



## **ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)**

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (Commission) is requesting proposals to conduct a socioeconomic analysis of the Atlantic menhaden commercial bait and reduction fishery. The Commission will award approximately \$80,000 in funds for the funding period of February 15, 2016 to February 15, 2017. Any investigator seeking support for this period must submit, as a single file, an electronic copy of their proposal by e-mail no later than **5:00 p.m. EST on Monday, January 4, 2016**. Please see the proposal guidelines section for proposal and submission instructions.

The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission was formed by the 15 Atlantic coastal states in 1942 for the promotion and protection of coastal fishery resources. The Commission serves as a deliberative body of the Atlantic coastal states, coordinating the conservation and management of nearshore fishery resources, including marine, shell and anadromous species.

### **Background**

The Commission's Atlantic Menhaden Management Board (Board) is responsible for the coastal management of Atlantic menhaden from Maine through Florida. The Atlantic menhaden fishery is currently managed with a total allowable catch that is allocated state-by-state based on the average landings history from 2009 to 2011. The Board is considering revisiting the state-by-state allocation and is therefore requesting proposals to conduct a socioeconomic analysis that will help characterize the coastwide commercial bait and reduction fishery and inform the allocation management discussion. For further information on Atlantic menhaden biology, stock assessments, fishery history and management please visit (<http://www.asmfc.org/species/atlantic-menhaden>).

### **Topic Areas**

The goal of the project for which we are soliciting proposals will be to collect and organize contemporary primary and secondary-source information from the U.S. Atlantic menhaden reduction, bait, and other fisheries stakeholders and explore selected socioeconomic dimensions of these stakeholders. This characterization of the coastwide menhaden fishery is a necessary first step in order to perform future economic analyses to describe the trade-offs of various allocation strategies. Information from the project will be made available to researchers and potential RFPs designed to explore allocation optimization.

The Commission seeks proposals that address the objectives of:

1. **defining social equity and the distributional consequences of management change on the Atlantic menhaden commercial bait and reduction fisheries; and**
2. **identifying political and social resources such as individuals, families, firms, and communities (including social organizations, power, and leadership).**

A list of research outputs (“deliverables”) identified as high priority to achieve the aims of the RFP is detailed below (Table 1) and should be used to characterize and describe the commercial fishery in the context of these objectives. These include a social and economic characterization of the menhaden bait and reduction fisheries along with the processing/distribution sector. A second list of additional research outputs, which have been identified as useful but not essential, is also included (Table 2). These encompass ecological and non-market values associated with menhaden and menhaden fisheries.

**Table 1. High Priority Research Outputs**

***Characterize the bait fishery coast-wide in context***

The harvesting sector of the fishery:

1. Trend in landings caught per year (by state/gear type)
  - a. Characterize distinction between true area of harvest vs state landed
  - b. Concentration in specific ports
2. Trend in average and total revenues from menhaden (by state and year)
  - a. Ex-vessel value
  - b. Distribution of revenues
  - c. Operational costs
  - d. Compare value of menhaden harvested under quota and value under bycatch allowance
3. Evaluate vessel and gear characteristics
4. Employment in the sector
  - a. Alternative employment opportunities (by state/county)
  - b. Annual revenue shares by species/state to identify alternative targets and sources of fishery revenues
5. Participation in fishery
  - a. Number of fishermen and boats (historic and current employment, including crew)
    - i. Identify to what extent fishermen focus on menhaden as a primary catch and during what seasons
  - b. Participant information
    - i. Demographics, education, distribution, longevity in fishery, income
    - ii. Attitudes, beliefs, norms, values, perceptions
      1. Importance of menhaden
        - a. Directly or via ecosystem services
        - b. Under bycatch allowance provisions and episodic event set aside

- 2. Job satisfaction, health safety
- iii. Networks (crew, friends, family)
- 6. Identify in-/direct subsidies, e.g., fuel subsidies, tax breaks etc.
- 7. Identify buy-backs to characterize exits from the fishery
- 8. Identify substitute bait products and their average dockside prices by state

Processing and distribution sector:

- 9. Number of bait retailers and wholesalers that sell menhaden (by state)
  - a. Number/types of employees
    - i. Income by position
  - b. Total bait sales and proportion of menhaden sales
- 10. Distribution of the product
  - a. Identify the clients or purchasers (both commercial and recreational)
    - i. Identify the product forms and prices
      - 1. Wholesale with prices and area
      - 2. Retail with prices and area
      - 3. Preferred form for each targeted fish species and user type

***Characterize the reduction fishery in context:***

The harvesting sector of the fishery:

- 11. Trend in landings and revenues ideally with operational costs
- 12. Time series with capacity utilization and fixed costs
- 13. Time series in quantity of quota allocated, quota landed, and menhaden processed
- 14. Participation in fishery
  - a. Trend in number and demographics of employees
    - i. Estimate the share of income these employees represent in their communities
    - ii. Attitudes, beliefs, norms, values, perceptions
      - 1. Job satisfaction, health safety
      - 2. Importance of menhaden
        - a. Directly or via ecosystem services
    - iii. Networks (crew, friends, family)
- 15. Population, education of communities of interest
  - a. Vulnerability
  - b. Alternative employment opportunities

Shoreside entities:

- 16. Importance in the community in terms of how many direct and ancillary jobs supported, etc.
  - a. Change over time
- 17. Uses of the reduction fishery product with info about supply chains
  - a. Substitutes for the product
  - b. Trends in prices for possible substitutes
- 18. Identify in-/direct subsidies, e.g., fuel subsidies, tax breaks etc.

## **Table 2. Secondary Research Outputs**

1. Compile results of studies that can be used to monetize/provide social valuation of the ecological and non-market values of Atlantic menhaden. Include description and analysis of methodologies used, general findings, and caveats.
2. Compile results of studies that monetize/provide social valuation of the human uses of Atlantic menhaden products (e.g. fish oil). Include description and analysis of methodologies used, general findings, and caveats.
3. Compile results of valuation studies that look at potential human indirect impacts and mortalities (e.g. impingement/entrainment at power plants). Include description and analysis of methodologies used, general findings, and caveats.

## **Duration, Eligibility, and Funding**

The Commission will fund one proposal on a competitive basis. Researchers at academic institutions, research laboratories, for-profit companies/firms, and extension/outreach facilities are all eligible. Proposed activities should be completed within one year with the funding period of February 15, 2016 to February 15, 2017. A no-cost extension is NOT available for this work.

## **PROPOSAL GUIDELINES**

Proposals should clearly outline the project objectives methodologies, research outputs, the qualifications of the investigators who would perform the work and a detailed budget. It is critically important to clearly and explicitly articulate how the proposed work addresses the research topics and specific research deliverables identified in this document. Proposals involving multiple investigators are welcome. Proposals requesting funding that is complementary to that sought from other sponsors are also welcome; in this case, other funding sources and amounts should be disclosed.

### **A proposal should consist of a single file, which includes:**

1. proposal cover sheet,
2. project description of up to 15 single-spaced pages of text in 11 point font or larger,
3. reference list,
4. budget justification,
5. detailed budget,
6. supporting documentation,
7. curriculum vitae of all investigators.

Appendices or other attachments are permitted, if necessary.

1. The proposal cover sheet should include:
  - A. For each of the principal investigators, co-principal investigators, and associate investigators, provide:
    - a) names,
    - b) affiliations,

- c) contact information (telephone and email).
  - B. Total requested project budget including direct and indirect costs broken out.
- 2. The project description must not exceed 15 pages, including minimum 1-inch margins and 11-point font. The project description must include subsections which describe the:
  - A. Alignment with the topics outlined in the RFP: Explicitly explain the connection of the proposed research to the priorities identified in the RFP.
  - B. Methodological approach: Describe the experimental designs, techniques, and analyses to be used. Be specific. This includes an explanation of how the data will be analyzed using appropriate statistical and/or graphical procedures. In addition, you should discuss new methods and their advantages over previous methods, potential difficulties and alternative approaches to achieve your goals. Readers should be able to make a determination of the appropriateness of the proposed approach for achieving the stated objectives. This section and the previous section should convince peer reviewers of your understanding of the state-of-the-art and the merit of your technical approach to conducting the research.
  - C. Expected outputs (deliverables)
- 3. Illustrations and tables, if included, must be of legible size and are not included in the page limitation.
- 4. References cited may be included as a separate section, and are not included within the stated page limits.
- 5. The budget justification should explain the rationale for each line-item included in the final budget.
- 6. Prepare a detailed budget sheet for the project. No match is required.
- 7. Supporting Documentation  
Each project narrative is expected to be complete. This section is NOT to be used for additional project description or discussion of investigators' qualifications or publications; such materials will be discarded prior to review. Allowable supporting documentation includes letters of support and/or collaboration and documentation of important facilities required for the proposed work.
- 8. Biography of Each Investigator  
Submit a two-page maximum curriculum vitae for each investigator or associate investigator.

### **SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS**

Investigators must submit by e-mail an electronic copy of the proposal. Electronic files must be a single file in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF format and must be sent via e-mail to Shanna Madsen (smadsen@asmfc.org) for receipt no later than **5:00 p.m. EST on Monday**

**January 4, 2016.** You must specify “Atlantic Menhaden Research Proposal” in the subject line. Proposals that are not received by the deadline will be returned without review. Hard copy and faxed submissions, in addition to proposals that fail to comply with content, format and length requirements, will not be accepted.

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

All proposals meeting the specified requirements will be screened by a Review Panel established by the Commission’s Committee on Economics and Social Science. Proposals will be reviewed and ranked by the Panel on the following:

1. ability to adequately address the identified general and specific research topic areas;
2. approach, including adequacy/feasibility of the methodologies as outlined;
3. appropriateness and expected quality of research outputs.

Note that proposals will primarily be evaluated on their ability to deliver the research outputs identified in Table 1. Addressing lower priority outputs identified in Table 2 will add value to the proposal, but should not supersede the higher priority outputs.

Decisions will be disseminated to PIs by the end of January and research is expected to begin February 15, 2016.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Contact: Shanna Madsen  
Fisheries Science Coordinator  
ASMFC  
1050 N. Highland Street,  
Suite 200 A-N, Arlington, VA  
**Email:** [smadsen@asmfc.org](mailto:smadsen@asmfc.org)  
**Phone:** 703-842-0740  
**Fax:** 703-842-0741