

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SEDAR COMMITTEE

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, South Carolina**

September 15, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

SEDAR Committee

Ben Hartig, Chair
Jack Cox
Charlie Phillips

Zack Bowen
Dr. Michelle Duval

Council Members

Mel Bell
Anna Beckwith
Chester Brewer
Dr. Wilson Laney
Chris Conklin

Jessica McCawley
Lt. Morgan Fowler
Mark Brown
Doug Haymans

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
John Carmichael
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer
Amber Von Harten
Roger Pugliese
Julia Byrd

Gregg Waugh
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Brian Chevront
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell

Observers/Participants:

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Phil Steele

Monica Smit-Brunello
Kevin Anson

Other Participants Attached

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, September 15, 2014, and was called to order at 9:05 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: Welcome to the SEDAR Committee. The first item of business is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved. The next is approval of the minutes. Are there any changes, deletions or corrections to the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us to activities update under Attachment 1, John Carmichael.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Attachment 1; you have the SEDAR Assessment Project Schedule as it is; and we also had the detailed schedule for SEDAR 41, which was based on the actions taken here at the end of the June meeting to accelerate so that it would get to the council in June of 2015. We'll talk a bit more about that, obviously in a second.

The other items to bring to your attention is in the overview with the table just to update you on where things stand is the SSC coming up at the end of October. We're looking forward to reviewing assessments of mutton snapper, king mackerel and hogfish, which is great, so we have a full load of assessments to look at during that meeting.

We'll have to talk about scheduling priorities and you see the list there on the table, which one through six is the priorities you guys identified in June. There were some questions there as to what could be done. Bonnie mentioned the staff issues that they had and some turnover within the Beaufort Lab and the acceleration of red snapper; so it really wasn't clear what could be started when and what the timing would be on these projects.

We expect some feedback from Bonnie on that; but then, again, as most people know there is a bit of an issue with red snapper in SEDAR 41, which obviously is going to have a lot of impact for what happens in the coming months. I'll move right on down into that. SEDAR 41 is the red snapper and gray triggerfish benchmark stock assessment.

It was put on an accelerated schedule and it was cranking along pretty good. There were a few data issues coming out of the data workshop that was in early August. There was some back and forth on trying to get gray triggerfish age issues straight and how they should be interpreted. The life history group was making good progress on that and people put a lot of effort into it.

Then we had a final webinar scheduled to finalize data and such and move on, which was last Friday, and the primary topic of that ended up being an issue with the headboat data. After the data workshop, a working paper was put forth and it highlighted some of the problems with reporting in the headboat fishery. The initial impetus was to address regulatory changes and how they should be interpreted when applying a CPUE Index from the headboat.

Issues were also brought up about the potential falsification of reports and issues with reporting that happened in the earlier years of the headboat program. A lot of you guys might remember that this was first brought to the council's attention at the Key West meeting a couple of years ago in regards to SEDAR 25 and black sea bass where there were a number of – at the time the

word “affidavit” was turned out – I don’t know if that’s proper but statements from fishermen, headboat operators claiming that the data were entered late; reports were done late; mates were paid to just fill out reports.

The SEDAR Committee at the council at that time had a lot of discussion and there were issues with how prevalent that was and whether or not it was the entire headboat region, the entire southeast region versus most of the reports were from kind of the central Florida/northern Florida area.

The headboat data is treated with a bit of uncertainty in all of the assessments like most of ours and particular the older catch set; so it went forward with SEDAR 25 there really wasn’t a lot done to look back on that issue. One thing being is we were running about 120 percent, probably, capacity for getting stock assessments if we talked to Bonnie folks and how much they’re asked to do; so there really hasn’t been time to circle back to say this issue and dig into it in depth.

Then fast forward to now and SEDAR 41 and it has come up again; and it became the primary topic, as I said, on that webinar. The gist of it comes down to the data workshop group agreeing if this type misreporting and falsification, as it has been termed, of reports is true, then it has a huge impact on the dataset that goes into the assessment.

Obviously, it would affect CPUE but it also affects the catch. In those early years you’re talking about a time when there was no private recreational sampling and no MRIP sampling; so that can be an important indicator of the nature and the scope of the recreational fishery in those times. It is also used as one of the pieces of information that is used to bridge that gap from when MRIP starts in 1981, MRFSS at the time, to the headboat, which started in 1972.

The relationship between the different sources of information you actually have is used to kind of fill in the blanks of the private recreational. It is also used in the equations that are carried forth to get some estimate of what the catch was going back to like 1955 or so, which is the first year. The whole idea is that with a long-lived fish, it can be important to have some idea of the scope of landings going way back in time so that you have more completed cohorts in your model and you also have some indication of kind of how things got started out.

The net result from the group was this is serious; the fact that those SEDAR 25 issues have come back again and pointing out that this should have been addressed before and it hasn’t; and that in the case of black sea bass there were some statements made potentially where those reports are coming from isn’t the core sea bass area; and made very clear on the webinar that this actually is the core of the red snapper area; and these were people participating in the red snapper fishery in those times.

Basically, the entire data workshop group took it very seriously, discussed a lot of alternatives, and there was a webinar summary sent around to everybody to try and clarify the many alternatives that were considered and some of the issues that were raised. The bottom line was there was just no technically acceptable approach for the entire group.

There are assumptions that could be made, higher CVs, shorter time series, what have you, but all of those have technical issue associated with them; and the group couldn't reach consensus that any of them were a best science going forward type of solution; and dealing with a benchmark assessment and knowing it is going to have to get through independent peer review, knowing the importance of this fishery, they really wanted to take it very serious and concluded with saying we need to dig into this headboat reporting issue, we need to find out how prevalent it was, we need to find out if it's just an uncertainty that could be addressed by CVs or is it maybe a bias?

Did they report high; did they report low; is there any consistency to the captains or were some high and some low? At this point nobody really knows and there was a real fear that if they put some sort of number and just use a higher CV, well, then, who picks that CV and how do know in picking that CV based on the results of the assessment model if you do it through just a number of sensitivities or something. There are a lot of technical issues and there was a lot of just really when you get right down to it unknowns that no one felt they had the kind of quantitative information that they could put on the table before this group to let it move forward.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for the summary, John, I really appreciate it. This came up on a data workshop webinar last week; but was it raised at all during the in-person data workshop? I guess my question is just that if this has come up before, I'm just curious why there wasn't more of an effort made on the front end to perhaps bring this issue to the analysts and have this done so that it could be completed in time for the data workshop and we wouldn't be getting off schedule.

MR. CARMICHAEL: There is always discussion about the uncertainties; and I think most folks who have been through many of these SEDARs are well aware of the issues with reporting. There was discussion where it really was sort of the seed that got this going was there was discussion within the indices about how the headboat time series is treated with regard to regulations and changing the fishing behavior for the headboat index.

The working paper primarily went into those issues. I think everyone agreed with breaking out the index and stuff to deal with that. The paper came in a couple weeks after the workshop had ended, after the data workshop; and it was put forth based on dealing with CPUE issues. There were discussions in the indices group; and they said, well, it would be good to document kind of when these changes happened; so if we split the time series at this point, we have some record of why we believe that's appropriate time.

Then the comments about the bad reporting and the issues with reporting going back to SEDAR 25 were included in the working paper; and that led folks to say, well, wait a minute, if this is part of the justification, that has bigger consequences. There were comments made to some folks within the recreational group and working on the recreational report that, well, wait a minute, there are problems with the catch here, too.

It kind of started with something that was to document what was discussed at the workshop, but then the scope of the problem really grew when you sat back and considered what are the true consequences of this aspect, and not just the regulations and the behavior, but when you put this potential falsification of trip reports on the table, what do you do?

I think this issue has come before and sometimes it has been, well, we know the data are uncertain and we deal with it; but I think some folks maybe felt that, look, we're getting this issue again; this is a hugely important assessment; this is the core area for this particular fishery; maybe we've gotten to the point where our work-arounds and our assumptions to solve this problem are clearly not adequate because we're getting these comments again; and I think we need to take them seriously and fix them properly.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but I appreciate the opportunity to ask a couple of questions. John, do we have a sense of when the reporting became more clear and less fraudulent?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Some will say '92 when I believe is the year when they say it became more mandatory. I'm not exactly clear on that because we're making it more mandatory now, but there were changes reportedly on how the fishermen viewed it that, okay, now we think it is more serious and there are greater consequences so we try to be more accurate versus it was felt that in the earlier years a combination of just being new, fishermen at that time sometimes just not taking it that serious, not knowing what is going to become of it and not knowing that 30 years ago it was going to be very important to a stock assessment. If you look at the working paper and talk about stuff, they kind of said that from '92 forward to have more confidence.

MR. HAYMANS: I know a lot of folks have issues with stock assessments that try to reach back 40 or 50 years for data; and so it would seem – and especially since this is a benchmark, it would seem that we could truncate it 20 years or 15 years and let's go ahead and move forward with this. Even though I know it's only half the animal's life history, I sure hate to see this particularly for this species get stalled.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And that was discussed and Bonnie may comment on that. It was discussed and the group didn't feel they had a technically valid way to move forward if we look at the discussions with them.

DR. PONWITH: John, is right, we're taking this very seriously. I think one of the criticisms of the people who supplied information was that if they didn't fill it out immediately, if they waited and did it when their permits were due, that created some recall bias and hampered the quality of those data.

The thing that I want to be very, very, very careful about is that if there is a recall bias, if you sit down at the end of the year and try and recreate a year's worth of data, there is a profoundly higher recall bias if we try and recreate actual numbers today for those years. We've spent a lot of time talking about this within the center since the webinar about what the correct way forward is.

I've got a proposal that I think is a reasonable way forward given the facts that we've got right now. What I think is going to be a good move is to create a protocol that is basically a set of steps that we would take of obtaining information; and then once we have the information in our hands of how mathematically or qualitatively we would deal with that information and then get

that protocol peer reviewed; so that before it is even begun, it is like, yes, this is a good approach to dealing with this problem. Then once that is peer reviewed, we can begin.

A round sketch of what we are thinking for that approach is that we would get either a focus group, a cross-section of headboat captains that have a long history in the region; or better yet, a census survey and collect a suite of information where we're gathering the same information from all of them; and then we use that to kind of build the data, the facts, and would it be getting at did you fill your reports out every day at the end of a trip or did was there a lag; just questions like that to gather the information.

Then based on the pool of information we get back from that, we would apply mathematical methodologies to be able to use that input then to make decisions on the quality of the data. Once those meetings are over, we would hold a second focus group meeting; and that would be with the managers of the headboat program.

We're fortunate in that the headboat has a long history; and the architects of that program are still walking among us. There are three of them that have pretty much the entire end-to-end history of that program in their heads; four if you include Ken Brennan. If we can get them as a second focus group and talk about what were the QA-QC protocols for when you were in charge of the program, how were they carried out, was it consistent across the history of the program, did it change; because there we have an indicator of the quality of the data and on the other hand we have an indicator of what was done regarding the quality of the data.

The thing that we want to be careful about is double-correcting; because if outliers had already been thrown out of the database, but the headboat captains didn't know that, you could end up double-correcting. Then what we would do is take the facts that we were able to gather from the first focus group, pull it together it with the QA-QC procedures from the second focus group, and then use those protocols that we established and peer reviewed prior to the whole thing starting to help us make decisions about how the data should be handled in light of those two together.

Once that is done, then we can resume the stock assessment. Now, my view, just kind of looking at the lay of the land, is that if we started working on this today and we were really, really aggressive, I think that it is reasonable that we could have those two focus groups, with the protocol written, peer reviewed, and those two focus groups held in the best possible case by the end of the calendar year.

It is a big deal; but if we're going to do it, my view is we need to be careful and we need to do it correctly and once and for all; so that every single stock assessment we do until the cows come home, we don't end up with this same problem again. We want to do it right, we want to do it once. That's kind of the thinking that we've got going right now. I'll stop and let people reflect.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on the committee. Bonnie actually answered some of the questions I had. It's kind of an observation. History-dependent data always has these sorts of issues. We base the decisions we make in part on those data. This isn't just a problem with this particular fishery. I run into it all the time. I deal with it at the state level with other things I do.

It just shows that it is a partnership; and if one of the partners doesn't do their job properly, this is what happens. I'm still struggling with how you go back and try to recreate something from – and I appreciate the process. It's better than I could come up with – but how you recreate something from 30 or 35 years ago, I can't remember what I had for breakfast sometimes.

That's some amazing recall. I know in the case of our industry, the boats are gone, a lot of the people are gone, and we're not necessarily at the heart of this particular fishery issue. It really shows the importance of everybody doing their job properly. I just think that needs to be said; and if folks has just done what they were supposed to do the way they were supposed to do it, we wouldn't here right now. That's just human nature.

One other thought I had was I know perhaps back during that period of time, I know our mandatory headboat reporting system went into place in '92; but prior to that we and maybe other state agencies had done some studies where we looked at what on with headboats in terms of CPUEs and things like that and species composition.

I don't know to what degree that might be helpful if we kind of reach out to the states and who has got some sort of data-related studies that were done on headboats from that time period that might be useful to kind of help clarify some of this. Then the other question I have is these data were used in more than just a red snapper stock assessment.

These data have been used in how many stock assessments since and so what are the implications there? I guess I wanted to get that off my chest about – and maybe I'm speaking like a state bureaucrat here, but if people just do their job properly and hold up their part of the partnership, this works better and the system is really reliant upon folks doing their job. Thank you.

MR. HARTIG: I'm going to say one short thing. I think people are now, Mel. I think people are vested in the process now and are providing good information. It is just how long it took us to get to that point is what is in question. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Bonnie addressed some of my concerns. I think this sounds like a good way forward. Mel touched on some of the points that I was thinking about, too. We're probably all thinking about that. I would just caution one other thing is that I've heard the words "the prior data" or "the information we have been using from that time period is fraudulent or inaccurate".

Well, I would caution us against making that assumption until we go through this protocol that Bonnie is talking about; because in essence we're saying potential people were untruthful at some point, either back then or perhaps it could even be said now because they don't like the results that come out of using information. I just caution us to be real careful and build the record that we're looking at all of it; and I wouldn't make any assumptions on that past data without seeing where this all comes out through the assessment.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you. I think maybe questionable data and going back and revisiting is a much better way to frame the conversation; and I appreciate that. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I have a clarifying question of Bonnie, if I could, and that is through this process is it basically accepting or rejecting the data or is it changing the data?

DR. PONWITH: That would be the protocol. What the protocol would do is basically create some if-then-else procedures, depending upon what we find when we pull. Right now what we're seeing is a series of statements that say "I falsified data". That is a classic biased sample; because all we're hearing from are people who said they falsified their data.

We don't know what the rest of the population did. We don't whether those represent the full population or whether those represent a handful of people who falsified data and everybody else pretty much reported every single day like they were supposed to. Until we do fact-finding and understand those statements in the context of the rest of the fleet, we won't know what the procedure is. I do not view this as binary.

I do not view this as the data stink here and the data don't stink going forward. I view that there is going to be some sort of a blended approach on how we deal with the data; but we won't know what that approach is until we get the whole lay of the land and understand the best procedures. Following best scientific practices, we want to do outcome neutral planning for this, meaning that we create a series of protocols that we would apply based on what we learn from the fact-finding. Once we have a full understanding of the quality of the data going back, then we'll apply procedures based on those protocols.

MR. BROWN: Bonnie, if those people are not around anymore or there are people that are around that worked for them or maybe even crewed on those boats, would those people be able to be talked to about this? Would their testimony be credible enough to use?

DR. PONWITH: Given the length of the history that we're trying to build, my view is that a lot depends upon whether we're going to take a sample or a census. If the goal is to take a census and the headboat captain is gone – either gone-gone or gone from the region – then I would think that someone knowledgeable of the fishery, someone who was a deckhand or something like that would be beneficial.

We could bin up the respondents in this focus group based on what their role was on the vessel. Again, a lot of those are the details that would need to be worked out; and that would be worked out in the protocol. Again, I think the first question is do we go for a census and do a survey across the entire fleet or do we try and get a representative sample that cross-cuts the fleet.

MR. HAYMANS: For John; so best case Bonnie's group is concluded by December; and we don't know what the results of that are going to be yet. Really this is putting the process off – if we restart it with – the assessment workshop is next, right; so we restart it in February?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Possibly. What I would expect is because these core data affect the historic time series and the assumptions that are used to fill in the blanks; there will be some recreational data workgroup things that need to be done. Whether that requires a meeting of those guys or they can do it over some webinars, we would have to see.

There will be some data wrap-up, yes, in which case maybe you could that done by January and get the assessment back underway February or so; and then maybe we're looking at a four- to six-month delay, no more than in the whole process, that would be good. Maybe we could still get the wrapped by the end of the year.

Again, I think a lot of that may hinge upon what comes out of this group and what type of subsequent processing needs to be done to the data to get us back on track and get us to where we want it to be, which is here is the data and you're ready to start the assessment. I think really it is going when you get to that point and then we will pretty well know the schedule from there forward.

MR. HAYMANS: And remind me how long are our ACLs set into the future for that; how far out are they?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think you can continue to say your ACLs in red snapper each year like you do, based on what the prior year did.

MR. HAYMANS: No; I mean we've got an ABC that is set for some amount of time. We changed the ACL I guess based on bycatch; but I thought 2018 or something like that as far as we go or maybe not that far.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'm not sure how far the ABC was put forth. You could ask the SSC to look at it. They may ask for some updated projections. There are work-arounds for that; but I'd have to check and see how far they gave the ABC recommendation the last time for the term of years.

DR. LANEY: I'm not on your committee. I have a question for Bonnie or John, maybe. During these discussions, has anyone indicated that they maybe kept like a second set of books that really had the true data in them; or, is there any possibility that there were regular participants in the headboat fishery like anglers who kept very detailed personal logs that might be available to us to help reality check some of those data? That's just a remote possibility, I suppose, but I thought I'd ask the question, anyway.

DR. PONWITH: Yes; and the answer to that "is to be determined". This is exactly the kind of fact-finding we'll have to do.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any further questions? I just had one thing, Bonnie. Rusty has got a time series of data at least from one headboat where we've got pictures going back I don't know how many years, but a long time series. Is there a way that we could corroborate at least that one vessel with the photographs from the catches in that regard and look at how that worked out?

DR. PONWITH: If that is from a certified headboat, that certainly would be part of the pool; so, absolutely, that information would be very, very informative.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; and I don't know how many other headboats have that kind of information going back as well. Maybe some do. I know Rusty is probably pretty unique in that regard; but

if we do have that kind of information going back, it will be interesting to look at others as well to see if we can get a handle on what kind of reporting biases we had and if we had any. All right, where are we?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Well, it sounds like we've acknowledged the delay in SEDAR 41. Bonnie has laid out a proposal that the science center intends to pursue to try and resolve this. I presume the committee supports that in getting forward. I guess the next question, then, is what are the consequences for other assessments in the next three to four months and going around the corner of the new year.

How does it affect some of these other stocks? We had red grouper wanting to be done, possibly starting later this year or early next year. Then we have the blueline tilefish and the golden tilefish. I don't know if Bonnie has had a chance to talk with her folks about how we pick up the pieces say between now and the next six months as they work on this headboat evaluation proposal.

DR. PONWITH: Red grouper is a smart stock to have in the queue because it is due. The problem is that we will not be able to do a red grouper stock assessment as it was originally planned. It was scheduled to happen starting in May of 2015; and quite honestly given the accelerated pace for the red snapper stock assessment under its original form, even that would have been a push because red snapper is never over until it's over.

There are all kinds of projections that have to be done after the assessment has been delivered; and there is quite a lot of follow-up that would have made that red grouper stock assessment challenging, particularly in light of the fact that we lost the lead assessment scientist that would have been handling that.

My view is now with red snapper dragging on through the summer and into the fall, red grouper does become very problematic to be able to get that into the 2015 schedule. The science center's views on the priority stocks just purely from a scientific standpoint is that again red grouper should be done, but our view in terms of the stocks and the priority is scamp as a benchmark stock assessment.

The Gulf menhaden is due for an update stock assessment in 2016 and then red grouper as an update stock assessment starting when we can, depending upon how this rescoping for the red snapper goes, and then golden tile as the fourth assessment. Again, it is because golden tile is due. The last benchmark was in 2011.

I know that the council has proposed getting blueline tilefish into the circulation as fast as possible. The problem with blueline tilefish coming up in the queue and bumping some of these other stocks is that blueline was just completed in 2013. That assessment used 2011 as its terminal year; and the council's proposal was to do a benchmark stock assessment on it as soon as possible.

I guess that would have translated originally to 2015. The thing about a benchmark stock assessment on top of a benchmark stock assessment is that it presumes, then, that you've have

had an opportunity to measure what is happening in that fishery and measure it in a way that could detect change.

For blue line tile the change presumably that you would be measuring would be changes in recruitment; but for blue line tile those fish really don't recruit into the fishery until sometimes like five years old; so basically you're doing a benchmark assessment using the data that we have and not enough time will have gone by to actually be able to measure a detectable change.

Even if recruitment doubled those fish wouldn't have entered the fishery yet. We're concerned about blue line. We understand that was a challenging assessment and that it has created some management challenges; but in our view golden tile is due and probably should trump blue line in the queue.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, I think blue line was meant to be a standard assessment in my recollection and not a benchmark based on our discussions in June; so maybe that doesn't present quite as many difficulties. I understand what you're saying about when the fish recruit to the fishery and being able to have some measurable difference. At least from my perspective some of the council's concerns were things that would hopefully be able to be addressed in a standard assessment, some of the items that I think the reviewers brought up about having this be a complete Atlantic coast-wide stock assessment rather than limited to the South Atlantic Council's jurisdiction. Now, I don't know if that can be addressed in a standard assessment.

I think some SSC members had asked questions regarding whether or not the model had been run with only data from north of Hatteras versus south of Hatteras or south of Canaveral because we had some issues in regards to some of the indices sort of taking opposite turns from one another in those geographic areas and trying to have some sort of work around for a spatially explicit assessment.

I guess those are the kinds of things I think about when I think about moving forward with a standard assessment there. Again, I'm not an analyst so I don't know what is up for change versus what isn't. I know that they developed a couple of different production models as well, and maybe those production models might be a little easier to update or to use for consideration of some of these questions. I just throw that out there. Thanks.

MR. HARTIG: Did you have anything in response to that, Bonnie?

DR. PONWITH: I'm just trying to picture – you know, some of the things that you raised was talking about Atlantic-wide versus just in our region and running a spatially explicit model. I'm not sure if those can be done as a standard; and by not sure, I would have to look at our protocols and understand a little bit more about the data and how different the analysis would be from what was done to be able to reflect on that. To run an Eastern Seaboard Assessment would take some coordination with the Mid-Atlantic folks. Again, I guess I would have to do some fact-finding to be able to comment on that and could possibly do that in time for full council. I won't be able to do it here.

DR. DUVAL: Right, and just in response to that, the assessment itself was Atlantic coastwide; so it incorporated the landings from the entire Atlantic Seaboard; so I was talking about sort of the opposite situation like what we did with snowy where it was truncated at the jurisdictional border between North Carolina and Virginia.

That said, I'll just be frank and say that I know that are significant landings that are occurring in the Mid-Atlantic Region up off of New Jersey. Maryland and Virginia have landing limits for the commercial sector, but there are none north of there as far as I know. I know that there are some pretty high trips coming in.

We do not have jurisdiction in that area, you do not have to have a snapper grouper permit to fish for those species, and so I know that there is some displaced effort that's moving up that way. While updating the landings' information within the existing model, they only show that as a tiny little blip in comparison to anything that's caught down here.

I still have some concerns about what that bodes for the recovery of the stock, if is indeed a coast-wide stock versus if we do have more localized or discrete populations that we're just not aware of because we don't have that information. I'm not pressing you for an answer right now. I just provide that as more information to take into consideration.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That seems definitely in the solid gray area and visions for a standard assessment and is an intentional gray area if you look at how the steering committee handled that. The idea was to essentially empower the SSC, because they're the ones who make the ABC and OFL recommendations, to be able to say how much they're willing to accept in terms of changes within the standard and be able to say when they throw the towel in and say, no, that's simply too much and we have to do a benchmark.

A number of years when we did this, I think we're seeing an evolution within the process and certainly within most of the participants a desire to move away from follow-up benchmarks as much as possible and to have more focused standard type assessments that address a couple of issues and clearly identify, well, if it's not new data and it's not an entirely new modeling framework, then let's try to do this within a standard.

I think it was something that could be done while headboat or something is going on; and if not, then at the next opportunity is if we could the analysts from the science center at the SSC meeting when they consider the terms of reference and see if the analytical group and the SSC can reach a consensus on some terms of reference that guide this forward through a standard assessment type process.

That gives them an opportunity to consider, you know, you can have a workshop during a standard, you can have a data/assessment workshop; and they could set up the process that makes both groups happy. That will be acceptable within SEDAR and it might get us out of some of the incredible time, demands and the overhead that goes into the benchmark process, which all of us are trying to move off of when we can.

MR. HARTIG: Any other questions? Bonnie, I think it may be helpful to have some discussion with you in this timeframe with Michelle and a couple of other people about what we'd really want and how we can move forward and then your input from your analysts and things. Between now and full council, I think we could probably get something decided. John, are we done with this item?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we've done all we can, yes, sir. We had a question about participation for SEDAR 41, council member representatives. Obviously, that will be brought up at a more appropriate time when we get the schedule worked out. The next item that came up in the final bit of business was to put out to this group and see if you had any suggestions for SEDAR SOPPS, any changes, issues or concerns.

The steering committee intends to talk about this at their next meeting the 1st of October. One thing I will add is that there was a very extensive review of the center's assessment programs that took place the 1st of July. I expect at the steering committee we will probably be looking to hear what comes out of that and allow that process to reach its endpoint so that we have maybe some good guidance from that peer review with specific changes we may make in our SOPPS.

While the steering committee sort of talked about maybe making some SOPP changes in October, I've got a feeling we may hold off on actually endorsing and supporting any changes. I just open it up here to see if anybody has anything that would like to throw out for consideration regarding SEDAR operations; and then maybe, Bonnie, if you guys have any questions on the program review, you could direct them to her and see where that stands.

DR. DUVAL: John, I just had a question that's really in the SEDAR Procedures Guide, under Part 3, the SEDAR Panel participant and appointment process. It describes who panelists are. These are individuals appointed by a cooperator to a workshop panel, appointed observers; and I guess my question is under appointed observers it states this group may include council members, cooperator staff and AP representatives.

I guess I just want to clarify for myself and others that I know that when we appoint a council member to participate in that process, that council member is an observer. You're not part of the plenary discussion that is coming to consensus on decisions with regard to the data. There is an observer and if your input solicited, you provide it.

Is that the same for our advisory panel members who are appointed to the data and assessment workshop panels? Are they full panelists or they are observers, their input is solicited and considered, but the decisions with regard to use of data, indices, et cetera, is made by the panelists in plenary?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It depends on the workshop. At the data workshop AP members and others are appointed as panelists; and they're expected to contribute to the decision-making, consensus-building documentation of findings and all that. At the assessment workshop, the actual assessment panel is the technical representatives such the analysts from whichever agency is doing that and the SSC representatives and perhaps others that you have appointed as panels.

When you make the appointments, there is usually a column that separates between who is a panelist and who is an observer. Council members are always observers at any time. AP folks and others and non-technical representatives can be panelists at a data workshop and they would be observers at an assessment workshop and at a review. Actually technical people and others could be even observers at a review because you just have that review panel.

MR. BROWN: John, I've got a question in regards to the headboat issues. Was there ever any problems like that in the Gulf or is there any way to compare the way things were done in the Gulf from the past as far as working out any of those types of problems?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'd say the relationship to the Gulf is another one of those big unknowns as to whether or not these issues carried over into there. There is a little bit different timing and when it was implemented in the Gulf and whether or not it is as severe or similar of what have you. We don't know at this time, but I expect that will be part of the protocol and evaluation that Bonnie mentioned certainly to make sure there isn't a loose end out there hanging for the Gulf headboat data as well.

MR. HARTIG: All right, any other questions to John about SEDAR procedures? I operate in kind of a gray area at times; but having said that, most of the analysts and at the workshops have been able to work it out. I appreciate that from that perspective, being able to do that, so that is one part of the process which is a little bit flexible at times which helps the process move forward.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We definitely err on the side of inclusiveness. It is certainly my instructions to the coordinators and others. We also acknowledge that as the process progresses it becomes more rigid and formal, we're most open and welcoming at the data workshop. There are people who walk in and they're welcome to sit in the workgroups and have discussions and stuff, but we make it clear who is the panel and who is responsible for the decisions. Then at the assessment workshop, it gets funneled in a little bit more and we identify specifically the technical group versus the observers.

At the review it becomes most rigid still, but all in all we try to give folks who show, regardless of their role, the opportunity to take part. Ben is definitely a walking gray area in these regards because he has such information about the fishery and people want to get that information. It is like you're a council member, I know, but you have great information about the fishery. And Mark kind of the same way coming from the headboat and dealing with SEDAR 41 and being a fisherman who is active, you want to get that information even if they are a council member.

MR. HARTIG: All right, any other business to come before the SEDAR Committee? Jack.

MR. COX: Yes; I would just like to say something to Bonnie about timing on SEDAR for red grouper. If we do have to put any assessments off, I'm just concerned that if you guys are paying attention to the catch levels of red grouper in recent years that something is going on. I'd hate to see ourselves in trouble and maybe we can catch up and find what has happened with the landings.

MR. HARTIG: I'd just say if you're concerned about red grouper; do you think we ought to look at that in terms of an action that we may want to look at like we did with scamp? I haven't looked at it and I don't know what the landings are.

MR. COX: Possibly so, yes.

MR. HARTIG: I'll talk to you about it. All right, the only thing under other business I had was the amberjack assessment. I don't know if we've got that penned in anywhere on the schedule in the near future, but that's one that I mentioned the last time in the SEDAR Committee and that I'll mention at the steering committee next month as well. Hopefully, we can get that on there somewhere because it has been a while since amberjack have been assessed.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It is not, as you can see, in this table; so I guess in terms of just SEDAR planning it would seem that everything in the South Atlantic is on hold pending getting this headboat data evaluation protocol laid out and timing set up and then we'll pick up and figure where to go from there I guess at the December meeting or something. I see Bonnie maybe can give us some insight.

DR. PONWITH: My view is that the council's perspectives on what their priorities are for stock assessments are invaluable. The best strategy given the uncertainty of how many and when is to create a list that is prioritized. If AJ is important, getting it on the list is important and understanding where it is from your perspectives relative to the other ones is important. There will be a bottom line below which those other stocks won't get done. Because we don't know where the line is and what the timing is right now, that prioritization is the best possible, most flexible tool we've got. I think that would be a good strategy for the council to consider.

MR. HARTIG: That's what we have with the list we have now. As far as amberjack goes, it is not critical. I wouldn't say we need to bump anything to do amberjack. I'd just like to see it on the schedule for the future; that's all. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: I have an additional question after you've finished with amberjack. Seeing as how we have a few minutes left in the agenda, I wanted to ask Bonnie a question. It deals with the number of stock assessments that we're doing and the fact that I guess there was some discussion among some state directors and maybe NMFS folks last week or the week before last with regard to the number of stock assessments that the center is able to churn out and the assessment scientists that you have on staff and the amount of time that they're allowed to do assessments versus their 40 percent of research. I would like a little bit of explanation on stock assessment biologists and the amount of time that they are allowed to spend on assessments.

DR. PONWITH: That is a good question and it was something that came up in the peer review. As you know, this spring we lost a lead stock assessment scientist; so for the South Atlantic right now we have four lead stock assessment scientists, people who are capable of taking on a benchmark; and then we have an additional two people who are assists, who help with those benchmarks, get the data ready and help with those analyses but aren't to a point where they can lead a benchmark stock assessment.

We are recruiting right now. That recruitment process is slow and cumbersome. It is always possible when we put in that recruitment we will poach someone from another place who comes ready to step right into a lead; and all they would have to do is become accustomed to the council process.

Typically we get someone who is a newly minted, highly technically competent person but who has never done a stock assessment in this kind of context before. Our approach is that person would spend a year in journeyman status, if you will, basically serving as an assist to be able to get accustomed to the process and step up some time after that for a lead position.

In the peer review one of the things that came up is that when you have scientists who are highly technically competent people, that it is important for them to be able to conduct operational stock assessments as well as conduct the research that it takes to make those stock assessments better; and over and over again the SSC creates a laundry list that is growing over time of the type of research that needs to be done to answer questions that were vexing in the current assessment.

Somebody needs to do that work. Certainly, academic scientists can, but also our view is that it is our responsibility for our own stock assessment scientists to be helping with that lift. The same way with the council; every year the council puts forward a research priority. If we don't have someone who is taking responsibility for chipping away at that, I have to sit and listen to the criticism that the list is growing and nothing has been knocked off.

The third part of that is that for a stock assessment scientist to be good and current and maintain current skills, they need to be spending part of their time conducting research. Right now I can tell you I heard you say the word "40 percent". Forty percent right now would be a pipe dream. They're spending nowhere near that amount.

By the time an assessment scientist finishes an assessment and runs all the post-assessment analyses that are required for decision-making in the council, there is barely a chance to get a drink of water before it is time to go back into another stock assessment; and that creates sort of this continuous do-loop of operational science with very little time for research and to makes those types of contribution in between.

We're recruiting right now for a vacancy. Ultimately that would bring us up to five lead analysts; and so that would mean some combination of less than five stock assessments per year because, of course, some are benchmarks, some are updates; and we've got to have those windows of time for that research in between.

One of the things that we're working on right now is looking across the reports that we got from the stock assessment, doing an analysis of that and using that for me to prepare sort of the summary across those and basically a response. That is in preparation right now. As soon as it is cleared at headquarters, that whole package becomes publicly available. Of course, the first recipients would be the council and the SSC. The goal is to have that ready in time for the SEDAR Steering Committee so we can have some of those discussions.

MR. HAYMANS: Is there any opportunity to supplement either the council's budget or one of the state's budgets to hire assessments from your budget?

DR. PONWITH: I can tell you that stock assessment scientists are the top of the heap in terms of priority financially for hires. If a vacancy comes forward and that vacancy is for work that is of lower diminishing importance, it is conceivable that we could repurpose that empty position to be another stock assessment scientist.

The bottom line is that if I had more stock-assessment-oriented money from congress to hire a stock assessment scientist, they would be hired. It is not a matter of, well, there is all this money and I'm not back-filling. It is choices between should we be doing another at-sea data collection to reduce our dependence on fishery-dependent data or do we use that money to hire another stock assessment.

There are all those choices in the whole process; do I hire one more person who is able to age these fish using the otoliths to be able to keep that backlog cleared or do I hire that other stock assessment; so it is kind of reaching the perfect balancing point in a very, very dynamic system. Did that get at your question?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, but also I guess where I was going with that and some of the discussions that have occurred, the federal pay scale is considerably higher than the state's pay scale or even the council's for that matter. In a desire to get more than five assessments done per year, if we were able to bring on some non-PhD capable assessment scientists who could sit churn through the updates and the standards at the state level – I'm fighting for the right words, but I think we could make a lot of use of those funds. There is just a desire to do more assessments than five per year and how do we get there.

DR. PONWITH: I agree; I have a desire to get more than five done a year. If you have ideas on how to get there, I'm certainly willing to look at that. Maybe what we can do is a little brainstorming offline and then come back with some ideas a little more fleshed out.

MR. HARTIG: Doug, pertinent to your question, during the stock assessment review I think one of the interesting things that I heard and heard a lot more about than I thought I was going to hear was about how the center has evolved in my Miami in particular and Beaufort as well. There is a number of scientists who have been there a long time; so their evolution through the process since 2006 where you had more research going on in the older days and now you've turned into an assessment mill; there was a lot of talk about that. And then how do we get more assessments in the future, maybe we don't look at the highest PhD level scientist to do the assessment.

Like turning the crank for an update, per se, maybe we use someone else. Then one of the guys from the other countries actually said, well, we have a couple of research scientists and then we have assessment scientists; so a couple of tiers, you have people who do research and then people who do assessments.

Then the people who do assessments can contact the researchers and get feedback on doing assessments. There are a number of ways this could evolve. There was a lot of talk about that so

what comes out of that stock assessment review will be important for moving forward in the future with more assessments. Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes, just to Doug's point is these assessments are just so critical to everything we do, so it's a simple matter of just trying to figure out other ways that we can increase output, if you consider it that way. That's what is what it is about so are there ways we can use resources to figure out ways to just increase output. If we just stick to five and five is all we can handle and five is the way it is always going to be, we're just going to keep having some of the same issues we're having. It is a very valid point.

DR. PONWITH: And the good news is you take a look at Alaska and Alaska will chug out 25 update assessments in a year; and you say, well, how can they do that? The way they do that is, of course, the data stream has existed for a very long time and hasn't changed for a very long time. Because of that, just by definition in our SOPPS, if we were in that situation, we could do a lot of updates; and the only time you ever would do a benchmark is if something very dramatic changed either in the environment or in the fishery.

The Catch-22 that we're in is that our data streams are not very long and undisturbed; and we don't want them to be very long and undisturbed because that would mean something like the great news we got in 2010 the ability to add SEFIS into our fishery-independent surveys. We want that to happen, but what that does then is it creates a need for a benchmark.

Again, what we need to do is be extremely disciplined about doing an update when an update is appropriate and saving those benchmarks for when a benchmark is genuinely required. What that will do is be the one contribution that we can make to increasing that through-put. It doesn't solve the problem of we could really use more assessment scientists, but it does make the wisest use of the ones we've got. It is hard; it takes a lot of discipline to be able to set those priorities smartly and to do the assessment that manages that through-put; and it takes a lot of discipline to be able to do that.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, discipline, and one thing I would add to that is that from my experience and the number of qualified people we have now to participate in assessments; that some of these older assessments that we have that hasn't had some of these fishermen with a long-term history of the fishery to come in and review the data at a data workshop; I still think that's one critical component that needs to be done for the assessments that we have on the plate so far.

There are a few of our assessments that I think would benefit from a review of the data in a benchmark; and probably one of them is greater amberjack, although we've got it penned in for an update. I know from my view that the input that I could have on the landings, where fish were going at certain times, how much fish was actually caught in one area versus the other of the Gulf and the South Atlantic, those kinds of decisions are very important for the historical time series.

In that regard in that species I think it would benefit from a benchmark. It doesn't have to be now but some time in the future. But some of these stocks; red porgy is another one I think would benefit from another review with a number of fishermen involved. Some of these you

could I think make substantive changes in the data at a data workshop by going through a benchmark process; the ones that haven't been run through.

Well, you see, Bonnie, the interest in red snapper now and in all of our assessments. We have a number of qualified people to participate now at the data workshop level; and that makes the assessment better in the long term. That's just one thing that I think we need to keep in mind as we go forward. We have a motion, possibly, and the motion would be –

MR. CARMICHAEL: If someone wants to make it, there is the potential to maybe clarify what your expectations are.

MR. HARTIG: The motion would be to support the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council assessment priorities as established in June 2014 and to add greater amberjack as number seven. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: If it would please the Chair, I move to support the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council assessment priorities as established in June 2014 and to add greater amberjack as number seven; blueline tilefish, standard; golden tilefish, update; red grouper, update; red porgy, benchmark/standard; scamp, benchmark; vermilion snapper, update; greater amberjack, update.

MR. HARTIG: Seconded by Michelle. Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved. All right, any other business to come before the SEDAR Committee. Bonnie, I have one thing again. Was the fishery-independent camera information; was it able to be utilized in SEDAR 41?

DR. PONWITH: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I will comment on that because we talk about productivity and we talk about getting more things done. That was a new dataset and there was an extra special workshop devoted to working through the issues of that particular dataset and how to craft index. When they got to the data workshop, I felt that paid off really well.

Those indices were well received and they were well documented; and there really wasn't a hang-up in the process for bringing that new information in. It does just sort of underscore some of the things in our region. Time put into that was time taken away from doing other things. Everywhere you turn, I get a lot of comments or coordinators get a lot of comments about how to get SEDAR to do more. Everyone wants it to do more.

If you look at the evolution of the steering committee, they've tried many, many things to do more. It is going to take everyone together to figure out how to do more. We talk about doing five; I looked back in response to various things, and there was a time when it was put forth on the table a proposal that we would have benchmark years and update years.

The reason for that was because we needed more time for the benchmarks because they have such a documentation and evaluation demand. There is research associated essentially with

these; and we've been cautioned since the early years by folks like Rick Methot. He was like don't let your assessments become research projects if you're going to move forward.

We have a tendency toward that. We want to evaluate everything people can come up with; and we want to try to build consensus for all the datasets. Well, the benchmark process is set up to be very slow and laborious to deal with that. But at the same time we envision this update year where maybe we could do five updates in a year and the next year; so it was kind of a breather time.

They were staggered so that when the South Atlantic was doing benchmarks, the Gulf was doing updates. Well, that's critically important for the data folks because there is one guy that does all the commercial discard logbook information. There is one headboat program guy. If it is a South Atlantic or a Gulf assessment and in some cases even Caribbean, those same folks are working all the time; so that is a real limitation in terms of scheduling and how we deal with it.

I always try to remind each cooperator that you're not alone in putting demands on the science center to get things done and those data people have to serve all the masters. That's a big burden. I really think we have to revisit this idea of benchmark years versus update years to give folks a breather.

The idea behind that was that if I didn't have all of my assessment people doing updates that year, maybe one person could do two over the course of the year or something, I have some capacity there to have someone develop methods. The last couple of years with the Magnuson Act and the push of the schedule we haven't given people time to do that.

If you look back kind of before the Magnuson Act change came out, this was put forth; and, honestly, if really didn't survive the next steering committee meeting and the demands from the cooperators related to things like red snapper on the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, black sea bass in the South Atlantic.

Those stocks came forth as, well, you really have to do a benchmark for this issue or that issue; so the whole idea of staggering the years got pushed aside and we haven't got back to it because we get these stocks with these legitimate issues that demand benchmarks. The benchmark process within SEDAR is intended to be very long and drawn out and thorough. It is thorough, it's transparent, it is not timely.

We have the opportunity with standards and updates to be more timely on things; but we have to accept that and we have to acknowledge that. There are going to be issues with the constituency that you're not going to be able to address. There are going to be things that people can bring up as criticisms of the stock assessments that the information simply does not exist in the world to answer those questions.

We can't revisit 1972; and I hope people realize that. There is likely to still be dissatisfaction with the solution that comes from the headboat dataset. We can't recreate 1972. We can't go back to those guys and find out exactly what they did; but hopefully we can reach a compromise and we can have a solution to the problem. That data is used in nearly every assessment.

We are in SEDAR 41 so it has been used 40 times with various assumptions. The reason that we do have to step back, as Bonnie said, and put everything on hold is because if that's not satisfactory, then we have to let her people do the due diligence and solve this properly. We need to keep that in mind with all of these.

The way to get more productivity is to kind of knuckle down and say, you know, a pretty good assessment that maybe still has a few threads out there that people have questions about, but it is extremely timely, I often believe it is way more useful for you in terms of making good recommendations than striving for that benchmark and address every issue, but it takes you a really long time because so much changes.

The driving force is what changes in recruitment, what changes in your fishery; and if we could get more of our assessments updated more often and create maybe some sort of research track for these bigger issues or find a way if there are concerns about some of the older data and we can bring insight from fishermen, let's do that globally.

Let's deal with a bunch of species at one time through our procedure workshops and keep our folks crunching on these updates. Our standard process was set up to allow that kind of information to be fed in without doing benchmarks. If we can start identifying some issues and do some of that processing out of specific benchmark assessments, we have an opportunity to move ahead. The same goes with data-limited stocks; we can put the effort into doing a bunch of data-limited stocks, have a group of people evaluate data all the snapper grouper, as much as the SSC did for the ORCS, and come up with input values for data-limited models and move ahead.

MR. HARTIG: That was good. Anything else for SEDAR? All right, seeing none, we stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 o'clock a.m., September 15, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 6, 2014

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

Ben Hartig

9277 Sharon Street
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
772/546-1541 (ph)
mackattackben@att.net

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Dr. Michelle Duval

NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
(PO Box 769)
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/808-8011 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

Robert E. Beal

Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

Mel Bell

S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Anna Beckwith

1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

Zack Bowen

P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

W. Chester Brewer

250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

Mark Brown

3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

Chris Conklin

P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/543-3833
conklincc@gmail.com

Jack Cox

2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@gmail.com

Dr. Roy Crabtree

Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727/824-5301 (ph); 727/824-5320 (f)
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov

LT Morgan Fowler

U.S. Coast Guard
510 SW 11th Court
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

Doug Haymans

Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

Deirdre Warner-Kramer

Office of Marine Conservation
OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
202/647-3228 (ph); 202/736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

Dr. Wilson Laney

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

Jessica McCawley

Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

Charles Phillips

Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

PHIL STEELE

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO

BONNIE POWELL

KEVIN ANSON

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2014 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair
Zack Bowen
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Doug Haymans
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Chevront

DATA COLLECTION

Mel Bell, Chair
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Doug Haymans
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Gregg Waugh - CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wilson Laney, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Gregg Waugh - Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Acting Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
LT Morgan Fowler
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Michelle Duval – Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Mark Brown
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

PROTECTED RESOURCES

Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mark Brown
Michelle Duval
LT Morgan Fowler
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR

- ✓ Ben Hartig, Chair
 - ✓ Zack Bowen
 - ✓ Jack Cox
 - ✓ Michelle Duval
 - ✓ Charlie Phillips
- Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

(Continued)

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

Executive Director

✓ Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

Staff Economist

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
✓ Julia Byrd – julia.byrd@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting
SEDAR Committee Meeting:
Monday, September 15, 2014

<u>NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:</u>	<u>AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS:</u>	<u>MAILING ADDRESS:</u>
Bob Bentley - SCENR	843-953-9046	bbentley@dnr.sc.gov	
Molly Buley - SCENR	843-953-9810	mbuley@dnr.sc.gov	
Emest Mohammad - SCENR	843-953-9364	MohammedE@dnr.sc.gov	
EMILY HELMICK - Pew	843-379-0703	ehelmick@pewtrusts.org	
Paslay Johnson - AS7/ECYS	386-839-0948	paslay@ad.com	
Dave Jean - NREDC			
Lora Clarke - Pew	631-379-0718	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
North Charleston, SC 29405
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10