SOUTHERN REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

APRIL 10, 2024

Briefing Materials

Contents

N.C. MFC Southern Regional Advisory Committee

Central District Office, Morehead City, NC

April 10, 2024

6 p.m.

6:00 p.m.	Call to Order*
	Vote on the Approval of the Agenda**
	Vote on the Approval of the Minutes from January 10, 2024 **
6:05 p.m.	Presentation of the Protection of Critical Sea Grass Habitat Through Shrimp Trawl Area Closures – Chris Stewart
	This is part of adaptive management adopted in February of 2022 by the MFC in the Shrimp FMP Amendment 2 to further protect SAV habitat in North Carolina, which identifies unprotected SAV habitat using updated imagery (SAV mosaic) and proposes additional protection through shrimp trawl area closures.
6:20 p.m.	Public Comment
6:50 p.m.	Shrimp FMP Amendment 2 – Adaptive Management – Protection of Critical Sea Grass Habitat Through Shrimp Trawl Area Closures
	Discussion by AC on SAV protection through shrimp trawl area closures **Vote to Recommend Management Options for MFC Consideration ****
7:50 p.m.	Issues from AC Members
8:00 p.m.	Adjourn

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

*****Action Items***

ROY COOPER
Governor

ELIZABETH S. BISER
Secretary

KATHY B. RAWLS
Director

January 29, 2024

MEMORANDUM

TO: Marine Fisheries Commission
Southern Regional Advisory Committee

FROM: Chris Stewart, Biologist Supervisor
Tina Moore, Southern District Manager
Fisheries Management Section

SUBJECT: Meeting of the Marine Fisheries Commission's Southern Regional Advisory Committee, Jan. 10, 2024 to provide recommendations for management options for Marine Fisheries Commission Consideration on draft Amendment 2 to the Striped Mullet Fishery Management Plan

---

The Marine Fisheries Commission's (MFC) Southern Regional Advisory Committee (AC) held a meeting on Jan. 10, 2024, at the Department of Environmental Quality Wilmington Regional Office, Wilmington, North Carolina and via webinar. Advisory Committee members could attend in either setting and communicate with other committee members.

The following Advisory Committee members were in attendance: Fred Scharf, Tom Smith, Samuel (Sam) Boyce, Jason Fowler (online), Jeff Harrel (online), Jeremy Skinner, Truby Proctor, Pam Morris (online), Kenneth Siegler, Michael Yates (Absent – Tim Wilson).

Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) Staff: Chris Stewart, Tina Moore, Kathy Rawls, Jeff Dobbs, Willow Patten, Dan Zapf, Brandi Salmon, Corrin Flora, Hope Wade, Garland Yopp, Ashley Bishop, Carter Witten, Debbie Manley, Anne Deaton, Jesse Bissette, Alexander Batchelder, Genny Ivec, Savannah Starling. Kim, Hardison

Public: Glenn Skinner, Lee Parsons, Joe Romano, Taylor Barefoot, Adam Child, Bob Parish, Luke Ingraham, Jack Spruill, Andy Wood, Sheel Patel, Bonnie Monleone. Thirty-nine viewers watched on YouTube.

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

Southern Regional AC Chair Fred Scharf called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. The Chair opened the floor for the AC members and DMF staff to provide introductions.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Fred Scharf asked the AC members if they approved of moving public comment after the Striped Mullet FMP draft Amendment 2 discussion but before the Southern AC votes on recommendations.

A motion was made to approve the modified agenda by Tom Smith. Second by Sam Boyce. The motion passed without objection.

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the Southern Regional AC meeting held on Apr. 12, 2023. Motion by Jason Fowler to approve the minutes. Second by Sam Boyce. The motion passed without objection.

STRIPED MULLET FMP DRAFT AMENDMENT 2

Discussion of Draft Amendment 2

Jeff Dobbs noted a full presentation on the management options is available online and today would be a verbal discussion following the Decision Document as part of the digital materials sent to the group and posted online. Dobbs said today's action item is to provide a recommendation to the MFC for Striped Mullet FMP Amendment 2 to achieve sustainable harvest. A 21.3 to 35.4% reduction in commercial harvest relative to commercial landings in 2019 is needed to rebuild the stock and end overfishing. Management options include season closures, size limit, trip limits, day of week options as well as combinations of various options. The DMF recommendation is for a day of the week trip limits (Option 5.n. – Jan. 1-31 and Nov. 16 – Dec. 31 50 lb., Sat-Sun 50 lb, Feb. 1 – Oct. 15 500 lb.) with as stop net catch cap (Option 6.b. – 30,000 lb. annual catch cap). Scharf asked about the measures put in place for 2023 as part of the supplement. Dobbs noted that an immediate reduction was needed; the division opted for regional season closures. However, fishermen indicated the 2023 season closures were difficult, particularly in the southern region. Therefore, for Amendment 2 DMF recommended a combination of management measures to achieve sustainable harvest while still allowing harvest to occur and reduced discards. Seigler noted there would be an abundance of discards with a 500-pound trip limit. Dobbs said trip limits would not occur during the roe fishery and would limit discards. Typically, the fish houses are not asking for high volume during this time. The meat and bait market demands are also lower during this time. Hopefully people will not change their gear configuration and fishing practices. Trip limits would only occur on Saturday and Sunday.

Smith indicated that has sat on three striped mullet FMPs now and each time we have done the bare minimum, basically catching the last fish that could be caught. We keep spinning our wheels and more needs to be done to increase escapement and rebuild the population. Several AC members agreed simpler is better and easier to enforce. Dobbs indicated at the options being presented came out of the workshop and that stakeholder indicated they didn't want complete season closures. The division wanted to do everything we could to reduce the impact to the roe fishery; however, we wanted to take an extremely conservative approach. Seigler said he would feel more comfortable with a minimum mesh size limit and felt that any reductions gained on Saturday and Sunday would be recouped the following week. Seigler further noted that if you went to a 1 3/8-inch bar mesh in a gill net it would allow escapement and those fish would contribute to the spawning stock for the next two years. Dobbs indicated gear restrictions are on the table. Scharf asked what was discussed regarding gear restrictions at the mullet workshop. Dobbs noted that the Striped Mullet AC was concerned mesh restrictions would impact other fisheries such as the white perch and sea mullet fisheries. More information can be found gill net issue paper.

Boyce asked about adaptive management, specifically how it would be applied between plans. He further noted that in year four it didn't make sense to implement it. Dobbs noted that if stock conditions change, we can make changes without reopening the plan. Flora noted the same language has been used in multiple plans. It's less prescriptive, we could do it twice if need be. We have a limited number of assessment biologists and the more prescriptive we get, the more our hands are tied. If the indices say we are doing good based on the annual FMP update, then we wouldn't need to do anything. Boyce said the wording made it sound like the stock would be assessed multiple times between reviews. Staff further noted that a

benchmark assessment occurs when more surveys are added to the assessment or other major changes occur; however, updates occur only when new data is added to the already existing data streams in the last assessment. Updates can shorten the time it takes to assess a stock. Dobbs went on to add that if the stock is recovered within two years, management would be loosened. Flora added the FMP update could be used to assess the stock as many of the indices used in the assessment are updated on an annual basis to monitor the stock. Dobbs further noted that if the target is not met, adaptive management gives us the ability to make changes during the 5-year cycle.

Boyce expressed his concern that when most recreational fishermen run out of bait, their 50 fish, they would only go out and get 50 more and it would be very difficult for Marine Patrol to enforce this measure. Therefore, he recommended that the division should conduct more messaging to explain why this is in place, so the public understands. Flora noted one of the objectives of the plan is public outreach and division would post best fishing practices to reduce discard mortality for the recreational fishery. Seigler asked how the fish limit was determined. Patten said the MRIP data showed that recreational fishermen landed less than 50 mullet. Seigler indicated that he would like to see the limit lower. Smith said fishermen use mullet for a lot of different things and that live bait is also a big part of fishery.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Glenn Skinner - Executive Director of the North Carolina Fisheries Association, and commercial fisherman – I have fished the roe mullet fishery for 30 years. Commercial landings have increased dramatically since the stock assessment has been completed. The 2022 fishing year had the fifth highest landings on record. Not only are our landings increasing, but the division's surveys are also increasing. The electrofishing data was not used in the stock assessment it is seeing large amounts of fish. The stock is rapidly expanding, and we are seeing larger fish. Some fish are as old as 3 years, indicating the stock is expanding. We saw much larger fish this year. We are currently not fishing at a very high rate and when the environmental conditions are right you see increases like this. Last year we had several 10,000 pounds sets. Which is all our nets would hold. We need to keep this simple and be equitable for everyone. Let's do a weekend closure, it meets the reduction needed and treats everyone the same no matter what fishery you are in. This stock is rapidly expanding based on the data I've seen; it is not overfished. Regarding the spawning stock biomass, we caught more fish last year than the stock assessment says exists. We need more data.

Taylor Barefoot – Commercial fishermen from Wilmington – I agree with Glenn, it needs to be cut and dry, no 500 pounds one day and 50 pounds another. The 500-pound trip limit doesn't work for Spanish, you can't control what hits the net. We need to go to the weekend closure. We can't divide the state into two different halves, it's not fair. We as fishermen need to work together to find a solution that works for everyone. Commercial fishermen need to make a living and provide for our families.

Lee Parsons – Charter boat captain for hire, recreational fisherman, has a major in marine technology and a minor in marine biology – I also have been a commercial fisherman in the strike net mullet fishery for roe. As a biologist, I have a problem with the roe fishery, you can't build the population back up if you keep taking the babies. I can live with 50 fish per trip, I can get other things to use as bait. It takes me 100 baits to run a trip on a good day. However, the drum fishery is going down, particularly in the southern region of the state. You need to work with other states. Is it fair to constrain fishermen in NC when you can go to other states and catch all you want. How can it work. When it comes to red drum you need to do research on caged oyster leases. Bottom leases work great. The fish don't like the caged oysters. Red drum and speckled trout don't like it due to the noise. You need to put a moratorium on caged oyster leases until a study can be done.

Jake Spruill – Defer to speak later, comments are not related to striped mullet. Left before giving comment.

Andy Wood – deferred to speak later in the meeting, comments are not related to striped mullet. Comments are provided closer to the end of the meeting.

Sheel Patel - Defer to speak later, comments are not related to striped mullet. Left before giving comment.

Joe Romano – Commercial fisherman and owner of Sea View Crab Co. – I back what Glenn said. Putting another derby fishery in place messes up everything; the price, floods the markets, deters buyers, etc. The Saturday and Sunday closure is equitable. The division is not hearing what the fishermen are saying. We need collaborative undertaking to tackle these issues. I believe if we have a problem, which I don't think we do, then why would we allow people to catch fish in cast nets before they are old enough to spawn. Data collection is the problem. The mullet fishermen can't be wrong, there are more fish than ever. This is not just for fun, it is food, substance, it's our heritage, it's our livelihoods. We are on the hills of losing many of our fisheries. If you shut us down on November 16th, you are cutting us out. Mullet don't operate on a calendar. Please support us with a Saturday and Sunday closure.

Bonnie Monleone – Defer to speak later, comments are not related to striped mullet. Left before giving comment.

Vote to Recommend Management Options for MFC Consideration

Smith said while simpler is best, just doing weekend closures only gets us to the number. It's likely that fishermen will continue to catch the same amount no matter what days are cut. Skinner indicated that once the fish make it to the ocean, they are no longer available; therefore, there will be reductions. Smith noted they are not entirely lost as the stop netters would still catch them. Skinner agreed, adding that they had a better shot than the estuarine gill netters. Boyce noted that the 30,000-pound stop net limit should address those concerns. Seigler expressed his concern the stop net limit would result in a large number of discards. The question was asked whether the limit was a daily cap or a season cap. Staff indicated once the limit was met the stop net fishery would close. Staff said you could approach it with payback if needed. Dobbs further noted the fishery rarely catches 30,000 pounds annually. Smith questioned how Marine Patrol would enforce the proposed management measures. Colonel Carter Witten, Larine Patrol noted the flat closures are the easiest to enforce and they currently enforce trip limits for several fisheries. It comes down to how the proclamation is written. Scharf said the challenge was enforcing the 500-pound trip limit. Witten further noted that most fishermen know what they have caught by sight alone. If an officer suspects that someone is over the limit, and they require fishermen to go back to the dock and weight their catch.

Scharf asked if Option 7, the seasonal catch limit, was essentially an annual quota. He noted for flounder the division tracks the landings on a daily basis. Would the division use the same infrastructure? There are always concerns with temporal closures that effort will get reallocated due to changes in fleet behavior. It's hard to know how it plays out until you do it. Typically, most states do not manage with annual catch quotas; however, NOAA commonly uses them. I know DMF tries to anticipate the shifts in effort and build it in, but it's hard to know. Annual catch limits work, because when the quota is met, fishing ends and escapement occurs. Dobbs said we know there will be recoupment if we are leaning towards the target. This is an extremely diverse fishery. People depend on the fishery throughout the year. By putting a catch limit in without other measures, you are going to disproportionally affect the roe fishery. Without having a hard end date, the reduction is shared across the fisheries. With a catch cap you are limited to the 2019 landings. Scharf added that the fishing year could start earlier in the year, say October 1. It could still disproportionately impact another part of the fishery. For example, you may not have a summer fishery. Dobbs noted that staff discussed a roe and non-roe season; however, you could have a period of time with no harvest. The catch cap is when you have exhausted all measures. Using a combination of options would be better for fishermen. Smith expressed the need to have a robust biomass first and need to aim for the high end of the reduction so we don't find ourselves back in the same situation. Scharf asked about the

reductions that were implemented with the other plans. Staff noted that the other plans haven't limited harvest and the 200 recreational limit was more an enforcement issue. Scharf noted that the stock was not in an overfished state at the time. Seigler said the biggest difference between plans was that the target changed since Amendment 1; and that is why reductions are now needed. Staff noted that while the target did change from 30% to 35%, it's the threshold that determines the overfished status and it has not changed. Scharf noted targets can change in an assessment due to fleet behavior. It's not driven by the status of the stock. Staff further noted the target was raised from 30% to 35% due to striped mullet's ecological role as a forage species, a better understanding of their life history, and the desire to create a buffer. It's a more conservative point so it could be more sustainable. We didn't account for it before, but we wanted to address it. Seigler questioned the model, adding if the old model was used, we wouldn't need management. Staff indicated that the peer reviewers identified several changes that could be made to the model to improve it; and they were incorporated in the 2022 model. This model found that the stock was overfished and overfishing was occurring. Scharf added the assessment has been approved for management and this is the best model that we have; however, the data ends in 2019, so anything you are seeing in recent years can't be accounted for. Our role is to provide input on the best options to go with. The challenge is due the complexity of the fishery, due to gears, user groups, seasonality. We try to spread the reductions across users to create fair and equitable reductions. Be aware that simple measures usually lead to one or two user groups taking a big hit.

Smith noted that when you put in monthly trip limits, it seems like you need an annual stopping point once "X" amount is caught. You have no season, you need escapement. Scharf asked about DMF recommendation and the commercial trip limits (Option 5.n.). Dobbs added the 50 lb. trip limit would stop the targeted and still allow incidental catch and allow some users to keep fish. Scharf asked about why the landings differed when the stop net cap was added. Staff indicated that for some years it could be an increase for the stop net fishery as they rarely land 30,000 pounds. We understand the cultural aspect of the fishery to NC. The 30,000-pound cap came from the workshop. Right now, there are only about four participants and it's not an emerging industry. Pam Morris noted she had the same concerns as Seigler with the division's recommendation. Further noting that there are a lot of fish out there right now, and we are only regulating people. Morris said she didn't support trip limits and didn't want to see any further regulations on the stop net fishery.

<u>Sustainable Harvest – Commercial Fishery</u>

Motion by Tom Smith to approve DMF recommendation 5.n., 6.b. and 10 for the commercial fishery.

Skinner noted he didn't agree with the motion as it was too complex. Smith said while he too believes that simpler is better, he merely just wanted to get the discussion going. While he feels a quota or a total allowable catch would be ideal, these options still allow fishing to occur while getting the needed reductions. Skinner disagreed and said he supported option 5.a. Scharf added that weekend closures would achieve the needed reduction if there were no shift in behavior. Seigler added the motion would cut out fishermen in the southern part of the state as the fish don't show up until Thanksgiving. Staff indicated that this would actually extend the season as compared to 2022. It was asked if the division examined different opening dates for north and south, more or less creating two roe mullet seasons. Dobbs indicated that it could be an option and part of the AC recommendation, but staff would need additional time to calculate the reductions. Dobbs noted when it was discussed at the workshop, fishermen were opposed to it. A friendly amendment was offered and accepted to modify the motion to include a north/south season for an equitable reduction using the Highway 58 Bridge at Emerald Isle. Dobbs noted that at the mullet workshop it was calculated and there was only a three-day difference using the landing from the last 5 years. Staff added it was not favored by fishermen. Dobbs noted that the line could be drawn at the 58 Bridge. Scharf called the motion to a vote.

The motion adjusted with the friendly amendment reads: Motion by Tom Smith to approve DMF recommendation 5.n., 6.b. and 10 for the commercial fishery. With staff looking to adjust the roe season north and south for equitable reduction. Seconded by Truby Proctor.

The motion passed 7-3.

Motion by Ken Seigler for Option 5.a. and the requirement of a minimum 1 3/8-inch bar mesh in gill nets from January 1 - March 31.

Seigler said he felt the motion would get an additional 35% reduction. Dobbs noted any reductions from reducing the minimum mesh size could not be quantifiable. We can calculate a reduction based on minimum fish size. Flora noted that since Option 5.a. meets the reduction, there would be no need to calculate this.

The motion failed due to lack of a second.

Motion by Ken Seigler for Option 5.a. and Option 10. Second by Jeremy Skinner.

Scharf asked if we could put forth both motions. Staff indicated yes, but it would be subject to the MFC interpretation. Both motions meet the reductions needed; however, one is more conservative. Seigler agrees there will be some recoupment with Option 5.a. However, it is simpler. The weekend only closure is fair to everyone. Skinner noted that he would agree with option 5.n if there was a problem with the stock. The numbers we are seeing indicate things are getting better, thus more extreme measures are not needed. Smith again, just doing the minimum has not worked and we will never fully realize the reduction if we don't go with the other motion. Skinner and Seigler disagreed. Scharf noted that if the stock is expanding and it supports your notion the division can use adaptive management (Option 10) if the stock rebounds faster than expected. Discussion circled back around to the stop net fishery cap and its contribution. Staff indicated that it made up such a small percentage of the harvest it changed the numbers only slightly. The stop net fishery would not be bound to anything, but the 30,000 cap. Option 10 was added as a friendly amendment to the motion.

Skinner asked if the amendment started in 2023. Staff indicated yes.

Motion fails 3-5 with two abstentions.

<u>Sustainable Harvest – Recreational Fishery</u>

Motion by Sam Boyce for Options 1.b. and 2.b. for the recreational fishery. Second by Jason Fowler.

Staff clarified the for-hire option allows the captain to have the fish on the boat prior to the clients getting on the boat; the limit would still be 50 fish per person. Seigler took issue with the commercial harvest being restricted on the weekends while letting recreational fishermen have 50 fish. Scharf said the recreational sector makes up less than 2% of the harvest. Seigler noted 50 juvenile mullet allowed per day for recreational use is not equitable when the commercial fishermen are limited to 50 pounds a day on the weekend, which equates to only 25 fish allowed commercially on those days.

Ken noted that in roe mullet terms that's 50 juvenile mullet equates out to 50 bait fish, which is not equitable if the commercial fishermen are limited to only 50 pounds on the weekends.

Motion passes 8-0 with two abstentions.

ISSUES FROM AC MEMBERS

Scharf encouraged the AC to provide staff as well as he and Tom Smith with topics to be discussed at future meetings.

Andy Wood, a member of the public who wished to defer comments until later after public comment in the meeting spoke briefly and provided staff with a letter from the Coastal Plain Conservation Group. Andy Wood – I would like to speak about eels, shad, sturgeon, and striped bass. We need holistic management. Beyond the saltwater and freshwater environments, management should look to how land use impacts fisheries. Please consider coastal forest destruction related to the wood pellet industry. It feeds an industry that is in economic crisis. Their whole plan of cutting and sending trees to England to burn is flawed and it would be better if we just exported coal. What's going on the land impacts the seas. Please see my handout for more details. The handout was saved with meeting materials and available upon request.

Scharf reminded the AC members that the Marine Fisheries Commission Update from 2023 was included in the digital package of materials that was sent out. Staff indicated that paper handouts are no longer mailed to the AC member and can be available at the meetings upon request. Staff noted the division will hold a Flounder Symposium in New Bern at the Riverfront Convention Center on March 20, 2024. The symposium is open to the public and is an opportunity for stakeholders, researchers and DMF staff to discuss research related to Southern Flounder in North Carolina. The details of the flounder symposium can be found on the division's website.

Jeremy Skinner motioned to adjourn, seconded by Tom Smith. The meeting ended at 8:52 p.m.

N.C. Marine Fisheries Commission
Update for Advisory Committees
April 2024

Meeting Schedules

MFC Advisory Committee (AC) Upcoming Meeting Schedules

Northern Regional AC	Southern Regional AC	Shellfish/Crustacean Standing AC	Finfish Standing AC	Habitat and Water Quality Standing AC
April 9	April 10	April 11	~~April 16~~	~~April 17~~
July 9	July 10	July 11	July 16	July 17
October 8	October 9	October 10	October 15	October 16

MFC 2024 Meeting Schedule

Date	Location
February 21 – 23	Doubletree Hotel, New Bern
May 22 – 24	Beaufort Hotel, Beaufort
August 21 – 23	Raleigh (location TBD)
November 20 – 22	Islander Hotel and Resort, Emerald Isle

At its February 2024 Meeting, the Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC):

- Approved a recommendation by the MFC Conservation Funding Committee to support the request by the DMF for a disbursement of funding equaling $40,000 from the Conservation Fund to provide support for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Edenton National Fish Hatchery to produce Phase II striped bass for stocking in the Albemarle Sound. This is part of a three-year stocking effort by the Wildlife Resources Commission and the Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) to restore striped bass populations in the Roanoke River and Albemarle Sound.
- Received a presentation on the completion report for field validation of Strategic Habitat Areas (SHA's) from Core Sound in Carteret County through Brunswick County. The presentation reviewed the results of that validation effort and discussed how SHAs could be applied to future protection, restoration, and enhancement efforts for critical habitats such as SAV. This was an informational presentation that required no action by the MFC.
- Selected its preferred management options for Striped Mullet FMP Amendment 2. The draft amendment was sent for review by the Department of Environmental Quality Secretary and required legislative entities. The draft amendment is expected to come back before the MFC at its May 2024 business meeting for final adoption. The preferred management options were:
    - ***Sustainable Harvest****:*
        - *Option 5: Combination of Measures: 5.n (day of week closure Jan-Sept Sat-Sun; Oct-Dec Sat-Mon).*
        - *Option 6: Stop Net Fishery Management: 6.a (Status quo).*
        - *Option 10: Adaptive Management Framework.*
    - ***Recreational Fishery:***

        - *Option 1: Recreational Vessel and Bag Limit: 1.c (100-fish bag, 400-fish vessel)*
        - *Option 2: For Hire Vessel and Bag Limit: 2.c (exception for bag limit for number of anglers fishing up to 400-fish maximum including in advance of a trip).*
- Was presented with an information paper that examines the resources needed to establish a long-term shrimp trawl observer program and a logbook program for North Carolina's shrimp trawl fishery. This was a specific recommendation from the 2022 Shrimp FMP Amendment 2 with the goal of gaining a better understanding of the current magnitude and composition of discards in the shrimp trawl fishery across all strata (e.g., season, area, and gear). *The MFC voted to look for multiple sources of funding and methods of monitoring that may be less expensive for a shrimp trawl observer program, in addition to the Commercial Fishing Resource Fund*.
- Received a presentation on the issue paper "Protection of Critical Sea Grass Habitat through Shrimp Trawl Area Closures", consistent with the 2022 Shrimp FMP Amendment 2. Amendment 2 included adaptive management for future action to address issues related to submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) identified through DEQ collaboration with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) support staff, the Habitat and Water Quality AC, and stakeholder groups. The DMF developed an issue paper that provides an adaptive management strategy to further protect SAV habitat in North Carolina, by identifying unprotected SAV habitat using updated imagery (SAV mosaic) and providing additional protection through proposed shrimp trawl area closures. *The MFC voted to refer the issue paper to the Northern and Southern regional and Shellfish/Crustacean advisory committees for their input.*
- Was presented an issue paper originally requested by the MFC about false albacore management. *The MFC selected Option 3 as its preferred management option and associated proposed language for rulemaking*. Rulemaking is scheduled to begin in August 2024. Option 3 is as follows:
    - *Formally monitor false albacore landings and provide a landings summary to the MFC at its annual August business meeting. Adopt rule for precautionary management of false albacore to cap harvest via recreational bag limits, recreational vessel limits, and commercial trip limits when the false albacore fishery landings exceed a threshold of 200% of average landings from both sectors combined from 2018 to 2022. Harvest reductions would be implemented if the threshold is exceeded as a means to prevent further expansion of the false albacore fisheries beyond the threshold, contingent on MFC concurrence*.
- Was presented an issue paper on simplifying pot marking requirements. *The MFC selected Option 2 as its preferred management option and associated proposed language for rulemaking*. Rulemaking is scheduled to begin in August 2024. Option 2 is as follows:
    - Amend rule to simplify pot buoy marking requirements by requiring only one of three ways to mark pot buoys, not two ways.
- *Requested that the Rules Review Commission waive the 210-day requirement for the Marine Fisheries Commission to submit a temporary rule to the Rules Review Commission based on the effective date of Session Law 2023-137, Section 6, per N.C.G.S. 150B-21.1(a2).* See the "Session Law 2023-137, Section 6" segment of this document for more information.

Preview of May 2024 Quarterly Business Meeting

Fishery Management Plans (FMPs)

- Striped Mullet FMP Amendment 2
    - The MFC is scheduled to vote on final approval of Amendment 2. If adopted, the MFC and DMF would begin implementing the management measures contained in the amendment.
- Estuarine Striped Bass FMP Amendment 2 Adaptive Management
    - DMF staff will present the Revision to Amendment 2 documenting no harvest in the Albemarle Sound and Roanoke River Management areas previously implemented through adaptive management, consistent with the 2022 update to the striped bass stock assessment. There is no MFC action that needs to take place on this item.
- Shrimp FMP Amendment 2 Implementation
    - The MFC will receive recommendations from the Northern, Southern, and Shellfish/Crustacean advisory committees about implementing adaptive management regarding "Protection of Critical Sea Grass Habitat through Shrimp Trawl Area Closures" with a potential vote on the proposed management measures.
- Spotted Seatrout FMP Amendment 1
    - The DMF is developing the draft amendment for the FMP advisory committee workshop scheduled to be held in April 2024. The MFC will hear a short update on the development of this FMP at its May 2024 business meeting, but no action is scheduled to take place.
- Eastern Oyster FMP Amendment 5 and Hard Clam FMP Amendment 3
    - The DMF is developing the draft amendments for the FMP advisory committee workshop to tentatively be held in late 2024. The MFC will hear a short update on the development of these FMPs at its May 2024 business meeting, but no action is scheduled to take place.
- Stock Assessment Updates*:* The DMF is working on stock assessment updates with data through 2022 for blue crab and southern flounder. The current stock assessments indicate both stocks are overfished and overfishing is occurring. Adaptive management in the Blue Crab FMP and the Southern Flounder FMP allows for management changes to address the results of each stock assessment update.
    - The MFC will receive a presentation on the Blue Crab Stock Assessment Update at its May 2024 business meeting. This could potentially result in additional management action for blue crab through the Adaptive Management framework in the Blue Crab FMP Amendment 3.

Rulemaking

- The MFC will vote on final approval of a package of rules covering:
    - Data collection and harassment prevention for the conservation of marine and estuarine resources;
    - Oyster sanctuary rule changes; and
    - Conforming rule changes for shellfish relay program and shellfish leases and franchises.

- The MFC will also be presented with language for rulemaking regarding the Interstate Wildlife Violator Compact, for rulemaking to potentially begin in August 2024.

Other Items

- The MFC will also receive a presentation on the Shellfish Lease and Aquaculture Program that covers the statutes and rules governing the approval process for new leases.

Session Law 2023-137, Section 6

This is the legislation that was passed in the fall of 2023 that requires any person who recreationally harvests red drum, flounder, spotted seatrout, striped bass, and weakfish to report that harvest to the DMF. The requirement applies in the coastal and joint fishing waters under the authority of the MFC and any connecting inland fishing waters that are under the authority of the Wildlife Resources Commission.
Additionally, it requires any person holding a commercial fishing license, who is engaged in a commercial fishing operation, to report all fish harvested to the DMF, regardless of sale. For the purposes of this law, "all fish" includes finfish, shellfish, and crustaceans.

The legislation phases in the requirements over a period of three years. The first phase is effective December 1, 2024, and includes a verbal warning for failure to report harvest. Warning tickets will be issued starting December 1, 2025, followed by an infraction with a $35 fine starting December 1, 2026 for failure to report harvest. These infractions count towards suspension of fishing licenses and permits.

The DMF is currently drafting temporary rules to implement this legislation. In order to meet the required deadlines for implementation, MFC will likely need to hold two special-called meetings, one in late spring and another in early summer. The exact dates of these meetings have not yet been finalized. The DMF is working with the Wildlife Resources Commission, who is also drafting temporary rules to implement this legislation.

PROTECTION OF CRITICAL SEA GRASS HABITAT THROUGH SHRIMP TRAWL AREA CLOSURES

March 25, 2024

ISSUE

Providing additional protection for critical sea grass habitat through shrimp trawl area closures.

II. ORIGINATION

The North Carolina Shrimp Fishery Management Plan (FMP) Amendment 2 and the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (NCMFC).

III. BACKGROUND

In February 2022, the NCMFC adopted the Shrimp Fishery Management Plan Amendment 2. With the adoption of Amendment 2 several management strategies were implemented to further reduce bycatch of non-target species and minimize ecosystem impacts (NCDMF 2022). The commission's management strategy included adaptive management for future action to address issues related to submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) identified through Department collaboration with the Coastal Habitat Protection Plan (CHPP) support staff, the Habitat and Water Quality Advisory Committee (AC), and stakeholder groups. Adaptive management combines management and monitoring, with the aim of improving decision-making over time as more information becomes available. Adaptive management uses an iterative learning process to improve management outcomes, allows flexibility in decision making, and incorporates new information to accommodate alternative and/or additional actions (Holling 1978; Allan and Stankey 2009; Smith et al. 2013). In the context of North Carolina FMPs, adaptive management is an optional management framework that allows for specific management changes to be implemented between FMP reviews under specified conditions to accomplish the goal and objectives of the plan.

This issue paper uses the adaptive management strategy adopted in Amendment 2 to further protect SAV habitat in North Carolina, by identifying unprotected SAV habitat using updated imagery and providing additional protection through shrimp trawl area closures. As new imagery becomes available, shrimp trawl lines may be created or adjusted to encompass additional SAV habitat via revision of existing proclamations (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03L .0101) or suspending of rules via proclamation (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03I .0102). The Atlantic State Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) SAV policy encourages state agencies to implement regular statewide SAV monitoring programs every five years to identify changes in SAV health and abundance (Havel and ASMFC 2018). Additionally, the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC) strongly recommends that a comprehensive adaptive management strategy be developed as a long-term protection strategy (SAMFC 2014). The 2021 Amendment to the CHPP recommends coast-wide monitoring occur every five years to evaluate the success of management actions and determine contributing relationships between changes in SAV species extent, distribution, and composition (Field et al 2020; NCDEQ 2021). The Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership coordinates annual aerial and ground-based monitoring statewide on a rotating schedule during the spring and fall each year.

North Carolina is home to the largest documented polyhaline and mesohaline (brackish) SAV ecosystem on the Atlantic seaboard of North America (Bartenfelder et al. 2022). NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03I .0101 (4)(i) defines SAV as fish habitat dominated by one or more species of underwater vascular plants and occurs in subtidal and intertidal zones. SAV habitat provides refuge, forage, corridor, spawning, and nursery areas for many organisms including flounder (*Paralichthys* spp.), red drum (*Sciaenops ocellatus*), spotted seatrout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*), snapper, grouper, bay scallops (*Argopecten irradians*), blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*), and penaeid shrimp (NCDMF 2021). Fish and invertebrate use of SAV differs spatially and temporally due to distribution ranges, time of recruitment, and life histories as well as seasonal abundance patterns of SAV (Micheli and Peterson 1999; Minello 1999; NOAA 2001; NCDEQ 2016). The SAFMC designated SAV as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for shrimp, snapper and grouper species, and spiny lobster (*Panulirus argus*), and Essential Fish Habitat Areas of Particular Concern for shrimp and snapper and grouper species (SAFMC 2021). The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council designated SAV as Habitat Areas of Particular Concerns for summer flounder (*P. dentatus*; MAFMC 2016).

Field sampling of Strategic Habitat Areas (SHAs) in regions 3 and 4 (Core Sound through Brunswick County) found that SHAs had a greater abundance of SAV dependent species [Penaeid shrimp, southern flounder (*P. lethostigma*), red drum, silver perch (*Bidyanus bidyanus*), blue crab, etc.], as well as SAV (NCDMF 2023), supporting the critical importance of SAV for fishery species (Deaton et al. 2023). SAV also provides other important ecosystem functions such as increasing structural complexity, sediment and shoreline stabilization, improving water quality, primary productivity, nutrient cycling, and carbon sequestration. Beyond its ecological value, SAV provides significant market and nonmarket value to the state of North Carolina (Sutherland et al. 2021). In the Albemarle-Pamlico estuary alone, a five percent decadal loss in SAV is estimated to account for $8.6 million in losses a year in commercial fishing, recreational fishing, property value, and carbon sequestration. For a complete review of habitat requirements, species composition, ecological and biological functions, fish use, and status of SAV habitat see the North Carolina CHPP source document (NCDEQ 2016) and the 2021 Amendment (NCDEQ 2021).

In North Carolina, beds of SAV occur in subtidal and intertidal areas of sheltered estuarine and riverine waters where there is suitable sediment, adequate light reaching the bottom, and moderate to negligible current disturbance (Ferguson and Wood 1990, 1994; Thayer et al. 1984). SAV habitat is primarily located in shallow subtidal water (<6 feet) and individual species vary in their occurrence as salinity, depth, and water clarity change (NCDEQ 2016, 2021). The distribution, abundance, and density of SAV varies seasonally and annually (Dawes et al. 1995; Fonseca et al. 1998; SAFMC 1998; Thayer et al. 1984). Therefore, historical as well as current occurrences need to be considered to determine locations of viable seagrass habitat (SAFMC 1998).

Since the 1980s various mapping and monitoring projects have been conducted by several universities and state and federal agencies to document the extent of SAV in North Carolina (NCDMF 2021). More recently, aerial survey and ground-based monitoring data were collected in the high salinity waters from Manteo to Wrightsville Beach from 2020 to 2021. These maps were merged with previous data to comprise the historical or maximum known extent of SAV along North Carolina's coast (commonly referred to as the SAV mosaic). The 2021 Amendment to the CHPP divides the mosaic into nine SAV regions to best represent regional variability of

waterbodies (Figure 1). For a complete review of coastal habitat mapping and SAV monitoring, see Amendment 1 to the CHPP (NCDEQ 2021).

While there are several major threats to SAV (i.e., eutrophication, sedimentation, pollution, coastal development, climate change, etc.), impacts from mobile bottom disturbing fishing gears is of particular concern. It has been well documented that bottom disturbing gears such as trawls can significantly reduce habitat complexity and community composition from the physical disruption of the habitat to the removal of species (Dorsey and Pederson 1998; Auster 1998; NCDMF 1999; SAFMC 2014; Hiddink et al. 2017; Sciberras et al. 2018; Barnette 2001; NRC 2002; NCDEQ 2016, 2021). Otter trawls, the primary fishing gear used to harvest shrimp in NC, are conical nets pulled behind vessels along the benthos (Stewart and Dietz 2021; NCDMF 2022). Shearing or cutting of SAV leaves, flowers, or seeds, and uprooting of the plant may occur from the sweep of the net or the digging of the trawl doors into the sediment (ASMFC 2000). Skimmer trawls, another common gear used to harvest shrimp in North Carolina, uses metal skids to keep frames with attached nets off the bottom as they are fished. However, damage to the bottom can still occur if the gear is improperly tuned or designed (Hein and Meier 1995). Additionally, skimmer trawls are effectively fished in shallow waters, raising concerns with propeller scarring. Both gears increase turbidity, which can slow the growth of primary (algae and plants) and secondary producers (organisms that consume other organisms), limit nutrient regeneration, and disrupt the feeding relationships of all organisms within the ecosystem (the food web). For a comprehensive review of the impact of trawling in North Carolina waters, see NCDMF (1999, 2014, 2022), and NCDEQ (2016, 2021).

IV. AUTHORITY

North Carolina General Statutes
§ 113134 RULES
§ 113-173 RECREATIONAL COMMERCIAL GEAR LICENSE
§ 113182 REGULATION OF FISHING AND FISHERIES
§ 113-182.1 FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS
§ 113-221.1 PROCLAMATIONS; EMERGENCY REVIEW
§ 143B-289.52 MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION – POWERS AND DUTIES

North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission Rules
15A NCAC 03H .0103 PROCLAMATIONS, GENERAL
15A NCAC 03J .0104 TRAWL NETS
15A NCAC 03L .0101 SHRIMP HARVEST RESTRICTIONS
15A NCAC 03L .0103 PROHIBITED NETS, MESH LENGTHS AND AREAS

V. DISCUSSION

Specific habitat protections for SAV have been implemented as part of FMPs for shrimp (NCDMF 2006, 2015, 2022), bay scallop (NCDMF 2007, 2015), hard clam (NCDMF 2008, 2017), and blue crab (NCDMF 1998; 2020). In addition, the 2006 Shrimp FMP included consideration of a strategy to expand areas where dredging and trawling is prohibited to allow some recovery of SAV and shell bottom where those habitats historically occurred (NCDMF 2006). Trawling was prohibited

in the Albemarle and Currituck sounds due to user conflicts, but the prohibition also provided ancillary protections for SAV habitat (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0104). Trawling and dredging is prohibited in SAV beds on the eastern side of Pamlico, Core, and Back sounds through a trawl net prohibited area designation (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0106). SAV beds north of the Intracoastal Waterway (IWW) and on the western end of Bogue Sound are protected via proclamation (NCDMF 2007). With the adoption of Amendment 2 to the Shrimp FMP, trawling in Bogue Sound was further restricted to the IWW only to protect SAV habitat while continuing to allow shrimp trawling. SAV in the New River is also protected within no trawl areas below the Highway 172 Bridge. Crab Spawning Sanctuaries (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03L .0205) and inlet trawling restrictions (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0401) provide a "no trawl corridor" around inlets that protect crabs and allows migration of sub-adult fish to the ocean. All trawling was permanently prohibited in Crab Spawning Sanctuaries with the adoption of Amendment 2 to the Shrimp FMP; prior to its adoption, trawling was limited to November through February. See Shrimp Fishery Management FMP Amendment 2 (NCDMF 2022) for additional area restrictions that prohibit trawls in North Carolina's coastal and estuarine waters.

Because the current understanding of SAV distribution is based on historic mapping efforts (1981-2021), maps may not represent the actual, real-time extent of SAV for a given year but represent potential SAV habitat. Unsworth et al. (2018) notes seagrass conservation targets should incorporate future potential distribution of seagrasses and account for physiological responses to shifting environmental conditions that may result in species range-changes, localized invasions and extinctions, and shifts in structure and function of SAV habitat. Therefore, any shrimp trawl closures implemented to protect SAV must be broad enough to capture potential SAV habitat distribution.

One method to promote protection and recovery of SAV habitat is the creation of management buffers around important habitats. The overall goal of a buffer is to achieve sustainable use of natural resources that benefit both local communities and resources, while limiting the impact of destructive activities that take place outside of a protected area (Sanderson and Bird 1998; Martino 2011; Ebregt and Greve 2000). Terrestrial buffers are used by the North Carolina Environmental Management and Coastal Resources commissions to protect wetlands and water quality (NCDEQ 2016). In the marine environment, buffers have been used in conjunction with Marine Protected Areas (MPA) to protect important marine and coastal ecosystems as well as create migration corridors. Increasing connectivity between SAV habitats and other essential fish habitats can further reduce habitat fragmentation (edge effect) which can negatively impact community structure and nursery value (Benitez-Malvido and Arroyo-Rodriguez 2008). As a part of the Hard Clam FMP, adaptive management is used to modify mechanical clam harvest areas (MCHAs) to allow a buffer between dredged areas and SAV and oyster beds (NCDMF 2008, 2017). Similar buffers between open shrimp trawl areas and the maximum known extent of SAV habitat should be established as a means of protecting SAV habitat. More expansive closures are needed to reduce the impact of turbidity and sedimentation associated with bottom disturbing gear. Excessive sedimentation from bottom disturbing fishing gear and propeller wash can bury SAV. Increased turbidity further reduces water clarity, SAV growth, productivity, and survival (NCDEQ 2016). Furthermore, buffers that are expanded to make use of existing navigation aids, landmarks, or management boundaries accomplish the goal of increased buffers while also helping to promote compliance and simplify enforcement.

The 2021 Amendment to the CHPP cites the need to further protect and restore SAV as new mapping data become available (NCDEQ 2021). At the time of the amendment, the maximum extent of SAV along North Carolina's coast was 191,155 acres (1981-2015). With the additional mapping data from 2020 to 2021, the maximum known extent of SAV habitat is approximately 196,190 acres (Table 2; Figure 1). While closing areas of critical SAV habitat allows for calculation of how much additional habitat will be protected from direct physical disturbance from shrimp trawls, overall and additional benefits to SAV are difficult to quantify. In the absence of shrimp trawls, SAV growth may continue to be impaired by poor water quality, climate change, disease, or other natural disturbances. It's important to note that while broad scale closures are often better for conservation and biodiversity (Ebregt and Greve 2000), their creation may prevent trawling in productive areas with no SAV and disproportionately impact some user groups (i.e., small vessels, Recreational Commercial Gear License holders). The division does not have shrimp trawl effort data specific for each SAV region; thus, the precise economic impacts to the shrimp trawl fishery cannot be estimated but effort was made to balance SAV habitat protection and impacts to fishermen when determining closure boundaries.

VI. MANAGEMENT OPTIONS AND IMPACTS

(+ Potential positive impact of action)
(- Potential negative impact of action)

SAV Region 1 – Currituck Sound and Back Bay

Region 1 extends from Back Bay south to Point Harbor and encompasses all of Currituck Sound. Based on the most recent SAV mosaic (1981-2021), there are 21,613 acres of known SAV habitat in this region (Table 2; Figure 1). Shrimp trawling is prohibited throughout Currituck Sound [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0104(b)(3)]; no additional shrimp trawl closures are needed to protect SAV habitat in this region.

SAV Region 2 – Albemarle / Roanoke Sound

Region 2 extends from the Albemarle Sound to the Melvin R. Daniels Bridge (HWY 64) in the Roanoke Sound and includes the Alligator River and portions of the Croatan Sound (Figure 1). There are 12,872 acres of known SAV habitat in this region of which 42.1% is unprotected (Table 2). Shrimp trawling is prohibited in the Albemarle Sound, and throughout much of Roanoke Sound [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0104(b)(3)]. Special secondary nursery areas (SSNA) are designated in Kitty Hawk/ Buzzards, and Shallowbag bays. While these SSNAs have not opened since 2017, establishing shrimp trawl prohibited areas will provide permanent protection to known SAV habitat within these SSNAs.

Shallow water and other impediments limit trawling in this region; however, there is a considerable amount of unprotected SAV habitat in waters surrounding Colington and Roanoke islands. Creating a new no shrimp trawl line from Weir Point to the Manns Harbor Bridge will protect SAV habitat along the western shoreline of Roanoke Island and increase connectivity (Figure 2). Further restricting trawling to the Roanoke Sound Channel will increase connectivity between SAV habitats and create clear boundaries for enforcement (Figure 2). Allowing trawling within 100 feet on either side of the channel will allow trawlers space to safely maneuver their vessels and reduce user group conflict. While broad shrimp trawl closures may further limit small

commercial and recreational vessels, they provide the greatest protection to SAV habitat. Complementary closures in Region 5 (Roanoke Sound to Ocracoke Inlet) should be considered in conjunction with closures in Region 2 to create a continuous closed area of SAV habitats across these regions (Figure 5).

1. Prohibit shrimp trawling along the western shoreline of Roanoke Island from Weir Point to the Manns Harbor Bridge.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow potential for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between SAV habitats among regions
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

2. Limit shrimp trawling to main channel only (100 ft either side) of the Roanoke Sound Channel.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow potential for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between SAV habitats among regions
   + Provides access to fishermen and has minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are dredged for navigation
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

SAV Region 3 – Tar-Pamlico and Neuse rivers

Region 3 stretches across three counties (Beaufort, Pamlico, and Carteret) and encompasses the Pungo, Tar-Pamlico, Neuse, and Bay rivers and their tributaries (Figures 1 and 3). There are 4,581 acres of known SAV habitat within this region, of which 11.6% is unprotected (Table 2). In the Pungo River, shrimp trawling is prohibited upstream of a line from Currituck Point running southwesterly to Wades Point [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0114(A)]. All waters upstream of a line running from the entrance of Goose Creek northeasterly to Wades Point are closed to trawling in the Tar-Pamlico River [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0114(B)]. In the Neuse River, shrimp trawling is prohibited upstream of a line running northerly from Cherry Point to Wilkinson Point [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0114(C)]. Most of the tributaries and bays in this region are designated as primary and secondary nursery areas; however, trawling is allowed in Bay River as well as parts of Goose Creek, Clubfoot Creek, Adams Creek, South River, and Turnagain Bay.

Shrimp trawling is prohibited in designated pot areas in the Pamlico, Bay, and Neuse rivers from June 1 to November 30 in less than six feet of water [NCMFC Rules 15A NCAC 03J .0104(b)(6), 03J .0301(a)(2), and 03R .0107(a)(5)(6)(7)(8)]. Establishing permanent shrimp trawl closures in select designated pot areas where SAV is known to occur will provide permanent protection to SAV habitat and further reduce conflict between shrimp trawls and crab pots. Permanent shrimp trawl closures are recommended for designated pot areas in Vandemere Creek, Shell Bay, White Perch Bay, Bonner Bay, Fisherman's Bay, Turnagain Bay, and South River (Figure 3).

3. Prohibit shrimp trawling year-round in designated pot areas in Vandemere Creek, Shell Bay, White Perch Bay, Bonner Bay, Fisherman's Bay, Turnagain Bay, and South River.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Provides additional protection to critical shell bottom habitat
   + Minimal impact to fishermen since areas are not used extensively
   + Reduce gear conflicts between trawls and crab pots
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

<u>SAV Region 4 – Pamlico Sound</u>

Region 4 encompasses most of Pamlico Sound, spanning from the Manns Harbor Bridge (HWY 64) to the mouth of Neuse River and Cedar Island (Figures 1 and 4). The eastern side of Pamlico Sound (Outer Banks) is in SAV Region 5 and connected to SAV Regions 2, 3, and 6. There are 712 acres of known SAV habitat in Region 4, of which 68.8% is unprotected (Table 2). Stumpy Point Bay is closed to trawling from Drain Point to a line running westerly to Kazer Point [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0106(2)]. Most of the feeder creeks and bays along the Hyde County shoreline are classified as Primary Nursey Areas (PNA) and Secondary Nursery Areas (SNA). It is unlawful to use trawl nets in PNAs and SNAs (NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03N .0104 and .0105). Trawling is also prohibited in three military danger zones and restricted areas located near the mouths of Long Shoal and Bay rivers as well as Piney Island.

SAV habitat has been documented along the northwestern shoreline of Dare County from Manns Harbor to Callaghan Creek and from Long Wretch Creek to Stumpy Point (Figure 4). Establishing straight-line closures along the shoreline would protect known SAV habitat, simplify enforcement, and have minimal impact to fishermen in the Croatan Sound (Figure 4). Expanding the Stumpy Point shrimp trawl closure to include the area from Drain Point to Sandy Point will further protect SAV habitat south of Wild Boar Point. Additional closures in Sandy, Parched Corn, Berrys, East Bluff, and West Bluff bays as well as the mouths of Burrus, Middletown, Back, Brooks, and Middle creeks should also be considered (Figure 4). Establishing prescribed area closures along the western Hyde County shoreline will further protect SAV habitat and simplify enforcement (Figure 4).

4. Create and expand existing closures along the western shoreline of Dare and Hyde counties to include the bays and tributaries from Manns Harbor to West Bluff Bay.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Minimal impact to fishermen since areas are not used extensively
   + Reduce gear conflicts between trawls and crab pots
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

SAV Region 5 – Roanoke Sound to Ocracoke Inlet

Region 5 extends from the Manns Harbor Bridge (HWY 64) south to Ocracoke Inlet and includes portions of the Roanoke and Pamlico sounds (Figures 1 and 5). There are 103,856 acres of known SAV habitat within this region; the largest acreage of SAV habitat in North Carolina (Table 2). Much of the eastern side of the Pamlico Sound is closed to trawling to protect SAV habitat (15A NCAC 03R .0106 (1)). Shrimp trawling is prohibited in the Wanchese Marshes Seed Oyster Management Area [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0116(2)]. Oregon, Hatteras, and Ocracoke inlets are designated as crab spawning sanctuaries. Amendment 2 to the Shrimp FMP permanently closed all crab spawning sanctuaries to trawling (NCDMF 2022; Proclamation SH-1-2023).

Because of their proximity and connection, shrimp trawl closures in SAV regions 2 and 5 should complement each other to increase connectivity as well as simplify enforcement and compliance. Therefore, shrimp trawling should be further restricted to within 100 feet on either side of the channel running from the southeastern shore of Wanchese to the Bodie Island marshes (Figure 5). Along the western shore of Roanoke Island, shrimp trawl closures should extend south of the Manns Harbor Bridge to the Wanchese Seed Oyster Management Area at Cedar Bush Bay to align with proposed closures in Region 2 (Figure 5). To protect the remaining SAV habitat along the western shoreline of the Outer Banks, the existing trawl net prohibited area should be extended to the west behind Salvo and Buxton Harbor (Figure 5).

5. Limit shrimp trawling to main channel only (100 ft either side) of the southeastern shore of Wanchese to the Bodie Island marshes.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between SAV habitats among regions
   + Provides access to fishermen and has minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are dredged for navigation
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

6. Prohibit trawling along the western shore of Roanoke Island from the Manns Harbor Bridge to northern most tip of the Wanchese Seed Oyster Management Area.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between SAV habitats among regions
   + Provides access to fishermen and has minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are dredged for navigation
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

7. Modify the existing trawl net prohibited area along the Outer Banks to include portions of the western shoreline behind Salvo and Buxton Harbor.

+ Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
+ Creates continuous closed areas between SAV habitats among regions
+ Minimal impact to fishermen since areas are not used extensively
- Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion
- SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

SAV Region 6 – Core Sound

Region 6 contains the second largest known SAV habitat within the state; however, the vast majority of SAV in this region is unprotected (Figures 1 and 6). There are 37,645 acres of known SAV and SAV habitat, of which 35.5% is unprotected (Table 2). The area on the eastern side of Core Sound is designated as a no trawl area by NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03R .0106 (1) and is in place to protect SAV but can be opened to peeler crab trawling by proclamation [NCMFC Rule 15A NCAC 03J .0104 (4)]. On the mainland side of Core Sound, Jarrett Bay, Brett Bay, Nelson Bay, Thorofare-Barry Bay, and Cedar Island Bay are designated as SSNAs; however, they have not opened since 2018 (Proclamation SH-6-2018). Prior to the adoption of Amendment 2 to the Shrimp FMP, West Bay was managed in conjunction with SSNAs, last opening in 2017 (NCDMF 2022). SSNA openings based on division sampling were eliminated as a part of Amendment 2; thus, openings in West Bay no longer occur. All other tributaries and bays in Core Sound are designated as PNAs. Ophelia and Drum inlets are designated as crab spawning sanctuaries and are closed to trawling.

Limiting shrimp trawling to the MCHA in Core Sound (Figure 6) will increase connectivity between SAV habitats among regions as well as simplify enforcement and compliance.

8. Prohibit trawling in Core Sound, and its tributaries except for the MCHA.
    + Decrease damage to SAV habitat from shrimp trawls
    + Creates continuous closed areas between SAV habitats among regions
    + Provides access to resource and has minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are impacted by other fisheries and or dredged for navigation
    - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
    - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV
    - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion

SAV Region 7 – Back Sound to Sanders Island

Region 7 stretches across Carteret and Onslow counites and comprises 12,265 acres of known SAV habitat, of which 45.4% is unprotected (Table 2; Figures 1 and 7). Amendment 2 to the Shrimp FMP prohibited trawling in Bogue Sound except for the IWW and permanently closed crab spawning sanctuaries located at Barden, Beaufort, and Bogue inlets to trawling. The North River SSNA may be open to trawling at the Director's discretion; however, it has not opened since 2000 (Proclamation SH-14-2000). The bays and tributaries that surround the North River, Newport River, White Oak River, Bear Creek, and Queens Creek are designated as either PNAs or SNAs, and are closed to trawling.

Due to the patchy distribution of SAV in this region, it is difficult to designate areas where trawling could occur without overlapping SAV habitat. Broader shrimp trawl closures providing a buffer between open areas and SAV habitat should be considered, particularly along the shoreline of the Straits and Back Sound (Figure 7). Further limiting trawling to the North River MCHA will protect SAV along the shoreline and continue to allow shrimp trawling and have minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are impacted by other fisheries or dredged for navigation (Figure 7). Additional shrimp trawl closures are recommended along the eastern shoreline of Newport River off Russells and Wading creeks. While SAV is less extensive in the White Oak River, additional shrimp trawl closures below the Highway 24 Bridge should be considered (Figure 7). Further limiting trawling to the IWW from Cedar Point to Sanders Island will provide additional protection to SAV habitat and increase connectivity among regions (Figure 7).

9. Prohibit shrimp trawling in the Straits, Back Sound, and their tributaries.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between regions and SAV habitats
   + Provides additional protection to critical shell bottom habitat
   + Minimal impact to fishermen since areas are not used extensively
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

10. Modify existing or create new shrimp trawl closure lines in the North and Newport rivers.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between regions and SAV habitats
   + Provides access to resource and has minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are impacted by other fisheries and or dredged for navigation
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV
   - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion

11. Limit shrimp trawling to IWW from Cedar Point to Sanders Island.
   + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
   + Creates continuous closed areas between regions and SAV habitats
   + Provides access to resource and has minimal impact to soft bottom habitats that are dredged for navigation
   - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
   - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion
   - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

SAV Region 8 – Brown's Inlet to Snow's Cut

Region 8 extends from Brown's Inlet to Carolina Beach (Snow's Cut) and encompasses the New River and Topsail, Stump, and Middle Sounds (Figures 1 and 8). Within this region there are 2,646 acres of known SAV habitat, of which 17.9% is unprotected (Table 2). The majority of SAV habitat in the region is in the New River and along the IWW (Stump and Topsail sounds) and is largely protected under existing rules and proclamations. In the New River, trawling is prohibited in all tributary creeks downstream of the closure line at Grey and Wards Point and in the military restricted zone that extends from the western shoreline of the river below Grey Point to the northeastern shoreline of Stones Bay. The waters upstream of the Highway 172 bridge are designated as SSNA and can be opened to the use of skimmer trawls only from September 1 to November 30. Below the Highway 172 Bridge, trawling is prohibited in all bays and tributary creeks and additional areas were closed to match the MCHA in 2017 to protect SAV (Proclamation SH-2-2017).

Trawling is restricted to the main channel throughout the IWW (Figure 8). The area from Marker #105 to the Wrightsville Beach drawbridge was closed to trawling following the adoption of the 2006 Shrimp FMP. Within the waters from Rich Inlet to Carolina Beach, the division maintains six shellfish management areas (SMA) as well as an oyster sanctuary at the mouth of Hewlett's Creek, all of which are closed to trawling. The remainder of the feeder creeks and bays along the IWW are classified as PNAs or SNAs and are closed to trawling. Trawling is further prohibited in the crab spawning sanctuaries located at Browns, New, Topsail, Rich, Masonboro, and Carolina Beach inlets.

The current no shrimp trawl lines in the New River MCHA could be modified to fully encompass documented SAV habitat at Hall Point (Figure 8). While depth limits effort in these areas, the existing lines could be refined via revision of existing proclamations. Above the Highway 172 Bridge, the creation of new shrimp trawl closure lines would be needed to protect SAV habitat at the mouths of Stones and Everett creeks as well as Pollocks Point. Establishing straight-line closures using channel markers and landmarks would simplify enforcement and compliance. Additional closures could be implemented to protect SAV Habitat between Wards and Lowes points (Figure 8). Additional closures are recommended in Chadwick Bay to protect SAV along the shoreline from Fullard Creek to Swan Point. There would be minimal to no impact to fishermen, as Chadwick Bay is a SSNA and last opened in 2012. The proposed closures would also protect several clutch planting sites off of Roses Point. Outside of the New River, no additional shrimp trawl closures are needed along the IWW.

12. Modify existing or create new shrimp trawl closure lines in the New River.
    + Decrease damage to SAV from shrimp trawls and allow for SAV recovery in formerly occupied areas
    + Minimal impact to fishermen since areas are not used extensively
    + Identifying clear boundaries could prevent damage gear and habitat
    - Decreases some traditional shrimp trawling areas
    - Modification of existing closure lines could cause confusion
    - SAV mapping reflects maximum known extent, so creation of broad no shrimp trawl areas may prevent shrimp trawling in areas that currently do not have SAV

SAV Region 9 – Cape Fear River to NC-SC Stateline

Region 9 spans across New Hanover and Brunswick counties and encompasses the Cape Fear River and the IWW to the NC-SC Stateline (Figure 1). Below Snow's Cut, trawling is allowed in the main river channel and behind many of the spoil islands. The areas known as the "Dow Chemical Bay" and "Radar Bay" are closed to trawling. Trawling, and all other boating activity, is prohibited in the military restricted area at the Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal. Trawling in the SSNA behind Kure Beach was prohibited following rule changes implemented in the May 2021 Revision to Amendment 1 that re-designated it as a permanent SNA (NCDMF 2021). The bays south of the Fort Fisher Ferry Terminal (First Bay or "the Basin", Second Bay, Buzzard's Bay) and behind Bald Head Island (Cape and Bay creeks) were designated as Trawl Net Prohibited areas with the implementation of the 2006 Shrimp FMP (NCDMF 2006). Trawling is further prohibited in the crab spawning sanctuary at the Cape Fear River Inlet.

Trawling in Brunswick County is primarily limited to the main channel of the IWW. Most of the shoreline bordering the IWW is designated as nursery areas and are closed to trawling. With the adoption of Amendment 1, shrimp trawling was prohibited in the IWW from the Sunset Beach Bridge to the South Carolina line, including the Shallotte River, Eastern Channel, and lower Calabash River to protect small shrimp and reduce bycatch. Following rule changes implemented in the May 2021 Revision to Amendment 1, the Lockwood Folly River and Saucepan Creek SSNAs were re-designated as permanent SNAs (NCDMF 2021). With the adoption of Amendment 2, the Carolina Boat Basin was closed to trawling (NCDMF 2022). The remainder of the feeder creeks and bays along the IWW are classified as PNAs or SNAs and are closed to trawling. Trawling is prohibited in crab spawning sanctuaries located at Shallotte River Inlet, Lockwood Folly Inlet, and Tubbs Inlet.

Elevated tidal heights in the southern portion of the state increase turbidity and light attenuation, limiting SAV growth in the region. No additional shrimp trawl closures are recommended in Region 9 due to the absence of documented SAV habitat.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

NCDMF: Implement shrimp trawl closures specified in this paper to further protect SAV and SAV habitat from physical damage, turbidity, and sedimentation.

The 2021 Amendment to the CHPP cites the need to further protect and restore SAV as new mapping data become available (NCDEQ 2021). The 2022 Shrimp FMP Amendment 2 adopted a strategy to provide recommendations for future action through adaptive management to address SAV issues identified through collaboration of the Division, CHPP support staff, Habitat and Water Quality AC, and stakeholder groups. In support of the CHPP, NCDMF recommends creating management buffers to protect SAV habitat from physical disturbance, turbidity, and sedimentation by implementing broad, region specific shrimp trawl closures. Specifically, the NCDMF recommends management options 1-12. The division also recommends that issue paper be referred to the regional and Shellfish/Crustation ACs for further input before making final recommendations to the MFC.

Habitat and Water Quality AC: Endorse the division's recommendations to protect existing and prospective SAV habitat. In portions of proposed closure areas where SAV cannot be supported, the division should work with stakeholders to maximize SAV protection while reducing impact on stakeholder to maximize SAV protection while reducing impact on stakeholder use. A commitment should be made to quantify the status of SAV habitat in NC and a monitoring program to measure progress of these programs.

VIII. LITERATURE CITED

Allan, C., and G. H. Stankey. 2009. *Adaptive Environmental Management: A Practitioner's Guide*. Dordrecht, Netherlands.

APNEP (Albemarle Pamlico National Estuary Partnership). 2019. Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) 2006-2008 Mapping-Revised. https://data-ncdenr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/f6cf4ca894f34026aeeec 060570a62c5_0 /explore?location=35.358065%2C-76.651338%2C7.71

APNEP. 2019b. Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) 2012-2014 Mapping. https://data-ncdenr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/988e14c594a74d49a22f1a1fb916d924_0/explore?location=35.254861%2C-76.274608%2C8.75

APNEP. 2022. Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) 2019-2020 Mapping. https://data-ncdenr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/ncdenr::submerged-aquatic-vegetation-sav-2019-2020-mapping/about

APNEP. 2022b. SAV Onslow 2021 Final. https://data-ncdenr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/34f32f64b129428185949722038fb168_0/explore?location=34.643577%2C-77.048248%2C12.17

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission), 2000. Evaluating fishing gear impacts to submerged aquatic vegetation and determining mitigation strategies. ASMFC Habitat Management Series 5. 38 pp.

Auster, P. J. 1998. A conceptual model of the impacts of fishing gear on the integrity of fish habitats. Conservation Biology. 12(6)1198-1203.

Barnette, M. C. 2001. A review of the fishing gear utilized within the Southeast Region and their potential impacts on essential fish habitat. National Marine Fisheries Service, St. Petersburg, FL. 68 pp.

Bartenfelder A., W.J. Kenworthy, B. Puckett, C. Deaton, and J.C. Jarvis. 2022. The Abundance and Persistence of Temperate and Tropical Seagrasses at Their Edge-of-Range in the Western Atlantic Ocean. Front. Mar. Sci. 9:917237.doi: 10.3389/fmars.2022.917237

Carraway, R.J. and L.J. Priddy. 1983. Mapping of submerged grass beds in Core and Bogue Sounds, Carteret County, North Carolina, by conventional aerial photography. North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development. Office of Coastal Management. Morehead City, NC.

Benítez-Malvido J. and Arroyo-Rodríguez V. 2008. Habitat fragmentation, edge effects and biological corridors in tropical ecosystems. In: Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS). Del Claro K, Oliveira P.S., Rico-Gray V., Ramirez A., Almeida A.A., Bonet A., Scarano F.R. Consoli F.L., Morales F.J., Naoki J., Costello J.A., Sampaio M.V., Quesada M., Morris M.R., Palacios M., Ramirez N., Marcal O., Ferraz R.H., Marquis R.J., Parentoni R., Rodriguez S.C., Luttge U. (editors). International Commission on Tropical Biology and Natural Resources. UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford ,UK, [http://www.eolss.net]

Davis, G.J., and M.M. Brinson. 1990. A survey of submersed aquatic vegetation of the Currituck Sound and the Western Albemarle-Pamlico estuarine system. NC Albemarle Pamlico Estuarine Study.

Dawes, C. J., D. Hanisak, and W. J. Kenworthy. 1995. Seagrass biodiversity in the Indian River Lagoon. Bulletin of Marine Science 57:59-66.

Deaton, A.S., A.C. Knight, and C.D. Deaton. 2023. Developing methodology for assessing fish use in Strategic Habitat Areas. Final Performance Report, Coastal Recreational Fishing License Grant. NCDEQ, DMF. 59 p.

Dorsey, E. D., and J. Pederson (editors). 1998. Effects of fishing gear on the sea floor of New England. Conservation Law Foundation, Boston.

Ebregt, A. and P.D. Greve. 2000. Buffer zones and their management. Policy and best practices for terrestrial ecosystems in developing countries. Theme Studies Series 5, Forests, Forestry & Biological Diversity Support Group, National Reference Centre for Nature Management. Wageningen, International Agricultural Centre, 63 p.

Field, D., J. Kenworthy, and D. Carpenter. 2020. Metric report: Extent of submerged aquatic vegetation. High salinity estuarine waters. Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership. Raleigh, NC 19 p.

Ferguson, R.L. and L.L. Wood, 1990. Mapping Submerged Aquatic Vegetation in North Carolina with Conventional Aerial Photography, Federal Coastal Wetland Mapping Programs (S. J. Kiraly, F. A. Cross, and f, D. Buffington, editors), US Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 90(18):725-733.

Ferguson, R. L. and L. L. Wood, 1994. Rooted vascular beds in the Albemarle-Pamlico estuarine system. Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine Study, Project No. 94-02, North Carolina Department of Environmental Health and Natural Resources, Raleigh, NC, and United States Environmental Protection Agency, National Estuary Program https://digital.ncdcr.gov/digital/collection/p249901coll22/id/206533/rec/1

Fonseca, M.S., W.J. Kenworthy, and G.W. Thayer. 1998. Guidelines for the conservation and restoration of seagrasses in the United States and adjacent waters. NOAA Coastal Ocean Office, Silver Springs, MD.

Havel, L.N. and ASMFC Habitat Committee. 2018. Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Policy. ASMFC Habitat Management Series No. 15, Arlington, VA. 13pp plus appendix.

Hiddink, J. G., S. Jennings, M. Sciberras, C. L. Szostek, K. M. Hughes, N. Ellis, A. D. Rijnsdorp, R. A. McConnaughey, T. Mazor, R. Hilborn, J. S. Collie, C. R. Pitcher, R. O. Amoroso, A. M. Parma, P. Suuronen, and M. J. Kaiser. 2017. Global analysis of depletion and recovery of seabed biota after bottom trawling disturbance. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 114:8301-8306. www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1618858114.

Hein, S., and P. Meier 1995. Skimmers: Their use and development in coastal Louisiana. Marine Fisheries Review 1995, Vol 57(1): 17-24.

Holling, C. S. (editor). 1978. Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management. John Wiley and Sons. London, England.

Martino, D. 2001. Buffer zones around protected areas: a brief literature review. Electronic Green Journal, 1(15).

MCAS Cherry Point (Marine Corp Air Station Cherry Point). 2007. Essential Fish Habitat assessment and study of the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Cherry Point's areas of responsibility. https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:9d0dcf6f-374f-4694-ace5-07a6e1cb6186#pageNum=1

Micheli, F. M., and C. H. Peterson. 1999. Estuarine vegetated habitats as corridors for predator movement. Conservation Biology 13(4):869-881.

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, editor. Fish habitat: Essential Fish Habitat and rehabilitation. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 22, Bethesda, Maryland.

National Research Council (NRC). 2002. Effects of Trawling and Dredging on Seafloor Habitat. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/10323.

NCDEQ (North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality), NCDOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation), and NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 2015. 2015 NC SAV mapping effort metadata. https://www.arcgis.com/sharing/rest/content/items/303e73f25bd94c47bbf051caca503645/info/metadata/metadata.xml?format=default&output=html

NCDEQ 2016. North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan Source Document. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 475 p.

NCDEQ 2021. North Carolina Coastal Habitat Protection Plan 2021 Amendment. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 287 p.

NCDMF (North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries). 1998. North Carolina Blue Crab Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 178 pp.

NCDMF. 1999. Shrimp and crab trawling in North Carolina's estuarine waters, a report to the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, 118 pp.

NCDMF. 2001. North Carolina Hard Clam Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 314 pp.

NCDMF. 2007. North Carolina Bay Scallop Fishery Management Plan. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 198 pp.

NCDMF. 2008. 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. 2014. Sedimentation in tidal creeks information paper. North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality. Division of Marine Fisheries, NC. 31 pp.

NCDMF. 2015. North Carolina Bay Scallop Fishery Management Plan Amendment 2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 179 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. 311 pp.

NCDMF. 2020. North Carolina Blue Crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) Fishery Management Plan Amendment 3. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. Morehead City, NC. 257 pp.

NCDMF. 2022. North Carolina Shrimp Fishery Management Plan, Amendment 2. North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, North Carolina. 323 p.

NCDWQ (North Carolina Division of Water Quality). 2005. 2005 SAV Ground Truthing Study. North Carolina Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality, Raleigh, NC https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:9b6844f0-361d-4f66-ab12-3e1130d6084a#pageNum=1

NCDWQ (North Carolina Division of Water Quality). 2007. 2007 SAV Ground Truthing Study. North Carolina Department of Environmental and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality, Raleigh, NC https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:56b1ec39-d0fb-4951-905e-f2bf691bdd8f#pageNum=1

NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). 2001. ELMR distribution and abundance and life history tables for estuarine fish and invertebrate species. NOAA/NOS Biogeography Program, unpublished data. Silver Springs, MD.

SAFMC (South Atlantic Fishery Management Council). 1998. Final habitat plan for the South Atlantic Region: Essential Fish Habitat requirements for fishery management plans of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Charleston, SC.

SAFMC. 2014. SAFMC Policy for Protection and Enhancement of Estuarine and Marine Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Habitat. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Charleston, SC. 14 p.

SAFMC. 2021. Users Guide to Essential Fish Habitat Designations by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Charleston, SC. 25 p.

Sanderson, S., & Bird, S. .1998. The new politics of protected areas. In K. Brandon, K. Redford, & S. Sanderson (Eds.), Parks in peril, people, politics and protected areas. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Sciberras, M., J. G. Hiddink, S. Jennings, C. L. Szostek, K. M. Hughes, B. Kneafsey, L. J. Clarke, N. Ellis, A. D. Rijnsdorp, R. A. McConnaughey, R. Hilborn, J. S. Collie, C. R. Pitcher, R. O. Amoroso, A. M. Parma, P. Suuronen, and M. J. Kaiser. 2018. Response of benthic fauna to experimental bottom fishing: A global meta-analysis. Fish and Fisheries 2018:1-18.

Smith, D. R., C. P. McGowan, J. P. Daily, J. D. Nichols, J. A. Sweka, and J. E. Lyons. 2013. Evaluating a Multispecies Adaptive Management Framework: Must Uncertainty Impede Effective Decision-Making? Journal of Applied Ecology. 50. 10.1111/1365-2664.12145.

Stewart, C. B., and D. Dietz. 2021. Characterization of Bycatch Reduction Devices and Turtle Excluder Devices Used in the Commercial Shrimp Fishery in North Carolina. Final Report for North Carolina Commercial Fishing Resource Fund Grant # 2358-0005. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC. 39 p.

Sutherland, S.A., von Haefen, R.H., Eggleston, D.B., Cao, J. 2021. Economic Valuation of Submerged Aquatic Vegetation in the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuary. Department of Environmental Quality, Albemarle-Pamlico National Estuary Partnership. Raleigh, NC. 68 pp.

Thayer, G.W., W.J. Kenworthy, and M.S. Fonseca. 1984. The ecology of eelgrass meadows of the Atlantic coast: a community profile. US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Unsworth, K.F., L. J. McKenzie, C. J. Collier, L. C. Cullen-Unsworth, C. M. Duarte, J. S. Eklöf, and L. M. Nordlund, 2019. Global challenges for seagrass conservation. Ambio. 48, 801-815.

Prepared by Chris B. Stewart, Chris.Stewart@deq.nc.gov, 910-796-7370
August 1, 2023
November 8, 2023
November 28, 2023
December 20, 2023
January 31, 2024
March 25, 2024

Tables

Table 1. Data sources, mapping years, methodology, and extent of each individual submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) mapping event used to create the North Carolina SAV Mosaic, 1981 to 2021.

Data Source	Mapping Year(s)	Methodology	Mapping Extent
Carraway & Priddy (1983)	1981	Maps of SAV were created from aerial natural color photography accompanied by ground truth data for verification including location and density.	1981 (May): Bogue, Back and Core sounds
Ferguson & Wood (1994)	1983, 1985, 1990, 1992	SAV was delineated and mapped from natural color aerial photography with a minimum mapping unit of 20m. Accompanying field inventories were conducted within study regions to verify SAV signatures and species distribution and composition.	1983 (Spring): Outer Banks from Ocracoke Inlet to Oregon Inlet 1985 (Spring): Core Sound 1988 (Spring): Core Sound, and behind Cape Hatteras from Hatteras to Avon 1990 (Fall): Currituck, Albemarle, Roanoke, and Croatan sounds, and Oregon Inlet to south of Pea Island 1991 (Fall): Pamlico River Estuary, Neuse River Estuary, western Pamlico Sound and Albemarle 1992 (Fall): Pamlico River, parts of eastern and western Pamlico Sound, and Albemarle Sound (Perquimans River)
Division Water Quality (now Water Resources)	1998	Maps from aerial photography.	Neuse River and tributaries
Elizabeth City State University	2002-2003, 2006	Maps from color aerial photography, accompanied by field survey point data to aid in photo interpretation were produced by the ECSU Remote Sensing Program. SAV polygons were generated using "heads up" digitizing on the computer monitor.	2002 (October): Northern shoreline of Albemarle Sound and tributaries from Big Flatty Creek to Edenton Bay 2003 (October): Back Bay, Currituck Sound, and Kitty Hawk Bay 2006: Western Albemarle Sound
North Carolina State University	2005	Aerial photography from July 2005 accompanied by ground truth data.	2005 (July): Southern shore of Albemarle Sound including Bull Bay to northern Croatan Sound
Division Water Quality Rapid Response Team (NCDEQ 2005, 2007)	2005-2007	Maps from interpolated transect data SAV was observed and collected using a garden rake from boat, traveling along the shoreline.	2005 and 2006 (June-September): field surveys were conducted for the major tributaries of Neuse and Pamlico rivers 2007 (May-August): field surveys were conducted in the Neuse and Pamlico rivers and tributaries
Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point (MCAS Cherry Point 2007)	2007	Field survey's consisting of visual observations and underwater cameras in ≤ 6 ft depth of water. Aerial survey using hyperspectral imagery, collected on May 14, 2007, was analyzed in ENVI software using the Spectral Angle Mapper Classification method to identify SAV.	May 14, 2007: imagery data of Piney Island was collected 2007 (June-July): field surveys for Piney Island and Brant Island Shoal

Table 1 (continued).

Data Source	Mapping Year(s)	Methodology	Mapping Extent
Albemarle Pamlico National Estuarine Partnership & SAV Partners (APNEP 2019, 2019b)	2006-2008	SAV was mapped along the coast of NC and northward into Back Bay, VA by manually digitizing visible SAV from remotely sensed imagery. Digitizing scale was typically set at 1:1,500 with a minimum mapping unit set at 15 m.	This extent encompasses the coastal zone that lies within the APNEP regional boundary (Bogue Inlet north to Back Bay), as well as that which is outside of that boundary (Bogue Inlet south to Masonboro Inlet). 2006 (May-June): Bogue, Back, and Core sounds 2007 (September): Pamlico and Pungo rivers 2007 (October): coast wide except Bogue, Back and Core sounds 2008 (May-June): Bogue, Back, and Core sounds
	2012-2014	SAV was mapped along the coast of NC by manually digitizing visible SAV from remotely sensed imagery. Digitizing scale was typically set between 1:2,000 and 1:3,000 with a minimum mapping unit set at 15m.	This extent encompasses the high-salinity coastal zone that lies within the APNEP regional boundary (Hwy. 64 Bridge of Roanoke Sound south to Bogue Inlet). 2013 (May): Bogue, Back, and North Pamlico sounds
NCDMF & APNEP (NCDEQ 2015)	2015	SAV was mapped along the Southern coast of NC by manually digitizing visible SAV from remotely sensed imagery.	This extent encompasses the high-salinity coastal zone of Onslow Bay that lies south of the APNEP regional boundary. Imagery collected May 24, 2015
APNEP SAV Partners (APNEP 2022)	2019-2020	SAV was mapped along the coast of NC by manually digitizing visible SAV from remotely sensed imagery. Digitizing scale was typically set between 1:1,500 and 1:3,000 with a minimum mapping unit set at 15 m.	This extent encompasses the high-salinity coastal zone that lies within the APNEP regional boundary (Hwy. 64 Bridge of Roanoke Sound south to Bogue Inlet), except for mainland Core Sound and multiple areas in Pamlico and Roanoke Sounds (see source metadata for detailed description). All SAV was digitized from 2020 (May-June) imagery – 2019 imagery was uninterpretable for SAV.
NCDMF & APNEP (APNEP 2022b)	2021	SAV was mapped along the Southern coast of NC by manually digitizing visible SAV from remotely sensed imagery. Digitizing scale was typically between 1:1,500 and 1:2,000 with a minimum mapping unit set at 15 m.	This extent encompasses the high-salinity coastal zone of Onslow Bay that lies south of Bogue Sound and terminating near Mason's Inlet (Onslow, Pender, and New Hanover counties). 2021 (May): Bear Inlet south to Mason's Inlet

Table 2. The known historic extent of mapped submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) in North Carolina, 1981-2021.

			Historic Extent SAV Habitat 1981-2015		Historic Extent SAV Habitat 1981-2021		Unprotected SAV Habitat 1981-2021	
SAV Region	Salinity Zone	SAV Region Name	Acres	Percent (%)	Acres	Percent (%)	Acres	Percent (%)
1	Low	Currituck Sound & Back Bay	21,613	11.3	21,613	11.3	81	0.4
2	Low	Albemarle Sound	12,872	6.7	12,872	6.7	5,422	42.1
3	Low	Tar-Pamlico & Neuse rivers	4,581	2.4	4,581	2.4	530	11.6
4	High	Pamlico Sound	712	0.4	712	0.4	490	68.8
5	High	Roanoke Sound to Ocracoke Inlet	101,739	53.2	103,856	53.2	19,693	19.0
6	High	Core Sound	36,862	19.3	37,645	19.3	13,095	34.8
7	High	Back Sound to Sanders Island	10,826	5.7	12,265	5.7	4,916	40.1
8	High	Brown’s Inlet to Snow's Cut	1,950	1.0	2,646	1	348	13.2
9	High/Low	Cape Fear River to SC line	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0
Total			191, 155		196,190		44,576	

Figures



Figure 1. Historic extent of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) habitat mapped in North Carolina, 1981 to 2021.



Figure 2. Proposed shrimp trawl closures in the Roanoke Sound (SAV Region 2) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).



Figure 3. Proposed shrimp trawl closures in the Tar-Pamlico and Neuse rivers (SAV Region 3) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).



Figure 4. Proposed shrimp trawl closures in the Pamlico Sound (SAV Region 4) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).



Figure 5. Proposed shrimp trawl closures from Roanoke Sound to Ocracoke Inlet (SAV Region 5) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).



Figure 6. Proposed shrimp trawl closures in the Core Sound (SAV Region 6) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).



Figure 7. Proposed shrimp trawl closures from Back Sound to Sanders Island (SAV Region 7) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).



Figure 8. Proposed shrimp trawl closures from Brown's Inlet to Snow's Cut (SAV Region 8) to protect submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV).

To view the AGOL interactive map viewer for the *Protection of Critical Sea Grass Habitat Through Shrimp Trawl Area Closures* issue paper please click on the web address below or copy and paste it in your web browser.

https://ncdenr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=61f2b88f26f7416caba3000163231ce1

The app will automatically open with the proposed closures as well as the SAV mosaic. If you would like to view additional layers, click on the icon (three stacked squares) at the bottom of the screen. Within the layer list, you can click on the three dots to left of the title to adjust the transparency or hide the labels of any of the selected layers to better see the SAV mosaic. Both the layer list and the legend can be moved or closed by re-clicking the icons at the bottom of the screen. The measurement tool may be useful and can be found in the lower right corner (circle with ruler); to disengage the tool re-click on the circle.