

6.0 COMMUNITY PROFILES

This Chapter identifies and describes the HMS fishing communities, as required under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other laws, and consolidates all of the communities profiled in previous HMS FMPs or FMP amendments and updates the community information where possible. Of the communities profiled in this chapter, ten were originally selected due to the proportion of HMS landings in the town, the relationship between the geographic communities and the fishing fleets, the existence of other community studies, and input from the HMS and Billfish Advisory Panels (which preceded the combined HMS Advisory Panel that currently exists). The remaining 14 communities, although not selected initially, have been identified as communities that could be impacted by changes to the current HMS regulations because of the number of HMS permits associated with these communities, and their community profile information has been incorporated into the document.

6.1 Introduction

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires, among other things, that all FMPs include a fishery impact statement intended to assess, specify, and describe the likely effects of the measures on fishermen and fishing communities (§303(a)(9)).

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) also requires federal agencies to consider the interactions of natural and human environments by using a “systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will ensure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences in planning and decision-making” (§102(2)(A)). Moreover, agencies need to address the aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health effects, which may be direct, indirect, or cumulative. Consideration of social impacts is a growing concern as fisheries experience increased participation and/or declines in stocks. The consequences of management actions need to be examined to better ascertain and, if necessary and possible, mitigate regulatory impacts on affected constituents.

Social impacts are generally the consequences to human populations resulting from some type of public or private action. Those consequences may include alterations to the ways in which people live, work or play, relate to one another, and organize to meet their needs. In addition, cultural impacts, which may involve changes in values and beliefs that affect people’s way of identifying themselves within their occupation, communities, and society in general are included under this interpretation. Social impacts analyses help determine the consequences of policy action in advance by comparing the status quo with the projected impacts. Community profiles are an initial step in the social impact assessment process. Although public hearings and scoping meetings provide input from those concerned with a particular action, they do not constitute a full overview of the fishery.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act outlines a set of National Standards (NS) that apply to all fishery management plans and the implementation of regulations. Specifically, NS 8 notes that:

“Conservation and management measures shall, consistent with the conservation requirements of this Act (including the prevention of overfishing and rebuilding of overfished stocks), take into account the importance of fishery resources to fishing

communities in order to: (1) provide for the sustained participation of such communities; and, (2) to the extent practicable, minimize adverse economic impacts on such communities.”

See also 50 CFR §600.345 for National Standard 8 Guidelines. “Sustained participation” is defined to mean continued access to the fishery within the constraints of the condition of the resource (50 CFR §600.345(b)(4)).

It should be clearly noted that NS 8 “does not constitute a basis for allocation of resources to a specific fishing community nor for providing preferential treatment based on residence in a fishing community” (50 CFR §600.345(b)(2)).

The Magnuson-Stevens Act further defines a “fishing community” as: “...a community that is substantially dependent upon or substantially engaged in the harvest or processing of fishery resources to meet social and economic needs, and includes fishing vessel owners, operators, and crew, and United States fish processors that are based in such community.”

(§3(17)) The National Standard guidelines expand upon the definition of a fishing community, and state that, “A fishing community is a social or economic group whose members reside in a specific location and share a common dependency on commercial, recreational, or subsistence fishing or on directly related fisheries-dependent services and industries (for example, boatyards, ice suppliers, tackle shops)” (50 CFR §600.345(b)(2)).

NMFS (2001) guidelines for social impact assessments specify that the following elements are utilized in the development of FMPs and FMP amendments:

1. The size and demographic characteristics of the fishery-related work force residing in the area; these determine demographic, income, and employment effects in relation to the work force as a whole, by community and region.
2. The cultural issues of attitudes, beliefs, and values of fishermen, fishery-related workers, other stakeholders, and their communities.
3. The effects of proposed actions on social structure and organization; that is, on the ability to provide necessary social support and services to families and communities.
4. The non-economic social aspects of the proposed action or policy; these include life-style issues, health and safety issues, and the non-consumptive and recreational use of living marine resources and their habitats.
5. The historical dependence on and participation in the fishery by fishermen and communities, reflected in the structure of fishing practices, income distribution and rights.

6.2 Methodology

6.2.1 Previous community profiles and assessments

NMFS contracted with Dr. Doug Wilson, from the Ecopolicy Center for Agriculture, Environmental and Resource Issues at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, to help develop the community profiles and social impact assessments for the 1999 HMS FMP and Amendment 1 to the FMP for Atlantic Billfish. Dr. Wilson and his colleagues completed their fieldwork in July 1998. This study covered commercial and recreational Atlantic HMS fisheries extending along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts from Maine to Texas and in the Caribbean. The study investigated the social and cultural characteristics of fishing communities in five states and one U.S. territory: Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Puerto Rico. These areas were selected because they each had important fishing communities that could be affected by the 1999 FMP for Atlantic Tunas, Swordfish, and Sharks and the 1999 Atlantic Billfish FMP Amendment 1, and because they are fairly evenly spread along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and the Caribbean. The study compiled basic sociological information from at least two coastal communities from each state or territory. For each state or territory, a profile of basic sociologic information was compiled, with at least two coastal communities visited for further analysis. Towns were selected based on HMS landings data, the relationship between the geographic communities and the fishing fleets, the existence of other community studies, and inputs from the Advisory Panels for HMS and Billfish. The information in this document incorporates by reference the Wilson *et al.*, (1998) study of the HMS fishery and the work of McCay and Cieri (2000) for the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, “The Fishing Ports of the Mid-Atlantic” (http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/econ/cia/McCay_Port_Study-Apr2000_Revised.pdf)

Additionally, NMFS contracted with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) at the College of William and Mary to re-evaluate several of the baseline HMS communities (Kirkley, 2005). The VIMS study gathered a profile of basic sociological information for the principal states involved with the Atlantic shark fishery. From the 255 communities identified as involved in the 2001 commercial fishery, Amendment 1 to the 1999 HMS FMP focused on specific towns based on shark landings data, the size of the shark fishing fleet, the relationship between the geographic communities and the fishing fleets, and the existence of other community studies. While the recreational fishery is an important component in the overall shark fishery, the VIMS study did not profile the shark recreational fishery because participation and landings were not documented in a manner that permits community identification. The Wilson *et al.*, study selected for profile, only the recreational fisheries found within commercial fishing communities due to the lack of community-based data for the sport fishery. To the extent that it is available, the information on the HMS-related recreational fisheries has been incorporated into the community profiles.

Following the Consolidated HMS FMP, which published in 2006, NMFS contracted MRAG Americas, Inc. to create a report updating current HMS fishery community profiles. The report utilized HMS permit information and U.S. census data to rank communities according to the percentage of HMS permits, by permit category, and in relation to their overall population; based on a methodology described by Sepez *et al.* (2005). Communities that met the mean percentage for at least one permit category were included and community profile information

was created or updated accordingly. The report identified 14 communities that have not previously been included (Wakefield, Rhode Island; Montauk, New York; Cape May, New Jersey; Ocean City, Maryland; Atlantic Beach, Beaufort, and Morehead City, North Carolina; Apalachicola, Destin, and Port Salerno, Florida; Orange Beach, Alabama; Grand Isle, Louisiana; and Freeport and Port Aransas, Texas), along with 10 communities that had been included in previous SAFE reports (Gloucester and New Bedford, Massachusetts; Barnegat Light and Brielle, New Jersey; Hatteras Village and Wanchese, North Carolina; Islamorada and Madeira Beach, Florida; and Dulac and Venice, Louisiana). This list did not include four communities that had been included in assessments since the 1999 HMS FMP (Fort Pierce, Panama City Beach, and Pompano Beach, Florida; and Arecibo, Puerto Rico). All communities that have been identified by MRAG Americas, Inc. and ones that have been evaluated in the past are included in this assessment to update the most recent community profile information available and to ensure continuity with the 1999 HMS FMP and previous amendments.

The list of communities profiled in the reports noted above is not intended to be an exhaustive record of every HMS-related community in the United States; rather the objective is to give a broad perspective of representative areas. The demographic profile tables found in the 2008 SAFE Report (NMFS, 2008) were modified from previous documents to include the same baseline information for each community profiled, and use both 1990 and 2000 Bureau of the Census data for comparative purposes. A profile for the U.S. Virgin Islands could not be created because the 1990 Census data were not available, and only some of the demographic information was available for 2000. Additionally, a descriptive profile for the Virgin Islands has not been developed for any previous HMS-related actions. The descriptive community profiles in this chapter include information provided by Wilson, *et al.* (1998) and Kirkley (2005), Impact Assessment, Inc. (2004), and recent information obtained from MRAG Americas, Inc. (2008). In this chapter, the community descriptions are organized by state.

Several other chapters in this SAFE report include information that addresses the requirements described Section 6.1 and that is an integral part of any social impact assessment and fishery impact statement. Please refer to the summary of regulatory actions in Chapter 1, description of the fisheries in Chapter 4, the economic evaluation in Chapter 5, and the permit data in Chapter 8.

6.2.2 Community Impacts from Hurricanes

This section is an overview of the impacts on HMS communities caused by hurricanes during 2009. Please refer to prior SAFE reports for hurricane impact information prior to 2009.

The 2009 hurricane season was well below average, largely due to El Nino developing during the peak months of August – October (Bell et al., 2010). Only two named storms made landfall in the United States, tropical storm Claudette and Ida, which became extratropical cyclone before making landfall (Bell et al., 2010). Both named storms made landfall in the Gulf Coast region with minimal impacts, and most likely had minimal detrimental effects on HMS fishery operations in this region.

6.2.3 Community Impacts from 2010 Deepwater Horizon/BP Oil Spill

On April 20, 2010, an explosion and subsequent fire damaged the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil rig, which capsized and sank approximately 50 miles southeast of Venice, Louisiana. Oil flowed for 86 days into the Gulf of Mexico from a damaged well head on the sea floor. In response to the Deepwater Horizon MC252 oil spill, NMFS issued a series of emergency rules (75 FR 24822, May 6, 2010; 75 FR 26679, May 12, 2010; 75 FR 27217, May 14, 2010) closing a portion of the Gulf of Mexico exclusive economic zone (EEZ) to all fishing and analyzed the environmental impacts of these closures in an Environmental Assessment. The fishery closures ranged in size from 6,817 sq. mi. (<4 percent of the U.S. GOM) on May 2, 2010, to 88,522 sq. mi. (approx. 37 percent of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico) on June 2, 2010. NMFS continues to adjust the spatial dimensions of the fishery closed area as new information becomes available regarding areas affected by oil. Information regarding the current status of the oil spill related fishery closed area may be found at <http://sero.nmfs.noaa.gov/>.

The Deepwater Horizon oil spill may have detrimental impacts to HMS fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico, but because many effects may not be apparent in the short-term a full assessment of impacts on HMS fishermen will not be possible for several years. NMFS will continue to monitor the economic impacts from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and will include updated information in future SAFE reports.

6.3 United States Demographic Profile

The U.S. demographic profile has not been updated since the 2000 U.S. Census. Please refer to the 2008 SAFE Report (NMFS, 2008) for detailed U.S. Census information.

6.4 State and Community Profiles

For information regarding HMS fishing activities for individual states and communities, please refer to the 2008 SAFE Report for Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (NMFS, 2008). A copy can be obtained from MRAG Americas, Inc online at: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/sfa/hms/hmsdocument_files/SAFEreports.htm. The 2008 SAFE Report contains the most recent information available to NMFS detailing U.S. Census information regarding communities participating in HMS fisheries.

More recent information regarding fishing communities in St. Croix can be found in Stoffle et. al, 2009 online at: https://grunt.sefsc.noaa.gov/P_QryLDS/download/TM582_tm_593.pdf?id=LDS

The Fisheries of the United States – 2009 (NMFS, 2010) report contains updated figures regarding recreational anglers by state and can be found online at: http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/fus/fus09/fus_2009.pdf

Information regarding HMS permits by state can be found in Chapter 8 of this 2010 SAFE Report.

Chapter 6 References

- Bell, G., E. Blake, T. Kimberlain, J. Gottschalck, C. Landsea, R. Pasch, J. Schemm and S. Goldenberg. 2010. The 2009 North Atlantic Hurricane Season: A Climate Perspective. Available at:
http://www.cpc.noaa.gov/products/expert_assessment/hurrsummary_2009.pdf
- Kirkley, J.E. 2005. The Communities of the Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery: An Overview of Change Associated with the HMS Fishery Management Plan. Department of Coastal and Ocean Policy, School of Marine Science, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia. (NOAA-NMFS-HMS contract report).
- Impact Assessment, Inc. 2004. Identifying Communities Associated with the Fishing Industry in Louisiana. La Jolla, California. (NOAA-NMFS-Contract WC133F-02-SE-0297).
- Ingles, P., and H. McIlvaine-Newsad. 2007. Any Port in the Storm: The Effects of Hurricane Katrina on Two Fishing Communities in Louisiana. NAPA Bulletin 28:69-86.
- Innovatative Emergency Management, Inc. 2010. A Study of the Economic Impact of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill; Part One: Fisheries. Report for Greater New Orleans, Inc. October 15, 2010. 55pp. Available online at:
<http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/docs/Economic%20Impact%20Study,%20Part%20I%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf>
- McCay and Cieri. 2000. Fishing Ports of the Mid-Atlantic. Report to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. 183 pp. Available at:
http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/st1/econ/cia/McCay_Port_Study-Apr2000_Revised.pdf
- MRAG Americas, Inc. 2008. Updated Profiles for HMS Dependant Fishing Communities, Social Impact Assessment Services for HMS Fishing Communities. Solicitation Number: DG133F-06-RQ-0381. Available at:
<http://www.mragamericas.com/pdf/sr/SIA%20for%20HMS%20Fishing%20Communities%20Final%20Report.pdf>
- NMFS, 2001. NMFS Operational Guidelines – Fishery Management Process: Appendix 2(g): Guidelines for Assessment of the Social Impact of Fishery Management Actions. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service.
- NMFS. 2005. Effects of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita on the Fishing Industry and Fishing Communities in the Gulf of Mexico: Hearings before the Subcom. on Fisheries and Oceans of the House Com. on Resources; 109th Cong. (December 15, 2005) (statement by Dr. William Hogarth, Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce).
- NMFS. 2008. Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation for Atlantic Highly Migratory Species. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service,

Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Highly Migratory Species Management Division, Silver Spring, MD. Public Document.

NMFS. 2010. Fisheries of the United States – 2009. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Science and Technology, Fisheries Statistics Division. 103pp.

Sepez, J., B.D. Tilt, C.L. Package, H.M. Lazrus and I. Vaccaro. 2005. Community Profiles for North Pacific Fisheries – Alaska. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-160

Stoffle, Brent, James R. Waters, Susan Abbott-Jamieson, Shawn Kelley, David Grasso, Joy Freibaum, Susanne Koestner, Nate O’Meara, Sita Davis, Marissa Stekedee, and Juan Agar. 2009. Can an Island be a Fishing Community: An Examination of St. Croix and its Fisheries. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-593, 57p.

Wilson, D., B.J. McCay, D. Estler, M. Perez-Lugo, J. LaMargue, S. Seminski, and A. Tomczuk. 1998. Social and Cultural Impact Assessment of the Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan and the Amendment to the Atlantic Billfish Fisheries Management Plan. The Ecopolicy Center for Agriculture, Environmental, and Resource Issues, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Cook College, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey (NOAA-NMFS-HMS contract report).