Comments on Vermilion Snapper SEDAR Update #3.
Rick DeVictor
5.16.07

The checked comments were addressed in the final report

√1. Section 1, 2nd paragraph. The SW was held March 15th.
√2. Section 2, 1st paragraph. Replace "black sea bass" with "vermilion snapper".
√3. Section 2.3.2. I thought that 2006 headboat landings were incomplete. If it was, should add explanation/details.
√4. Section 2.5.5. Define "F" first time in report.
√5. Section 3.2. Would be helpful here or elsewhere to note what years that landings data was used in the benchmark.
√6. Section 5.2. 3rd paragraph. Elaborate on the change to ten kg for model convergence, as this was a large part of the workshop (e.g., explain that the model is on a log scale, so further from zero makes a big difference..) Why 10 (other values were tried)?
√7. Section 6.1. Spell out MRFSS first time used in the report.
√8. Section 7.1. Explain why only the chevron index was updated.
√9. Section 9.1. Section heading should read "Results of length-structured model".
√10.   Section 9.1.3. The last sentence states that the "current estimate of F is 0.73". Should clarify in the report that "current" means the terminal year (2006).
√11.   Figure 18. Due to shading issue, this information does not show up so well. Should include table with Fs for each gear and total F throughout the years.
  12.   Figure 18. Table needs to be resized; some of the numbers go into the text above.
√13.   Section 10.2. "Is" should be lowercase.
√14.   Section 10.2. The report states that the change in Fmax is "due to differences in the estimates of catch-weighted selectivity". Further explanation would help Council members further understand this. A reference to a specific table/figure showing this would be helpful.
√(2nd comment not addressed) 15.   Section 10.2. Restate Fcurrent here and how it changed from the benchmark.
16. Section 12.2. After #1, more detail is appropriate here. There was discussion at the workshop that an age-structured model might be more appropriate, a length based was used for the benchmark due to the number of lengths, however there is a high degree of variation in lengths from year to year (probably due to sampling error and/or biases). This inclusion of such information is suggested.
17. Table 1a/1b. Include a footnote that outlines what gear is included as "other". Would be useful to have other broken-out especially since it doubled in 2006.
18. Table 2. Why no headboat length samples for 2006? Add footnote.
19. Table 2. People are going to wonder why went from 11,137 lengths in 2004 to 90 and 2,731 lengths in 2005 and 2006, respectively. I recall an error with data transfer within TIP in 2005. This needs to be explained in the report, especially since this a length-based model and the hook-line fishery the predominate fishery.
20. Table 4. Why can we produce a Bmsy value and not Bcurr?

21. Table 4. Show values also in lbs.
22. Footnote why values are provided for "Rebuild Time" and "ABC".
23. Table 4. Include values for base M. Generation time probably not needed as not determining the rebuilding time.
√24.   In the report, we should clarify if F is Fterminal and Fmax are instantaneous or annual. If instantaneous, it should be converted to annual as Fannuals are used by managers to calculate reductions needed to end overfishing.

Erik Williams provided the following response:

```
Rick, I am not sure what you mean by annual vs. instantaneous F's.  All
F's are instantaneous rates.  I am not aware of an "annual F", unless
what you mean is exploitation rate, which I define as the fraction of
fish removed in a given year.  I think I know what you are after and
that is the translation between a percent reduction in F into a percent
reduction in landings.  This is what Jack McGovern has done using the
Baranov catch equation.  For example, if the overfishing is defined by
F but the management is operating on TAC, then we need to know what is
the percentage reduction in TAC that achieves the necessary reduction
in F to prevent overfishing.  Jack can handle this.  Let me know if
there is something else needed here.
```

√25. Common format is to have table heading above table and figure heading below.
√26. Include Update TORs and workshop participants.
27. Tables should be provided to show the numbers used to generate the figures.
√28. Ensure that anytime data is shown in kg that it is also shown in lbs.
√29. Include tables with the MARMAP and headboat CPUE values.
30. Include length composition data in tabular format.
√31.   Would be good to have a table that just shows harvested fish and another table that shows harvested plus dead discards (MRFSS).
√32.   Clarify that the vermilion update was scheduled to be completed in 2007 for some time – currently the first sentence reads that the Council first requested the vermilion update in December.