

FINAL SSC ROADMAP

June 10-12, 2007

NOTE #1: THE SSC MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 1 PM ON SUNDAY AND RUN DURING THE SAME TIME COUNCIL COMMITTEES WILL BE MEETING ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY; THE SCHEDULE IS STRUCTURED TO ENSURE THE SSC FINALIZES THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE A COUNCIL COMMITTEE DISCUSSES THAT PARTICULAR ITEM.

NOTE #2: ALL DISCUSSIONS (FULL SSC AND SUBCOMMITTEES) MUST BE RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED SO CHAIRS SHOULD ENSURE ONLY ONE PERSON IS TALKING AT ANY ONE TIME AND THAT THEY ARE SPEAKING DIRECTLY INTO THE MICROPHONE.

NOTE #3: A WRITTEN SSC REPORT(S) SHALL BE COMPLETED BY TUESDAY WHEN THE SSC ADJOURNS.

1. Role of the SSC – the role of the SSC was greatly and significantly expanded by the recent changes to the Magnuson-Steven Act (**Attachment 1**). The issue of paying SSC members has been discussed by our SSC Selection Committee and is not a part of the role discussed here. Basically, Congress transferred the responsibility to set the top end of the catch level to prevent overfishing (what the Council has called Acceptable Biological Catch or ABC in mackerel management for years) from the Council to you the SSC. Big Change! Expect to have constituents show up to offer input during your meetings (see agenda item at start of all SSC meetings) and expect them to want to talk with you during breaks and evenings. At the June meeting the SSC will be expected to provide an ABC for gag and vermilion snapper that incorporates estimates of bycatch and discard mortality and to provide some guidance on where between this maximum catch level and zero the Council should set the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) to balance the socioeconomic impacts with the need to be risk averse.

The SSC will also be asked to review, revise, and approve a Research Plan.

The SSC should evaluate all Council amendments with the new MSA requirements for cumulative economic and social impacts, judge the completeness and effectiveness of bycatch reporting programs, etc.

We should spend some time discussing these items so that everyone is on the same page. It would also be good for the SSC to have some of these discussions before June via emails. If you want we can also set-up a conference call. Let Carolyn know how you want to handle this.

**SEC. 302. REGIONAL FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCILS 16 U.S.C. 1852
97-453, 101-627, 104-297**

101-627

(g) COMMITTEES AND ADVISORY PANELS.—

(1)(A) Each Council shall establish, maintain, and appoint the members of a scientific and statistical committee to assist it in the development, collection, evaluation, and peer review of such statistical, biological, economic, social, and other scientific information as is relevant to such Council's development and amendment of any fishery management plan.

(B) Each scientific and statistical committee shall provide its Council ongoing scientific advice for fishery management decisions, including recommendations for acceptable biological catch, preventing overfishing, maximum sustainable yield, and achieving rebuilding targets, and reports on stock status and health, bycatch, habitat fishing practices.

(C) Members appointed by the Councils to the scientific and statistical committees shall be Federal employees, State employees, academicians, or independent experts and shall have strong scientific or technical credentials and experience.

(D) Each member of a scientific and statistical committee shall be treated as an affected individual for purposes of paragraphs (2), (3)(B), (4), and (5)(A) of subsection (j). The Secretary shall keep disclosures made pursuant to this subparagraph on file.

(E) The Secretary and each Council may establish a peer review process for that Council for scientific information used to advise the Council about the conservation and management of the fishery. The review process, which may include existing committees or panels, is deemed to satisfy the requirements of the guidelines issued pursuant to section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal year 2001 (Public Law 106-554—Appendix C; 114 Stat. 2763A-153).

(F) In addition to the provisions of section 302(f)(7), the Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, pay a stipend to members of the scientific and statistical committees or advisory panels who are not employed by the Federal Government or a State marine fisheries agency.

(G) A science and statistical committee shall hold its meetings in conjunction with the meeting of the Council, to the extent practicable.

95-354, 97-453, 101-627

(h) FUNCTIONS.--Each Council shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Act--
(6) develop annual catch limits for each of its managed fisheries that may not exceed the fishing level recommendations of its scientific and statistical committee or the peer review process established under subsection (g);

(7) develop, in conjunction with the scientific and statistical committee, multi-year research priorities for fisheries, fisheries interactions, habitats, and other areas of research that are necessary for management purposes, that shall—

(A) establish priorities for 5-year periods;

(B) be updated as necessary; and

(C) be submitted to the Secretary and the regional science centers of the National Marine Fisheries Service for their consideration in developing research priorities and budgets for the region of the Council; and

SEC. 303. CONTENTS OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS 16 U.S.C. 1853

95-354, 99-659, 101-627, 104-297

(a) REQUIRED PROVISIONS.--Any fishery management plan which is prepared by any Council, or by the Secretary, with respect to any fishery, shall--

(9) include a fishery impact statement for the plan or amendment (in the case of a plan or amendment thereto submitted to or prepared by the Secretary after October 1, 1990) which shall assess, specify, and analyze the likely effects, if any, including the cumulative conservation, economic, and social impacts, of the conservation and management measures on, and possible mitigation measures for—

(A) participants in the fisheries and fishing communities affected by the plan or amendment;

(B) participants in the fisheries conducted in adjacent areas under the authority of another Council, after consultation with such Council and representatives of those

participants; and

(C) the safety of human life at sea, including whether and to what extent such measures may affect the safety of participants in the fishery;

(10) specify objective and measurable criteria for identifying when the fishery to which the plan applies is overfished (with an analysis of how the criteria were determined and the relationship of the criteria to the reproductive potential of stocks of fish in that fishery) and, in the case of a fishery which the Council or the Secretary has determined is approaching an overfished condition or is overfished, contain conservation and management measures to prevent overfishing or end overfishing and rebuild the fishery;

(11) establish a standardized reporting methodology to assess the amount and type of bycatch occurring in the fishery, and include conservation and management measures that, to the extent practicable and in the following priority--

(A) minimize bycatch; and

(B) minimize the mortality of bycatch which cannot be avoided;

(12) assess the type and amount of fish caught and released alive during recreational fishing under catch and release fishery management programs and the mortality of such fish, and include conservation and management measures that, to the extent practicable, minimize mortality and ensure the extended survival of such fish;

(13) include a description of the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors which participate in the fishery, including its economic impact, and, to the extent practicable, quantify trends in landings of the managed fishery resource by the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors;

(14) to the extent that rebuilding plans or other conservation and management measures which reduce the overall harvest in a fishery are necessary, allocate, taking into consideration the economic impact of the harvest restrictions or recovery benefits on the fishery participants in each sector, any harvest restrictions or recovery benefits fairly and equitably among the commercial, recreational, and charter fishing sectors in the fishery and;

(15) establish a mechanism for specifying annual catch limits in the plan (including a multiyear plan), implementing regulations, or annual specifications, at a level such that overfishing does not occur in the fishery, including measures to ensure accountability.

P.L. 109-479, sec. 104(b)

EFFECTIVE DATES; APPLICATION TO CERTAIN SPECIES.—The amendment made by subsection

(a)(10)—

(1) shall, unless otherwise provided for under an international agreement in which the United States participates, take effect—

(A) in fishing year 2010 for fisheries determined by the Secretary to be subject to overfishing; and

(B) in fishing year 2011 for all other fisheries; and

(2) shall not apply to a fishery for species that have a life cycle of approximately 1 year unless the Secretary has determined the fishery is subject to overfishing of that species; and

(3) shall not limit or otherwise affect the requirements of section 301(a)(1) or 304(e) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1851(a)(1) or 1854(e), respectively).

2. SEDAR 10 Corrected Atlantic Gag Assessment - review and provide recommendations to the Council on the Atlantic Gag Grouper SEDAR Assessment. The South Atlantic Council has indicated that the SSC is their review body for all SEDAR Assessments. **IN ADDITION, THE MAGNUSON-STEVENSON ACT NOW REQUIRES THAT THE SSC PROVIDE THE COUNCIL WITH AN ALLOWABLE CATCH LEVEL THAT WILL PREVENT OVERFISHING; THIS CAN BE A RANGE OR A POINT ESTIMATE.** SSC written recommendations including an ABC are to be presented to Snapper Grouper Committee on June 12th at 8:00 AM.

The Council has provided the following SSC Terms of Reference (TOR) for the gag grouper SEDAR 10 assessment. Specific items to be provided by the SSC include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Examine the data, assessment, and review workshops TORs and determine if each of the Terms of Reference items were met (included in gag assessment document).
- B. Examine the Review Panel's recommendation that, until the next assessment, the Council adopt a MSST value for gag grouper at the lowest observed SSB (around 5 million lbs) in place of the current definition $[(1 - M)B_{MSY}]$. The SSC should advise the Council on this recommendation.
- C. Does the absence of commercial and recreational data from the Atlantic side of the Florida Keys affect the outcome of the assessment?
- D. Any SSC suggestions on how to have recreational and commercial data provided from the Atlantic side of the Florida Keys for inclusion in future assessments and updates. (Note: this applies to most if not all of the SEDAR assessments and updates.)
- E. A table of the landings in pounds by sector should be included for the Council. Given that one was not produced in the assessment, the SSC is requested to take the assessment output and provide such a table.
- F. How adequate is the assessment with the lack of age and length sampling, the lack of a fishery independent index, and highly variable MRFSS estimates?
- G. In Section 2.2, the Consensus Report states that the lack of length samples from MRFSS resulted in the use of headboat length compositions to reflect the charterboat length compositions. Are headboat and charterboat fishing similar enough to make this presumption?
- H. Relative to SSB, the run with the headboat CPUE data omitted shows the population increasing in recent years, reaching the highest terminal value of all the runs. Conversely, the run with the commercial handline CPUE omitted results in the lowest SSB value in the terminal year. Examine the conflicting indices of abundance. Is it reasonable to conclude, as the Review Panel did, that this highlights the balance fit between these two indices?
- I. Examine the increase, in recent years, of the catch by the shore mode recreational sectors. Is one explanation that the catch is from bridges in Florida?
- J. The Review Panel questioned whether the ADMB statistical catch at age model conforms to the Model Acceptance Note 1 in the TOR for the Assessment Workshop. Examine the implications of the use of a model that doesn't conform to the TOR. Provide recommendations of an appropriate model given the Review Panel's concerns. Has ADMB been peer-reviewed?

- K. Evaluate the Ad Hoc Review of gag and red grouper to address issues relative to the Atlantic gag assessment. Given their recommendations and that some of the sensitivity runs “blew up” the SSC should determine whether or not they believe the correction justifies further independent review by going back to the Assessment Workshop stage.
- L. Review the treatment of selectivity – the recreational selectivity at age changed with implementation of the first recreation size limit of 20” TL (1/1/92) and then the 24” TL size limit (2/24/99). Was this modeled correctly? Are these changes accounted for in the management advice? If not, what affect would they have on management advice?
- M. How were discards estimated and modeled? How are discards estimated for the future? What exactly is included for discards in the estimated management values from the model?
- N. The magnitude of MSY and SSB_{msy} changed substantially in the corrected assessment; status determinations did not change much. Does this seem correct?
- O. Some of the sensitivity runs “blew up” in the corrected assessment. What are the implications of this change?
- P. Is the stock undergoing overfishing?
- Q. Is the stock overfished? Review the existing and proposed definitions of MSST.
- R. Is the stock approaching an overfished status? Evaluate based on existing and proposed MSST definitions.
- S. Provide an estimate of MSY.
- T. Provide an Allowable Biological Catch Level to prevent overfishing using or not using the 2% increase in efficiency per year. This catch level must include discards. This can be viewed as a 2-part process with the Biological Sub-Committee taking the lead on developing the ABC and the Socioeconomic Committee taking the lead on providing guidance to the Council on where between ABC and 0 the TAC should be set based on balancing the socioeconomic impacts and the need to be risk averse.

The Council’s schedule for addressing gag grouper is as follows:

- A. The Council approved a motion at the March 2007 meeting indicating that gag would be addressed in the Council’s Fishery Ecosystem Plan Comprehensive Amendment.
- B. Committee/Council review draft document at June 10-15, 2007 meeting.
- C. Committee/Council review draft document at September 17-21, 2007 meeting.
- D. Committee/Council review draft document and approve for public hearings at the December 2-7, 2007 Council meeting.

3. Vermilion Snapper Update (SEDAR 2) - review and provide recommendations to the Council on the Vermilion Snapper SEDAR Update. The SSC is the review body for SEDAR Assessment Updates and is the group to write the Review Report and the Advisory Report (please follow the reports included for gag in the SEDAR 10 documents). **THE MAGNUSON-STEVENSON ACT NOW REQUIRES THAT THE SSC PROVIDE THE COUNCIL WITH AN ALLOWABLE CATCH LEVEL THAT WILL PREVENT OVERFISHING; THIS CAN BE A RANGE OR A POINT ESTIMATE.** SSC written recommendations in the form of the Review Report and the Advisory Report presented to Snapper Grouper Committee on June 12th at 8:00 AM.

Items to be provided by the SSC include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Examine the Assessment Update and determine if each of the Terms of Reference items (**Attachment 3**) were met.
- B. Is there a table with commercial and recreational landings and discards in pounds?
- C. Are the updates to earlier catch data sufficient to affect the outcome of the stock assessment. If so, provide a recommendation to the Council on how to proceed (e.g., request the update be redone before the SSC can develop an ABC).
- D. Review the treatment of selectivity – the recreational selectivity at age changed with implementation of the first recreation size limit of 10” TL (1/1/92), the 11” TL size limit (2/24/99), and then the 12” TL size limit (10/23/06). Was this modeled correctly? Are these changes accounted for in the management advice? If not, what affect would they have on management advice?
- E. How were discards estimated and modeled? How are discards estimated for the future? What exactly is included for discards in the estimated management values from the model?
- F. Is the stock undergoing overfishing?
- G. Is the stock overfished?
- H. Is the stock approaching an overfished status?
- I. Provide an Allowable Biological Catch Level to prevent overfishing. This catch level must include discards. This can be viewed as a 2-part process with the Biological Sub-Committee taking the lead on developing the ABC and the Socioeconomic Committee taking the lead on providing guidance to the Council on where between ABC and 0 the TAC should be set based on balancing the socioeconomic impacts and the need to be risk averse.
- J. Does the absence of commercial and recreational data from the Atlantic side of the Florida Keys affect the outcome of the assessment?
- K. Any SSC suggestions on how to have recreational and commercial data provided from the Atlantic side of the Florida Keys for inclusion in future assessments and updates. (Note: this applies to most if not all of the SEDAR assessments and updates.)
- L. Write the Review Report (see gag grouper example).
- M. Write the Advisory Report (see gag grouper example).
- N. See remaining items in Rick DeVictor’s comments.
- O. See new material added by Gregg Waugh.
- P. Biomass values seem to be unreasonable. If we can’t be provided an estimate of the current biomass, is the estimate of MSY that was provided usable?
- Q. Are the assessment update results useful to the Council for management or should the results be rejected and a new age-based benchmark assessment requested. For

example, would you expect the 90 commercial lengths to adequately characterize the 2005 commercial hook-and-line fishery? Does the number of fish measured in 2006 (3,565) adequately characterize the fishery, particularly without any headboat samples?

- R. Can the MSY from the original benchmark be used? Can the F rates be used? In light of the large changes to the landings data, should the Council base SFA parameters on output from the original benchmark assessment.

The Council's schedule for addressing vermilion snapper is as follows:

- A. The Council approved a motion at the March 2007 meeting indicating that vermilion snapper would be addressed in the Council's Fishery Ecosystem Plan Comprehensive Amendment.
- B. Committee/Council review draft document at June 10-15, 2007 meeting.
- C. Committee/Council review draft document at September 17-21, 2007 meeting.
- D. Committee/Council review draft document and approve for public hearings at the December 2-7, 2007 Council meeting.

Note: Amendment 15 uses SFA parameters based on the original benchmark assessment so some of the changes/decisions will impact Amendment 15.

4. Snapper Grouper Amendment 15 (Rebuilding programs, etc.) – review preliminary economic model results; provide input to Council before they approve for public hearings. SSC written recommendations presented to Snapper Grouper Committee on June 12th at 1:30 PM.

Items to be provided by the SSC include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Review the action that would limit black sea bass pot effort through either limiting the number of black sea bass pots allowed or the distribution of pot tags. Is this based on the best available science?
- B. Team has added the SSC's recommended scenarios for the estimation of discards for 3 overfished species. The Council directed staff to present the results to the SSC, especially for red pogy where the SSC recommended the use of different years from those used in the scenarios developed by the team. Is this based on the best available science?
- C. Provide an Allowable Biological Catch Level to prevent overfishing for snowy grouper, red pogy, and black sea bass. [Note: Special attention should be paid to snowy grouper as the quota is based on Fmsy.] These catch levels must include discards. This can be viewed as a 2-part process with the Biological Subcommittee taking the lead on developing the ABC and the Socioeconomic Committee taking the lead on providing guidance to the Council on where between ABC and 0 the TAC should be set based on balancing the socioeconomic impacts and the need to be risk averse.
- D. Is the proposed bycatch reporting program sufficient to meet the requirements of the reauthorized MSA?
- E. Review change in the recreational overage alternative. The alternatives previously read that action should be taken if recreational overages occur for 3 and 5 consecutive years for alternatives 4a and 4b, respectively. Now it reads to

- take action if overage occurs based on a 3 year and 2 year running average, respectively. Is this sufficient to prevent overfishing?
- F. In the action that forms a deepwater snapper grouper complex to reduce bycatch, the Council retained the 1 fish vessel limit for speckled hind and Warsaw grouper for the recreational sector (action would still take off the books for the commercial sector). Council also wants staff to explain to the SSC the Council's rationale for removing the commercial 1 fish vessel limit for the commercial sector as the SSC has biological concerns with the Council taking this action.
 - G. In terms of rebuilding strategies, constant catch strategies were moved to the "Considered But Rejected Alternatives Appendix" for snowy grouper and black sea bass as they would allow overfishing to occur for a significant number of years. All rebuilding strategies for the 3 overfished species now has an estimation of discards included.
 - H. Allocation alternatives have been added for snowy grouper and red porgy. Are these based on the best available science? Have the potential economic and social impacts been analyzed sufficiently?
 - I. Jim Waters will present preliminary results of the economic simulation model. The SSC should provide comments and directions to refine analyses as necessary.

The Council's schedule for completing Amendment 15 is as follows:

- A. Review and modify document at June 10-15, 2007.
- B. Approve for public hearings at the September 17-21, 2007 Council meeting.
- C. Document ready for distribution by October 31, 2007.
- D. Public hearings during November 2007 with the final one in Atlantic Beach, NC on December 3, 2007 (during the Council meeting week).
- E. Review all comments and approve all actions at the March 3-7, 2008 Council meeting in Georgia.
- F. Review complete document and approve for formal review by Secretary of Commerce at the June 9-13, 2008 meeting in Florida.
- G. Send to Secretary of Commerce for formal review by June 30, 2008.
- H. Regulations effective January 1, 2009.

5. Mackerel Amendment 18 – this is basically the same document reviewed by the SSC at the December 2006 meeting. Some of the numbers have been updated and we have received further updated landings that will be incorporated.

Items to be provided by the SSC include but are not limited to the following:

- A. Is this amendment based on the best available science?
- B. Review the potential new alternative for Atlantic king mackerel TAC of 7.6 million pounds based on the SEDAR 5 updated projections. The current preferred is TAC = 7.1 (ABC = 5.3 – 9.6 MP). Commercial catches almost equaled the quota for 2006/07 and the Council received support for a higher TAC. The TAC of 7.6 million pounds is from the updated projections (see Appendix Appendix B) and the associated ABC = 4.6 – 11.8 million pounds.

The Council's schedule for completing Mackerel Amendment 18 is as follows:

- A. SAFMC reviews public hearing and SSC input and approves for formal review at June 11-15, 2007 meeting.
- B. GMFMC reviews public hearing input and approves for formal review at July 30 - August 3, 2007 meeting.
- C. SAFMC staff sends document to NMFS SERO by August 20, 2007.

Note: The Council may review the final document at the September 2007 meeting before sending for formal review by Secretary of Commerce.

6. Mackerel Amendment 19 Scoping Document – we are very early in the process and the draft scoping document is provided for your input. Any suggestions at this stage would be appreciated.

The Councils' preliminary schedule for completing Mackerel Amendment 19 is as follows:

- A. SAFMC Staff (Gregg to prepare first cut) draft scoping document based on material in the decision document – 1/19/07; Revised to 2/12/07.
- B. Draft scoping document sent to Team by 1/19/07; Revised to 2/12/07.
- C. Team review and approve scoping document by COB 2/2/07; Revised to 2/20/07.
- D. Amendment 19 scoping document ready for SAFMC March 5-9, 2007 meeting by 2/7/07 for their briefing book. Comments from Team included in 2nd briefing book mailing on 2/26/07.
- E. Amendment 19 scoping document provided to GMFMC for their March 26-29, 2007 meeting.
- F. SAFMC reviews/approves Amendment 19 scoping document during their March 5-9, 2007 meeting.
- G. GMFMC reviews/approves Amendment 19 scoping document during their March 26-29, 2007 meeting.
- H. Scoping process by both Councils – May/June 2007
- I. SAFMC review scoping comments and action on preparation of Amendment 19 at the June 11-15, 2007 meeting.
- J. GMFMC review scoping comments and action on preparation of Amendment 19 at the June 2007 meeting.
- K. Team prepares draft Plan Amendment 19 document – July and August 2007
- L. SAFMC reviews, revises and approves for public hearings – September 17-21, 2007 meeting.
- M. GMFMC reviews, revises and approves for public hearings – October 29 – November 1, 2007 meeting.
- N. Public hearings held late 2007 or early 2008.

7. Research Plan Required by Magnuson-Stevens Act – the SSC has reviewed some data needs in the past. This is your opportunity to comment on the first plan that the Council will provide to the Secretary of Commerce.

The Council’s schedule for completion of the research prioritization and submission of the first SAFMC 5-year plan:

- A. Review by SAFMC SEDAR Committee & Council, March 2007
- B. Review by SAFMC SSC, June 2007
- C. SAFMC SEDAR Committee Review & Approval, September 2007
- D. Council Approval, September 2007
- E. Submission to Secretary, November 1, 2007.

8. NMFS Comparisons: Electronic vs Paper Logbooks vs State Trip Tickets

NMFS will present the results of their analyses comparing electronic vs paper logbooks vs state trip ticket data. The Council will consider requiring electronic logbooks in the FEP Comprehensive Amendment. The Council is also concerned about the duplication of paper logbooks versus state trip tickets (not the bycatch or economic logbooks but the landings logbook).

The SSC should review and provide any recommendations as appropriate.

9. Written SSC Reports – the written SSC reports will include the following:

- A. Vermilion Snapper Review Report
- B. Vermilion Snapper Advisory Report
- C. SSC Report (compiled from the various written reports presented to the Committee/Council with the expanded rationale). **The SSC Written Report must be completed by the end of the day on June 12, 2007.**

10. Fishery Ecosystem Plan and Comprehensive Amendment (no SSC review required at this meeting) – a rough timetable is shown below. There is not sufficient time for the SSC to discuss these two items at this time. These two items will be discussed in detail at the December 2007 SSC meeting.

- A. FEP
 - (i) Review/Revise Draft – June & September 2007
 - (ii) Approve for Public Hearings – September or December 2007
 - (iii) Final Approval – June or September 2008
- B. FEP Comprehensive Amendment
 - (i) Review/Revise Draft – June & September 2007
 - (ii) Approve for Public Hearings – December 2007 or March 2008
 - (iii) Final Approval – June or September 2008

11. December 2007 Meeting – December 2-4, 2007 or December 1-3, 2007 [**SSC INPUT REQUESTED ON DATES – SATURDAY VS SUNDAY START**] at the Sheraton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront Hotel, Atlantic Beach, NC. Agenda items include:

- A. Snapper Grouper Amendment 15
- B. Fishery Ecosystem Plan
- C. FEP Comprehensive Amendment
- D. Mackerel Amendment 19 (king mackerel stock boundary & permits)
- E. Shrimp Amendment 7 (evaluate removing the rock shrimp use-it or lose-it action)
- F. Snapper Grouper Amendment 16 (Limited Access Privilege Program or LAP Program)

12. June 2008 Meeting – June 8-10, 2008 or June 7-9, 2008 [**SSC INPUT REQUESTED ON DATES – SATURDAY VS SUNDAY START**] in Florida. Agenda items include:

- A. Greater Amberjack SEDAR Assessment & ABC
- B. Red Snapper SEDAR Assessment & ABC
- C. Mutton Snapper SEDAR Assessment & ABC
- D. Fishery Ecosystem Plan
- E. FEP Comprehensive Amendment
- F. Snapper Grouper Amendment 16 (Limited Access Privilege Program or LAP Program)

13. December 2008 Meeting – November 30 - December 2, 2008 or November 29-December 1, 2008 [**SSC INPUT REQUESTED ON DATES – SATURDAY VS SUNDAY START**] in North Carolina. Agenda items include:

- A. King Mackerel SEDAR Assessment & ABC
- B. Other Issues?