing industry, as well as those by consumers of seafood produce ripple effects as the money is spent and re-spent in the state economy. Each dollar earned and spent generates additional economic impacts by stimulating further activity in other industries which fosters jobs, income, and business sales. These impacts are estimated using the NCDMF commercial fishing economic impact model which utilizes information from socioeconomic surveys of commercial fishermen and seafood dealers in North Carolina, economic multipliers found in *Fisheries Economics of the United States, 2020,* and IMPLAN economic impact modeling software. In 2022, the commercial clam fishery in North Carolina supported an estimated 326 full-time and part-time jobs, approximately $1.37 million in income, and approximately $3 million in sales impacts. In the last ten years the industry has contracted in landings, participants, and economic impacts.

Table 3. Economic impact of the commercial Hard Clam fishery in North Carolina, 2013-2022 reported in 2022 dollars. NCDMF Fisheries Economics Program.

				Estimated Economic Impacts			
Year	Participants[1]	Trips[1]	Clams landed (in thousands)[1]	Ex-vessel value (in thousands)[1]	Jobs[2,3]	Income impacts (in thousands)[3]	Sales impacts (in thousands)[3]
2022	276	6,194	3,828	$890	326	$1,370	$2,988
2021	268	5,140	3,557	$789	313	$1,399	$2,996
2020	292	5,438	3,430	$903	338	$1,389	$2,997
2019	311	8,151	5,428	$1,110	365	$1,793	$4,119
2018	452	12,211	9,492	$1,710	537	$2,667	$5,843
2017	544	18,189	13,156	$2,349	647	$3,490	$7,920
2016	599	19,612	16,047	$2,891	722	$4,247	$9,252
2015	627	20,413	19,529	$5,850	885	$8,400	$18,830
2014	581	18,372	20,538	$3,267	728	$4,883	$11,222
2013	491	15,241	16,061	$2,611	606	$4,124	$8,767

[1]As reported by the NCDMF trip ticket program.
[2]Represents both full-time and part-time jobs.
[3]Economic impacts calculated using the NCDMF commercial fishing economic impact model and reported in 2022 dollars.

Recreational Fishery Economics

The NCDMF has limited data on recreational clamming, including the number of participants and the effect of their effort on the economy. For more information on the Recreational Fishery, see the Recreational Harvest Issue Paper.

Social Importance of the Fishery

COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN

The NCDMF Fisheries Economics Program has been conducting a series of in-depth interview-style surveys with commercial fishermen along the coast since 1999. Data from these interviews are added to a growing database and used for fishery management plans, among other uses. The description of the clam fishery from these surveys can be found in Amendment 2.

ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION AND IMPACT

Coastal Habitat Protection Plan

In the 1990s, addressing habitat and water quality degradation was recognized by resource managers, fishermen, the public, and the legislature as a critical component for improving and sustaining fish stocks, as well as the coastal ecosystem. When the

Fisheries Reform Act of 1997 (FRA; G.S. 143B-279.8) was passed, it required developing Coastal Habitat Protection Plans (CHPPs). The legislative goal of the CHPP is "…the long-term enhancement of coastal fisheries associated with coastal habitats." The FRA specifies that the CHPP will identify threats and recommend management actions to protect and restore coastal habitats critical to North Carolina's coastal fishery resources. The plans are updated every five years and must be adopted by the NC Coastal Resources Commission (CRC), the NC Environmental Management Commission (EMC), and the NC Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) to ensure consistency among commissions as well as their supporting NC Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) agencies. The 2021 CHPP Amendment is the most recent update to the CHPP, building upon the 2016 CHPP source document.

The North Carolina DEQ CHPP includes four overarching goals for the protection of coastal habitat: 1) improve effectiveness of existing rules and programs protecting coastal fish habitats; 2) identify and delineate strategic coastal habitats; 3) enhance habitat and protect it from physical impacts; and 4) enhance and protect water quality. The CHPP is an interagency plan with its goals and actions carried out by several state agencies. For instance, while the NCDMF has the capacity to recommend management decisions towards meeting the goals described above pertaining to coastal habitat, the Division of Water Resources has the ability to enforce policies concerning water quality issues described in the CHPP. Overall, achieving the goals set by the CHPP to protect North Carolina's coastal resources involves managers and policy makers from several state agencies to make recommendations and ultimately enforce them as regulations.

Hard Clams occur extensively in estuarine systems. Habitats for juvenile and adult Hard Clams include both intertidal and subtidal soft bottom (defined by Street et al. (2005) as "unconsolidated, unvegetated sediment that occurs in freshwater, estuarine, and marine systems" to include both deeper subtidal bottom and shallow intertidal flats), shell bottom (which can be commonly referred to as oyster beds, rocks, reefs, bars, and shell hash), and SAV. NCDMF's Estuarine Bottom Habitat Mapping (EBHM) Program mapped North Carolina's shellfish-growing bottom habitats between 1990 and 2021 and identified the top clam-producing bottom types across the state, as listed in

Table 4.

Table 4. Average clam densities for the top five clam-producing bottom types as identified by the EBHM program.

EBHM bottom habitat category	Avg. clams per square meter	Habitat description
Intertidal Firm Non-vegetated Shell	2.03±0.03	Intertidal oyster reef/reef fringe on sandy or muddy sand bottom
Intertidal Hard Non-vegetated Shell	1.50±0.04	Intertidal oyster reef/reef fringe on sandy or shelly bottom
Subtidal Firm Non-vegetated Shell	0.86±0.03	Subtidal oyster reef/reef fringe on sandy or muddy sand bottom
Subtidal Hard Non-vegetated Shell	0.87±0.04	Subtidal oyster reef/reef fringe on sandy or shelly bottom
Subtidal Hard Vegetated w/o Shell	0.71±0.01	SAV beds on sandy bottom

By region, *Subtidal Hard Vegetated without Shell* (SAV on sandy bottom) was the most productive clam habitat in the Pamlico Sound region, but in regions south of Pamlico Sound, unvegetated intertidal and subtidal shelly bottom types both produced more clams than vegetated bottom (

Table 4). Other unvegetated, non-shelly bottom types (identified in the CHPP as “soft bottom habitat”) also provide habitat for clams, but the EBHM program generally found clams at lower densities in those habitats than in shell bottom and SAV habitat. The EBHM program data support findings in the scientific literature that SAV (Peterson et al. 1984; Irlandi 1994; Carroll et al. 2008) and shell bottom (Peterson et al. 1995) provide superior habitat to unstructured soft bottom habitat. In addition to hosting lower densities of clams, soft bottom habitat is by far the most extensive estuarine habitat in North Carolina, and faces fewer threats than structured habitats. Therefore, the protection of SAV and shell bottom habitats from both physical impacts and water quality degradation are important when considering protecting clam habitats.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, THREATS, AND ALTERATIONS

Physical Threats

MOBILE BOTTOM DISTURBING FISHING GEAR

Goal 3 of the 2016 CHPP is to “enhance and protect habitats from adverse physical impacts,” which includes reducing the impacts of mobile bottom disturbing fishing gear, the negative effects of which are described in detail in Section 8.1.1 of the 2016 CHPP. Soft bottom habitat, because of its low structure and dynamic nature, has historically been considered the most appropriate location to use bottom disturbing gear. NCMFC rules restrict bottom disturbing gears in designated soft bottom habitat. Fishing gears with the greatest potential to damage soft bottom include dredges and trawls. Of the threats to structured clam habitat, physical disturbance from mechanical harvest of clams and oysters is the most obvious. Impacts of mechanical harvest on unstructured, soft bottom sediments are less studied, and the 2021 CHPP (NCDEQ 2021) highlights the need for increased monitoring of the condition of North Carolina's estuarine soft bottom habitat with regards to chemical and microbial contaminants and benthic macroinvertebrate communities. Recommended Action (RA) 8.6 in the 2021 CHPP (expansion of DWR's benthic macroinvertebrate sampling to estuaries) could directly contribute to a better understanding of the impacts of bottom disturbing gear on soft bottom habitats, and RA 8.1 (convene an expert workgroup to document data gaps and monitoring needs) and RA 8.2 (develop an ecosystem condition report) will provide a roadmap to better understanding impacts to Hard Clam habitats. For more in depth information on mobile bottom disturbing fishing gear, see the Mechanical Harvest Issue Paper.

HAND HARVEST METHODS

Intensive hand harvest methods can be destructive to oyster rocks. The harvest of clams or oysters by tonging or raking on intertidal oyster beds causes damage not only to living oysters but also to the cohesive shell structure of the reef (Lenihan and Peterson 1998). This destruction has been an issue where oysters and Hard Clams co-exist, primarily around the inlets in the northern part of the state and on intertidal oyster beds in the south (NCDMF 2001a). For more history on hand harvest methods, see Amendment 2 of the Hard Clam FMP.

Water Quality Threats

Marine bivalves, including oysters, have been shown to accumulate chemical contaminates, such as hydrocarbons and heavy metals, in high concentrations. Reductions in growth and increased mortality have been observed in soft-shelled clams (*M. arenaria*) following oil spill pollution events (Appeldoorn 1981). Impaired larval development, increased respiration, reduction in shell thickness, inhibition of shell growth, and general emaciation of tissues have been attributed to adult bivalve exposure to heavy metal contamination (Roesijadi 1996).

High concentrations of organic contaminates also result in impairment of physiological mechanisms, histopathological disorders, and loss of reproductive potential in bivalves (Capuzzo 1996). As shellfish can easily accumulate chemical pollutants in their tissues, consumption of impaired shellfish can create a health risk. Subsequently, shellfish closures occur due to chemical contamination, commonly associated with industry, marinas, and runoff.

Delivery of inorganic pollutants, organic contaminants, and harmful microbes to waterways occurs via both point and non-point sources. The accumulation of such harmful agents in the water column subjects oyster populations to the adverse effects listed above. Point sources have identifiable origins and include National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) wastewater discharges. Although wastewater discharges are treated, mechanical failure can allow contaminated sewage to reach shellfish growing waters, thereby triggering an area to be closed to harvest.

Non-point sources of microbial contamination include runoff from animal agriculture operations and urban development. Animal agriculture produces waste with fecal bacteria, runoff from pastures, concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), and land where CAFO waste has been applied as manure, all of which can be transported to surface waters and subsequently lead to shellfish restrictions (Wolfson and Harrigan 2010; Burkholder et al. 2007; Hribar 2010). Impervious surfaces (e.g., roads, roofs, parking lots) facilitate runoff and microbe transportation, facilitating significant water quality degradation in neighboring watersheds (Holland et al. 2004). For instance, in New Hanover County, an analysis of the impact of urban development showed that just 10-20% impervious cover in an area impairs water quality (Malin et al. 2000). In North Carolina, most CAFOs primarily house swine and poultry with a majority located in the coastal plain portions of the Cape Fear and Neuse River basins; however, both occur in all basins across the coastal plain (DWR 2024; Off 2022).

HYPOXIA

Point and non-point sources (developed and agricultural lands) are also sources of increased nutrient loads, which fuel phytoplankton growth and increase the strength and frequency of algal blooms. The eventual bacterial decomposition of these blooms results in a depletion of dissolved oxygen levels that can be dangerous to shellfish, particularly in warm, deep waters. Increased eutrophication leads to decreased oxygen levels (hypoxia and anoxia), which North Carolina’s estuaries can already be prone to because of salinity stratification and high summertime water temperatures (Buzzelli et al. 2002).

These low-oxygen events degrade the usability of subtidal oyster reef habitats for fish (Eby and Crowder 2002) and cause high rates of oyster mortality in the deeper (4-6 m) waters of the estuaries (Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Powers et al. 2009; Johnson et al. 2009). Increased state action to limit nutrient loading from urban and agricultural lands is critical for reducing hypoxia impacts to estuarine habitat and resources, including oysters and the reefs they create (DWR 2024).

CLIMATE CHANGE

According to North Carolina's 2020 Climate Science Report (Kunkel et al. 2020), the intensity of hurricanes is likely to increase with warming temperatures, which will result in increased heavy precipitation from hurricanes. Additionally, it is likely the frequency of severe thunderstorms and the annual total precipitation in NC will increase. The expected increase in heavy precipitation events will lead to increased runoff, which will result in an increase in chemical and microbial pollutants transferred to clam habitats. Recent research has provided evidence that negative impacts from increased precipitation and pollutant delivery to estuaries have already begun in North Carolina (Kunkel et al. 2020; Paerl et al. 2019).

For instance, Paerl et al. (2020) investigated the impact of tropical cyclones on nutrient delivery and algal bloom occurrences in the Neuse River Estuary and Pamlico Sound. They found high-discharge storm events, such as high-rainfall tropical cyclones, can double annual nutrient loadings to the estuary, leading to increased nutrients and dissolved organic carbon. Phytoplankton response to moderate storm events is immediate, while during high-rainfall events like Floyd (1999), Matthew (2016), Florence (2018), and Dorian (2019) phytoplankton growth is diverted downstream to Pamlico Sound, where it can persist for weeks. Additionally, increased organic matter and phytoplankton biomass from heavy rainfall events contribute to oxygen depletion, exacerbating hypoxic and anoxic conditions in the Neuse River and Pamlico Sound.

Additionally, warming water temperatures caused by climate change may benefit growth rates for pathogens that can negatively impact resources. For instance, increased water temperatures have been linked to increasing abundance of the bacterium, *Vibrio*, over the past 60 years (Vezzulli et al. 2016). This is a significant public health issue and can disrupt shellfish markets, as *Vibrio* species get taken up by filter-feeding shellfish and can cause life-threatening illness when consumed. Common wisdom in North Carolina has advised against consuming raw shellfish in the warm-water months for this reason, and rising water temperatures threaten to increase this risk, potentially through longer periods of the year.

In addition to causing hypoxia, the enhanced phytoplankton growth resulting from increased rainfall and nutrient delivery to estuaries will also result in negative impacts to SAV habitat. The majority of SAV loss in North Carolina has been attributed to decreases in light availability due to increased eutrophication (nutrient enrichment) and suspended sediments, and those losses are expected to increase as eutrophication increases due to climate change (NCDEQ 2021). Further, North Carolina's dominant high-salinity SAV

species, Eelgrass (*Zostera marina*), is already growing at the warmest edge of its thermal tolerance in NC, regularly experiencing stressful temperatures that affect growth and reproduction. While the response of eelgrass to increased water temperatures is complex, and the species may be more resilient in North Carolina than other states (Bartenfelder et al. 2022), projections of shifts in the range of eelgrass due to warming waters indicate that the species' southern limit is likely to move northward and potentially out of North Carolina altogether by 2100 (Wilson and Lotze, 2019).

To reduce the negative impacts of climate change on the Hard Clam fishery, it will be important for state agencies to implement policies that encourage the use of agriculture, forestry, and urban stormwater best management practices (BMPs) to reduce the amount of runoff reaching North Carolina's estuaries. This need, among others, has been emphasized in the CHPP as recommended actions to improve water quality. While the MFC has little direct control over such actions to mitigate the impacts of increased runoff, it can continue to support them through its role in developing and approving the CHPP, coordinating the efforts of the Environmental Management Commission, the Coastal Resources Commissions, and their respective state agencies to continue trying to improve water quality for fish habitats.

WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT THROUGH THE CHPP

Improved water quality has been a component of all editions of the CHPP, and the 2021 CHPP included a specific focus on improving water quality to protect SAV habitat, which will directly benefit the clam fishery. The 2021 CHPP proposed to follow the successful examples of management in Chesapeake Bay and Tampa Bay with a five-element strategy that includes 1) supporting efforts to improve water quality; 2) protecting and restoring SAV; 3) enhancing SAV research and monitoring; 4) improving collaboration through citizen involvement, education and outreach; and 5) addressing other contributing factors such as physical disturbance and climate change.

The 2021 CHPP's SAV protection recommendations heavily emphasize the first element, and Division of Water Resources (DWR) staff have led the Nutrient Criteria Development Process (NCDP), with collaboration from other DEQ divisions, including DMF habitat and enhancement staff. Because the EMC's current chlorophyll and turbidity standards are not enough to protect SAV from light limitation, the 2021 CHPP placed increased emphasis on developing new standards and updating current but deficient standards to improve water quality to protect and restore SAV. To address that, the NCDP team has developed a water clarity standard, as poor clarity is what prevents light from reaching SAV beds, and DWR staff are beginning the process of bringing the proposed standard to the EMC within the next year. There are many potential pitfalls along the way, but if the approval process is successful, it will take approximately a year.

From there, it will take until the 2030 biennial update to the North Carolina Integrated Report (303d list), which identifies which water quality parameters are exceeded in which of the state's waterbodies, to have enough data to assess waterbodies as impaired for clarity. An impairment listing on the 303d list triggers the need to develop a Total Maximum Daily Load, or TMDL, (or another approved alternative). TMDL development

also identified sources and causes of water quality degradation so that restoration efforts can target the appropriate issues (common causes are detailed in the 2021 CHPP, but include increased freshwater input and nutrient delivery from impervious surfaces, agriculture, and wastewater, among others).

Following TMDL development, then on-the-ground restoration work would begin to start improving water clarity, so the earliest potential improvements from this effort may occur in the early 2030s. The timeline of this effort is not short, but it represents the best opportunity for statewide restoration of SAV habitat through improving water quality, which will also reduce the frequency of shellfish harvest closures and provide benefits to other habitats like oyster reefs by reducing nutrient pollution and the severity of hypoxic events.

The 2026 update to the CHPP will consider progress made in this process and provide further recommendations to advance this process and other avenues for improving water quality in North Carolina's estuaries through collaboration with DWR, DCM, and other state agencies with direct jurisdiction over issues driving water quality degradation.

ENVIRONMENTAL PATHOGENS

There are various environmental pathogens that can impact shellfish and those that consume shellfish. These pathogens include Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning (NSP), *Vibrio*, and Green Gill.

Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning (NSP) is a disease caused by consumption of molluscan shellfish contaminated with brevetoxins primarily produced by the dinoflagellate, *Karenia brevis*. Blooms of *K. brevis*, called Florida red tide, occur frequently along the Gulf of Mexico. Ocean currents have transported *K. brevis* blooms up the Atlantic coast and has been carried to North Carolina, which accounted for the red tide event and NSP outbreak in 1987 (Watkins et al. 2008).

Vibrio spp are salt loving bacteria that inhabit coastal waters throughout the world, and with the exception of toxigenic *Vibrio cholera* 01, are not usually associated with pollution that triggers shellfish closures and can be ubiquitous in open shellfish growing areas. Vibrios are more common during the warmer summer months and are found throughout the coastal waters of North Carolina (Blackwell and Oliver 2008; Pfeffer et al. 2003).

Green gill in clams comes from the single-celled alga called *Haslea ostrearia.* This is a blue-green diatom found in the coastal waters of North Carolina. For more detailed information on these environmental pathogens, see Amendment 2 of the Hard Clam FMP.

Shellfish Sanitation

The NCDMF has a contingency plan in place as required by the FDA, including a monitoring program (National Shellfish Sanitation Program, NSSP) and management plan. The purpose is to ensure quick response of any harmful algal species within State waters that may threaten the health and safety of shellfish consumers. The plan also details the system to provide early warning of any potential issues, actions to be taken to

protect public health and steps to reopen areas to harvest. (Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section Marine Biotoxin Contingency Plan 2022). Shellfish Sanitation and Marine Patrol are the primary Sections of NCDMF responsible for North Carolina's compliance with the NSSP.

The Shellfish Sanitation Section classifies shellfish growing areas and recommends closures and re-openings to the Director that are implemented by proclamation. The entire North Carolina coast is divided into a series of management units that are referred to as Growing Areas. Each of these Growing Areas is individually managed to determine which portions of the area are suitable for shellfish harvest, and which need to be closed to harvest. Data collected and used in classifying Growing Areas include actual and potential pollution sources, rainfall and runoff impacts, physical hydrodynamic patterns, and bacteriological water quality.

Shellfish growing waters can be classified as "Approved", "Conditionally Approved", "Restricted", or "Prohibited". Approved areas are consistently open to harvest, while Prohibited areas are off limits for shellfish harvest. Conditionally Approved areas can be open to harvest under certain conditions, such as dry weather when stormwater runoff is not having an impact on surrounding water quality, and Restricted waters can be used for harvest at certain times as long as the shellfish are subjected to further cleansing before they are made available for consumption. For a map of both temporary and permanent closures, please visit the Interactive Shellfish Closure Map on NCDMF's Shellfish Sanitation website. Additional information can be found under Current Polluted Area Proclamations.

Enhancement Activities

The NCDMF has not identified a need to target restoration efforts towards increasing Hard Clam populations; however, NCDMF supports enhancement programs which benefit native shellfish species through a variety of initiatives. In recognition of the eastern oyster as a keystone species in estuarine habitat, these initiatives focus on oyster restoration, while indirectly and simultaneously providing enhancement to Hard Clam habitat.

Habitat Enhancement Programs

CULTCH PLANTING

The objective of the NCDMF cultch planting program is to provide shellfish habitat on public bottom grounds open to commercial harvest. While cultch planting is traditionally viewed as an oyster restoration measure, it may also serve as a restoration tool for other shellfish species, including Hard Clams. A comprehensive overview of the cultch planting program is available in the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 4.

OYSTER SANCTUARIES

Oyster Sanctuaries in North Carolina are designed in such a way that enhanced habitat complexity may provide habitat for both oysters and other species typically found on or near oyster reefs. At many of these sites, soft bottom habitat between hard substrate patches may provide ideal habitat for clam colonization and also offer refuge from predation (Castagna 1970).

Hard Clams, as with oysters, in harvest-protected sanctuaries can serve as broodstock populations, providing subsidies to harvestable areas (Gobler et al. 2022). While a monitoring protocol is in place for oyster sanctuaries, there is currently no provision for addressing Hard Clam ecology associated with these protected areas.

A comprehensive overview of the Oyster Sanctuary Program is available in the Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5, Appendix 4.

SHELLFISH AQUACULTURE

Aquaculture of Hard Clams has ecosystem service value similar to wild stocks. Hard Clams maintain the capacity to filter large volumes of water. Depending on the ploidy of Hard Clams in culture, environmental conditions, and the duration of grow out, shellfish aquaculture may provide an additional source of larvae for habitat enhancement. However, currently there are limited seed producers in North Carolina, potentially hindering the growth of clam aquaculture.

CLAM RESTORATION EFFORTS IN OTHER STATES

Although a majority of shellfish restoration efforts have focused on oysters, a few recent projects have looked at effective strategies for enhancing depleted clam populations along the east coast. The cost-effectiveness of various methods has been investigated, including the use of spawner sanctuaries, planting seeded shell, and larval release in shallow lagoons of New York and Florida (Arnold et al. 2002; Doall et al. 2009; Gobler et al. 2022). Among these strategies, spawner sanctuaries appear to have had the most success. This strategy, as suggested by Peterson (2002), takes advantage of the long lifespan and sustained reproductive output of *M. mercenaria*.

A study conducted in Shinnecock Bay, along Long Island, New York observed the 9-year impact of transplanting 3.2 million adult Hard Clams and placing them in high-density no-take spawner sanctuaries (Gobler et al. 2022). Compared to neighboring lagoons during the same time period, Shinnecock Bay saw a 16-fold increase in landings of clams, in addition to significant decreases in harmful algae density and chlorophyll A concentration and a significant net gain in seagrass habitat (Gobler et al. 2022). While other projects testing the spawner sanctuary strategy had mixed results, their takeaways highlighted the importance of suitable environmental conditions using healthy adult clams. For instance, shallow water (< 2 m), higher DO, higher temperatures, and higher salinity (> 20 psu) likely all play a significant role in both the ability of adult clams to recondition between spawning years, as well as survivability and recruitment of larvae (Castagna & Chanley 1973; Doall et al. 2009; Arnold et al. 2002; Gobler et al. 2022).

Therefore, careful consideration of environmental variables must occur during site selection for any possible clam restoration projects. While both oysters and clams have similar ecological roles as filter feeders in shallow water estuaries, each has specific physiological tolerances and environmental needs. Oysters can survive a wide range of environmental conditions, while clams have a narrower tolerance of environmental variables and are not constrained to the tidal column upper limits (Galimany et al., 2017). Furthermore, researchers have placed considerable emphasis on the necessity of long-

term monitoring surveys (similar to protocols used for NC's Oyster Sanctuary Program) following any restoration efforts involving *M. mercenaria* (Simpson et al. 2022).

Protected Resources

A "protected species" is defined as any organism whose population is protected by federal or state statute due to the risk of extinction. In North Carolina, these species are primarily protected by the following federal statues: the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), Endangered Species Act (ESA), and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The primary marine mammal that occurs in North Carolina estuaries is the common Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*; Hayes 2018) though the West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*) seasonally occurs during warm water months (Cummings et al. 2014). The NMFS splits this fishery into two distinct Category III fisheries: the Atlantic Shellfish Bottom Trawl fishery and the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean shellfish dive, hand/mechanical collection fishery. The Category III designations indicate there are no known gear interactions with marine mammals. More information on the MMPA List of Fisheries and fisheries categorizations can be found on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) MMPA website.

North Carolina estuaries are also home to multiple ESA-listed species including the Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*), Leatherback Sea Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), Hawksbill Sea Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata)*, Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus*), and Shortnose Sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*). These species are unlikely to be impacted as harvest methods employed largely exclude any potential for direct interactions. Due to the lack of recorded interactions and the unlikelihood of any interactions between these ESA-listed species and the clam industry, it can be assumed that any potential impacts of Hard Clam harvest on protected species populations would be primarily indirect and at the ecosystem-level.

North Carolina is home to a diverse array of migratory bird species (Potter et al. 2006). Overall, there is little evidence to suggest that any Hard Clam harvest method impacts MBTA-protected species. Some research suggests that hand and rake harvest of clams has a negligible effect on certain species of shorebirds (Navedo and Masero 2008).

FINAL AMENDMENT THREE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

****Section will be completed when the MFC selects preferred management and prior to DEQ secretary and legislative committees review****

RESEARCH NEEDS

The research recommendations listed below are offered by the division to improve future management strategies of the Hard Clam fishery. They are considered high priority as they will help to better understand the Hard Clam fishery and meet the goal and objectives of the FMP. This list of research recommendations is also provided in the Annual FMP Review and NCDMF Research Priorities documents.

- Develop Hard Clam sampling methodology to monitor regional adult abundance
- Map and characterize Hard Clam habitat use by bottom type
- Develop a survey to better quantify recreational harvest
- Determine natural morality estimates
- Investigate causes of recent clam-kills and overall decline in Hard Clam abundance in the New River

MANAGEMENT FROM PREVIOUS PLANS

There are management measures from the original FMP to carry forward into Amendment 3 unless otherwise changed in Amendment 3. Management measures from the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 2 that will be carried forward into Amendment 3 are listed below:

- Daily harvest limit for recreational purposes is 100 clams per person per day not to exceed 200 per clams per vessel per day.
- Implement shading requirements for clams on a vessel, during transport to a dealer, or storage on a dock during June through September. These requirements would be implemented as a public health protection measure under 15A NCAC 03K .0110.
- Maintain management of the Ward Creek Shellfish Management Area as described in the Hard Clam FMP Amendment 1.
- Maintain current daily mechanical Hard Clam harvest limits by waterbody (Table 1).
- Discontinue the mechanical clam harvest rotation between Pamlico Sound and Core Sound.
- Institute a resting period within the mechanical clam harvest area in the northern part of Core Sound.
- Take latitude/longitude coordinates of the poles marking the open mechanical clam harvest area boundary in the New River, still with the flexibility to move a line to avoid critical habitats.
- Maintain management of the mechanical clam harvest in existing areas from Core Sound south to Topsail Sound, including modifications to the mechanical clam harvest lines to exclude areas where oyster habitat and SAV habitat exist based on all available information.

LITERATURE CITED

Anstead, K. A., K. Drew, D. Chagaris, A. M. Schueller, J. E. McNamee, A. Buchheister, G. Nesslage, J. H. Uphoff Jr., M. J. Wilberg, A. Sharov, M. J. Dean, J. Brust, M. Celestino, S. Madsen, S. Murray, M. Appelman, J. C. Ballenger, J. Brito, E. Cosby, C. Craig, C. Flora, K. Gottschall, R. J. Latour, E. Leonard, R. Mroch, J. Newhard, D. Orner, C. Swanson, J. Tinsman, E. D. Houde, T. J. Miller, and H. Townsend. 2021. The Path to an Ecosystem Approach for Forage Fish Management: A Case Study of Atlantic Menhaden. Frontiers in Marine Science 8:607657.

APNEP. 2022. Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) 2019-2020 Mapping. Available: https://data-ncdenr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/ncdenr::submerged-aquatic-vegetation-sav-2019-2020-mapping/about

Abbott, R.T. 1986. A Guide to Field Identification of Seashells of North America. Rev. Ed. Golden Press, New York, NY. 280 pp.

Abbot, R. T. 1974. American Seashells, 2nd Edition. van Nostrand Reinhold, New York. 663 pp.

Anderson, W.D., W.J. Keith, F.H. Mills, M.E. Bailey, and J.L. Steinmeyer. 1978. A survey of South Carolina's Hard Clam resources. South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department, Marine Resources Center, Tech. rept. 32, vi+ 17 p. + 15 p. (Appendix III).

Ansell, A. D. 1968. The rate of growth of the Hard Clam *Mercenaria mercenaria* (L) throughout the geographical range. Journale de Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer . 31: 364- 409.

Ansell, A. D. and F. A. Loosmore. 1963. Preliminary observations on the relationship between growth, spawning and condition in experimental colonies of Venus mercenaria L. Journale de Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer. 28: 285-294.

APNEP (Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership). 2020. Clean Waters and SAV: Making the Connection Technical Workshop summary report. Department of Environmental Quality, Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership, Raleigh, NC https://apnep.nc.gov/our-work/monitoring/submerged-aquatic-vegetation-monitoring/clean-waters-and-sav-making-connection

Appeldoorn, R. S. 1981. Response of Soft-Shell Clam (*Mya arenaria*) Growth to Onset and Abatement of Pollution. Journal of Shellfish Research. 1(1): 41-49.

Arnold, W.S. 1983. The effect of prey size, predator size, and sediment composition on the rate of predation of the blue crab, *Callinectes sapidus* Rathbun, on the Hard Clam, *Mercenaria mercenaria* (Linne). *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol*. 80:207-219.

Arnold, W. S., D. C. Marelli, T. M. Bert, D. S. Jones, and I. R. Quitmyer. 1991. Habitat-specific growth of Hard Clams *Mercenaria mercenaria* (L.) from Indian River, Florida. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 147: 245-265.

Arnold, W., Marelli, D., Parker, M., Hoffman, P., Frischer, M., & Scarpa, J. 2002. Enhancing Hard Clam (Mercenaria spp.) population density in the Indian River Lagoon, Florida: A comparison of strategies to maintain the commercial fishery. Journal of Shellfish Research 21:659-672.

Bartenfelder et al 2022 The abundance and persistence of temperate and tropical seagrasses at their edge-of-range in the Western Atlantic Ocean

Beal, B. F. 1983. Predation of juveniles of the Hard Clam *Mercenaria mercenaria* (Linne) by the snapping shrimp *Alpheus heterochaelis* Say and *Alpheus normanni* Kingsley. Journal of Shellfish Research. 3: 1-10

Blackwell K. D. and Oliver J. D. 2008. The Ecology of *Vibrio vulnificus, Vibrio cholerae* and *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* in North Carolina estuaries. Journal of Microbiology.46(2): 146-153

Bower, S. M., S. E. McGladdery, and L. M. Price. 1994. Synopsis of infectious disease and parasites of commercially exploited shellfish. Annual Review of Fish Diseases. 4: 1-200.

Bricelj, V. M. and R. E. Malouf. 1980. Aspects of reproduction of Hard Clams (*Mercenaria mercenaria*) in Great South Bay, New York. Proceedings of the National Shellfish Association. 70: 216-229.

Burkholder, J. M., G. M. Hallegraeff, G. Melia, A. Cohen, H. A. Bowers, D. W. Oldach, M. W. Parrow, M. J. Sullivan, P. V. Zimba, E. H. Allen, C. A. Kinder, and M. A. Mallin. 2007. Phytoplankton and bacterial assemblages in ballast water of U.S. military ships as a function of port of origin, voyage time, and ocean exchange practices. Harmful Algae 6(4):486–518.

Buzzelli, C. P., Luettich, R. A. Jr., Powers, S. P., Peterson, C. H., McNinch, J. E., Pinckney, J. L., Paerl, H. W. 2002. Estimating the spatial extent of bottom-water hypoxia and habitat degradation in a shallow estuary. Marine Ecology Progress Series 230:103-112.

Bricelj, V.M.; Kraeuter, J.N., and Flimlin, G., 2017. Status and trends of Hard Clam, Mercenaria mercenaria, populations in a coastal lagoon ecosystem, Barnegat Bay–Little Egg Harbor, New Jersey. In: Buchanan, G.A.; Belton, T.J., and Paudel, B. (eds.), A Comprehensive Assessment of Barnegat Bay–Little Egg Harbor, New Jersey. Journal of Coastal Research, Special Issue No. 78, pp. 205–253. Coconut Creek (Florida), ISSN 0749-0208.

Capuzzo. J. M. 1996. Biological effects of contaminants on shellfish populations in coastal habitat: A case history of New Bedford, MA. In: Sherman, K. (ed.). Marine Ecosystem Management: The Northeast Shellfish. Blackwell Science. Cambridge, MA.

Carlton, J. T. 1992 Introduced Marine and Estuarine Mollusks of North America: An End-of-the-20th-Century Perspective. *J. Shellfish Res.* Vol. 11. No. 2. 489-505.

Carriker, M. R. 1959. The role of physical and biological factors in the culture of *Crassostrea* and *Mercenaria* in a salt-water pond. Ecological Monographs. 29(3): 219-266. Carteret County Crossroads. 2003. Core Sound Shellfish Moratorium Information Sheet. Report produced for Carteret County Crossroads.

Carroll, J., C. J. Gobler, B. J. Peterson. 2008. Resource-restricted growth of eelgrass in New York estuaries: light limitation, and alleviation of nutrient stress by Hard Clams. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 369: 51-62.

Castagna, M. A. 1970. Hard clam culture method developed at VIMS. Marine Resources Advisory Series 4. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, Va. 3 pp.

Castagna, M. & Chanley, P. 1973. Salinity tolerance of some marine bivalves from inshore and estuarine environments in Virginia waters on the western mid-Atlantic coast. *Malacologia* 12:47-96.

Chanley, P. E. 1958. Survival of some juvenile bivalves in water of low salinity. Proceedings of the National Shellfish Association. 48: 52-65

Chavanich, S.; Tan, L. T.; Vallejo, B.; Viyakarn, V. 2010. Report on the current status of marine non-indigenous species in the Western Pacific region, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, Subcommission for the Western Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand. Pp. 1-61.

Chestnut, A. F. 1951a. Growth rates and movements of Hard Clams, *Venus mercenaria*. Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute. Fourth Annual Session. 49-59.

Chew, Kenneth. 2001. Introduction of the Hard Clam (*Mercenaria mercenaria*) to the Pacific coast of North America with notes on its introduction to Puerto Rico, England, and France., In: Kraeuter, J. N.; Castagna, M.(Eds.) Biology of the Hard Clam Develop. Aquacult. Fish. Sci. 31:701-709.

Crane, J.M, Jr., L.G. Allen, and C. Eisemann. 1975. Growth rate, distribution, and population density of the northern quahog *Mercenaria mercenaria* in Long Beach, California. Calif. Fish Game 61:68-81.

Coen, L. D., R.D. Brumbaugh, D. Bushek, R. Grizzle, M.W. Luckenbach, M.H. Posey, S.P. Powers, and S.G. Tolley. 2007. Ecosystem services related to oyster restoration. Marine Ecology Progress Series 341: 303-307.

Cummings, E. W., D. A. Pabst, J. E. Blum, S. G. Barco, S. J. Davis, V. G. Thayer, N. Adimey, and W.A. McLellan. 2014. Spatial and temporal patterns of habitat use and mortality of the Florida manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*) in the mid-Atlantic states of North Carolina and Virginia from 1991 to 2012. Aquatic Mammals 40(2):126–138. https://doi.org/ 10.1578/AM.40.2.2014.126

Cunningham, P. A., R. J. Curry, R. W. Pratt, and S. J. Stichter. 1992. Watershed planning in the Albemarle-Pamlico estuarine system. Report 92-05 – Fishing practices mapping. North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Environmental Protection Agency, National Estuary Program. 227 pp.

Currin, C.A., W.S. Chappell, and A. Deaton. 2010. Developing alternative shoreline armoring strategies: The living shoreline approach in North Carolina. In: Shipman, H., Dethier, M.N., Gelfenbaum, G., Fresh, K.L., and Dinicola, R.S., eds. 2010. Puget Sound Shorelines and the Impacts of Armoring—Proceedings of a State of the Science Workshop, May 2009. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2010-5254. p. 91-102.

Dahl, S. F. M. Perrigault, Q. Liu, J. L. Collier, D. A. Barnes, B. Allam. 2011. Effects of temperature on Hard Clam (*Mercenaria mercenaria*) immunity and QPX (Quahog Parasite Unknown) disease development: I. Dynamics of QPX disease. Journal of Invertebrate Pathology. 106: 314-321.

Davis, H. C. 1958. Survival and growth of clam and oyster at different salinities. Biol. Bull. 114:296-307.

Davis, H.C. and A. Calabrese. 1964. Combined effects of temperature and salinity on development of eggs and growth of larvae of *M. mercenaria* and *C. virginica*. U.S. Dept. Interior, Fish Wildl. Ser., Fish. Bull. 63:643-655.

Diehl, S. 1992. Fish predation and benthic community structure: the role of omnivory and habitat complexity. Ecology. 73: 1646-1661.

Dillon, R.T. and J.J. Manzi. 1989a. Genetics and shell morphology of Hard Clams (genus *Mercenaria*) from Laguna Madre, Texas. *Nautilus*. 103(2): 73-77.

Dillon, R.T. and J.J. Manzi. 1989b. Genetics and shell morphology in a hybrid zone between the Hard Clams, *Mercenaria mercenaria* and *M. campechiensis*. *Marine Biology*. 100: 217-222.

Doall, M., Padilla, D., Lobue, C., Clapp, C., Webb, A., & Hornstein, J. 2009. Evaluating Northern Quahog (= Hard Clam, Mercenaria mercenaria L.) Restoration: Are Transplanted Clams Spawning and Reconditioning. Journal of Shellfish Research 27:1069-1080.

DWR. 2024. DWR Animal Operation Permits. North Carolina Division of Water Resources. Accessed 06-February-2024 from

https://ncdenr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=85ae6392d0e94010a305eedf06e3f288.

Eby, L.A., and L.B. Crowder. 2002. Hypoxia-based habitat compression in the Neuse River Estuary: context-dependent shifts in behavioral avoidance thresholds. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 59: 952–965.

Eldridge, P. J. and A. G. Eversole. 1982. Compensatory growth and mortality of the Hard Clam, *Mercenaria mercenaria*(Linnaeus, 1758). Veliger. 24: 276-278.

Epperly, S. P., J. Braun, and A. Veishlow. 1995. Sea Turtles in North Carolina Waters. Conservation Biology 9(2):384-394.

Eversole, A. G. 2001. Reproduction in *Mercenaria mercenaria*. In: Kraeuter, J. N. and M. Castagna (eds.).Biology of the Hard Clam. Elsevier Science. B.V. Amsterdam. 221- 260.

Eversole, A. G., C. Cordes, and D. Moran. 1987. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrate (South Atlantic): Hard Clam. United States Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Services Program FWS/OBS-82/11.12. 33 pp.

Eversole, A. G., L. W. Grimes, and P. J. Eldridge. 1986. Variability in growth of Hard Clams, *Mercenaria mercenaria* in a South Carolina estuary. Amercian Malaocology Bulletin. 4: 149- 155.

Eversole, A. G., W. K. Michener, and P. J. Eldridge. 1984. Gonadal condition of Hard Clams in a South Carolina estuary. Proceedings from the Annual Conference in the Southeast Associations of Fisheries and Wildlife Agencies. 38: 495-505.

Fegley, S. R. 2001. Demography and dynamics on Hard Clam Populations. In: J. N. Kraeuter and M. Castagna (eds.). Biology of the Hard Clam. Elsevier Science. B.V. Amsterdam. 383- 418.

Ford, S. E. 2001. Pest, parasites, diseases, and defense mechanisms of the Hard Clam, *Mercenaria mercenaria*. In: Kraeuter, J. N. and M. Castagna (eds.).Biology of the Hard Clam. Elsevier Science. B.V. Amsterdam. 591-628.

Fritz, L. W. 2001. Shell Structure and Age Determination. In: Kraeuter. J. N. and M. Castagna (eds.). Biology of the Hard Clam. Elsevier Science. B.V. Amsterdam. 53-76.

Funderburk, S.L., J.A. Mihursky, S.J. Jordan, and D. Riley. 1991. Habitat requirements for Chesapeake Bay living resources. Habitat Objectives Workgroup, Living Resources Subcommittee and Chesapeake Research Consortium with assistance from Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Solomons, MD

Gagnon, K., Rinde, E., Bengil, E. G. T., Carugati, L., Christianen, M. J. A., Danovaro, R., Gambi, C., Govers, L. L., Kipson, S., Meysick, L., Pajusalu, L., Kizilkaya, I. T., van de Kippel, J., van der Heide, T., van Katwijk, M. M., and Boström, C., 2020. Facilitating foundation species: The potential for plant–bivalve interactions to improve habitat restoration success. Journal of Applied Ecology, 57:1161-1179.

Galimany, E., Lunt, J., Freeman, C. J., Reed, S., Segura-García, I., and Paul, V. J., 2017. Feeding behavior of eastern oysters Crassostrea virginica and Hard Clams Mercenaria mercenaria in shallow estuaries. Marine Ecology Progress Series 567:125-137.

Gobler, C., Doall, M., Peterson, B. Young, C., DeLany, F., Wallace, R, Tomasetti, S., Curtin, T., Morrell, B., Lamoureux, E., Ueoka, B., Griffith, A., Carroll, J., Nanjappa, D., Jankowiak, J., Goleski, J., Famularo, A., Pikitch, E., & Kulp, R. 2022. Rebuilding A Collapsed Bivalve Population, Restoring Seagrass Meadows, and Eradicating Harmful Algal Blooms in a Temperate Lagoon Using Spawner Sanctuaries. Frontiers in Marine Science 9:911731.

Goodwin D. H., Gillikin D. P., Jorn E. N., Fratian M. C., Wanamaker A. D. 2021. Comparing contemporary biogeochemical archives from *Mercenaria mercenaria* and *Crassostrea virginica*: Insights on paleoenvironmental reconstructions. *Palaeogeogr. Palaeocl*. 562, 110110. doi: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2020.110110

Grabowski, J. H. 2002. The influence of trophic interactions, habitat complexity, and landscape setting on community dynamics and restoration of oyster reefs. PhD Thesis. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Guthrie, J. F. and C. W. Lewis. 1982. The clam-kicking fishery of North Carolina. Marine Fisheries Review. 44(1): 16-21.

Hadley, N. and L. Coen. 2006. Hard clams. Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. http://www.dnr.sc.gov/cwcs/pdf/Hardclam.pdf. 8 pp.

Hamwi, A. 1968. Pumping rate of *Mercenaria mercenaria* as a function of salinity and temperature. *Proc. Natl. Shellfish. Assoc*. 58:4 (Abstr.)

Harte, M. E. 2001. Systematics and taxonomy. In: J. N. Kraeuter & M. Castagna, editors. Biology of the Hard Clam. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier. Pp. 3–51.

Hayes, S. A., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, and Rosel. 2018. US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments - 2017: (second edition). National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-245, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. 378 p.

Heppell, D. 1961. The naturalization in Europe of the quahog, *Mercenaria mercenaria* (L.). *J. Concho*l. 25:21- 34.

Hiwatari, Takekiko; Shinotsuka, Yumi; Kohata, Kunio; Watanabe, Masataka. 2006. Exotic Hard Clam in Tokyo Bay identified as *Mercenaria mercenaria* by genetic analysis. *Fisheries Science* 72(3): 578-584.

Holland, A. F., D. M. Sanger, C. P. Gawle, S. B. Lerberg, M. S. Santiago, G. H. M. Riekerk, L. E. Zimmerman, and G. I. Scott. 2004. Linkages between tidal creek ecosystems and the landscape and demographic attributes of their watersheds. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 298:151-178.

Hribar, C., 2010. Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations and Their Impact on Communities.

Irlandi, E. A. 1994. Large- and small-scale effects of habitat structure on rates of predation: How percent coverage of seagrass affects rates of predation and siphon nipping on an infaunal bivalve. Oecologia 98(2):176-183.

Johnson et al. 2009. Assessing in situ tolerance of eastern oysters (Crassostrea virginica) under moderate hypoxic regions: implications for restoration. Journal of Shellfish Research. 28(2) 185-192.

Jones, Douglas S., Quitmyer, Irvy R., Arnold, William S., and Marelli, Dan C. 1990. Annual Shell Banding, Age, and Growth Rate of Hard Clams (*Mercenaria* Spp.) from Floria. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 9, no. 1: 215–25.

Kelaher, B.P. 2003. Changes in habitat complexity negatively affect diverse gastropod assemblages in coralline algal turf. Oecologia. 135: 431–441.

Kemp, W.M., R. Batiuk, R. Bartleson, P. Bergstrom, V. Carter, C.L. Gallegos, W. Hunley, L. Karrh, E.W. Koch, J.M. Landwehr, K.A. Moore, L. Murray, M. Naylor, N.B. Rybicki, J.C. Stevenson, and D.J. Wilcox. 2004.Habitat requirements for submerged aquatic vegetation in Chesapeake Bay: water quality, light regime, and physical-chemical factors. Estuaries 27(3):363-377

Kerswill, C. J. 1941. Some environmental factors limiting growth and distribution of the quahaug *Venus mercenaria* L. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Toronto. Ontario, Canada. 104 pp.

Kraeuter, J. H. 2001. Predators and predation. In: Kraeuter J. N. and M. Castagna (eds). Biology of the Hard Clam. Elsevier Science. B.V. Amsterdam. 441-590.

Kunkel, K.E., Karl, T.R., Squires, M.F., Yin, X., Stegall, S.T. and Easterling, D.R., 2020. Precipitation extremes: Trends and relationships with average precipitation and precipitable water in the contiguous United States. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, *59*(1), pp.125-142.

NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality) 2021. North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan 2021 Amendment. Department of Environmental Quality, Raleigh, NC. 266 p.

Lenihan, H. S., and C. H. Peterson. 1998. How habitat degradation through fishery disturbance enhances impacts of hypoxia on oyster reefs. Ecological Applications 8. 128-140.

Loosanoff, V. L. and H. C. Davis. 1950. Conditioning V. mercenaria for spawning in winter and breeding its larvae in the laboratory. The Biological Bulletin. Marine Biology Laboratory. Woods Hole, MA. 98: 60-65.

Loosanoff, V.L. 1937. Effects of temperature upon shell movements of clams, Venus mercenaria (L.). Biol. Bull. (Woods Hole) 76:171-182.

MacKenzie, C. L., Jr. 1977. Predation on Hard Clam (*Mercenaria mercenaria*) populations. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 106(6): 530-537.

Mackenzie, C. L., Jr., Morrison, A., Taylor, D. L., Burrell, V. G., Arnold, W. S., & Wakida-Kusunoki, A. T. 2002. Quahogs in Eastern North America: Part I, biology, ecology, and historical uses. *Mar. Fish. Rev.* 64(2), 1–55.

Mallin, M. A., K. E. Williams, E. C. Esham, and R. P. Lowe. 2000. Effect of human development on bacteriological water quality in coastal watersheds. Ecological Applications. 10(4): 1047-1056.]

Meyer, D.L., E.C. Townsend, G.W. Thayer. 1997. Stabilization and Erosion Control Value of Oyster Cultch for Intertidal Marsh. Restoration Ecology. 5: 93-99.

Navedo, J. G. and J. A. Masero. 2008. Effects of traditional clam harvesting on the foraging ecology of migrating curlews (*Numenius arquata*). Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 355(1):59-65.

NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality) 2021. North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan 2021 Amendment. Department of Environmental Quality, Raleigh, NC. 266 p.

NCDMF. 1991. North Carolina Fishery Management Plan. Hard Clam. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 29 pp Osborne, T.Z., Martindale, M.Q., Nunez, J.M., and Ibarra-Castro, L. 2021. Restoration of clam populations in the Indian River Lagoon for water quality improvement. Final Report. Indian River Lagoon National Estuary Program. October, 2021.

NCDMF. 2001a. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 218 pp.

NCDMF. 2001b. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 164 pp.

NCDMF. 2008a. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. Amendment 1. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 158 pp.

NCDMF, 2008b. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan. Amendment 2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 164 pp.

NCDMF 2017. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. Amendment 2. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2022. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries License and Statistics Section Annual Report. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 547pp.

NCDMF. 2022. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section. Marine Biotoxin Contingency Plan. 14 pp.

NCDMF. 2022. SAV Onslow 2021 Final. Available: https://data-ncdenr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/ncdenr::sav-onslow-2021-final/about

Off. 2022. North Carolina keeps poultry farm locations secret. We mapped them anyway. The Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, NC, retrieved 06-February-2024 from https://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/state/north-carolina/article267929707.html

Paerl, H.W., Hall, N.S., Hounshell, A.G., Luettich Jr, R.A., Rossignol, K.L., Osburn, C.L. and Bales, J., 2019. Recent increase in catastrophic tropical cyclone flooding in coastal North Carolina, USA: Long-term observations suggest a regime shift. *Scientific reports*, *9*(1), p.10620.

Paerl, H.W., Hall, N.S., Hounshell, A.G., Rossignol, K.L., Barnard, M.A., Luettich, R.A., Rudolph, J.C., Osburn, C.L., Bales, J. and Harding, L.W., 2020. Recent increases of rainfall and flooding from tropical cyclones (TCs) in North Carolina (USA): implications for organic matter and nutrient cycling in coastal watersheds. *Biogeochemistry*, *150*, pp.197-216.

Peters JW, Eggleston DB, Puckett BJ, Theuerkauf SJ (2017). Oyster demographic in harvested reefs vs. no-take reserves: implications for larval spillover and restoration success. Frontiers in Marine Science 4:326.

Pfeffer C. S, Hite M. F., Oliver J. D. 2003. Ecology of *Vibrio vulnificus* in estuarine waters of eastern North Carolina. Applied Environmental Microbiology. 69(6): 3526-31

Peterson, C. H. 1982. Clam Predation by whelks (*Busycon* spp.): experimental tests of the importance of prey size, prey density, and seagrass cover. Marine Biology. 66(2): 159-170.

Peterson, C. H. 1983. A concept of quantitative reproductive senility: application to the Hard Clam, Mercenaria mercenaria (L.). Oecologia. 58: 164-168.

Peterson, C. H. 1986a. Quantitative allometry of gamete production by *Mercenaria mercenaria* into old age. Marine Ecological Progress Series. 29: 93-97.

Peterson, C. H. 1986b. Enhancement of *Mercenaria mercenaria* densities in seagrass beds: Is pattern fixed during settlement season or altered by subsequent differential survival. Limnological Oceanography. 31(1): 200-205.

Peterson, C. H. 2002. Recruitment overfishing in a bivalve mollusk fishery: Hard Clams (*Mercenaria mercenaria*) in North Carolina. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences. 59: 96-104.

Peterson, C. H., H. C. Summerson, and P. B. Duncan. 1984. The influence of seagrass cover on population structure and individual growth rate of a suspension feeding bivalve, *Mercenaria mercenaria.* Journal of Marine Resources. 42: 123-138.

Peterson, C. H., H. C. Summerson, and S. R. Fegley. 1987. Ecological consequences of mechanical harvesting on clams. Fishery Bulletin. 85(2): 281-298

Peterson, C. H., H. C. Summerson, and J. Huber. 1995. Replenishment of Hard Clam stocks using hatchery seed: combined importance of bottom type, seed size, planting season, and density. Journal of Shellfish Research. 14(2): 93-300.

Potter, E. F., J. F. Parnell, R. P. Teulings, and R. Davis. 2006. Birds of the Carolinas. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Porter, H. J. 1964. The North Carolina Marine and Estuarine Mollusca- an Atlas of Occurrence. University of North Carolina. Institute of Marine Science. Morehead City, NC. 351 pp.

Powers, S.P., C.H. Peterson, J.H. Grabowski, H.S. Lenihan. 2009. Success of constructed oyster reefs in no harvest sanctuaries: implications for restoration. Marine Ecology Progress Series 389: 159-170.

Pratt, D. M. and D. A. Campbell. 1956. Environmental factors affecting growth in *Venus mercenaria.* Limnology and Oceanography. 1(1): 2-17.

Rice, M. A., C. Hickox, and I. Zehra. 1989. Effects of intensive fishing effort on population structure of quahogs, *Mercenaria mercenaria* (Linnaeus 1758) in Narrgansett Bay. Journal of Shellfish Research. 14: 293-301.

Ridgway, Iain D., C. A. Richardson, E. Enos, Z. Ungvari, S. N. Austad, E. E. R. Philipp, and Anna Csiszar. 2011. New Species Longevity Record for the Northern Quahog (=Hard Clam), *Mercenaria Mercenaria*. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 30. 35–38. https://doi.org/10.2983/035.030.0106.

Roegner, G. C. & Mann, R. L. 1991. "Hard Clam *Mercenaria mercenaria*". VIMS Books and Book Chapters. 20.

Roesijadi, G. 1996. Metallothionein and its role in toxic metal regulation. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. 113(2): 117-123.

Simpson, L., Armstrong, C., Beal, J., & Osborne, T. 2022. Research, Management and Outreach Priorities for Clam Restoration in the Indian River Lagoon, Florida.

Smolowitz, R., D. Leavitt, and F. Perkins. 1998. Observations of protistan disease similar to QPX in *Mercenaria mercenaria* (Hard Clams) from the coast of Massachusetts. Journal of Invertebrate Pathology. 71: 9-25.

Stanley, J.G. & DeWitt, R. Species profiles: life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (North Atlantic) - Hard Clam. U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv. FWS/OBS-82/11.18. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1983. TR EL-82-4. 19pp. Available: http://www.nwrc.usgs.gov/publications/specprof.htm

Street, M. W., A. S. Deaton, W. S. Chappell, and P. D. Mooreside. 2005. North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 656 pp.

Summerson, H. C. and C. H. Peterson. 1990. Recruitment failure of the bay scallop, *Argopecten irradians concentricus*, during the first red tide, *Ptychodiscus brevis*, outbreak recorded in North Carolina. Estuaries. 13(3): 322-331.

Tester, P. A., R. P. Stumpf, F. M. Vukovich, P. K. Fowler, and J. T. Turner. 1991. An expatriate red tide bloom: Transport, distribution, and persistence. Limnology and Oceanography. 36: 1053-1061.Tester, P. A., and P. K. Fowler. 1990. Brevetoxin contamination of *Mercenaria mercenaria* and *Crassostrea virginica*: A management issue. In: Graneli,E., B. Sundstrom, L. Edler, and D. M. Anderson (eds.). Toxic Marine Phytoplankton. Elsevier Science. New York, NY.

USEPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency). 2003. Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Dissolved Oxygen, Water Clarity and Chlorophyll *a* for the Chesapeake Bay and Its Tidal Tributaries. EPA 903-R-03-002. Region III Chesapeake Bay Program Office, Annapolis, MD

Vezzulli, L., Grande, C., Reid, P.C., Hélaouët, P., Edwards, M., Höfle, M.G., Brettar, I., Colwell, R.R. and Pruzzo, C., 2016. Climate influence on Vibrio and associated human diseases during the past half-century in the coastal North Atlantic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(34), pp.E5062-E5071.

Watkins, Sharon M., Andrew Reich, Lora E. Fleming and Roberta Hammond. 2008. Neurotoxic Shellfish Poisoning. MDPI. www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2579735/. (September 2008).

Waycott, M., C.M. Duarte, T.J. Carruthers, R.J. Orth, W.C. Dennison, S. Olyarnik, A. Calladine, J.W. Fourqurean, K.L. Heck, A.R. Hughes, and G.A. Kendrick. 2009. Accelerating loss of seagrasses across the globe threatens coastal ecosystems. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 106(30):12377-12381

Weis, J.S. and Weis, P., 1996. The effects of using wood treated with chromate copper arsenate in shallow-water environments: A review. Estuaries, 19(2A), 306–310.

Wells, H. W. 1957. Abundance of the Hard Clam *Mercenaria mercenaria* in relation to environmental factors. *Ecology*. 38:123–128.

Wilson K. L., and Lotze H. K. (2019). Climate Change Projections Reveal Range Shifts of Eelgrass Zostera Marina in the Northwest Atlantic. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 620, 47–62. doi: 10.3354/meps12973

Wolfson, L. and Harrigan, T., 2010. Cows, Streams, and E. Coli: What everyone needs to know. *Michigan State University Extension E*, *3101*.

Wong, M. C., Peterson, C. H., & Kay, J. 2010. Prey size selection and bottom type influence multiple predator effects in a crab–bivalve system. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, *409*, 143–156. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08621

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Clam Mechanical Harvest Issue

ISSUE

The number of participants and trips in the mechanical clam fishery on public bottom have steadily declined since the 1990s to the lowest levels on record. This, along with habitat concerns associated with bottom disturbing gears, as well as significant cost to the state for management of this fishery, has led the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) to re-examine if this fishery should still be allowed to operate.

ORIGINATION

The NCDMF

BACKGROUND

Historical Importance

Historically, harvest of Hard Clams by mechanical methods from public bottom made up a significant portion of the commercial Hard Clam landing on public bottom from its advent in the mid-1940s all the way through the early-2010's. As detailed in the Status of the Fishery section, mechanical harvest of Hard Clams began as a rudimentary version of dredging where boat propellers were used to blow sediment away and expose Hard Clams for hand harvest. This evolved through time into the modern methods of escalator dredging and clam trawling we see today (see Mechanical Harvest subsection of the Status of the Fishery section).

Historical mechanical harvest data are sparse until 1950 when commercial reporting became more regular. The mechanical harvest in the early 1950s was massive compared to recent decades, exceeding 35 million Hard Clams in 1951 (Figure 1.1). This period of high landings was followed by a steep decline in landings that lasted until the late 1960s. An increase in demand for North Carolina Hard Clams was created during the 1976-1977 season, when Hard Clam beds in the northeastern states became inaccessible due to abnormally thick ice. This period marked another large increase in mechanical harvest that would last into the mid-1980s. Since the late 1980s, Hard Clam landings have declined. This decline is likely the result of a decrease in abundance, increased closures of shellfish waters from pollution, changing market demand, several major storms, and a red tide event in 1987.



Figure 1.1. Hard Clam landings (number of clams) using mechanical gears on public bottom by year, 1950-2022. TTP data is presented in the red box.

Since 1994, the mechanical Hard Clam fishery has seen a steady decline in landings and participation to its lowest levels since clam trawls were first used in the late 1960s (Figure 1.1). Landings from this fishery have declined from a maximum harvest of over 8.7 million Hard Clams in 1995, to a level that has remained below 100,000 Hard Clams per year from 2017 to 2022. The precipitous decline in landings is mirrored by a similar decline in participation over the same period. In 1996, the fishery maxed out at 138 participants. Over the next two and a half decades, participation quickly waned with less than 10 participants per year active in the fishery from 2019 to 2022 (Figure 1 2).



Figure 1 2. Hard Clam landings (number of clams) and number of participants using mechanical gears on public bottom by year, 1994-2022.

As detailed in the Status of the Fishery section, the mechanical Hard Clam harvest season can occur from December 1 through March 31 and is opened by proclamation in specific areas. These areas are limited to what is defined in Amendment 2. These areas include portions of Core Sound, North River, Newport River, Bogue Sound, White Oak River, New River, New River inlet, and the IWW in Onslow and Pender Counties. These areas can be reduced, but cannot be expanded beyond what is outlined in Amendment 2. Since 1994, the New River and Core Sound have accounted for over 80% of the total mechanical Hard Clam harvest from 1994-2022 (Figure 1. 3). The New River was the most important waterbody for mechanical harvest from 2000 to 2016, before being overtaken by Core Sound. The New River has seen a consistent decline in overall contribution to the landings since 2012, except for 2020 which had extremely low landings overall because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The consistent decline is primarily due to a series of clam kill events that occurred in the 2010s, which decimated the population within New River, and caused fishermen to move to new waterbodies or transition to other fisheries.



Figure 1. 3. Percentage of annual mechanical Hard Clam harvest in NC on public bottom by waterbody and year, 1994-2022.

Enforcement

Each year the Division marks all the mechanical clam harvest area boundaries with posts and signs (except for the New River) to ensure enforceability of these boundaries. The staff must replace all missing or damaged posts and signs affected by weather or vandalism. The loss of posts and signs can be significant in years with major weather events such as hurricanes.

In addition to the significant cost and staff time associated with marking the mechanical harvest areas, a large force of Marine Patrol officers is required to monitor and enforce these areas. Normally, each harvest area will have several officers watching the lines with a couple on standby with vessels in case there is a violation. Then when the vessels start returning to the docks, it takes several officers to complete an inspection (i.e., count the Hard Clams, check licenses, and maintain security while counting the Hard Clams). The large volume of Hard Clams caught from these operations requires a good deal of Marine Patrol manpower, especially when several vessels return to the docks at the same time. In Core Sound, the vast area encompassed by the mechanical clam harvest area, along with its zig-zagging boundary makes enforcement difficult and resource intensive.

Maintenance Dredging

The NCDMF also allows the harvest of Hard Clams by mechanical means before maintenance dredging occurs in some navigational channels through NCMFC Rule 15A

NCAC 03K .0301 (b). The purpose of this is to allow commercial fishermen access to a resource that would otherwise be destroyed during the maintenance dredging process. The execution of opening an area prior to maintenance dredging requires communication and collaboration between the division, Army Corps of Engineers (ACE), and the fishermen requesting access to mechanically harvest within the proposed dredge area. Late notice by fishermen, difficulty in communication with ACE, and the time to prepare and process proclamations to open areas have been major obstacles to this program since its inception in 1991. Due to the complicated process and limited interest from mechanical harvesters, no openings for mechanical harvest in proposed maintenance dredging areas have occurred since 2007.

AUTHORITY

N.C. General Statutes

113-134	Rules.
113-182	Regulation of fishing and fisheries.
113-182.1	Fishery Management Plans.
113-201	Legislative findings and declaration of policy; authority of Marine Fisheries Commission.
113-221.1	Proclamation; emergency review.
143B-289.52	Marine Fisheries Commission – powers and duties.

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission Rules (15A NCAC)

03K .0302	Mechanical Harvest of Clams from Public Bottom

DISCUSSION

The NCDMF recommends consideration of options to further reduce, phase out, or eliminate the mechanical clam harvest fishery due to habitat concerns with mechanical gears, declining participation in a fishery that lands just 0.1% of its historical catch, and significant cost to the state for monitoring and enforcement.

Habitat Concerns

Goal 3 of the 2016 CHPP is to “enhance and protect habitats from adverse physical impacts,” which includes reducing the impacts of mobile bottom disturbing fishing gear, the negative effects of which are described in detail in Section 8.1.1 of the 2016 CHPP. Under Goal 3, the primary relevant recommended actions are 3.3 “Protect habitat from adverse fishing gear effects through improved compliance” and 3.8 “Develop coordinated policies including management adaptations and guidelines to increase resiliency of fish habitat to ecosystem changes." The management options presented in this issue paper support those recommended actions by simplifying compliance and contributing to the CHPP’s comprehensive management strategy of managing both physical and water quality impacts to improve habitat resilience.

Summarizing information compiled in the 2016 CHPP, impacts from mobile bottom-disturbing fishing gear range from changes in community composition from removal of species to physical disruption of the habitat (Barnette 2001). Corbett et al (2004), found an increase in total suspended sediment 1.5 – 3 times above background concentrations for less than a day, and minor impacts on nutrient and chlorophyll a concentrations. Wind played a greater role in mixing the water column and altering its nutrient and sediment characteristics. Bottom trawls, dredges, and other mobile gears can cause rapid and extensive physical damage to hard bottom habitat (e.g. Auster and Langton 1999; SAFMC 1998). Habitat complexity is reduced through flattening of mounds, filling of depressions, dispersing shell hash, and removing small biotic cover such as hydrozoans and sponges (Auster et al. 1996; Løkkenborg 2005). Auster and Langton (1999), ASMFC (2000), and Collie et al. (2000) discussed impacts of fishing gears on SAV. Belowground effects, such as those from toothed dredges, heavy trawls, and boat propellers, may cause total loss of SAV, requiring months to years to recover. Excessive sedimentation from bottom disturbing fishing gear and propeller wash can bury SAV. Because of the severe bottom impacts, the MFC restricts use of this gear to open sand and mud bottoms, including areas frequently dredged for navigation, such as the AIWW, disallowing it in SAV and oyster habitats. Clam trawling, or kicking, began in Core Sound as a method involving the scouring of bottom sediment with a prop wash while towing a trawl. Anecdotal accounts indicate significant negative impacts occurred to oyster rocks prior to marking and closing areas to mechanical harvest of clams. As part of CHPP implementation, the area allowed for clam kicking was modified by proclamation to clearly avoid all SAV and oyster beds and to establish a buffer of 50-100 feet between the gear and structured habitats.

Fishing related impacts to habitat have been reviewed and compiled in fishery management plans and have been summarized in documents produced by the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council (SAFMC), Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council (MAFMC), N.C. Moratorium Steering Committee (MSC 1996), Auster and Langton (1999), NCDMF (1999), and Collie et al. (2000). Gears with the greatest potential for damage to soft bottom include dredges and trawls. However, research suggests that neither activity has a significant effect on clam recruitment (Auster and Langton 1999; NCDMF 1999; Collie et al. 2000). Dredges and trawls have a greater impact on structured habitat where clams are more abundant. Oyster rocks and cultch plantings provide excellent habitat for Hard Clam settlement and growth in areas where salinity regimes and water flow are suitable for survival. Hard Clam harvesting in oyster rocks involves overturning or sifting through shells and oysters overlying clams, possibly damaging the oysters. For this reason, oyster rocks are protected from mechanical harvest of clams and bull rakes by rule (Marine Fisheries Commission Rules 15A NCAC 03K .0304 and 03K .0102). Most harvesting of clams in relation to oysters occurs around the base of the beds where they are most abundant (Noble 1996). Clams are also harvested by mechanical methods using either hydraulic escalator dredge or clam trawl. Current fisheries regulations prohibit the use of mechanical gear in SAV beds and live oyster beds because of the destructive capacity of the gear. Mechanical harvest of clams is now only allowed in designated harvest areas that do not contain significant SAV or oyster resources. In the 20-year period analyzed in the 2016 CHPP, trips for mechanical harvest of clams made up 18% of all trips using mobile bottom-disturbing fishing gears; however, that

percentage had decreased to 6% of all trips by the terminal year of the analysis (2013), largely attributed to changes in regulations regarding gear restriction areas for mechanical harvesting of clams.

In accordance with the CHPP (e.g. 2016 CHPP action 3.3: protect habitat from adverse fishing gear effects through improved compliance), the division has already reduced the allowable mechanical clam harvest areas in the state due to concerns over encroachment with oysters and overlap with SAV beds. Beginning in 2008, the division discontinued the Pamlico Sound area in rotation with the northern Core Sound area and instituted an annual resting period between northern Core Sound and the southern Core Sound areas due to limited harvest and concerns over impacts to the crab fishery in the area (NCDMF 2017). From 2019-2020 (north of Bogue Inlet; APNEP 2022) and 2021 (south of Bogue Inlet; NCDMF 2022), a comprehensive study was conducted to map SAV beds across the state. The SAV maps generated from this study were overlayed onto the mechanical clam harvest area maps to look for areas of overlap. Significant overlap was identified in four of the harvest areas including Core Sound, North River, Bogue Sound, and New River. The mechanical clam harvest areas were then adjusted to eliminate overlap and provide a suitable buffer. An example of this overlap and subsequent area modification in 2020 for North River can be seen in Figure 1. 4. Due to the large extent of overlap with SAV, the entire mechanical clam harvest area in Bogue Sound was eliminated in 2020 (Figure 1. 5).



Figure 1. 4. Map of the original North River mechanical clam harvest area (black line) overlaid with SAV mosaic (in green; APNEP 2022) to show SAV overlap. The dotted red line is where the new southern area boundary was established in 2020.

Figure 1. 5. Map of the original Bogue Sound mechanical clam harvest area (black line) overlaid with SAV mosaic (in green; APNEP 2022) to show SAV overlap. This area was closed to mechanical clam harvest in 2020 due to the large extent of SAV overlap.

Organisms in soft bottom habitat are adapted to shifting and changing sediments. However, when sedimentation is excessive, there can be negative impacts. In addition to direct physical damage to the shell mound structure, bottom disturbing fishing gear, including hydraulic clam dredges, clam trawls (kickers), and shrimp and crab trawls can impact clam beds and oyster reefs indirectly by re-suspending sediment. High levels of suspended sediment in an estuarine or marine habitat can reduce successful settlement of larval clams and oysters and can smother other benthic invertebrates (Coen et al. 1999; AFS 2003). Excessive sedimentation can also harm shellfish by clogging gills, increasing survival time of pathogenic bacteria, or increasing ingestion of non-food particles (SAFMC 1998). Water column sediments can increase survival of fecal coliform bacteria in waterways (Schueler 1999), and while fecal coliform bacteria do not affect the viability of clams or oysters, pathogenic bacteria can make shellfish unfit for human consumption.

Socioeconomic Analysis

Commercial landings and effort data collected through the DMF trip ticket program are used to estimate the economic impact of the commercial fishing industry. For commercial fishing output, total impacts are estimated by incorporating modifiers from NOAA's Fisheries Economics of the United States reports from 2012-2020 (National Marine Fisheries Service 2023), which account for proportional expenditures and spillover impacts from related industries. By assuming the mechanical clam harvest commercial fishery's economic contribution is a proportion equal to its contribution to total commercial ex-vessel values, we can generate an estimate of the economic contribution of the clam mechanical harvest fishery statewide.

From 2012 to 2022, clam mechanical harvest on public bottom economic sales contributions have varied from a high of $960,000 in 2012 to a low of approximately $62,000 in 2020 and supported between 41 and 4 jobs annually. Annual sales impacts and number of trips have consistently declined over the past decade, notably dropping sharply in 2017 and again in 2020 (Table 1.1.). The industry expanded in 2021, and to a lesser extent in 2022, but has not returned to pre-2016 landings or participation which has steadily declined over the period (Table 1.1.).

Table 1.1. Annual economic contributions from the clam mechanical harvest commercial fishery to the state of North Carolina from 2012-2022 reported in 2022 dollars. * Indicates confidential data

Year	Trips	Participants	Ex-Vessel Value	Job Impacts	Income Impacts	Value Added Impacts	Sales Impacts
2022	41	3	< $75,000*	4	$44,522	$92,392	$105,235
2021	72	3	< $75,000*	5	$32,630	$149,882	$175,563
2020	32	6	$18,891	7	$29,053	$53,201	$62,685
2019	40	6	$32,992	8	$53,273	$83,219	$122,346
2018	56	9	$24,752	10	$38,595	$69,255	$84,564
2017	59	10	$27,570	11	$40,962	$67,218	$92,955
2016	106	15	$83,951	19	$123,316	$214,598	$268,630
2015	178	17	$257,687	28	$369,966	$649,341	$829,340
2014	360	33	$226,378	43	$338,399	$554,643	$777,574
2013	348	29	$252,269	40	$365,723	$636,974	$826,304
2012	414	29	$284,867	41	$423,831	$701,532	$960,031

Each year the division uses a large number of staff, primarily marine patrol officers, and financial resources to monitor, manage, and enforce this fishery. These costs are difficult to justify for a fishery with low participation and diminished value. The cost to the state to facilitate the execution of this fishery may be better used to fund projects more beneficial to the clam fishery as a whole, or at least one that benefits more users.

Maintenance Dredging

If the mechanical clam harvest fishery on public bottom were to be discontinued, it may be necessary to end the exception for mechanical harvest prior to maintenance dredging described in rule 15A NCAC 03K .0301 (b). If the primary mechanical clam fishery is closed, fishermen that currently participate in the fishery would likely get rid of their gear, leaving no one to participate in pre-maintenance dredging openings. This would further benefit the habitat by reducing the extent of turbidity issues associated with mechanical gears. This program has not been utilized since 2007, and with declines in the mechanical clam harvest fishery as whole, it is unlikely to be used much in the future.

Management options

Due to concerns about physical disturbance of SAV and oyster habitat by the gear, concerns about turbidity and sedimentation, dwindling participation and landings, and significant cost to demarcate, maintain, and enforce the fishery, the division believes it is necessary to examine the validity of this fishery.

Due to the requirements of G.S. 113 221 (d), it is unlikely that mechanical clam harvest fishery could be ended immediately upon adoption of this amendment. An immediate closure of this fishery could “result in severe curtailment of the usefulness or value of equipment in which fishermen have any substantial investment” as outlined in statute.

This would require “a future effective date so as to minimize undue potential economic loss to fishermen”. Possible management options include, but are not limited to; status quo, ending the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging activities, further limiting mechanical clam harvest areas, phasing out the fishery, and ending the fishery immediately. These management options would only affect mechanical clam harvest from public bottom and would not affect their use on private bottom.

Status quo would allow the fishery to continue to operate as it currently does. The fishermen currently operating in the fishery could continue, and new harvesters could join. The cost to the state for demarcation and enforcement would remain the same, making up a significant cost compared to the total value of the fishery. Concerns about effects of bottom disturbing gears on structured habitats would not be addressed.

Discontinuing the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging could also be considered. This would end a program that has not been utilized since 2007. This option could be pursued on its own, or in conjunction with a closure or phase out of the whole fishery. This would require a change to rule 15A NCAC 03K .0301 (b).

Mechanical clam harvest areas could be further limited to create boundaries that are more easily enforceable that also create buffers around critical habitat to protect them from sedimentation associated with bottom disturbing gears, as was done in the North River (Figure 1. 4). To improve enforceability the boundaries would be based on permanent structures or known geographic features, be rectangular or rhomboid in shape without zig-zagging lines and have complete line of sight visibility. The exact boundaries for these reduced areas would be developed after adoption of Amendment 3 based on habitat protection, enforceability, and fishermen input on specific locations the industry would like to maintain. This option would be implemented through proclamation after the new, smaller areas boundaries are developed. As with status quo, fishermen currently operating in the fishery could continue, and new harvesters could join. The cost to the state for demarcation would be reduced, but the resources required for enforcement would likely remain the same, making up a significant cost compared to the total value of the fishery. This would help address habitat concerns, but sedimentation would still occur from mechanical harvesting operations.

The mechanical clam harvest fishery could be phased out over a set timeframe, as was done with the shellfish relay program. This option would allow fishermen currently operating in the fishery to continue during the phase out period, but would discourage new participants. The phase out period would allow current mechanical harvesters time to get rid of gear and transition to other clam harvesting methods or fisheries. This option would address habitat concerns from the use of the gear as well as cost concerns associated with demarcation and enforcement. This option is consistent with G.S. 113-221 (d), as it gives “a future effective date so as to minimize undue potential economic loss to fishermen”.

After hearing concerns from the FMP Advisory Committee about participants wanting the ability to re-enter the fishery, the DMF developed an option for a phase out timeframe of three years from adoption of this amendment unless minimum participation and landings increases occur in the fishery in any year prior to 2027. This increase in participation and landings would show the fishery is no longer diminishing. Historical fisheries data were examined to develop potential thresholds for the minimum participation and landings that would signal renewed participation in the fishery. A reasonable threshold for participants in the mechanical clam harvest fishery on public bottom is ten participants. Ten participants have not been active in a single year in the fishery since 2017 and is over three times the number of active participants in 2022 (three participants), but still less than a tenth of the peak participation in 1996 (132 participants). A reasonable threshold for landings in the mechanical clam harvest fishery on public bottom is one-million clams. The fishery last landed at least one-million clams in 2014 (1.5 million clams) and one-million clams is over six times the number caught in 2022 (less than 200,000 clams), but still less than an eighth of the peak landings in 1995 (8.2 million clams). In this option, if both thresholds are met in any single year prior to January 2027, the issue would be brought back to the MFC for consideration at their May 2027 business meeting, or the next meeting that participation and harvest estimates are available from 2026, where they would decide whether to move forward with phase out of the fishery. This timing ensures that if following May 2027 the phase out continues as planned, fishermen would still have had three years to sell their gear and exit the fishery before the phase out is complete and the fishery closes in 2028, which would be consistent with G.S. 113-221 (d) (Figure 1. 6).

Figure 1. 6. Proposed timeline for the phase out of the Mechanical Clam Harvest Fishery on public bottom if number of participants and landings triggers in this management option are met.

There is a potential that setting participation and landing thresholds that trigger reconsideration by the MFC for phasing out the fishery may have an unintended consequence. Fishermen may re-enter this fishery in the near term in an effort to maintain it as an option in the long term. Based on the habitat degradation effects of mechanical clam harvest, along with the aforementioned DMF resources needed for demarcation and enforcement of management areas, the DMF recommends the phasing out of this gear within three years without triggers for reconsideration of the phase out.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Option 1: Mechanical Clam Harvest

a. Status quo
b. Further limit mechanical clam harvest areas to improve enforceability and protect habitat

- Make mechanical areas rectangular with straight lines for enforcement like was done in North River.
- Focus on specific areas where the industry would like to maintain
- There are only a small number of overlaps with current SAV mosaics. Most of which is on the western banks of Core Sound
- Could look into overlap with oysters or other SHAs and critical habitat

c. Phase out mechanical clam harvest in three years (May 2028) to be consistent with G.S. 113 221 (d) unless two metrics are met that signify increased participation in the fishery
   - Phase out needed to comply with G.S. 113-221 (d)
   - Would allow fishermen to plan ahead and sell gear, transition to other fisheries

d. Phase out mechanical clam harvest in three years (May 2028) to be consistent with G.S. 113 221 (d) without participation and landing triggers

Option 2: Mechanical Clam Harvest in Conjunction with Maintenance Dredging

a. Status quo
b. Discontinue allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging upon adoption of this plan

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Division recommends Option 1.d, a phase out of the mechanical clam harvest fishery to be completed three years from the adoption of this plan. The DMF also recommends Option 2.b, the immediate end to the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging.

Appendix 2: Recreational Shellfish Harvest Issue Paper

ISSUE

The number of recreational shellfish harvesters in North Carolina is currently unknown, which prevents reliable estimates of total recreational harvest of shellfish. Additionally, commercial harvesters are provided with human health and safety information regarding shellfish harvest when acquiring their license; however, there is currently no mechanism for reaching and educating recreational harvesters.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (NCDMF) Oyster/Clam Plan Development Team (PDT).

BACKGROUND

Despite the importance of the commercial shellfish fisheries (molluscan and crustacean) to the state, limited data exist on recreational shellfish harvest. Currently, the NCDMF has limited data on recreational shellfish harvesting, including the number of participants and the extent of their economic activity. Collection of recreational shellfish harvest data, in addition to existing commercial landings data available through the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program (NCTTP) would provide a better estimate of total fishing mortality, relative abundance, and improve knowledge of variation in abundance caused by a combination of fishing effort and environmental changes. A more accurate account of landings allows managers to examine the proportional harvest of recreational and commercial fisheries to make better decisions on management strategies for both harvest sectors. It is imperative to collect high quality recreational harvest data to address potential management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions Collection of this data is crucial to completing a stock assessment and moving to stock level management of Oyster and Hard Clam.

Efforts to accurately quantify the impact of recreational fishing on shellfish have had limited success in North Carolina. The NCDMF collects data on recreational fishing in conjunction with the federal government's Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP). However, MRIP collects information on finfish only.

Participation in recreational shellfishing in North Carolina has not been assessed for over 30 years. In 1991, a phone survey was conducted by the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS), precursor to the MRIP, and it indicated that 3% of households in coastal North Carolina participated in recreational shellfishing, compared to an average of approximately 7% for finfish at that time (D. Mumford, NCDMF, personal communication). In 1991, MRFSS reported that in the state more than one million recreational fishing trips targeted shellfish. However, data on actual shellfish harvest estimates were not reported. The current extent of coastal households in North Carolina that recreationally harvest shellfish is unknown at this time.

The Marine Fisheries Commission in the original Bay Scallop, Hard Clam, and Oyster FMPs recommended developing a mechanism to obtain data on recreational harvest of shellfish (DMF 2007). The need for a mechanism to be able to accurately quantify recreational effort and harvest has been a consistent area of concern in all subsequent North Carolina shellfish and crustacean FMPs. The Hard Clam Fisheries Management Plan FMP (NCDMF 2001a) and Eastern Oyster FMP (NCDMF 2001b) supported adoption of a mechanism to provide data on recreational shellfish harvest. As a result, House Bill 1427 was introduced before the General Assembly in 2003 to establish a recreational shellfish license. This license would have been for shellfish only and would have been instituted on a trial basis for three years. However, the bill was never passed. In 2004, House Bill 831 did pass a saltwater fishing license mandating those individuals recreationally fishing for both finfish and shellfish to obtain a license. However, the state legislature revisited the issue in 2005 and replaced the saltwater fishing license with the Coastal Recreational Fishing License (CRFL).

The CRFL, which was implemented January 1, 2007, is only required when targeting finfish. When the CRFL legislation was originally drafted in 2007, it also included shellfish. However, the inclusion of shellfish was removed from the draft bill was removed before it was finally legislated. To fill this data gap, a survey of shellfish harvesting participation was added to the CRFL in November 2010 to collect monthly data on the harvest of crabs, oysters, clams, and scallops from the CRFL pool. The survey sample is made up of approximately 650 randomly selected CRFL holders that hold a valid license for at least one day during the survey period and answer “yes” to the harvest of at least one of the following species: crabs, oysters, clams, or scallops. In September 2014, the sample size was doubled to approximately 1,300 CRFL holders to increase the number of responses and precision of estimates. The selected CRFL holders are sent a letter explaining the survey along with the survey itself. Those that have not responded by the end of the month are sent a second copy of the survey. This survey obtains information on the number of trips taken during the survey period, average length of the trip, average party size, number of species kept and discarded, gear used, location information (water access), waterbody, and county of harvest. The mail survey estimates are a useful representation of shellfish harvest by CRFL holders but are limited in that they do not cover the entire population of potential recreational shellfish harvesters and probably represent a minimum estimate of effort and harvest. Despite good response rates, few responses contain oyster and clam activity.

The Fisheries Reform Act of 1997 (FRA) created a Recreational Commercial Gear License (RCGL) to allow recreational fisherman to use limited amounts of commercial gear to harvest recreational limits of seafood for personal consumption; however, shellfish gear (including hand, rakes, and tongs) was not authorized under this license. Since these gears are not covered by RCGL, recreational shellfishers can use these gears to harvest recreational bag limits of oysters and clams without a license. Therefore, recreational harvest data are not captured by past RCGL surveys.

Some recreational fishers may purchase a commercial shellfish license rather than a CRFL because the license is easy to obtain (available to any NC resident), is relatively

inexpensive ($50.00), and allows fishers to harvest more shellfish than allowed under recreational limits. The Trip Ticket Program only captures landings from fishers who sell their catch to certified seafood dealers. Identifying and surveying individuals who purchase a commercial shellfish license but do not have any record of landings within the North Carolina Trip Ticket Program could be used to determine if the license is indeed being used for recreational purposes. This is also true for fishers who buy a Standard Commercial Fishing License (SCFL) with a shellfish endorsement but do not have any reported landings of shellfish. Even though this approach limits the sampling universe to only recreational fishers who bought a commercial license, it would provide some information on recreational shellfish harvest occurring that is not constrained by recreational limits. The shellfish harvest survey provides the ability to characterize recreational shellfish harvest but still has limitations for estimating the total recreational harvest of shellfish.

With the limited data collected from the optional CRFL survey, some pieces of information about recreational effort have been captured. For instance, recreational oyster harvest was reported from 92 waterbodies throughout coastal North Carolina, with Topsail, Pamlico, Bogue, and Masonboro sounds all including more than 100 reported trips. The same survey revealed 70% of recreational oyster harvest effort originated from private residences, private boat ramps, or from shore. Given only 28% of reported effort originated at public access locations, intercept-oriented surveys are less than ideal. Recreational oyster harvest effort and catch were concentrated between October and March, accounting for over 84% of reported trips. Conversely, some individuals reported recreational harvest of oysters during summer months despite state-imposed restrictions on harvest during this time. This suggests unfamiliarity with state regulations such as season and area closures.

Another concern of not having a license requirement for recreational shellfish harvest is the inability to easily communicate health and safety concerns of this harvest to recreational participants. The Shellfish Sanitation and Recreational Water Quality Section (SSRWQ) within the NCDMF is responsible for ensuring all shellfish (oysters, clams, mussels) harvested or processed within North Carolina are safe for human consumption. To ensure shellfish are being harvested from areas free of contaminants, the SSRWQ conducts pollution source assessments around shellfish growing areas, direct water quality sampling, hydrographic studies at point source discharges of pollution, and studies of the impacts of stormwater runoff on water quality. The SSRWQ also conducts inspections and certifications of shellfish dealer facilities, as well as providing training for commercial harvesters and dealers, to ensure that shellfish are handled, stored, processed, and transported in a manner that keeps them safe for consumption.

To help keep the public informed of safe harvest areas and safe harvesting and handling practices, the SSRWQ produces several publicly available informational resources, including the following:

> Prohibited Shellfish Harvest Boundaries – SSRWQ establishes permanent closure boundaries that prohibit the harvest of shellfish in areas where there may be

consistent contamination exceeding the standards for safe human consumption. These permanently closed areas are described and established via proclamation.

Polluted Area Proclamations and Temporary Closure Maps – In addition to the permanently closed areas described above, studies have found that water quality in certain areas can be negatively impacted by stormwater runoff, and shellfish can become temporarily unsafe for harvest under certain conditions. SSRWQ has developed management plans describing rainfall thresholds that can generate negative impacts and require temporary closures of these impacted areas. Temporary closures are put in place via proclamation and shown visually on the Division website through a web map updated as closed areas change.

Articles and Fact Sheets on Safe Handling Practices – Temperature abuse or improper handling practices can render shellfish unsafe to eat. To provide the public with information on how to safely store and handle shellfish, SSRWQ has prepared articles, fact sheets, and pamphlets available through the Division website.

Information on *Vibrio* Bacteria – *Vibrio* bacteria are naturally occurring bacteria that can be found in North Carolina waters and can cause severe illness in certain susceptible populations if consumed or through exposure to open wounds. Notably, these bacteria can proliferate within harvested shellfish even after they've been removed from the water, if the shellfish are held in warm/hot temperatures for extended periods of time. Proper handling/cooling of harvested shellfish is a critical step towards avoiding illness. SSRWQ has made available pamphlets and articles describing risks associated with these types of bacteria, and best practices for shellfish handling.

Although commercial harvesters, dealers, and shellfish lease/franchise holders are provided with all this information when acquiring their license, getting their dealer certification, or acquiring/renewing their lease, there is no mechanism for reaching and educating recreational harvesters unless they actively seek out information.

AUTHORITY

N.C. General Statute

113-134	Rules.
113-169.2	Shellfish license for NC residents without a SCFL,
113-174.2	Coastal Recreational Fishing License.
113-182	Regulation of fishing and fisheries.
113-182.1	Fishery Management Plans.
113-201	Legislative findings and declaration of policy; authority of Marine Fisheries Commission.
113-221.1	Proclamation; emergency review.
143B-289.52	Marine Fisheries Commission – powers and duties.

Session Law 2023-137

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission Rule (15A NCAC)

03O.0101	PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS TO OBTAIN LICENSES, ENDORSEMENTS AND COMMERCIAL FISHING VESSEL REGISTRATION
03O.0107	LISENCE REPLACEMENT AND FEES
03O.0501	PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS TO OBTAIN PERMITS
03O.0502	PERMIT CONDITIONS; GENERAL
03O.0506	SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIRED FOR SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT PURPOSES

DISCUSSION

Given North Carolina's shellfish fisheries are exclusively under state jurisdiction, lack of recreational shellfish harvest data makes conducting stock assessments and addressing potential management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions difficult. There are no data on demographics, perceptions, or expenditures of recreational shellfish harvesters in the state. Consequently, there is no data available to conduct an economic impact assessment of recreational oyster harvesting. Due to widespread accessibility of intertidal oysters and clams along North Carolina's coast, the potential impact of recreational harvest could be significant.

Table 2.1. Recreational shellfish harvest license requirements for east coast states.

State	License Requirements
Maine	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits
New Hampshire	State license
Massachusetts	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits
Rhode Island	Required for non-residents
Connecticut	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits
New York	No state license, towns have local restrictions and permits, also has residency requirements
New Jersey	State license
Delaware	State license
Maryland	None, must be state resident
Virginia	None
North Carolina	None
South Carolina	State license
Georgia	State license and free permit
Florida	State license

License requirements for recreational shellfish harvesting varies by state along the United States east coast (Given North Carolina's shellfish fisheries are exclusively under state

jurisdiction, lack of recreational shellfish harvest data makes conducting stock assessments and addressing potential management issues such as harvest limits, size limits, and gear restrictions difficult. There are no data on demographics, perceptions, or expenditures of recreational shellfish harvesters in the state. Consequently, there is no data available to conduct an economic impact assessment of recreational oyster harvesting. Due to widespread accessibility of intertidal oysters and clams along North Carolina's coast, the potential impact of recreational harvest could be significant.

Table 2.1). Most states require some type of license while in Maine, Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut individual towns and cities require a license to recreationally harvest shellfish. North Carolina and Virginia are the only states without some form of license, local permitting, or residency requirements.

There are multiple avenues the NCDMF and MFC could pursue to better assess the population of recreational shellfish harvesters. One solution is to include shellfish as part of the CRFL. This can be accomplished by three different methods. The first is to require the existing CRFL to recreationally harvest both finfish and shellfish. The second would be to create a separate shellfish only CRFL. This license would only give a recreational angler access to the allowed shellfish species and would exclude finfish harvest. This would allow fishery access to recreational anglers who are only interested in harvesting shellfish, and the cost could be set at a lower price than a standard CRFL. The third option would be to require the existing CRFL and create an additional recreational shellfish endorsement. The endorsement would be applied to the CRFL and would indicate the angler is licensed to recreationally harvest both finfish and shellfish. One drawback to these three options is it would require legislation to change the CRFL.

Another solution is to develop a recreational shellfish permit. The MFC has the authority to implement a permit to help manage estuarine and coastal resources and can set a maximum fee of up to $100 (although most permits are free of charge). A permit could function similar to a license. Recreational anglers would be required to have the permit to participate in the recreational shellfish fishery. A nominal fee for the permit would discourage participants from only obtaining the permit because it was free, helping to constrain the sampling universe.

Creating a specific CRFL, as outlined above, or a recreational shellfish permit would provide NCDMF with a complete pool of recreational shellfish harvesters. That list could then be used as a survey frame to help estimate effort and harvest in the fishery. Having a list of the population of recreational shellfish harvesters is useful for distributing shellfish area closure proclamations and maps. If shellfish species are added to the existing CRFL, the activity survey conducted during CRFL sale would still be needed to identify fishers who are involved in recreational shellfishing. These fishers would then receive additional surveys to estimate effort and harvest in the recreational shellfish fishery.

Although creating a specific type of CRFL, adding shellfish under the existing CRFL, or developing a recreational shellfish permit would be the most efficient mechanisms to determine effort in the fishery, another way to obtain these data would be to capture this activity in MRIP. The MRIP does capture some non-finfish activity, but those data are

broad and not available to shellfish at the species level and MRIP agents rarely encounter those types of recreational fishing trips. Most recreational shellfishing effort is by coastal residents using private docks and access points as opposed to public access points. Because MRIP is a nationwide program, any changes to methodology designed to intercept more recreational shellfishing activity would need to undergo extensive review process and if implemented could take away from intercepts in other target fisheries.

Personal consumption by participants holding commercial fishing licenses (either a SCFL with a shellfish endorsement or a Shellfish license without a SCFL) would not be covered under any type of recreational shellfish license or permit. In the fall of 2023, the North Carolina General Assembly passed Session Law 2023-137. Section 6 of this legislation requires anyone holding a commercial fishing license who is engaged in a commercial fishing operation to report all fish (including shellfish) harvested to NCDMF, regardless of if the fish are sold or kept for personal consumption. Currently, this legislation is effective December 1, 2025. The NCDMF is working on draft rules to implement this law and to develop the reporting mechanism for these participants. Implementation of this law should fill this data gap.

Implementing a licensing or permitting requirement for recreational shellfish harvesters would give the NCDMF the opportunity to inform participants of where to find information on harvest closure boundaries, where to sign up to receive polluted area proclamations or to access temporary closure maps, and where to find information on safe handling practices, particularly as it relates to *Vibrio* bacteria.

To pursue any of these solutions, significant time and effort will be needed to assess internal program and resource capabilities and limitations. Any legislative changes require a specific process and are ultimately out of NCDMF or MFC control. Given these constraints, the NCDMF recommends exploring potential options and solutions outside of the FMP process.

MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

Option 1: Recreational Harvest

a. Status Quo
    - Does not provide reliable estimates of recreational shellfish harvest or effort.
    - Does not provide a mechanism to ensure recreational shellfish harvesters are provided with SSRWQ health and safety information and links to harvest area closures.
b. Support the NCDMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to estimate recreational shellfish participation and landings, with the intent to move towards a stock assessment and stock level management for both hard clams and oysters; and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The DMF Supports the NCDMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, with the intent to move towards a stock assessment and stock level management for both hard clams and oysters; and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.

LITERATURE CITED

NCDMF. 2001a. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

NCDMF. 2001b. North Carolina Oyster Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, PO Box 769, Morehead City, NC.

Appendix 3: Hard Clam Management in Other States

State	Fishery	License Requirements	Trip Limit	Size Limit	Gear Limit	Open Season Area
Maine	Recreational	No state license. License by town.	1 peck per person/day (peck is 1/4 of a bushel)	1 inch hinge width	Limited to hand rakes and tongs	-
	Commercial	State license	-	-	-	
New Hampshire	Recreational	State license	No open season for *Mercenaria mercenaria*. Regs for other clam species	No limit	-	No open season
	Commercial	-	-	-		-
Massachusetts	Recreational	No state license, towns have local restrictions & permits	Consult town regs	1 inch shell thickness	-	-
	Commercial	Town permit and shellfish ID card issued by Mass DMF	40 Bu/Day	1 inch thickness (wild)		
Rhode Island	Recreational	Required only for non-residents	(Shellfish management areas)Resident limit: 1 peck/person. Non resident: 1/2 peck/person. (Non-management areas) Resident: 1/2 BU/person. Non resident: 1 peck/person	1 inch hinge width	-	-
	Commercial	-	Bay Quahog: Shellfish management areas: 3 BU/person/day with exceptions. Non management areas: 12 BU/person/day	-	Bay Quahog: No person shall dig and/or take any bay quahogs from the waters of this State by dredge(s), rakes, or other apparatus operated by mechanical power or hauled by power boats, unless otherwise provided for in these regulations.	

Connecticut	Recreational	No State, towns have local restrictions and permits	1/4 - 1/2 BU variable by town	1.5-2 inches variable by town	-	-
	Commercial	State license	-	-		
New York	Recreational	No State, towns have local restrictions on permits, and residency requirements	100 clams/day	1 inch thickness	Only rakes and tongs allowed	Open areas - year round
	Commercial	Shellfish digger permit required	No limit	-	No mechanical	-
New Jersey	Recreational	State license	150 clams	1.5 inches length	Hand implements only	No harvest on Sundays
	Commercial	State license + training course	-	1- 1.5 inches length	No mechanical or motive power	-
Delaware	Recreational	State license. For >100 but <500 clams need a non-commercial clamming permit.	Residents: 100 clams/day. Non Residents: 50 clams/day	1.5 inches or larger	Hand held rake only	Clamming prohibited 30 min before sunrise and after sunset.
	Commercial	Commercial clam tong/rake license	2,500 clams/day	-	-	-
		Commercial dredge clam license	no limit			
Maryland	Recreational	None, must be state resident.	250 clams/day	1 inch transverse measurement	Hand operated gear only. No mechanical harvesting.	-
	Commercial	State license	No limit	1 inch transverse measurement	Hydraulic Dredge: sunrise to 4pm. Other gear: sunrise to sunset	Harvest only in Pocomoke and Tangier Sound. 1/1 - 5/31 & 9/15 - 12/31
Virginia	Recreational	None	250 clams/day by hand or tongs from open areas	-	Hand or ordinary tongs	-
	Commercial	State license	-		-	
North Carolina	Recreational	None	100 clams/person/day	1 inch thick	Hand or rake	Year round
	Commercial	State license	Hand harvest 6,250 clams/ trip. Mechanical harvest limits vary by open water body	1 inch thick	Hand or mechanical implements	Hand harvest open year-round. Mechanical harvest is second Monday in Dec – March 31

South Carolina	Recreational	State license	1/2 BU clams/person/day	1 inch thick	Hand operated gear	No harvest from 5/15 - 9/1
	Commercial	State license	No limit	-	-	-
Georgia	Recreational	State license and free permit	1 BU clams/person/day	3/4-inch depth (perpendicular to hinge)	Hand or handheld implements	Clamming prohibited 30 min before sunrise and after sunset. Approved locations
	Commercial	State license	No limit			
Florida	Recreational	State license	One 5-gallon bucket/person/day	1 inch thick across the hinge	-	Year round
	Commercial	Aquaculture license	-	-		-

Appendix 4: Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan Advisory Committee Workshop Summary

ISSUE

Summarize stakeholder input received during the Oyster & Clam Fishery Management Plans Advisory Committee Workshop.

ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF).

BACKGROUND

The Oyster-Clam Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) Advisory Committee (AC) met for a three-day workshop July 15, 16, and 27 at Craven Community College in New Bern. As these two fisheries share considerable overlap in their ecology and management, these FMPs are revised simultaneously though written separately. The purpose of the workshop was for the AC to assist DMF staff in evaluating management issues and options included in the draft documents of Amendment 5 for the Eastern Oyster FMP and Amendment 3 for the Hard Clam FMP. Specifically, DMF sought to solicit feedback and input on the impacts of management options on the oyster and clam resources and user groups. It is important to note the aim of the AC workshop was to receive input from committee members based on their experiences, expertise, and sector relationships, not to build a consensus among AC members or to recommend specific management strategies.

For the Hard Clam FMP, DMF staff presented overviews of the base plan (life history, stock status, description of the fisheries, habitat impacts, and environmental threats), mechanical clam harvest issue paper, and the recreational shellfish harvest issue paper. Each presentation was followed by an opportunity for the AC to ask clarifying questions and discuss the content and management options included in each paper or section of the draft. Below is a summary of the input and subsequent discussions for the base plan and issue papers of Amendment 3. These ideas represent options the AC suggested the Division explore. Division staff explored these options and discussed where they could be incorporated into the base plan and issue papers.

DISCUSSION

Base Plan

Members of the AC suggested adding more demographic information in the mechanical and hand harvest fishery. The AC also suggested more graphs comparing private harvest

and commercial harvest. They noted clam aquaculture has been slow to grow due to limited seed supply in NC.

Similar to oyster, the AC emphasized the importance of water quality and its importance to SAV. Since water quality issues are explored extensively in the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan and enforced by the Division of Water Resources, the AC suggested strengthening ties to the CHPP in the base plans.

Mechanical Clam Harvest

The division brought forward several options to AC members to address the mechanical clam harvest issue. Options included phase out of the fishery and further reducing the mechanical clam harvest areas to make enforcement easier. The division also presented an option to end the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging operations.

Members of the AC expressed concerns with discontinuing the mechanical clam harvest fishery. They noted this fishery is an important source of supplemental income for a small group of mostly retired people. Members also stated the fishery has an important historical significance to the state and to their heritage and should, therefore, be preserved. They also stated many of the participants in this fishery are aging out and hope to pass the tradition and equipment on to their children to continue the practice.

Members of the AC expressed support for changing the boundaries of the mechanical clam harvest areas to be more easily enforced. They were open to areas being reduced in size if input from fishermen was considered when defining the new boundaries.

AC members did not believe the mechanical clam harvest fishery was a major source of turbidity, SAV degradation, or any other water quality concerns. They felt protecting these habitats should not come at the cost of the clam fishery. There was broad support for further protections and research on SAV, but the focus should be on large-scale threats, such as prop scarring from recreational vessels.

Recreational Shellfish Harvest

AC members recognized the potential widespread impact of recreational shellfish harvest, particularly with high tourism occurring along the coast and harvest effort being largely undocumented. The AC workshop further highlighted the importance of understanding this impact as estimating recreational harvest would be necessary for a future stock assessment. Members of the AC recognized the potential scale of recreational harvest and the importance of filling the current data gap. As such, the AC voiced support for taking steps to collect this data, either through survey or temporary permit, until a recreational license could be put in place. Additionally, the AC identified the importance of a system in place to improve public education for safe harvest practices and reduce consumption during warm months. Listing public health as a concern furthered the discussion to the potential economic impact Vibrio cases might have on North Carolina’s shellfish fisheries. Ultimately, the AC agreed that a nominal

permit would be a great step before a license to promote education and to collect recreational data.

Appendix 5: Summary Of Management Recommendations and Comment

Table 5.1. Summary of management recommendations from Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF), the Northern, Southern, Shellfish Crustacean, and Habitat & Water Quality Advisory Committees (AC).

	DMF	Northern AC	Southern AC	Shellfish & Crustacean AC	Habitat & Water Quality AC
Appendix 1: Clam Mechanical Harvest					
MCH	Initial Recommendation: Option 1.c. The Division recommends a phase out to be completed three years from the adoption of this plan unless fishery participation increases to 10 participants and landings increase to 1 million clams in any year prior to 2027. If these increases are met, the issue would be reconsidered by the MFC at their May 2027 business meeting, or the next meeting that participation and harvest estimates are available from 2026. Final Recommendation: Option 1.d. The Division recommends a phase out to be completed three years from the adoption of this plan, without participation and landings triggers.	Option 1.a. Mechanical clam harvest to stay at status quo.	Option 1.a. Maintain status quo in the mechanical clam fishery.	Option 1.c. Recommend the Division's initial recommendation regarding phasing out the mechanical clam harvest as described in the mechanical clam harvest issue paper	Option 1.c. Endorse the Division's initial recommendation in the Mechanical Clam Harvest Issue Paper
MCH with Maintenance Dredging	Option 2.b. The Division recommends the immediate end to the allowance for mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging.	Option 2.a. Mechanical clam harvest to stay at status quo.	Option 2.a. Maintain status quo in the mechanical clam fishery.	Option 2.b. Recommend to discontinue the allowance of mechanical clam harvest in conjunction with maintenance dredging	Option 2.b. Endorse the Division's recommendation in the Mechanical Clam Harvest Issue Paper

Appendix 2: Recreational Shellfish Harvest					
	Option 1.b. Support the NCDMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, and to establish a mechanism to provide all recreational shellfish harvesters with SSRWQ health and safety information outside of the FMP process.	Option 1.b. Endorse the MFC tasking the DMF with exploring options for a recreational shellfish license/permit outside of the FMP process.	Option 1.b. Recommend that the MFC task the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, as all of Option 1. b. is written.	Option 1.b. Recommend that the MFC task the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, as all of Option 1. b. is written.	Option 1.b. Recommend that the MFC task the DMF to further explore potential options and develop a solution to quantify recreational shellfish participation and landings, as all of Option 1. b. is written. In addition: the AC supports the expansion of monitoring efforts and the establishment of sentinel sites as a critical step in validating the success of FMPs, and to prioritize the proper funding and partnerships with research institutions.

Online Clam and Oyster Public Questionnaire

The online Spotted Seatrout Public Questionnaire opened on December 11, 2024, and closed January 15, 2025. In total, the questionnaire had 8 participants, 3 comments for both clam and oyster, 2 comments for clam, and 3 comments for oyster.

Of the open response comments received, the 2 comments specifically for clam were advocating for status quo of the mechanical clam fishery. Comments received for both clam and oyster were advocating to promote the stocking of shellfish to help rebuild natural populations, promoting sustainable methods like aquaculture, and protecting habitat from bottom disturbing gear.

NC Marine Fisheries Commission

Rulemaking

March 2025 Quarterly Business Meeting

Documents

Rule Suspensions

Rulemaking Update Memo

2023-2024 Annual Rulemaking Cycle

2024-2025 Annual Rulemaking Cycle

2024-2025 Proposed Rules Public Comment Period News Release

North Carolina Register Excerpt

2024-2025 Proposed Rules Public Comment

Public Hearing Summary

Rewritten 15A NCAC 03O .0605

JOSH STEIN
Governor

D. REID WILSON
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

February 3, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission

FROM: Jason Rock, Fisheries Management Section Chief

SUBJECT: Temporary Rule Suspensions

Issue
In accordance with the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries Resource Management Policy Number 2014-2, Temporary Rule Suspension, the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission will vote on any new rule suspensions that have occurred since the last meeting of the commission.

Findings
There have been no new rule suspensions since the November 2024 meeting.

Action Needed
No action is needed.

Overview
In accordance with policy, the division will report current rule suspensions previously approved by the commission as non-action items. They include:

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0103 (h) GILL NETS, SEINES, IDENTIFICATION, RESTRICTIONS

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to implement year-round small mesh gill net attendance requirements in certain areas of the Tar-Pamlico and Neuse rivers systems. This action was taken as part of a department initiative to review existing small mesh gill net rules to limit yardage and address attendance requirements in certain areas of the state. This suspension continues in Proclamation M-5-2025.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0501 (e)(2) DEFINITIONS AND STANDARDS FOR POUND NETS AND POUND NET SETS

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to increase the minimum mesh size of escape panels for flounder pound nets

in accordance with Amendment 3 of the North Carolina Southern Flounder Fishery Management Plan. This suspension was implemented in proclamation M-34-2015 and continues in Proclamation M-9-2024.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03L .0103 (a)(1) PROHIBITED NETS, MESH LENGTHS AND AREAS

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to adjust trawl net minimum mesh size requirements in accordance with Amendment 2 to the North Carolina Shrimp Fishery Management Plan. This suspension was implemented in Proclamation SH-3-2019 and continues in Proclamation SH-1-2022.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03L .0105 (2) RECREATIONAL SHRIMP LIMITS

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to modify the recreational possession limit of shrimp by removing the four quarts heads on and two and a half quarts heads off prohibition from waters closed to shrimping in accordance with Amendment 2 to the North Carolina Shrimp Fishery Management Plan. This suspension was implemented in Proclamation SH-4-2022.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03L .0205 (a) CRAB SPAWNING SANCTUARIES

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to close crab spawning sanctuaries year-round to the use of trawls in accordance with Amendment 2 to the North Carolina Shrimp Fishery Management Plan. This suspension was implemented in Proclamation M-13-2024.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03M .0502 (a) MULLET

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to modify the recreational and for-hire possession limits of mullet in accordance with Amendment 2 to the North Carolina Striped Mullet Fishery Management Plan. This suspension was implemented in Proclamation FF-27-2024.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03M .0515 (a)(2) DOLPHIN

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to adjust the recreational vessel limit to complement management of dolphin under the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Amendment 10 to the Fishery

Management Plan for the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic. This suspension was implemented in Proclamation FF-30-2022.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03O .0501 (e)(4) PROCEDURES AND REQUIREMENTS TO OBTAIN PERMITS

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to issue the Shellfish Relocation Permit to permittees already issued a Division of Coastal Management permit for development activity. This suspension was implemented in Proclamation M-11-2023.

NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03Q .0107 (4) SPECIAL REGULATIONS: JOINT WATERS

Suspension of a portion of this rule for an indefinite period. Suspension of this rule allows the division to adjust the creel limit for American shad under the management framework of the North Carolina American Shad Sustainable Fishery Plan. This suspension was continued in Proclamation FF-8-2025.

JOSH STEIN
Governor

D. REID WILSON
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

January 24, 2025

MEMORANDUM

TO: N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission

FROM: Catherine Blum, Rulemaking Coordinator
Marine Fisheries Commission Office

SUBJECT: Rulemaking Update

Issue
Update the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) on the status of rulemaking in support of the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 rulemaking cycles. Request the MFC vote on final approval of the eight rules in the 2024-2025 Rulemaking Cycle.

Findings

- 2023-2024 Rulemaking Cycle – Update
  - At its May 2023 business meeting, the MFC began the process for 103 rules in this cycle.
  - On April 1, 2024, 80 of these rules became effective; three additional rules became effective June 17, 2024, following legislative review.
  - At its May 2024 business meeting, the MFC gave final approval of the remaining 20 rules. The rules received final approval at the July 31 Rules Review Commission (RRC) meeting.
  - Two of these rules became effective August 1, 2024. The remaining 18 rules are automatically subject to legislative review during the 2025 long session and thus, will have a delayed effective date.
- 2024-2025 Rulemaking Cycle – Action
  - At its August 2024 business meeting, the MFC began the process for eight rules in this cycle.
  - On October 1, 2024, a news release was issued and the proposed rules were published in the *N.C. Register*, beginning the public comment process.
  - A public hearing was held on October 30, 2024, and the public comment period closed December 2, 2024.
  - The public comments received will be presented to the MFC at its February 2025 business meeting when it is scheduled to vote on final approval of the rules. The rules have an earliest effective date of May 1, 2025.

Action Needed
The MFC will be asked to vote on final approval of the eight rules in the 2024-2025 Rulemaking Cycle.

2023-2024 Rulemaking Cycle Update (18 of 103 rules remaining)

At its May 2023 business meeting, the MFC approved Notice of Text for Rulemaking to begin the process for 103 rules. A table showing the timing of the steps in the process is included in the rulemaking section of the briefing materials. A news release was issued August 1, 2023, and the proposed rules were published in the August 1, 2023, issue of the *N.C. Register*, beginning the public comment process.

The MFC accepted public comments on the proposed rules from August 1 through 5 p.m. October 2, 2023. A public hearing was held via WebEx with a listening station at the Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) Central District Office in Morehead City on August 16, 2023, at 6 p.m. The MFC received the public comments at its November 2023 business meeting and gave final approval of 83 of the 103 rules that are related to shellfish plants and inspections, to meet readoption deadlines. There are 80 rules that became effective on April 1, 2024. Three rules were automatically subject to legislative review per Session Law 2019-198 and N.C.G.S. § 14-4.1 and became effective June 17, 2024. These 83 rules are available in the latest supplement to the April 1, 2020 North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission Rules (see https://www.deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/marine-fisheries/rules-proclamations-and-size-and-bag-limits/rules).

At its May 2024 business meeting, the MFC was again provided with a copy of the public comments received for this rulemaking cycle and then gave final approval of the remaining 20 rules. A summary of these proposed rules by subject is provided below. The rules received final approval at the July 31 Rules Review Commission (RRC) meeting. Two rules became effective August 1, 2024 (15A NCAC 03K .0110, 03R .0117) and are available in the latest supplement to the April 1, 2020 North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission Rules. The remaining 18 rules are automatically subject to legislative review per Session Law 2019-37, and Session Law 2019-198 and N.C.G.S. § 14-4.1 during the 2025 long session and thus, will have a delayed effective date.

READOPTION OF SHELLFISH PLANT AND INSPECTION RULES IN 15A NCAC 18A .0300 THROUGH .0800 (1 of 85 rules remaining)

Pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 150B-21.3A, this package of 85 rules for shellfish plants and inspections in 15A NCAC 03K and 18A consisted of the readoption of one rule with no changes, readoption of 55 rules with amendments, repeal through readoption of 23 rules, amendment of two rules, adoption of three rules, and the repeal of one rule. The changes help ensure that North Carolina remains in full compliance with national requirements, provide efficiencies for the DMF in the process of implementing and enforcing the rules, and clarify and update the rules for stakeholders. The one remaining rule (15A NCAC 18A .0302) contains minor conforming amendments.

DATA COLLECTION AND HARASSMENT PREVENTION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF MARINE AND ESTUARINE RESOURCES (5 rules)

Due to the increasing occurrence and severity of harassment during, and decreasing participation in, DMF data collection initiatives, amendments are proposed to five MFC rules. Proposed amendments set requirements to address harassment of DMF employees by any licensee or person engaged in regulated activity under Chapter 113, Subchapter IV, of the General Statutes (e.g., fishing) that

occurs in the process of obtaining data for the conservation of marine and estuarine resources, and data for the protection of public health related to the public health programs that fall under the authority of the MFC. Additional amendments provide the types of data that may be collected. The amendments support the importance of participation by persons engaged in regulated fishing activity in DMF data collection and provide a safer working environment for DMF employees.

CONFORMING RULE CHANGES FOR SHELLFISH RELAY PROGRAM AND SHELLFISH LEASES AND FRANCHISES (12 rules)

In 2021, the DMF began the process of discontinuing its Shellfish Relay Program (relaying of shellfish from certain polluted areas) due primarily to insufficient resources to run the program and lack of widespread use. The Shellfish Relay Program ended May 1, 2024. The MFC first received information about the discontinuation of the Shellfish Relay Program at its February 2022 business meeting. DMF identified 11 rules relating to the Shellfish Relay Program that set specific requirements for the relaying of shellfish from certain polluted areas. Changes are proposed to amend portions of rules or repeal rules consistent with rulemaking requirements in the Administrative Procedure Act (N.C.G.S. § 150B).

Additional proposed changes for shellfish lease and franchise requirements are proposed to 15A NCAC 03O .0201 to conform to requirements of Session Law 2019-37 (Act to Provide Further Support to the Shellfish Aquaculture Industry in North Carolina). Specifically, changes incorporate and conform the shellfish production and planting requirements from Session Law 2019-37 for shellfish leases granted before July 1, 2019, and for shellfish leases granted on or after this date. Additional proposed changes require shellfish lease or franchise holders to meet the listed production, marking, and permit requirements for current shellfish leases before being eligible for additional shellfish lease acreage. Doing so would help ensure more efficient and meaningful use of the public trust bottom by preventing persons who are not in good standing from precluding potential applicants from applying for a shellfish lease in affected areas.

2024-2025 Rulemaking Cycle (8 rules)

At its August 2024 business meeting, the MFC approved Notice of Text for Rulemaking to begin the process for eight rules. A summary of the proposed rules by subject is provided below. A table showing the timing of the steps in the process is included in the rulemaking section of the briefing materials. On October 1, 2024, a news release was issued and the proposed rules were published in the *N.C. Register*, beginning the public comment process. These documents are provided in the rulemaking section of the briefing materials.

The MFC accepted public comments on the proposed rules from October 1 through 5 p.m. December 2, 2024. Fourteen written public comments were submitted about the rules, which are summarized with the corresponding subject below and are included in a table in the briefing materials. A public hearing was held on October 30, 2024, at 6 p.m. via WebEx with a listening station at the DMF's Central District Office in Morehead City. Thank you to Commissioner Hobgood for serving as the hearing officer. Eighteen members of the public provided comments that are summarized with the corresponding subjects below. A summary of the hearing is also included in the briefing materials.

The public comments received will be presented to the MFC at its February 2025 business meeting when it is scheduled to vote on final approval of the rules. One of the proposed rules to implement the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact contains a minor conforming change that DMF staff identified was needed following publication of the rule in the *N.C. Register*, which is detailed in the corresponding summary below. This minor change is reflected in the version of the rule that will be presented to the MFC for a vote on final approval. Proposed rules have an earliest effective date of May 1, 2025, except for rules automatically subject to legislative review per Session Law 2019-198 and N.C.G.S. § 14-4.1. Rules that are subject would likely be available for review during the 2026 short session and thus, would have a delayed effective date.

POT MARKING REQUIREMENTS RULE AMENDMENTS (1 rule)
Proposed amendments would simplify pot marking requirements for commercial fishermen by requiring only one of three ways to mark pot buoys, not two ways: 1) gear owner's current motorboat registration number; or 2) gear owner's U.S. vessel documentation name; or 3) gear owner's last name and initials. The current rule requires the gear owner's last name and initials be identified on each buoy as a baseline. Then, if a vessel is used, the identification must also include either the gear owner's current motorboat registration number or the gear owner's U.S. vessel documentation name. There have been no problems with pot identification and pot identification would be sufficient via a single identifier. The proposed amendments would simplify the requirements and grant some relief to commercial fishermen that use pots in their commercial fishing operation. No public comments were received about this proposed rule. The rule is automatically subject to legislative review per Session Law 2019-198 and N.C.G.S. § 14-4.1.

FALSE ALBACORE MANAGEMENT RULE ADOPTION (1 rule)
The proposed adoption of this rule would provide a mechanism to implement management measures to cap harvest when the false albacore fishery landings exceed a threshold of 200% of average landings from both sectors combined from 2018 to 2022. Harvest restrictions would be implemented if the threshold is exceeded as a means to prevent further expansion of the false albacore fisheries beyond the threshold. Currently, there are no rules in place for management of false albacore in North Carolina.

There is no baseline stock assessment for false albacore and thus, no biological basis for reducing harvest. The only mechanism to monitor false albacore is through annual landings in North Carolina, which is not a measure for sustainability of the stock. While there is no need to manage to meet sustainability requirements, the MFC is seeking proactive management of false albacore to limit expansion of new and existing fisheries. Management options would include commercial trip limits, recreational bag limits, and recreational vessel limits. Twelve written public comments were submitted in support of this proposed rule and 18 speakers at the public hearing expressed support for this proposed rule. Two written public comments were submitted opposing the proposed rule, one of which stated the proposed rule does not go far enough, while the other opposing comment, which was submitted by the N.C. Fisheries Association (NCFA), stated "Without more biological data or support from at least one inter-jurisdictional management council/commission, NCFA cannot support arbitrary suppression of a viable North Carolina fishery while other states will not be subject to similar regulations."

INTERSTATE WILDLIFE VIOLATOR COMPACT RULE ADOPTIONS (6 rules)
The Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact is a voluntary interstate agreement that provides participating states with a mechanism to participate in a reciprocal program to: (1) promote compliance with the statutes, laws, administrative rules and regulations relating to management of wildlife resources in their respective states; and (2) provide for the fair and impartial treatment of wildlife violators operating within the participating states in recognition of the individual's right of due process and the sovereign status of a party state. North Carolina's participation in the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact has been enacted into state law, so it must be implemented and enforced. Article 22B includes N.C.G.S. § 113-300.7, which requires the Wildlife Resources Commission (WRC) and the MFC to adopt rules necessary to carry out the purpose of Article 22B. The WRC has adopted its rules. For the purposes of the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact, "wildlife" includes marine and estuarine resources managed by the MFC and the DMF. One speaker at the public hearing expressed support for these proposed rules.

After the proposed rules were published in the *N.C. Register*, DMF staff identified a minor conforming change needed in 15A NCAC 03O .0605, WVC RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION OF SUSPENSIONS, on lines 18 and 19 of the rule. Consistent with the RRC's *Administrative Rule Style Guide*[1], which provides guidance to agencies adopting rules, it is preferrable to use the phrase "such as" instead of the abbreviation "e.g." This minor change is reflected in the version of the rule that will be presented to the MFC for a vote on final approval and is included in the briefing materials.

[1] *https://www.oah.nc.gov/documents/rules/administrative-rule-style-guide-updated-april-2021/download*

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission
2023-2024 Annual Rulemaking Cycle

February 2025

Time of Year	Action
February-April 2023	Fiscal analysis of rules prepared by DMF staff and approved by Office of State Budget and Management
May 26, 2023	MFC approved Notice of Text for Rulemaking
Aug. 1, 2023	Publication of proposed rules in the *North Carolina Register*
Aug. 1-Oct. 2, 2023	Public comment period held
Aug. 16, 2023	Public hearing held via WebEx with listening station
Nov. 17, 2023	MFC receives public comments and approves 83 of 103 permanent rules
Jan. 31, 2024	83 rules approved by Office of Administrative Hearings/ Rules Review Commission
April 1, 2024	Effective date of 80 rules not subject to legislative review
April 1, 2024	Rulebook supplement available online
May 24, 2024	MFC received reminder of public comments and approved remaining 20 of 103 permanent rules
June 17, 2024	Effective date of 3 rules subject to legislative review per S.L. 2019-198 and G.S. 14-4.1
June 17, 2024	Rulebook supplement available online
July 31, 2024	20 rules approved by Office of Administrative Hearings/ Rules Review Commission
August 1, 2024	Effective date of 2 rules not subject to legislative review
August 1, 2024	Rulebook supplement available online
2025 legislative session	Possible effective date of 18 rules subject to legislative review per S.L. 2019-37, and S.L. 2019-198 and G.S. 14-4.1

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission
2024-2025 Annual Rulemaking Cycle

February 2025

Time of Year	Action
February-July 2024	Fiscal analysis of rules prepared by DMF staff and approved by Office of State Budget and Management
Aug. 23, 2024	MFC approved Notice of Text for Rulemaking
Oct. 1, 2024	Publication of proposed rules in the *North Carolina Register*
Oct. 1-Dec. 2, 2024	Public comment period held
Oct. 30, 2024, 6 p.m.	Public hearing held via WebEx with listening station
February 2025	MFC receives public comments and votes on final approval of permanent rules
April 2025	Rules reviewed by Office of Administrative Hearings/ Rules Review Commission
May 1, 2025	Earliest effective date of rules not subject to legislative review
May 1, 2025	Rulebook supplement available online
2026 legislative session	Possible effective date of rules subject to legislative review per S.L. 2019-198 and G.S. 14-4.1

ROY COOPER
Governor
MARY PENNY KELLEY
Secretary
KATHY B. RAWLS
Division Director

Oct. 1, 2024

Comment period opens, public hearing scheduled for eight marine fisheries rules

MOREHEAD CITY – The N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission is accepting public comment on eight proposed rules pertaining to the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact, false albacore management and pot marking requirements.

A public hearing will be held by web conference on Oct. 30 at 6 p.m. A listening station will be established at the NCDEQ Division of Marine Fisheries Central District Office at 5285 Highway 70 West, Morehead City.

The public may join the meeting online; however, those who wish to comment during the hearing must register to speak by noon on the day of the hearing. Those who wish to speak at the listening station may sign up when they arrive.

WHO:	Marine Fisheries Commission
WHAT:	Public Hearing for Proposed Rules
WHEN:	Oct. 30 at 6 p.m.
WHERE:	Meeting by Web Conference Click Here for Information and to Sign Up to Speak

Members of the public may also submit written comments through an online form or through the mail to:

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission Rules Comments
P.O. Box 769
Morehead City, N.C. 28557

Comments must be posted online or be received by the N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries by 5 p.m. Dec. 2, 2024.

Links to the public hearing registration form and online comment form, as well as text of the proposed rules and links to join the meeting, can be found on the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission's 2024-2025 Proposed Rules Page.

Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact – Proposed adoption of 15A NCAC 03O .0601-.0606 would comply with the requirements of the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact Act ("Act"). In its definition of "wildlife," the Act includes all species of animals the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission and the Division of Marine Fisheries protect and regulate. The Act provides reciprocal recognition of license suspensions with participating states

and enhanced flexibility for fair and impartial treatment of non-residents with wildlife resources violations, including fishing violations. The adoption of these rules would allow the Division of Marine Fisheries to hold wildlife violators accountable and treat them the same, regardless of their state residency.

False Albacore Management – The proposed adoption of 15A NCAC 03M .0523 would delegate authority to the Fisheries Director to issue a public notice, called a "proclamation," to manage the false albacore fishery if landings exceed a predetermined threshold, with prior consent by the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission. False albacore (*Euthynnus alletteratus*), also known as "little tunny," is not managed at the state or federal level in North Carolina or in any Atlantic waters on the East Coast. North Carolina currently has no procedural means to manage this fishery. The N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission is seeking to establish procedures in case the fishery continues to expand. The proposed rule adoption would be the first regulation for the false albacore fishery implemented in Atlantic waters.

Pot Marking Requirements – Proposed amendments to 15A NCAC 03J .0301 would reduce the burden on stakeholders who use pots for fishing by only requiring one form of pot identification, instead of two forms, as is currently required. The agency coordinated with N.C. Marine Patrol to conclude that one form of identification is sufficient for marking pots. The proposed changes are in response to feedback from stakeholders and internal review of processes.

The public comments and proposed rule changes will be presented to the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission for final approval of the rules in February 2025. The proposed rules have an earliest effective date of May 1, 2025.

For questions about the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission rulemaking process, email Catherine Blum, rules coordinator for the Division of Marine Fisheries.

For More Information
Contact: Patricia Smith
Phone: 252-515-5500

Website: http://www.ncmarinefisheries.net
Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/NCMarineFisheries
Instagram: https://www.instagram.com/NC_DMF
Twitter: https://twitter.com/NC_DMF
P.O. Box 769, 3441 Arendell St., Morehead City N.C. 28577

NORTH CAROLINA REGISTER

VOLUME 39 • ISSUE 07 • Pages 339 – 453

October 1, 2024

PUBLISHED BY
The Office of Administrative Hearings
Rules Division
1711 New Hope Church Road
Raleigh, NC 27609
Telephone 984-236-1850
Fax 984-236-1947

Donald R. van der Vaart, Director
Ashley B. Snyder, Codifier of Rules
Dana McGhee, Publications Coordinator
Cathy Matthews-Thayer, Editorial Assistant

Contact List for Rulemaking Questions or Concerns

For questions or concerns regarding the Administrative Procedure Act or any of its components, consult with the agencies below. The bolded headings are typical issues which the given agency can address but are not inclusive.

Rule Notices, Filings, Register, Deadlines, Copies of Proposed Rules, etc.

Office of Administrative Hearings
Rules Division
1711 New Hope Church Road — 984-236-1850
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609 — 984-236-1947 FAX

contact:	Ashley B. Snyder, Codifier of Rules	ashley.snyder@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1941
	Dana McGhee, Publications Coordinator	dana.mcghee@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1937
	Cathy Matthews-Thayer, Editorial Assistant	cathy.thayer@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1901

Rule Review and Legal Issues

Rules Review Commission
1711 New Hope Church Road — 984-236-1850
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609 — 984-236-1947 FAX

contact:	Brian Liebman, Commission Counsel	brian.liebman@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1948
	William W. Peaslee, Commission Counsel	bill.peaslee@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1939
	Seth M. Ascher, Commission Counsel	seth.ascher@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1934
	Travis Wiggs, Commission Counsel	travis.wiggs@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1929
	Alexander Burgos, Paralegal	alexander.burgos@oah.nc.gov	984-236-1940

Fiscal Notes & Economic Analysis

Office of State Budget and Management
116 West Jones Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603-8005
Contact: Julie Ventaloro, Economic Analyst — osbmruleanalysis@osbm.nc.gov — 984-236-0694

NC Association of County Commissioners — 919-715-2893
215 North Dawson Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603
contact: Amy Bason — amy.bason@ncacc.org

NC League of Municipalities — 919-715-2925
424 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1900
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
contact: Baxter Wells — bwells@nclm.org

Legislative Process Concerning Rulemaking

545 Legislative Office Building
300 North Salisbury Street — 919-733-2578
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 — 919-715-5460 FAX

Jason Moran-Bates, Staff Attorney
Chris Saunders, Staff Attorney
Aaron McGlothlin, Staff Attorney

NORTH CAROLINA REGISTER

Publication Schedule for January 2024 – December 2024

FILING DEADLINES			NOTICE OF TEXT		PERMANENT RULE			TEMPORARY RULES
Volume & issue number	Issue date	Last day for filing	Earliest date for public hearing	End of required comment Period	Deadline to submit to RRC for review at next meeting	RRC Meeting Date	Earliest Eff. Date of Permanent Rule	270th day from publication in the Register
38:13	01/02/24	12/06/23	01/17/24	03/04/24	03/20/24	04/30/2024	05/01/24	09/28/24
38:14	01/16/24	12/19/23	01/31/24	03/18/24	03/20/24	04/30/2024	05/01/24	10/12/24
38:15	02/01/24	01/10/24	02/16/24	04/01/24	04/20/24	05/29/2024	06/01/24	10/28/24
38:16	02/15/24	01/25/24	03/01/24	04/15/24	04/20/24	05/29/2024	06/01/24	11/11/24
38:17	03/01/24	02/09/24	03/16/24	04/30/24	05/20/24	06/26/2024	07/01/24	11/26/24
38:18	03/15/24	02/23/24	03/30/24	05/14/24	05/20/24	06/26/2024	07/01/24	12/10/24
38:19	04/01/24	03/08/24	04/16/24	05/31/24	06/20/24	07/31/2024	08/01/24	12/27/24
38:20	04/15/24	03/22/24	04/30/24	06/14/24	06/20/24	07/31/2024	08/01/24	01/10/25
38:21	05/01/24	04/10/24	05/16/24	07/01/24	07/20/24	08/28/2024	09/01/24	01/26/25
38:22	05/15/24	04/24/24	05/30/24	07/15/24	07/20/24	08/28/2024	09/01/24	02/09/25
38:23	06/03/24	05/10/24	06/18/24	08/02/24	08/20/24	09/25/2024	10/01/24	02/28/25
38:24	06/17/24	05/24/24	07/02/24	08/16/24	08/20/24	09/25/2024	10/01/24	03/14/25
39:01	07/01/24	06/10/24	07/16/24	08/30/24	09/20/24	10/30/2024	11/01/24	03/28/25
39:02	07/15/24	06/21/24	07/30/24	09/13/24	09/20/24	10/30/2024	11/01/24	04/11/25
39:03	08/01/24	07/11/24	08/16/24	09/30/24	10/20/24	11/26/2024	12/01/24	04/28/25
39:04	08/15/24	07/25/24	08/30/24	10/14/24	10/20/24	11/26/2024	12/01/24	05/12/25
39:05	09/03/24	08/12/24	09/18/24	11/04/24	11/20/24	12/19/2024	01/01/25	05/31/25
39:06	09/16/24	08/23/24	10/01/24	11/15/24	11/20/24	12/19/2024	01/01/25	06/13/25
39:07	10/01/24	09/10/24	10/16/24	12/02/24	12/20/24	*01/29/2025	02/01/25	06/28/25
39:08	10/15/24	09/24/24	10/30/24	12/16/24	12/20/24	*01/29/2025	02/01/25	07/12/25
39:09	11/01/24	10/11/24	11/16/24	12/31/24	01/20/25	*02/26/2025	03/01/25	07/29/25
39:10	11/15/24	10/24/24	11/30/24	01/14/25	01/20/25	*02/26/2025	03/01/25	08/12/25
39:11	12/02/24	11/06/24	12/17/24	01/31/25	02/20/25	*03/26/2025	04/01/25	08/29/25
39:12	12/16/24	11/21/24	12/31/24	02/14/25	02/20/25	*03/26/2025	04/01/25	09/12/25

*Dates not approved by the RRC

EXPLANATION OF THE PUBLICATION SCHEDULE

This Publication Schedule is prepared by the Office of Administrative Hearings as a public service and the computation of time periods are not to be deemed binding or controlling. Time is computed according to 26 NCAC 2C .0302 and the Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 6.

GENERAL

The North Carolina Register shall be published twice a month and contains the following information submitted for publication by a state agency:

(1) temporary rules;
(2) text of proposed rules;
(3) text of permanent rules approved by the Rules Review Commission;
(4) emergency rules
(5) Executive Orders of the Governor;
(6) final decision letters from the U.S. Attorney General concerning changes in laws affecting voting in a jurisdiction subject of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as required by G.S. 120-30.9H; and
(7) other information the Codifier of Rules determines to be helpful to the public.

COMPUTING TIME: In computing time in the schedule, the day of publication of the North Carolina Register is not included. The last day of the period so computed is included, unless it is a Saturday, Sunday, or State holiday, in which event the period runs until the preceding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or State holiday.

FILING DEADLINES

ISSUE DATE: The Register is published on the first and fifteen of each month if the first or fifteenth of the month is not a Saturday, Sunday, or State holiday for employees mandated by the State Human Resources Commission. If the first or fifteenth of any month is a Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday for State employees, the North Carolina Register issue for that day will be published on the day of that month after the first or fifteenth that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday for State employees.

LAST DAY FOR FILING: The last day for filing for any issue is 15 days before the issue date excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays for State employees.

NOTICE OF TEXT

EARLIEST DATE FOR PUBLIC HEARING: The hearing date shall be at least 15 days but not later than 60 days after the date a notice of the hearing is published.

END OF REQUIRED COMMENT PERIOD An agency shall accept comments on the text of a proposed rule for at least 60 days after the text is published.

DEADLINE TO SUBMIT TO THE RULES REVIEW COMMISSION: The Commission shall review a rule submitted to it on or before the twentieth of a month by the last day of the next month.

Note from the Codifier: *The notices published in this Section of the NC Register include the text of proposed rules. The agency must accept comments on the proposed rule(s) for at least 60 days from the publication date, or until the public hearing, or a later date if specified in the notice by the agency. If the agency adopts a rule that differs substantially from a prior published notice, the agency must publish the text of the proposed different rule and accept comment on the proposed different rule for 60 days. Statutory reference: G.S. 150B-21.2.*

TITLE 15A — DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Notice *is hereby given in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.2 that the Marine Fisheries Commission intends to adopt the rules cited as 15A NCAC 03M .0523; 03O .0601-.0606 and amend the rule cited as 15A NCAC 03J .0301.*

Link to agency website pursuant to G.S. 150B-19.1(c): *https://deq.nc.gov/mfc-proposed-rules*

Proposed Effective Date:
15A NCAC 03J .0301 — Subject to Legislative Review
15A NCAC 03M .0523; 03O .0601-.0606 — May 1, 2025

Public Hearing:
Date: *October 30, 2024*
Time: *6:00 p.m.*
Location:
WebEx Events meeting link:
https://ncgov.webex.com/ncgov/j.php?MTID=m104177ff009f62977013418ccb145fa9
Event number: 2425 240 2363
Event password: 1234
Event phone number: 1-415-655-0003
Listening station: Division of Marine Fisheries Central District Office, 5285 Highway 70 West, Morehead City, NC 28557

Reason for Proposed Action:

Pot Marking Requirements
15A NCAC 03J .0301 *POTS*
In accordance with N.C.G.S. § 150B-19.1(a)(2), the proposed rule amendments seek to reduce the burden on stakeholders who use pots for fishing by only requiring one form of pot identification, not two forms. The agency coordinated with N.C. Marine Patrol to conclude that one form of identification is sufficient for marking pots. The proposed changes are in response to feedback from stakeholders and internal review of processes.

False Albacore Management
15A NCAC 03M .0523 *FALSE ALBACORE*
The proposed rule adoption would delegate proclamation authority to the Fisheries Director to issue a proclamation to manage the false albacore fishery if landings exceed a predetermined threshold, with prior consent by the Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC). False albacore (Euthynnus alletteratus), also known as "little tunny", is not managed at the state nor federal level in North Carolina nor in any Atlantic waters on the east coast of the United States. North Carolina does not currently have any means to manage this fishery and the MFC is seeking the ability to do so to be prepared if the fishery continues to expand. The need for potential management was identified when there was concern expressed by the recreational fishing industry and the MFC that commercial and recreational landings have increased annually over the last 10 years and that the pressure could continue to increase over time with no tool available to implement management. The proposed rule adoption would be the first regulation for the false albacore fishery implemented in Atlantic waters.

Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact
15A NCAC 03O .0601 *WVC GENERAL PROVISIONS*
15A NCAC 03O .0602 *WVC OPERATIONS MANUAL*
15A NCAC 03O .0603 *WVC CONDITIONS FOR N.C. VIOLATIONS BY NON-RESIDENTS*
15A NCAC 03O .0604 *WVC CONDITIONS FOR N.C. RESIDENTS FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR OR FAILURE TO COMPLY IN ANOTHER WVC MEMBER STATE*
15A NCAC 03O .0605 *WVC RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION OF SUSPENSIONS*
15A NCAC 03O .0606 *APPEALS*
The proposed adoption of these six rules would comply with the Wildlife Violator Compact Act (WVC). The N.C. General Assembly enacted the WVC in statute (Article 22B) via Senate Bill 175 in 2008. The bill was signed into law on July 14, 2008, and became effective on October 1, 2008. In 2009, House Bill 105 added the N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) and the N.C. Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) to the WVC and all species of animals they protect or regulate to the definition of "wildlife". This act became effective on October 1, 2009. Article 22B includes G.S. § 113-300.7, which requires the N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission (WRC) and the MFC to adopt rules necessary to carry out the purpose of Article 22B. The legislation requires the WRC to adopt its rules first, which it did, effective August 1, 2017. The WVC would have two primary benefits pertaining to the wildlife resources under the authority of the MFC and the DMF: 1) reciprocal recognition of license suspensions with WVC participating states; and 2) enhanced flexibility for fair and impartial treatment of non-resident violators. North Carolina's participation in the WVC gives N.C. agencies a mechanism to increase accountability on wildlife violators who have been suspended in other jurisdictions. The adoption of MFC rules would allow DMF to hold those wildlife violators accountable and would result in the N.C. Marine Patrol being able to treat all wildlife violators equally, regardless of their state residency. By providing a mechanism to suspend licenses in outside jurisdictions there is a consequence for those charged should they fail to appear in court or fail to comply, thus serving as a deterrent for wildlife violators from outside jurisdictions.

Comments may be submitted to: *Catherine Blum, P.O. Box 769, Morehead City, NC 28557 (Written comments may also be*

submitted via an online form available at https://deq.nc.gov/mfc-proposed-rules.)

Comment period ends: *December 2, 2024*

Rule is automatically subject to legislative review: *S.L. 2019-198: 15A NCAC 03J .0301*

Procedure for Subjecting a Proposed Rule to Legislative Review: If an objection is not resolved prior to the adoption of the rule, a person may also submit written objections to the Rules Review Commission. If the Rules Review Commission receives written and signed objections in accordance with G.S. 150B-21.3(b2) from 10 or more persons clearly requesting review by the legislature and the Rules Review Commission approves the rule, the rule will become effective as provided in G.S. 150B-21.3(b1). The Commission will receive written objections until 5:00 p.m. on the day following the day the Commission approves the rule. The Commission will receive those objections by mail, delivery service, hand delivery, or email. If you have any further questions concerning the submission of objections to the Commission, please call a Commission staff attorney at 984-236-1850.

Fiscal impact. Does any rule or combination of rules in this notice create an economic impact? Check all that apply.

☒ **State funds affected**
☒ **Local funds affected**
☐ **Substantial economic impact (>= $1,000,000)**
☒ **Approved by OSBM**
☐ **No fiscal note required**

CHAPTER 03 — MARINE FISHERIES

SUBCHAPTER 03J — NETS, POTS, DREDGES, AND OTHER FISHING DEVICES

SECTION .0300 — POTS, DREDGES, AND OTHER FISHING DEVICES

15A NCAC 03J .0301 POTS

(a) It shall be unlawful to use pots except during time periods and in areas specified herein:

(1) in Internal Waters from December 1 through May 31, except that:
  (A) in the Northern Region designated in 15A NCAC 03R .0118(1) all pots shall be removed from Internal Waters from January 1 through January 31. Fish pots upstream of the U.S. 17 Bridge across Chowan River and upstream of a line across the mouth of Roanoke, Cashie, Middle, and Eastmost Rivers to the Highway 258 Bridge are exempt from this removal requirement.
  (B) in the Southern Region designated in 15A NCAC 03R .0118(2) all pots shall be removed from Internal Waters from March 1 through March 15.
(2) in Internal Waters from June 1 through November 30 in the Northern Region designated in 15A NCAC 03R .0118(1):
  (A) in areas described in 15A NCAC 03R .0107(a).
  (B) to allow for the variable spatial distribution of crustacea and finfish, the Fisheries Director may, by proclamation, specify time periods for and designate the areas described in 15A NCAC 03R .0107(b) or any part thereof, for the use of pots.
(3) in Internal Waters from May 1 through November 30 in the Southern Region designated in 15A NCAC 03R .0118(2), the Fisheries Director may, by proclamation, specify time periods and areas for the use of pots.
(4) in the Atlantic Ocean from May 1 through November 30 the Fisheries Director may, by proclamation, specify time periods and areas for the use of pots.

(b) It shall be unlawful to use pots:
(1) in any navigation channel marked by State or Federal agencies; or
(2) in any turning basin maintained and marked by the North Carolina Ferry Division.

(c) It shall be unlawful to use pots in a commercial fishing operation unless each pot is marked by attaching a floating buoy of any color except any shade of yellow or any shade of hot pink, or any combination of colors that include any shade of yellow or any shade of hot pink. Buoys shall be of solid foam or other solid buoyant material no less than five inches in diameter and no less than five inches in length. ~~The gear owner's last name and initials~~ One of the following shall be engraved on the attached buoy or identified by attaching engraved metal or plastic tags to the ~~buoy. If a vessel is used, the identification shall also include one of the following:~~ buoy:
(1) gear owner's current motor boat registration number; ~~or~~
(2) gear owner's U.S. vessel documentation ~~name.~~ name; or
(3) gear owner's last name and initials.

(d) Pots attached to shore or a pier shall be exempt from Subparagraphs (a)(2) and (a)(3) of this Rule.

(e) It shall be unlawful to use shrimp pots with mesh lengths smaller than one and one-fourth inches stretch or five-eighths-inch bar.

(f) It shall be unlawful to use pots to take eels with mesh lengths smaller than one-half inch by one-half inch.

(g) Except for unbaited pots or pots baited with a male crab, it shall be unlawful to use crab pots in Coastal Fishing Waters unless each pot contains no less than three unobstructed escape rings that are at least two and five-sixteenth inches inside diameter and:
(1) for pots with a divider:
  (A) two escape rings shall be located on opposite panels of the upper chamber of the pot; and

(B) at least one escape ring shall be located within one full mesh of the corner and one full mesh of the bottom of the divider in the upper chamber of the pot.

(2) for pots without a divider:

(A) two escape rings shall be located on opposite panels of the pot; and

(B) at least one escape ring shall be located within one full mesh of the corner and one full mesh of the bottom of the pot.

For the purpose of this Rule, a "divider" shall mean a panel that separates the crab pot into upper and lower sections.

(h) The Fisheries Director may, by proclamation, impose on a commercial fishing operation and for recreational purposes any of the following restrictions for pots:

(1) specify time;

(2) specify area;

(3) specify means and methods;

(4) specify record keeping and reporting requirements;

(5) specify season, including a closed season for removal of all pots from Internal Waters;

(6) specify species; and

(7) specify quantity.

(i) It shall be unlawful to use more than 150 crab pots per vessel in Newport River.

(j) It shall be unlawful to remove crab pots from the water or remove crabs from crab pots between one hour after sunset and one hour before sunrise.

(k) It shall be unlawful to use pots to take crabs unless the line connecting the pot to the buoy is non-floating.

(l) It shall be unlawful to use pots with leads or leaders to take shrimp. For the purpose of this Rule, "leads" or "leaders" shall mean any fixed or stationary net or device used to direct fish into any gear used to capture fish. Any device with leads or leaders used to capture fish shall not be a pot.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-173; 113-182; 113-221.1; 143B-289.52.

SUBCHAPTER 03M — FINFISH

SECTION .0500 — OTHER FINFISH

15A NCAC 03M .0523 FALSE ALBACORE

(a) If the level of landings of false albacore in a calendar year exceeds 200 percent of the five-year average of North Carolina recreational and commercial landings combined from 2018-2022, the Fisheries Director shall issue a proclamation as set forth in Paragraph (b) of this Rule.

(b) In accordance with Paragraph (a) of this Rule and after prior consent of the Marine Fisheries Commission, the Fisheries Director shall, by proclamation, impose the following requirements on the taking of false albacore:

(1) for recreational purposes, specify a bag limit not to exceed 10 fish per person per day, not to exceed 30 fish per vessel per day; and

(2) for a commercial fishing operation, specify a trip limit not to exceed 3,500 pounds in any one day or trip, whichever is more restrictive.

(c) A proclamation issued in accordance with Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this Rule shall become effective January 1 of the year following the year when the determination is made that a proclamation shall be issued. The proclamation shall expire when the level of landings falls below the landings level in Paragraph (a) of this Rule in a subsequent calendar year and after prior consent of the Marine Fisheries Commission.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-182; 113-221.1; 143B-289.52.

SUBCHAPTER 03O — LICENSES, LEASES, FRANCHISES, AND PERMITS

SECTION .0600 — INTERSTATE WILDLIFE VIOLATOR COMPACT (WVC)

15A NCAC 03O .0601 WVC GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The purpose of this Section is to establish the rules necessary to implement G.S. 113 Article 22B, the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact (hereinafter referred to as WVC).

(b) The rules in this Section shall apply to any person possessing a license, privilege, or right to take, possess, sell, buy, or transport wildlife in the State of North Carolina. Violations under this Section apply only to offenses charged by an inspector as set forth in laws or rules administered by the Division of Marine Fisheries or under G.S. 113-136(d). The rules shall not apply to any offenses committed in North Carolina or any other WVC state prior to July 1, 2025.

(c) The definitions in G.S. 113-300.6 Article II shall apply throughout this Section and to all forms prescribed pursuant to this Section, unless otherwise indicated.

(d) For the purpose of this Section, "member state" shall mean "party state" as defined in G.S. 113-300.6.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7.

15A NCAC 03O .0602 WVC OPERATIONS MANUAL

The Wildlife Violator Compact Operations Manual and G.S. 113-300.6 hereby establish the administrative and procedural guidelines for participation in the WVC. The Wildlife Violator Compact Operations Manual is incorporated by reference including subsequent amendments and editions, and is available at http://www.ncwildlife.org or http://www.deq.nc.gov/wildlifeviolatorcompact, at no cost.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7.

15A NCAC 03O .0603 WVC CONDITIONS FOR NORTH CAROLINA VIOLATIONS BY NON-RESIDENTS

(a) All offenses charged by an inspector as set forth in laws or rules administered by the Division of Marine Fisheries or under G.S. 113-136(d) are subject to the provisions of the WVC.

(b) Non-residents of North Carolina who are residents of a WVC member state at the time of a misdemeanor violation as set forth in Paragraph (a) of this Rule occurring in North Carolina may be

released on personal recognizance when the violation consists of a written citation requiring a violator to resolve the violation directly with the court, either in person, by mail, or through an attorney.

(c) Upon failure to comply with the terms of a citation issued by an inspector, the Division shall send notice of failure to comply. The notice shall be a letter sent by the U.S. Postal Service to the last known address of the wildlife violator or be delivered personally. The Division shall report the failure to comply to the non-resident's home state to start suspension procedures in accordance with the Wildlife Violator Compact Operations Manual.

(d) To have any licenses or permits returned by the Division, the non-resident shall submit to the Division a judgment, receipt, or other official record indicating that the citation has been resolved through the North Carolina Court System. The Division shall return affected licenses and permits.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7.

15A NCAC 03O .0604 WVC CONDITIONS FOR NORTH CAROLINA RESIDENTS FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR OR FAILURE TO COMPLY IN ANOTHER WVC MEMBER STATE

(a) North Carolina residents who commit a wildlife violation as defined by G.S. 113-300.6 in another WVC member state, who upon release on personal recognizance from the issuing state, failed to resolve the terms of his or her citation, shall have any licenses and permits for which the Division of Marine Fisheries has enforcement authority in North Carolina suspended pursuant to G.S. 113-300.7.

(b) If the Division receives notice of an unresolved citation, a Notice of Suspension shall be prepared and sent to the wildlife violator as follows:

(1) the suspension shall have a delayed effective date of at least 14 business days from the date of the mail used to send the notice of suspension to the wildlife violator, to allow the wildlife violator to contact the court in the issuing state and resolve the citation;

(2) the notice shall be a letter sent by the U.S. Postal Service to the last known address of the wildlife violator or be delivered personally;

(3) the notice of suspension shall inform the violator of the issuing state from which the wildlife violator is suspended, the details of the violation provided by that issuing state to the Division, and procedures to be followed in resolving the matter with the court in the issuing state; and

(4) the notice shall provide the procedure for appealing the suspension.

(c) Any suspension ratified by the Division shall remain in effect until such time as the North Carolina resident resolves the violation in the issuing state.

(d) When a North Carolina resident resolves a violation with the court in the issuing state, it is the responsibility of the resident to notify the Division and present documentation of compliance by submitting a copy of either the court judgment resolving the matter or a Notice of Compliance from the issuing state. Upon receipt of the required documentation, the Division shall issue an acknowledgement of compliance to the resident. If the acknowledgement is issued before the effective date of the suspension, the suspension shall be rescinded. If the acknowledgment of compliance is issued after the effective date of the suspension, the Division shall return any licenses or permits.

(e) The issuing state shall be notified by the Division if the suspension order is overturned by the Office of Administrative Hearings.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7; 143B-289.52.

15A NCAC 03O .0605 WVC RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION OF SUSPENSIONS

(a) When the Division of Marine Fisheries receives notice of a suspension from a WVC member state of a person's license or permit that is the result of a conviction or an accumulation of convictions of wildlife violations in one or more WVC member states, the Division shall determine whether the conviction, or accumulation of convictions, leading to the suspension could have led to the suspension of licenses and permits for which the Division has enforcement authority pursuant to Chapter 113, Subchapter IV of the General Statutes. If it is determined that the person's licenses and permits would have been suspended under Chapter 113, Subchapter IV of the General Statutes, the person's North Carolina licenses and permits shall be suspended pursuant to G.S. 113-300.7 for the period of suspension imposed by the WVC member state where the violation occurred.

(b) North Carolina shall communicate suspension information to other WVC member states using the WVC database, and may include the following information about the wildlife violator:

(1) name;

(2) date of birth;

(3) last known address;

(4) violations and convictions upon which the suspension is based;

(5) scope of the suspension (e.g., fishing, hunting, trapping, all privileges or rights); and

(6) effective dates of the suspension and term of the suspension.

(c) In the event documentation of a violation and subsequent license suspension is needed by a WVC member state for license suspension hearings or other purposes, the Division may provide certified copies of the citation or other charging instrument, any arrest or investigation reports, suspension orders, and the disposition of the matter.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7; 143B-289.52.

15A NCAC 03O .0606 APPEALS

A person served with a notice of suspension or revocation pursuant to this Section may obtain an administrative review of the suspension or revocation pursuant to G.S. 150B-23. Notice of the right to administrative review shall be included in the notice of suspension or revocation.

Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7; 143B-289.52.

2024-2025 MFC Proposed Rules Public Comments

Created	Name	Address: City	Address: State	Are your comments for or against the proposed rulemaking?	Please enter your comments on proposed changes to the rules and cite the rule or rules on which you are commenting.
10/28/2024 9:12	Philip G. Stammler	Durham	North Carolina	For	I'm very glad to see the proposed regulation on the false albacore fishery in the state of North Carolina. As a lifetime state fishing license holder, I support the state investing in an important resource for our statewide economy through sensible and necessary catch regulation.
10/29/2024 14:39	Newman Weaver	Georgetown	South Carolina	For	I'm am 100% in favor of a management plan for False Albacore
10/29/2024 18:55	Paul CARUSO	Marstons Mills	Massachusetts	For	Please do whatever is in the power of the NCMFC to conserve this important coast wide fisheries game fish!
10/29/2024 21:04	Capt. Ray Jarvis	Westport	Massachusetts	For	I am a full time charter captain from Massachusetts. False Albacore account for about 1/3 of the 100 or so charters I run a season. Without this fish making an appearance in our waters annually, I would struggle to run a successful charter business. I have been involved in tagging these fish with the ASGA. I personally tagged a fish in here in Massachusetts that was recaptured over 1200 miles away off of Key West, Florida. The False Albacore travels far and wide in its annual migration, this has been proven through recent scientific work. That being said, it is abundantly clear to me that this fish needs to be managed with everyone in mind. From Florida to New England, many people rely on the presence of this species. It is crazy to have an unmanaged fishery in this day and age, and I thank you for taking the time to steps to ensure that this species is protected for future generations. Thank you, Ray Jarvis
10/29/2024 22:59	Christopher Clifford	McLean	Virginia	For	I strongly support adoption of rule 15A NCAC 03M .0523 and proactive management of the false albacore fishery. Thank you for your stewardship.

Created	Name	Address: City	Address: State	Are your comments for or against the proposed rulemaking?	Please enter your comments on proposed changes to the rules and cite the rule or rules on which you are commenting.
10/30/2024 9:24	Jeff Minderlein	Catonsville	Maryland	For	Protect the Faux Albie!!! Not the only reason we come to NC but one of them. Capt JP Minderlein
10/30/2024 11:28	Richard Bertoli	Orangeburg	New York	For	15A NCAC 03M .0523 False Albacore North Carolina currently lacks the procedural means to safeguard the false albacore fishery, even as its popularity continues to rise along the East Coast. By regulating the fishery proactively, the state can ensure sustainable populations of false albacore for future generations.
10/30/2024 15:10	Eric Spicer	North Kingstown	Rhode Island	For	I am writing in support of 15A NCAC 03M .0523. We have only recently gained scientific confirmation of what many of us have believed for a long time, we share false albacore as a resource all along the Atlantic coast. I work in the recreational fishing industry at a tackle shop in Rhode Island. False Albacore has become a key piece of our business, even more so as we see a decline in other fisheries. Anglers targeting false albacore are some of the most passionate people we come across at our shop, these anglers are after the thrill of catching a speeding bullet, myself included. I doubt most recreational anglers would blink if you told them they could not take a False Albacore home with them. We would love to see what abundance in a fishery can do for the growth of the recreational fishing industry and the revenue it brings to small businesses like fishing guides and tackle shops. I applaud North Carolina for being the tip of the spear for False Albacore management and setting a precedent that other states will soon follow. I hope this action leads to a long and healthy fishery for our beloved albies.

Created	Name	Address: City	Address: State	Are your comments for or against the proposed rulemaking?	Please enter your comments on proposed changes to the rules and cite the rule or rules on which you are commenting.
10/30/2024 16:14	Will Anders	Raleigh	North Carolina	Against	I am an avid false albacore angler who is glad that we're discussing some rules but also don't think that this rule goes nearly far enough. I think that the cap limit is far too high at 200% and as we've learned through our experience with many other fisheries (gray trout, spot, flounder, etc.) when there is a sustained time period in which overfishing is occurring, things can appear okay for a while until all of a sudden you have a collapsed population that may or may not be able to ever recover. Furthermore, false albacore has tons of recreational value while basically no food value so the benefit to anglers and the community is major and the "cost" of our state choosing not to harvest these is basically nothing. Lastly, the timing of when decisions are made doesn't make sense given seasonal patterns - you can find albacore for most of the year, but they're always going to be most prevalent in the fall, so why would we potentially set ourselves up to have data in August that shows a need to cut back on harvest but not starting that restriction for a long time while in the intervening time period folks can decimate the species?
10/30/2024 17:05	kelsey dick	Charleston	South Carolina	For	I am in favor of the proposed rule, 15A NCAC 03M .0523, that would empower the Fisheries Director to issue management actions, or proclamations, if false albacore landings exceed a specific threshold. False albacore are critical to recreational anglers, especially as other fisheries decline or face further restrictions, it is important to manage this fishery.

Created	Name	Address: City	Address: State	Are your comments for or against the proposed rulemaking?	Please enter your comments on proposed changes to the rules and cite the rule or rules on which you are commenting.
10/31/2024 11:33	Scott Davis	Charleston	South Carolina	For	Thank you to the commission for taking this giant first step to protect False Albacore. It is a crucial move to protect a fish that so many love. Unregulated, their future would certainly continue to decline and be removed to stories I tell my kids about how good it "used to be." I don't want to be that dad, and the Albie do not deserve to be that fish. Thank you again for the work y'all are doing.
11/4/2024 15:49	Ken S	Kernersville	North Carolina	For	I agree to set limits if the fish are currently being harvested. Protect our fishery from over harvest whether it is recreation anglers or commercial operations.
11/26/2024 12:15	David Sneed	Raleigh	North Carolina	For	The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina submits its continued support for the proposed rules on False Albacore Management. This is a very popular recreationally targeted species with growing coastwide commercial harvest and, as such, the guardrails proposed to control harvest are an important and necessary first step towards management for long-term viability of the species.
11/30/2024 10:55	North Carolina Fisheries Association	Morehead City	North Carolina	Against	The North Carolina Fisheries Association opposes proposed rule 15A NCAC 03M .0523 for false albacore management. False albacore is a highly migratory species that can be found in all temperate and tropical waters of the Atlantic Ocean. There is no biological data suggesting need for special management or protection of this species. In fact, management for false albacore has been determined unnecessary by the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. This rule attempts to cap harvest based solely on landings with no regard to estimates of stock size, number of recruits, spawning stock biomass, amount of fishing effort, or any other metric used to determine sustainability of the fishery. In fact, the NC Division of Marine Fisheries admits in the first paragraph of the Fiscal Impact Analysis of this proposed rule that they do not currently have any means to manage this fishery and they go on to say they cannot realize the costs and benefits related to implementation of [these] management measures. Without more biological data or support from at least one inter-jurisdictional management council/commission, NCFA cannot support arbitrary suppression of a viable North Carolina fishery while other states will not be subject to similar regulations. Thomas Newman, North Carolina Fisheries Association, Fisheries Liaison

MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED RULES

DIVISION OF MARINE FISHERIES
CENTRAL DISTRICT OFFICE, MOREHEAD CITY, N.C.
OCTOBER 30, 2024, 6 P.M.

Marine Fisheries Commission:	A Hobgood, Tom Roller
Division of Marine Fisheries Staff:	Chris Batsavage, Catherine Blum, Jesse Bissette, Ben Bolton, Tina Moore, Brandi Salmon, McLean Seward, Hope Wade, Jason Walker
Public:	David Blinken, Bobby Brewer, Blane Chocklett, Luyen Chou, Brendan Curley, Jack Cushman, Scott Davis, Tony Friedrich, Wilson Greene, Joseph Harris, Michael Hogan, Dan Holmes, Peter Jenkins, Nick Jones, Brian Kelly, John Mauser, Eddie Nickens, Terry Nugent, Will Poston, Kevin Prather, Cody Rubner, Todd Treonze
Media:	None

Marine Fisheries Commission member A Hobgood, serving as the hearing officer, opened the public hearing for Marine Fisheries Commission proposed rules at 6 p.m. He explained that there are changes to eight rules proposed by the Marine Fisheries Commission and the proposed effective date of these rules is May 1, 2025, unless the rules are automatically subject to legislative review per S.L. 2019-198. He said public comments on the proposed rules will be presented to the Marine Fisheries Commission at its February 2025 business meeting prior to its vote on final approval of the rules. Commissioner Hobgood reviewed guidelines of the public hearing process and explained the hearing is a formal process to receive public comments only about the proposed rules as published in the *N.C. Register*.

Division staff member Catherine Blum reviewed the proposed rules by explaining the reason for proposed action as published in Volume 39, Issue 07 of the *N.C. Register*. She said the comment period for these eight rules ends at 5 p.m. December 2, 2024. Mrs. Blum said comments may be submitted via U.S. mail to the Division of Marine Fisheries, P.O. Box 769, Morehead City, NC 28557; written comments may also be submitted via an online form available on the Division of Marine Fisheries website, on the "2024-2025" proposed rules webpage.

Commissioner Hobgood opened the floor for the public to provide comments.

Luyen Chou provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is a recreational angler from the New York area, but he is also the founder and CEO of the "Got One" app, which he said is a fish logging app for mobile phones that recreational anglers use to log their catches. Mr. Chou said they increasingly share all their data about recreationally caught fish, including discards, with agencies including NOAA and state agencies like North Carolina, Massachusetts DMF, and Louisiana Division of Wildlife and Fisheries. He spoke in support of the proposed false albacore rule and said he is happy to see these initiatives and proposals. As an angler and as CEO of "Got One", he said he sees firsthand how valuable false albacore are to the recreational fishing community. Mr. Chou said they are a highly prized fish for recreational anglers. He said this is particularly poignant to him this year because it comes on the heels of two years of great work that has been done by researchers from the New England Aquarium and the American Saltwater Guides Association (ASGA), which has determined false

albacore are a single stock that migrate along the coastline; they are not separate, independent stocks, which is something many people have wondered about for a long time. Mr. Chou said this year in particular, at least in New York and among the New England waters, was a very poor year for false albacore catches, with almost none recorded in the Montauk area, which is legendary for false albacore in the fall. He said there was less than a third of the false albacore catches logged in the "Got One" app compared to last year, even with fewer users. He said the time is now to take serious measures to manage this stock and he is appreciative that North Carolina is taking the lead on this.

Will Poston provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he supports this action and, in general, precautionary proactive fishery management strategies. While working on fisheries policy with the American Saltwater Guides Association is his primary job, first and foremost he is a fisherman, outdoorsman, and conservationist. Mr. Poston said the Commission knows how important false albacore is to the state and the rest of the coast, the Commission has read comments and looked at the MRIP data, and has seen the amount of life, oftentimes inside the hook, during peak false albacore season. Mr. Poston has spent the last few falls chasing false albacore in New England but has also taken several trips down to North Carolina to get his false albacore fix. He said he wants the Commission to know that North Carolina has a world class fishery and destination for false albacore, or “trash fish” as many further south call them, which is an unfortunate label they have. Mr. Poston said without a doubt, North Carolina is wise to establish guardrails to protect the future of this fishery and to further preserve the opportunities false albacore provide for so many coastal communities. He said he can talk more about his own economic impacts, the joys of seeing friends catch their first, or coastal migration data from ASGA’s false albacore project, but he will leave us with this: in this day and age of incredible fishing efficiency, advanced technologies, expanding coastal populations, and climate change’s impacts on marine ecosystems, it is pretty crazy to think that there isn’t any form of management for a species as important as false albacore. Mr. Poston said North Carolina deserves a great deal of credit for the leadership role they have taken in leading towards precautionary guardrail management for false albacore. He thanked the Division and the Commission for their work on false albacore and seeing the growing need to also look at Atlantic bonito.

Blane Chocklett provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he lives in Troutville, Virginia, and is part of the ASGA team. He wants to thank North Carolina and the Commission for being proactive on this issue of management for false albacore. He has been in the fishing industry for over 30 years as a fishing guide, over 15 years as a retailer owning a fish and tackle store, an industry consultant, and an ambassador for some of the top brands in the fishing and outdoor industry, including: Patagonia, Yeti, Costa Sunglasses, and Scientific Anglers. Mr. Chocklett said he is also the Southeast region field editor for Fly Fisherman magazine, as well as an author and photographer, and currently owns and operates an international fly and tackle company. He said part of his livelihood over the years has been to travel and host fishing trips all over the world and nowhere that he has been is any more world class than the coast of North Carolina and its false albacore blitzes in the fall. He said he has hosted many trips here with lots of friends and clients, using many of the local guides, hotels, Airbnb’s, as well as amazing restaurants. He spoke in favor of this regulation to help protect and support false albacore so his kids, grandkids, and their kids can see the amazing sights he has seen. Mr. Chocklett said the Crystal Coast is home away from home, and a special place he looks forward to coming back year after year. He said it's very important that we take this measure to protect these fish, so we can all see the future of the false albacore and make sure that they're protected for future generations.

Tony Friedrich provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is the president and policy director for the American Saltwater Guides Association. He thanked the state of North Carolina for taking the time to have this hearing and also taking the time to do this regulation. He said false albacore are just an incredible resource and species that attract anglers all the way up from Massachusetts and all the way down to Florida. He stated that the work that has been done to show how

fast they swim, how far they can range, and new things are being found out every day. Mr. Friedrich said that the Guides Association was pleased to find out that the state agency in North Carolina was considering these guardrail regulations to set the tone for the rest of the coast to appreciate this fish. He said there have been untold resources put into the sciences, as was previously mentioned with the New England Aquarium, and it is continuing with DNA research at Dr. Walt Golet's lab in Maine and Massachusetts's Division of Marine Fisheries. Mr. Friedrich said that in his job, he does not see state agencies working towards a common goal of proactive fisheries management very often, so a heartfelt thank you to the Commission and the Division. He said that the Guide's Association appreciates and supports this, and it is heartwarming to see a little bit of proactive management that can go a long way. He said it is better to start management before there is a crisis. He said false albacore provide an incredible economic engine off the coast of North Carolina, people come and spend untold dollars, and he does not want to see that end. He said the Guide's Association wants to be in this for the long haul with North Carolina and false albacore, so they are in full support and the Commission has their deepest thanks and appreciation for taking this step and being the leaders on the coast for these regulations.

Scott Davis provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is from Charleston, South Carolina, and is a former guide and fly shop owner, and also works for the American Saltwater Guides Association here in the state. Mr. Davis said he is a hundred percent behind false albacore management due to the economic importance for the businesses along the Atlantic coast. He said that he wants to emphasize what Tony Friedrich said, and he is very appreciative the Commission is taking the time to take a look at this.

Capt. Terry Nugent provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule and the proposed Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact rules. Capt. Nugent said he represents Riptide charters as a light tackle guide, he has been doing so for 26 years, both up on Cape Cod and currently here in Morehead City. He said every year he comes down here, rents a house for two months and entertains clients, several hundred every year, whose primary goal is to utilize the amazing false albacore fishery. He said he has worked hand-in-hand with many of the prior speakers, Tony Friedrich and Will Poston, and would like to echo their sentiment. He said the economic benefit cannot be understated, his clients come down, they love the local restaurants, they fly and utilize the airports and car services. He said the fishery is fantastic. Capt. Nugent said he is currently here working with Tony Friedrich, Will Poston, and with the New England Aquarium doing the tagging. He said his clients just love it here, and he wants to make sure that the fishery continues. He said on a completely unrelated note, he did 20 years as a state trooper, so he loved the idea of the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact and North Carolina joining with other states. Capt. Nugent said he had no intention of speaking on the compact, but after listening to the briefing on it, he thinks it is a fantastic plan and would like to throw his support behind it as well. He said he thanks the Commission for the proactive support; he hears that some of the other states may be joining with their regulations. He said he hopes other states up and down the East Coast have the same foresight and proactive response.

Nick Jones provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is a recreational angler and is commenting in support of the proposed rule for false albacore. He said he is truly excited to see North Carolina's leadership in proposing this rule, which is honestly an overdue measure that is going to allow for sustainable false albacore management. He said the species is integral to our coastal ecosystems and economy and provides invaluable recreational experiences for anglers of all ages. Mr. Jones said, given its rising popularity among anglers and lack of management, he strongly supports giving the fisheries director the authority to enact regulations based on the landing thresholds. He said this measure is going to ensure that false albacore populations remain healthy, setting a crucial precedent for all the other Atlantic states to follow. He said he urges the Commission to adopt this rule for this valuable species for future generations and he really commends what the Commission is doing.

Joseph Harris provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is a recreational angler and wanted to voice his support for the false albacore management plan. He said false albacore is a fishery that is dear to his heart. Mr. Harris said he has already been in North Carolina eight days this year; he is visiting this weekend and will be continuing to visit through the month of December. He said he appreciates the work and to carry on.

John Mauser provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he runs Tailing Tide Guide Service and fishes from Swansboro to the Cape Lookout area. He said on average he is running about 200 charters per year. He said each year, from late September through the end of November, about 100 percent of the charters are false albacore with flying light tackle. He said those 60 days straight of fishing accounts for about 40 percent of his income. Mr. Mauser said he has anglers from as far as Canada, California, Texas, and Washington state that fish with him. He said the clients he is currently fishing with are from Washington state and they are staying for two months, renting a house in Beaufort, paying for rental cars, restaurants, grocery stores, and their wives are shopping. He said there is so much money that the clients are putting into the community during the fall because of this one species of fish, when our tourists have gone home. He said he would guess the average angler spends anywhere from $1,000 to $1,300 per day in our coastal communities from Nags Head to Wilmington while they are here to buy everything. Mr. Mauser said then you multiply that by two or three anglers per boat, 60 days a year in the fall, and all the false albacore guides from Nags Head to Cape Lookout to Wilmington, it really starts to add up. He said it is a big deal for him as a guide and the communities here on the coast that we have these fish here. He said beyond the financial importance of the fish, they are just an amazing species. He said he has been fishing for almost 40 years on the coast of North Carolina and has seen so many issues over the years, including flounder, striped bass, and speckled trout stock issues being depleted, coming back, and being depleted again. He said he loves that the Commission is being proactive with the false albacore to put these guardrail regulations in place. Mr. Mauser said he likes that the regulations do not hurt anybody, whether it is a commercial fisherman who is currently fishing for them, a fishing guide or recreational angler. He said the regulation gives space for the false albacore to grow, and if anglers want to harvest fish, that is fine, but it protects from some type of catastrophic event that could happen in the future. He said he does not think there is a better way to regulate false albacore than what the Commission is doing, and he just wants to applaud the Commission for being leaders as far as this goes, no other state has done this yet. He said he appreciates the Commission for considering this and he hopes to see the dominoes continue to fall and it go through. Mr. Mauser said he is looking forward to his kids, grandkids, and lots of future generations being able to continue to fish for these absolutely amazing fish that anglers love so much.

Peter Jenkins provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he owns Saltwater Edge in Rhode Island and is chairman of the American Saltwater Guides Association. He said he is in support of the false albacore measures that have been discussed. He said he has traveled to Harker 's Island three times over the last decade. Mr. Jenkins said false albacore is truly a remarkable fishery, and an important fishery in the Northeast. He said there is a unique opportunity in fisheries management, in that North Carolina can initiate management with the data provided by the Guides Association, demonstrating a coast wide stock. He said he works in the recreational fishing industry in Rhode Island and false albacore has become a key piece of his business, even more with the decline in other fisheries. He said most recreational anglers do not care to keep false albacore. He said he would love to see what abundance in the fishery can do for the growth of the recreational fishing industry and the revenue it brings to small businesses like fishing guides and tackle shops. He said he thinks it is notable hearing what others said about the economic contribution false albacore makes locally when people travel. Mr. Jenkins said thank you to North Carolina for providing science-based, proactive guardrail management for an extremely important recreational game fish for him personally, his business, and for his customers.

Todd Treonze provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said thank you to the Commission and the state of North Carolina for looking at false albacore management. He said he is a recreational angler based in Newport, Rhode Island, he owns a fishing apparel company by the name of Hook Gear, and he is a freelance writer for the New England publication of Fisherman magazine. He said he wrote an article that was the cover article in February of this year focusing on his experiences over the last six years fishing the Harkers Island area with Capt. Nugent. He said this is truly a world class fishery. Mr. Treonze said he has experienced things in North Carolina that he can only dream of seeing in New England when the fish migrate, and he wants to be able to see them continue to migrate for years to come. He said he is truly appreciative of North Carolina for taking this leadership stance in false albacore management, and he really hopes this sets precedence and will translate to the northern states as well. He said this stock of fish, as we know now, is one stock of fish that migrate. He said that when the false albacore start to show up, his life changes for two months until they go back south, and he looks forward to his time. Mr. Treonze said he was flying to North Carolina the following Friday to spend a long weekend with Capt. Nugent. He said he looks forward to bringing his friends and family to North Carolina to enjoy the experiences that are offered, and he wants to see that last for years to come. He said he is in full support of any efforts that can be taken to protect this near and dear species as long as possible.

David Blinken provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he has been guiding for over 30 years on the east end of Long Island, and he fully supports the measures North Carolina has proposed and the leadership role in this issue. He said the false albacore represent a very important part of Long Island's fishery, and without them business is lost, a great part of the fall business is based upon people coming to fish for false albacore. He said the attraction of the false albacore is vastly important, the fight and the frenetic feeds all contribute to an exciting experience and its popularity as a game fish. Mr. Blinken said the preservation of the false albacore, both as a game fish, and a forage fish is vitally important. He said the loss of this vital fish would have lasting economic impacts up and down the coast for light tackle guides like him. He said it is clear false albacore numbers are already dropping, so it is critically important to put in the proposed measures. He said he echoes everything said by Tony Friedrich, Luyen Chou, Blane Chocklett, Peter Jenkins, and everybody else who had spoken. He said he is in favor of the proposed measures and is looking forward to seeing them go through.

Capt. Brian Kelly provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is in support of false albacore management, to put in place slot sizes, to protect year classes, and to have a sustainable fishery for both commercial and recreational demands. He said he is a guide for false albacore from the middle of August to the end of October on Cape Cod, and it makes up about 50 percent of his guiding calendar which stems from May to the end of October. Capt. Kelly said it is the highest demand inquiry he gets, he has anglers come in from all throughout the coast and world to fish for false albacore, as far as Ireland. He said he wants to thank the Commission for putting these measures in place and foreseeing this issue, and he is in full support.

Cody Rubner provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is a guide on the East Coast of Florida and the director of communications for the American Saltwater Guides Association (ASGA). He said on behalf of ASGA, the guides, recreational anglers, and businesses that are represented, he would like to express strong support for North Carolina's proactive rulemaking efforts to establish guardrail management for false albacore. He said he echoes every sentiment that has been heard so far and wants to touch on two things. He said, regarding the false albacore project, when a massive multi-year research project is launched, it requires a lot of manpower investment and financial investment. Mr. Rubner said the ASGA team was anxious about the project's longevity and potential, but right away dozens of large industry brands jumped on, brands that are extremely intentional with their brand decisions and that represent hundreds of millions of dollars. He said the brands were excited to jump on because they saw the value for their communities. He said not only do the false albacore support

guides and local businesses, they also support national industry at scale. Mr. Rubner said the false albacore have a cult following from all the guides, anglers, and shop owners who have first-hand experience. He said a prime example is that the ASGA made a hat to hopefully offset the cost of a couple tags. He said the hat was launched one day, and the next day and a hundred of them sold out in 24 hours. He said people really love, live, and breathe chasing the false albacore. He said one extra sentiment, as a 30-year-old guide who is actively involved in fisheries conversations up and down the East Coast, almost every one is within the context of negativity. Mr. Rubner said things are in a bad place and the Commission has tough decisions to make to try and get the fisheries back on track. He said it is really exciting to participate in a positive environment and the Commission should not underestimate what this decision represents. He said this is more than just guardrails for false albacore in North Carolina, it is a remarkable shift in the outdated mindset that we do not have to wait to conserve things until there are barely any left.

Eddie Nickens provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is from Raleigh, North Carolina, a rare native North Carolinian. He said he is not speaking for any organization, but as the owner of a house in Morehead City that he frequents on occasion. He said he is a freelance journalist and has been writing about North Carolina's natural treasures for 40 years. Mr. Nickens said he is an editor at large for Field and Stream, a contributing editor for Garden & Gun, a contributing editor for Ducks Unlimited, and he writes a column for the state magazine called Ramblin' Man in which he has extolled the beauty of the coast and the awesomeness of false albacore. He said as of January 2025, he will be the editor of Tail magazine, which is the only print magazine dedicated to saltwater fly fishing in the world. He said he is only able to do all this because he lives, grew up, and works in North Carolina and is able to utilize the resources that North Carolina has. He said whenever he speaks at events or author signings around the country, people ask him one question at the end, and that is if he could only go one place, where would it be? He said his answer is very disappointing because it is always to stay at home in November so he could chase the false albacore. He said there is nothing like these fish, and there is nothing like North Carolina in the fall with the false albacore. Mr. Nickens said there is no comparable accretion of joy and happiness that he has seen in the sporting world, and he is so thankful that North Carolina is taking the time and taking the leadership to step out and say we are blessed to have a good thing, and we are going to do everything we can to not mess this up. He said beyond what has already been heard about how wonderful these fish are and this notion of the economic impact, he wanted to point out an observation. He said the University of Miami recently did a study, an economic analysis that on average, based on estimated population of bonefish, every single bonefish in Florida returns $3,500 a year to the local economy, every bonefish is worth $75,000 over its life returned to the local economy. He said bonefish and false albacore is comparing apples to apricots; false albacore is a far superior fish. He said when you are at Cape Lookout and looking over that hook, there is $60,000, $70,000, $80,000 of economic impact every single day of the false albacore season, then multiply that up and down the coast. He said North Carolina has been given a jewel, a gift, a rarity that is a winner on every part of the spectrum, from the joy it brings people to the economics that it brings back to our guides and their families. He said after reading that economic analysis, he holds a false albacore and knows this is a fish that is putting a kid through college or paying rent despite all the joy it gives. Mr. Nickens said this is a fish that North Carolina has the opportunity to take the lead on and he appreciates what the Commission is doing.

Michael Hogan provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is the founder and CEO of Hogy Lure Company, and he is here representing the company and also as an angler. He said he is in deep support of North Carolina's proactive management of false albacore; he is a fellow false albacore addict and echoes the sentiment of everyone who had previously spoken. He said he repeatedly has traveled down to North Carolina for false albacore and just had the conversation with Capt. Terry Nugent about coming down to film some false albacore fishing. He said false albacore easily account for 30 percent of sales throughout the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic; his company sells to a wide

range of retailers from private shops to big box stores, a meaningful number of which are in North Carolina. Mr. Hogan said he could track the false albacore migration with weekly sales reports by state. He said his company works closely with charter boat captains and from first-hand conversations, false albacore represents an equally big portion of charter revenue and their overall businesses. He said a lot of the pro staff captains headquartered in Massachusetts regularly travel to North Carolina to chase these awesome fish. He said that anglers, guides, and businesses all deeply care about these fish and future generations' ability to chase them. Mr. Hogan said he attended ASGA's Science Symposium for industry insiders earlier this year, and the entire auditorium was filled wall to wall with business owners, guides, and fishing-related brands from across the country, all eager to learn more about ASGA's contributions to false albacore science and understanding. He said it was a truly uplifting event just knowing how many business owners out there are as passionate as he is. Mr. Hogan said there is real opportunity to ensure that false albacore continue to thrive, supporting businesses and all the communities that rely on them throughout the whole coast, and he thanked the Commission for the leadership about this proactive management.

Kevin Prather provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is a recreational angler currently in Texas, once in North Carolina. He said he is very proud to be part of the hearing and very proud that North Carolina is holding this space and considering a very proactive, evidence-based measure that will have an impact up and down the coast. He said the writing is on the wall that something needs to be done with false albacore, as well as other species. He said the impact up and down the coast is so important, and it is great seeing folks from all over the place come and voice their support, there is such a strong community behind this. He said he has never met Blane Chocklett but fishes his flies, he has never met Luyen Chou but is familiar with the "Got One" app, and he has never met Captain Mauser but has e-mailed him about podcast episodes. He said he is sitting at his tying bench, tying flies he learned to tie from a YouTube video of Scotty Davis, but he has never met any of these folks. Mr. Prather said this is a very strong, passionate community; the culture behind false albacore in North Carolina and the history goes back decades and decades. He said the country is watching and he is very proud of what is going on here. He said he can talk about the economic impact and what it means to him personally, but at the end of the day, it is the right thing to begin living as part of this planet instead of just simply extracting resources from it.

Dan Holmes provided comments about the proposed false albacore management rule. He said he is an avid angler and guide out on Nantucket Island, and the false albacore is paramount to the fishery there. He said with the concern of the striped bass, false albacore is really keeping things going. He said he is in full support, and measures for any fish are crucial. He said false albacore particularly are up and coming with a lot of attention, more and more every year. Mr. Holmes said he really appreciates everyone from the Commission and Division getting ahead of this, he is in full support and is looking forward to the benefits of these actions.

Jack Cushman attended the public hearing and requested to speak, but he experienced technical problems and was unable to deliver his comments. DMF staff encouraged him to submit his comments in writing by the stated deadline.

Hearing no further public comments on the proposed rules, Commissioner Hobgood closed the hearing at 6:50 p.m.

/cb/cs

15A NCAC 03O .0605 is adopted with changes as published in 39:07 NCR 384 as follows:

15A NCAC 03O .0605 WVC RECIPROCAL RECOGNITION OF SUSPENSIONS

(a) When the Division of Marine Fisheries receives notice of a suspension from a WVC member state of a person's license or permit that is the result of a conviction or an accumulation of convictions of wildlife violations in one or more WVC member states, the Division shall determine whether the conviction, or accumulation of convictions, leading to the suspension could have led to the suspension of licenses and permits for which the Division has enforcement authority pursuant to Chapter 113, Subchapter IV of the General Statutes. If it is determined that the person's licenses and permits would have been suspended under Chapter 113, Subchapter IV of the General Statutes, the person's North Carolina licenses and permits shall be suspended pursuant to G.S. 113-300.7 for the period of suspension imposed by the WVC member state where the violation occurred.

(b) North Carolina shall communicate suspension information to other WVC member states using the WVC database, and may include the following information about the wildlife violator:

(1) name;

(2) date of birth;

(3) last known address;

(4) violations and convictions upon which the suspension is based;

(5) scope of the ~~suspension (e.g.,~~ suspension, such as fishing, hunting, trapping, or all privileges or ~~rights);~~ rights; and

(6) effective dates of the suspension and term of the suspension.

(c) In the event documentation of a violation and subsequent license suspension is needed by a WVC member state for license suspension hearings or other purposes, the Division may provide certified copies of the citation or other charging instrument, any arrest or investigation reports, suspension orders, and the disposition of the matter.

History Note: *Authority G.S. 113-134; 113-300.7; 143B-289.52;*
Eff. May 1, 2025.