Tier 1 Information:

1. Management Action

S-86: Ban live mounts of all shark species to reduce shark mortality due to charter fishing practices that ensure mount sales and dockside marketing and promote proper handling and release techniques for shark species to reduce mortality in catch & release scenarios.

2. Intended Result (Output/Outcome)

What is the end product/result of this management action?

- This intended result of this management action is to reduce shark mortality through the promotion of proper catch-and-release fishing techniques.
- Removal of most shark species is prohibited in Florida including: sawfish, Atlantic angel shark, basking shark, big eye shark, sand tiger shark, big eye six gill, bigeye thresher, big nose shark, Caribbean reef shark, Caribbean sharpnose, dusky, Galapagos, lemon, long fin mako, narrow tooth, night shark, silky shark, sand tiger, sand bar, seven gill, six gill, small tail, spiny dogfish, whale shark, white shark, tiger shark, great hammerhead, scalloped hammerhead, smooth hammerhead, manta ray, double ray, and spotted eagle ray. It is illegal to take these species out of state waters. Take of these species is, on the other hand, permitted in Federal Waters.
- There are 10 species of sharks commonly caught in Florida: bull, nurse, common thresher, spinner, Atlantic sharpnose, bonnethead, blacknose, finetooth, blacktip and smooth dogfish. The group supports the concept of working with regulated catch and release shark fisheries to promote practice of keeping these sharks in the water to increase chances of survival.
- This RMA seeks to change federal law to ban live mounts. FWC could not ban live mounts on legally harvested species, so there must be a ban on the practice of taking sharks out of the water to take measurements to make mounts. Must take measurements in the water and immediately release, not take shark to dock for measurements.

3. Duration of Activity

Is this a discrete action or a recurring activity? Explain.

- This would need to be a recurring activity.

4. Justification

What issue or problem will this management action address? Explain.

- This will address the issue that many sharks that otherwise could be released after being caught are instead suffering mortality. This will increase shark populations and apex predators that are currently overfished.

5. Potential Pros

What are the potential advantages associated with this management action?

- Stop the practice of killing sharks to mount them.
- Stop the improper handling of sharks that results in incidental mortality.

6. Potential Cons

What are the potential disadvantages associated with this management action?

- Charter fishermen may try to harp on the result that some species of sharks die after release anyway. Charter fishermen will have pushback.
- Many species of shark that are protected in Florida waters do not benefit from the same protection in federal waters.

7. Location
County/Counties: Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Martin, Other?
• The State of Florida.

Relevant Habitats: Coral reef, seagrass, watershed, etc.?
• Relevant habitats include: pelagic, ocean, nearshore, and offshore.

Specific Location: City, site name, coordinates, etc.?
• All waters in the SEFCRI Region.

8. Extent
   Area, number, etc.
• All species of sharks throughout state and federal waters.

9. Is this action spatial in nature?
• No.

Do you believe this management action could be informed by the Our Florida Reefs Marine Planner Decision Support Tool?
   If yes, you will proceed to the next section on Marine Planner Information.
• No.

Marine Planer Information:
N/A

Tier 2 Information: No Tier 2 Info was filled out by CWGs

WHY?
1. Strategic Goals & Objectives to be Achieved
   Refer to the SEFCRI Coral Reef Management Goals and Objectives Reference Guide.
   •

2. Current Status
   Is this activity currently underway, or are there planned actions related to this recommendation in southeast Florida? If so, what are they, and what is their status.
   • FWC is working on a shark outreach campaign that emphasizes safe handling and how to increase survival with catch and release shark fishing.

3. Intended Benefits (Outcomes)
   What potential environmental benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?
   • An increase in shark populations will improve overall ecosystem health.

   What potential social/economic benefits or positive impacts might this management action have?
   • There is the potential for increase in shark catch and release charters as well as other tourism activities involving live sharks.

   What is the likely duration of these benefits - short term or long-lasting? Explain.
   • Long lasting, as it has the potential to change detrimental practices.

4. Indirect Costs (Outcomes)
   What potential negative environmental impacts might this action have?
What potential negative social/economic impacts might this action have?
• This RMA could have negative impact on the live mount industry.

What is the likely duration of these negative impacts - short term or long-lasting? Explain.
• Initial impact could be negative initially, but with change of practice could be compensated for over time.

5. Risk
What is the threat of adverse environmental, social, or economic effects arising from not implementing this action?
• Unintended mortality of shark species will continue if this RMA is not implemented.

6. Relevant Supporting Data
What existing science supports this recommendation? (Provide citations)
• -

7. Information Gaps
What uncertainties or information gaps still exist?
• -

WHEN?
8. Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation
How long will this recommendation take to implement?
• -

9. Linkage to Other Proposed Management Actions
Is this activity linked to other proposed management recommendations?
• -

If so, which ones, and how are they linked? (e.g., is this activity a necessary step for other management actions to be completed?)
• -

Does this activity conflict with other existing or proposed management actions?
• -

WHO?
10. Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation
What agency or organization currently has/would have authority? Refer to the Agencies and Actions Reference Guide.
• FWC would be the lead agency.

11. Other Agencies or Organizations
Are there any other agencies or organizations that may also support implementation? Explain.
• NGO’s.

12. Key Stakeholders
Identify those stakeholders most greatly impacted by this management action, including those from whom you might expect a high level of support or opposition. Explain.
• The charter and recreational fishing industries could be opposed.
• Conservation organizations and NGOs would support this.

**HOW?**

13. **Feasibility**
   *Is there appropriate political will to support this? Explain.*
   • There should not be any strong political objections.

   *What are the potential technical challenges to implementing this action? Has it been done elsewhere?*
   • This should not be a technical challenge, as it has been completed in many jurisdictions around the world.

14. **Legislative Considerations**
   *Does the recommendation conflict with or actively support existing local, state, or federal laws or regulations? Explain.*
   • This RMA supports current FWC regulations.

15. **Permitting Requirements**
   *Will any permits be required to implement this action? Explain.*
   • There are no permitting requirements.

16. **Estimated Direct Costs**
   *Approximately how much will this action likely cost? (Consider one-time direct costs, annual costs, and staff time, including enforcement.)*
   • -

   *Will costs associated with this activity be one-time or recurring?*
   • -

   *If recurring, approximately how long will staff time and annual costs be necessary to implement the management action?*
   • -

17. **Enforcement**
   *Does this require enforcement effort?*
   • Yes, it would require enforcement.

   *Provide an explanation if available.*
   • -

18. **Potential Funding Sources**
   *Identify potential funding organizations/grant opportunities, etc.*
   • -

19. **Measurable Outcomes/Success Criteria/Milestones**
   *How will the success of this recommendation be measured? How will you know when the intended result is achieved?*
   • -

**SEFCRI/TAC Targeted Questions:**

1. **TAC -** Is the recommendation likely to achieve the intended result? Explain.
2. **TAC - Is the recommendation sufficient to address the identified issue or problem? Explain.**

   **Tier 1 – #4 (Justification)**
   - 

3. **TAC - Is the recommendation technically achievable from a science or management perspective? Explain.**

   **Tier 2 – #8 (Anticipated Timeframe for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #13 (Feasibility)**
   - 

4. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - Has this been done (by SEFCRI, other agencies or organizations in the SEFCRI region)? Explain.**

   **Tier 2 – #2 (Current Status)**
   - 

5. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - Is this recommendation a research or monitoring project? (Recommendations should be turn-dirt management actions, not the step you take before a management action). Explain.**

   - 

6. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - If either of the following applies to this management action, provide feedback on which information submitted by the Community Working Groups may be more appropriate, or if entries should be merged. Explain.**

   a. There are different viewpoints for an individual management action (i.e. two working group members provided separate information, as indicated by a ‘//’ marking between them).
   b. Information submitted for this and other draft management actions is sufficiently similar that they might be considered the same.

   - 

7. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - Non-agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your stakeholder perspective? Explain.**

   **Tier 1 - #5 (Potential Pros), Tier 1 - #6 (Potential Cons), Tier 2 - #3 (Intended Benefits), Tier 2 - #4 (Indirect Costs) and Tier 2 - #12 (Key Stakeholders)**
   - 

8. **SEFCRI Team, PPT & Other Advisors - Agency Question: Is the recommendation technically achievable from a management perspective? If not, do you have suggestions that would allow this to become technically achievable from your agency's management perspective? Explain.**

   **Tier 2 – #10 (Lead Agency or Organization for Implementation) and Tier 2 - #11 (Other Agencies or Organizations)**
   - FWC: FWC would be unlikely to support this.
   - FWC General Comments: The need for reducing shark mortality is unclear. Species of shark are managed by sustainable harvest, not by the use of the animal after harvest. Species of sharks that are overfished or vulnerable to overfishing are currently prohibited from harvesting, targeting, or possessing. Healthy populations of shark provide good opportunities for the charter fishing industry.

**Comments from the Reviewers:**

- If it is not legally possible to ban "live mounts" (aka "skin mounts") perhaps an easier task would be to mandate
Questions from the Reviewers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Information Needs Highlighted by the Reviewers</th>
<th>Addressed by CWG:</th>
<th>Not Addressed by CWG</th>
<th>Because:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Must justify that populations of sharks (by species) are not “healthy” and should be preserved.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>This does not apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see list of protected species by FWC at this link: <a href="http://myfwc.com/fishing/saltwater/recreational/sharks">http://myfwc.com/fishing/saltwater/recreational/sharks</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 30+ species’ populations are currently “not healthy” and require state protection because of dwindling populations. The 2014 hammerhead study and observer reports confirm that sensitive shark species suffer mortality due to catch &amp; release scenarios.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Need help addressing it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions from the CWGs back to the Reviewers:

•

•