SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGMENT COUNCIL

SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE

SSC Meeting Report

April 5-7, 2011

Crowne Plaza Hotel
4831 Tanger Outlet Boulevard
North Charleston, SC 29418

VERSION
FINAL DRAFT

PURPOSE

This meeting is convened to:

- review the SEDAR 23 stock assessment of Goliath grouper
- review the stock assessment update of spiny lobster
- consider ABC control rule alternatives
- assign unassessed SAFMC stock to control rule tiers
- review the Comprehensive ACL Amendment, Snapper Grouper Amendment 24 and Regulatory Amendment 11, Spiny Lobster FMP Amendment 10, Coastal Migratory Pelagic Amendment 18, and CEBA II.

CONTENTS

Briefing Documents:
Attachment 1. GMFMC ABC Control Rule
Attachment 2a. Final Mackerel Results of Committee & Council Motions
Attachment 2b. Mackerel Amendment 18/EA
Attachment 2c. Cobia Presentation (SC DNR)
Attachment 3. Draft Comprehensive ACL Amendment
Attachment 4. ACL Amendment Actions and Alternatives
Attachment 5. Dolphin/Wahoo Actions and Alternatives
Attachment 6. Draft S-G Amendment 24
Attachment 7. SEFSC red grouper projection
Attachment 8. MSST Alternatives
Attachment 9. SEDAR 23 Assessment Report of Goliath Grouper.
Attachment 10. Spiny Lobster Assessment Update Report
Attachment 11a. Spiny Lobster Amendment 10 Summary
Attachment 11b. Spiny Lobster Amendment 10/EIS
Attachment 12. ABC Control Rule
Attachment 13. Landings trends for unassessed stocks (Spreadsheet)
Attachment 14. SG FMP Regulatory Amendment 11
Attachment 15. Preliminary RA11 analyses presentation
Attachment 16. Draft CEBA 2.
Attachment 17 Regional Operating Agreement March 2011

Other Documents Reviewed:
Revised Attachment 13, 4/1
Landings Trends Methods, 4/1
SA ACL Analysis 3-10-11, 3/28
MARMAP Draft

1. Introduction

1.1. Documents

Agenda
Minutes, August 2010

1.2. Action

Introductions
Review and Approve Agenda
Approve August 2010 Minutes

The agenda for the current meeting and the minutes from the November 2010 meeting were approved.

2. Review GMFMC SSC ABC Control Rule

2.1. Documents

Attachment 1. GMFMC ABC Control Rule

2.2. Overview

The SAFMC has requested that the SSC review the ABC Control rule developed by the GMFMC SSC and consider its applicability for South Atlantic Stocks. The Council has two FMPs (Mackerel & Spiny Lobster) that are joint with the Gulf Council and so the issue of using the Gulf ABC Control Rule first surfaces in these two FMPs. Both Councils need to use the same ABC Control Rule for Mackerel and Spiny Lobster, and the SAFMC is considering using it for a number of the unassessed stocks in FMPs until stock assessments are conducted.

The Gulf rule is provided for consideration and John Carmichael will provide an overview. Luiz Barbieri also serves on the Gulf SSC and may be able to provide further details.

The Council has selected as preferred the ABC based on the Gulf Control rule for stocks in the joint Coastal Migratory Pelagics (CMP) FMP. Application to CMP stocks can be discussed in detail during item 3. Application to other stocks can be discussed during item 4. A general discussion of the rule is desired for this item.

2.3. Action

- Review and comment on the GMFMC ABC Control Rule.
- Compare and contrast the Gulf and SAFMC SSC approaches, with particular attention to the treatment of unassessed stocks.
- Consider and discuss how the Gulf and SAFMC rules address risk and uncertainties.

SSC Consensus Recommendations

The SSC recommended not adopting the GMFMC ABC Control Rule for South Atlantic stocks. Instead, the SSC recommended the use of its own ABC Control Rule with Tier 4 modified to provide better guidance for deriving ABC for unassessed or catch-only stocks. A decision tree approach is applied to determine the appropriate ABC value. The ability to determine OFL is evaluated on a case-by-case (i.e., stock-specific) basis.

SSC Discussion

The SSC discussed the use of standard deviation as a means to adjust ABC above the median landings in the GMFMC ABC Control Rule. The issue that concerned the group the most was that by using this method the landings-based ABC would be higher with higher uncertainty (i.e., higher variability in landings) and lower with less uncertainty. Additionally, the use of standard deviation could suggest a level of statistical rigor that would not necessarily be there. Using a percentile of the landings values would be a more uniform application that is not as impacted by the variation in the data or landings sampling error. Given 10 years of data, and being consistent with the 75th percentile (25% of the landings value exceed that value) the SSC recommended using the 3rd highest point or the 80th percentile of the data. This recommendation was integrated into a decision tree developed for landings-only stocks as described in item 9 below (ABC Tier Assignments).

3. Mackerel Amendment 18

3.1. Documents

Attachment 2a. Final Mackerel Results of Committee & Council Motions
Attachment 2b. Mackerel Amendment 18
Attachment 2c. Cobia Presentation (SC DNR)

3.2. Overview

Amendment Actions:

- Establish Cobia migratory groups
- Establish OFL, ABC, ACL, and AMs for Atlantic migratory groups of king & Spanish mackerel and cobia
- Establish management measures necessary to ensure ACLs not exceeded

Staff Contact: Gregg Waugh

Schedule:

NOI	1/22/2008
Scoping Complete	2/2009
Council review options & make recommendations	2008-2010
APs review	2009
SSC first review	Dec 2009
SSC provide ABC recommendations	April 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing	December 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing	March 2011
SSC Final review	April 2011
Public Hearings	April 2011
Final Review & Submission	June 2011
Regulations implemented	by December 31, 2011

3.3. Action

- Review all actions and alternatives and provide input to be incorporated into the "Council Conclusions" section for each action. Provide a summary statement of SSC recommendations for each action.
- Final review of fishing level recommendations and alternatives.

SSC Consensus Recommendations

King mackerel – recommended no changes.
Spanish mackerel – OFL: Unknown ABC: 5.69 million pounds
Cobia – OFL: Unknown ABC: 1,571,399 pounds

SSC Discussion

The SSC recommended not changing the regulations for king mackerel. The SSC reviewed the current fishing level recommendations for Spanish mackerel as provided in the draft amendment. Because the Spanish mackerel ABC value was based on landings data and the SSC developed a new interim approach, the SSC reconsidered its earlier recommendation. If the previous SSC control rule for "landings only" stocks was applied to Spanish, the value resulted in extremely low ACTs, which seemed unreasonable given that rebuilding was noted in the most recent assessment. Discussions within the SSC centered on the method used to determine how high above the median landings value the ABC should be set. The use of standard deviations and percentiles were discussed in detail, with a recommendation for using the 80th percentile, or in this case the third highest point for use as the ABC. Given the data at hand, the

OFL for Spanish mackerel was determined to be unknown. The ABC was set at the 80th percentile for the time series ranging from 1999-2008.

The SSC reviewed the current fishing level recommendations for cobia. The Council proposed following the Gulf of Mexico's ABC control rule to determine the ABC. The SSC examined the Council's ABC to see what percentage the value represented relative to the median landings. The ABC was 25.6% above the median landings value. This value was consistent with the percentages that were being considered in the new interim rule being considered by the SSC, thus the ABC value derived by the Council was acceptable to the SSC.

4. Comprehensive ACL Amendment

4.1. Documents

Attachment 3. Draft Comprehensive ACL Amendment
Attachment 4. ACL Amendment Actions and Alternatives
Attachment 5. Dolphin/Wahoo Actions and Alternatives

4.2. Overview

This amendment will apply to a number of Council FMPs and will address ACLs and AMs for all stocks not addressed through Snapper-Grouper Amendments 17A, 17B, Golden Crab Amendment 5, Mackerel Amendment 18 and CE-BA 2.

This amendment will include the ABC control rules for assessed and unassessed stocks developed by the SSC. The Committee is asked to review the various alternatives proposed for ABC and OFL control rules in this document. ABC values have been updated to reflect the recommendations from the March SSC conference call, and additional alternatives added based on Council discussion. The supplemental document summarizing the actions and alternatives will be useful to the committee in reviewing the particulars of the ABC and OFL actions.

The SSC recommended that OFL is unknown for the unassessed stocks. At the March meeting the Council was informed that OFLs should be provided for all stocks. Council discussed various ways of deriving an OFL, such as using the approach of the Gulf Council ABC control rule (which you are asked to review at this meeting) which provides an OFL and ABC based on mean landings and a standard deviation. They also considered deriving OFL from ABC in the same manner that ABC was suggested to be derived from OFL, using the formula OFL=ABC/0.75.

The Council is considering several alternatives for triggering AMs when ACLS are reached, particularly in the recreational sector monitored by MRIP where concerns over triggering action due to data uncertainty is most prevalent. The Council has considered a 3 year moving average to reduce the influence of measurement uncertainty, but there is concern that such an approach will be biased when very high

spikes occur that influence the mean over several subsequent years. Another alternative was raised at the March meeting that would consider confidence bounds around the MRIP estimates and a 5 year modified mean (5 years, dropping the high and low values) to trigger AMs. The AMs to which such considerations would apply are those which require the RA to consider bag and season changes, outside of normal council action procedures, when an overage has occurred in the recreational sector.

The Committee is provided the Draft Amendment document that was reviewed by the Council at the March Meeting. Two additional documents are provided to help the SSC in discussions of specific alternatives, one addressing dolphin and wahoo actions and one addressing actions for other species in the amendment.

Staff Contact:

1. Snapper Grouper: Myra Brouwer
2. Golden Crab: Gregg Waugh
3. Dolphin/Wahoo: Gregg Waugh

Comprehensive ACL Schedule

NOI	1/16/09
Scoping Complete	Feb 2009
Council review options & make recommendations	March 2009 – June 2010
APs review	July 2009, Nov 2010
SSC first review	Dec 2009
SSC provide ABC recommendations	April 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing	December 2010
Public Hearings	Jan/Feb 2011
SSC Final review	April 2011
Council Approval	June 2011
Final Review & Submission	June 2011
Regulations implemented	By December 31, 2011

4.3. Presentations

Overview: Myra Brouwer
Recreational ACL evaluation and AM Triggers: John Carmichael

4.4. ACTIONS

- Review all actions and alternatives and provide input to be incorporated into the "Council Conclusions" section for each action. Provide a summary statement of SSC recommendations for each action.
- Final review of fishing level recommendations and alternatives. Ensure OFL and ABC values are consistent with ABC Control Rule and ABC recommendations for snapper grouper species, dolphin and wahoo.

SSC Consensus Recommendations

ABC/OFL Summary Table: SAFMC Unassessed stocks (April 2011). ABC values were determined from the interim procedure (i.e., decision tree application) developed at the April 2011 meeting.

Species	*Trend*	*ABC*	*VALUE*	*OFL*	*NOTE*
Cobia	*Flat*	*mean +1.5 SD*	*1,571,399*	*Unknown*	*Preferred Alternative of mean +1.5 SD acceptable*
Spanish Mackerel	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*5.69 m*	*Unknown*	*Assessed, but no Fmsy or biomass values*
Dolphin	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*14,596,216*	*Unknown*	*Landings in the most recent time period are lower*
Wahoo	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*1,491,785*	*Unknown*	*Decline in landings after bag change*
Almaco Jack	*Up*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*291,922*	*Unknown*	
Atlantic Spadefish	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*282,841*	*Unknown*	
Banded Rudderfish	*Up*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*152,999*	*Unknown*	
Blue Runner	*Up*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*1,289,941*	*Unknown*	
Blueline Tilefish	*growth*	*modified*	*592,602*	*Unknown*	*Allow 2x increase in landings over the stable period*
Cubera Snapper	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*31,772*	*Unknown*	
Gray Snapper	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*894,019*	*Unknown*	*Will 2010/11 landings recover to median?*
Gray Triggerfish	*2 node*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*672,565*	*Unknown*	*Stock recovering from excessive peak in landings?*
Hogfish	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*147,638*	*Unknown*	
Lane Snapper	*Slight Down*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*153,466*	*Unknown*	*Recent decline in landings a concern or is it a function of reduced effort?*
Lesser Amberjack	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*10,568*	*Unknown*	
Red Hind	*Recent Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*25,885*	*Unknown*	*Stability in landings after excessive peak?*
Rock Hind	*Flat*	*3rd highest 99-08*	*37,569*	*Unknown*	
Scamp	*Flat*	*Median*	*492,572*	*Unknown*	*Concern with FI trend*
Silk Snapper	*Down*	*Median*	*27,519*	*Unknown*	*May modify years*
White Grunt	*Down*	*Median*	*635,899*	*Unknown*	*Median landings may not be sustainable*
Yellowedge Grouper	*Down*	*Median*	*30,221*	*Unknown*	*Landings time series is highly variable.*

SSC Discussion

Bulleted SSC discussion on ABC values follows below:

*1. **DOLPHIN***

The SSC commented on the decline in landings post 1999-2000 (or so) Various factors likely - FMP effect on commercial fishery, impacts of voluntary bag limit and FMP, recent environmental conditions and impacts on charter industry, private also. Also noted FL longline closure. Biological data reportedly show no trend in length composition.

Recommend to apply the revised unassessed stocks control rule. Set the ABC at the third highest landings value(1999-2008) 14,596,216 lbs.

Comment on Council Motion regarding ABC=median + 1 SD: ABC above is similar to the value resulting from the Council guidance.

OFL is unknown.

Other complications: There is no assessment; current fishery removals are impacted by management, and no measure of the stock biomass relative to landings exists. An assessment is scheduled for 2014.

*2. **WAHOO***

Decline in landings post 2002 related to bag limit change.

Recommend applying decision tree. Use the 3rd highest landings value 1999-2008. ABC = 1,491,785 lbs.

Wahoo landings are significant in charter fishery, impacted by economic trends as noted in dolphin.

OFL unknown. No assessment available. No measures of abundance available. Assessment scheduled for 2014.

3. Snapper-Grouper Stocks

ALMACO JACK

Pre-1999 landings are low and likely unreliable due to species identification problems, i.e., not distinguishing them from greater amberjack. Additionally, Almaco jack is not a target species of grouper-snapper complex fisheries. Catch data shows no trend since 1999. Recommend apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC=291,922lbs.

No assessment. No biomass measures.

OFL=Unknown.

ATLANTIC SPADEFISH

No apparent trend in landings. Apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC=282,241lbs.

No assessment. No biomass measure.

OFL is unknown.

Although this species is in the grouper snapper complex, it is a temperate species and landings are primarily from state waters. In federal waters they are caught on shallow (<~100 Ft.) reef and rock out cropping habitat.

BANDED RUDDERFISH

Early landings are low and probably unreliable due to species identification problems, i.e., most likely not distinguished from greater amberjack. Otherwise, no trend. Apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC = 152,999 lbs.

No assessment. No biomass. Not a directed fishery.

OFL is unknown.

BLUE RUNNER

Although the species is fairly common in landings from the grouper-snapper complex it's not a targeted or desirable species and probably not recorded in early landings. It might be a species identification problem, but not likely

as it is easily distinguished from the Seriola spp. Shows similar species id issue in early years. Throughout - this is referring to pre-1996 or so - but it is a gradual occurrence.

No overall trend exhibited in landings. Apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC=1,289,941 lbs.

No assessment. No biomass info.

Not a directed fishery - taken by variety gears, used for bait.

OFL Unknown.

BLUELINE TILEFISH

This may be a developing fishery north of Cape Hatteras, NC, but south of Cape Hatteras in the headboat landings in the 1970s it was in most of the catches sampled, and targeted as a desirable member of the snapper-grouper complex caught on deep reef habitat.

This may have become a directed fishery recently, in response to snowy grouper regulations. Growth of the fishery is occurring in the area mainly off North Carolina, north of Cape Hatteras where concentrations are targeted that were not previously fished. It is possible that ocean environmental variation has caused a northward shift in distribution north of Cape Hatteras where it was not previously common. Fish north of Cape Hatteras are caught on longlines and mono on soft bottoms while not catching snowy grouper. Blueline tilefish off SC are caught on rocky bottoms at the shelf edge and on slope reefs.

Assessment is scheduled for2013.

One concern is inhibiting growth that may be possible in a developing fishery. Suggest using the highest observed point for an ABC value, given that an assessment is coming soon; therefore, there is little long-term risk. This will cap the catch at current level. The current biomass or rate of exploitation is unknown, and it is unknown whether the fishery has already exceeded sustainable levels.

Port sampling is occurring to obtain length composition of the catch and aging structures. The SSC advises that this biological sampling should

continue for this fishery. A life history study is in progress and will support the pending assessment. There is also a need to address the spatial extent of the fishery for possible differences north and south of Cape Hatteras. Note: highest landings pre-2006 was 296,301 lbs.

The SSC agreed to allow some increase in landings from that period of perceived stability. This would allow some growth; recommend basing ABC on pre-2006 landings x 2 = 592,602 lbs.

Must add caveats to any recommendation given.

Reported fishery ongoing for long time, some information suggesting signs of considerable exploitation even pre-2006 (e.g., Harris et al, Onslow Bay, South area covered in that, different area than current growth)

OFL is unknown.

Assessment pending.

COBIA

No biomass measures. (see Mackerel 18 discussion; recommended ABC = 1,571,399 lbs.)

OFL. Unknown.

Assessment pending for 2012.

CUBERA SNAPPER

This is mainly a Florida species and not targeted by a directed fishery. There are species identification issues, especially at smaller sizes. This species was very rare in headboat landings off North Carolina and South Carolina even in the 1970s. This is mainly a recreational species, which may explain the large amount of observed variability in the landings data. No observed is trend.

Apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC=31,772 lbs.

No assessment, no biomass measures.

OFL is unknown.

GRAY SNAPPER

Questionable terminal point in the landings time series. Possible economic effects. This species is seen mainly in the recreational fishery.

Relative to the overall landings trend; landings are becoming more variable, but remain fairly stable.

Apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC=894,019 lbs.

No assessment, no biomass information.

OFL is unknown.

GRAY TRIGGERFISH

Was assessed through PDRP, with difficulty obtaining fits using multiple techniques, therefore effort data were uninformative.

MARMAP has a CPUE (see draft report). No age data yet. Trend in the fishery-independent index is relatively flat since 1999, while landings are showing an increasing trend. Some drop recently, in the last 3 years. MARMAP CPUE and landings track each other more consistently in the early period. MARMAP average lengths are generally increasing, but only slightly. No signs of concern in the FI info.

Is it possible landings are small relative to biomass?

Recent catch trend is increasing approaching 1998 peak. May be due to redirection of the fishery, but CPUE and mean length from FI does not indicate increases are of concern at this time.

Apply decision tree, condition 2 (third highest landings value). ABC = 672,565 lbs.

Decision tied to fishing level that did not lead to decline in later years - unlike higher observed landings levels.

OFL unknown. Have biomass trend from MARMAP, exploratory assessment, PDRP, but not released at this point. Assessment planned for 2012.

HOGFISH

Assessment pursue in SEDAR 6. Rejected because of analytical and data issues. FL may consider assessing in 2013.

Trend in landings is flat.

Recommend decision tree, condition 2 = 147,638 lbs.

No accepted assessment, no biomass info stock-wide.

OFL is unknown.

LANE SNAPPER

Trend in landings shows a slight decline since 2000/2001. The SSC discussed this topic considerably.

Discussed whether recent catch could impact stock, based on recent trend. Trends in other fisheries and in the overall snapper-grouper complex relative to this species were also discussed.

The SSC concluded there is no evidence of a need for a strong concern that the decline in landings represents an issue for the population. Landings are relatively low and the species is not a target stock. The SSC suspects many factors contributing to general declines in recreational fishery over the last few years could be affecting the decline in this species as well.

Commercial landings decline in lane snapper attributed to trap prohibition. This is not a directed fishery.

This species is believed to be fairly productive and fast growing. It occupies shallow waters, and is mainly a Florida species.

The SSC originally considered applying the decision tree, condition 4: Apply, however, given the conclusion regarding the declining trend, the SSC recommended applying condition 2 (third highest landings value).

ABC = 153,466 lbs.

No assessment. No biomass info.

OFL is unknown.

LESSER AMBERJACK

Trend in landings is variable, but stable. Note very low landings. This is a rare species, and there is the strong possibility that species identification was a problem, i.e., they were not distinguished from greater amberjack. No cause for concern in landings time series.

Recommend applying decision tree, condition 1. Given relatively low landings, the SSC recommends the Council consider removal from the FMU.

If not, recommend decision tree, Condition 2. ABC = 10,568 lbs.

No assessment and no biomass measures available.

OFL is unknown.

RED HIND

Landings trend – Peak landings occurred in 1995, dropping to the median in 1999, relatively flat thereafter.

Terminal landings year is low, which is likely due to regulations (deep water complex).

Stability of last 10 or so years indicates no cause for concern with current levels.

Recommend applying decision tree, condition 2. ABC = 25,885 lbs.

No assessment. No biomass measures.

OFL is unknown.

ROCK HIND

Note increase in landings post 1991. Not aware of species id issues to explain. This species is another component of deepwater complex, which may explain terminal downward.

Question of species ID, and where species-specific landings are obtained.

In the past, it was believed that rock hind was typically landed as mixed groupers. This is an issue that needs to be considered when species groupings are being considered.

No trend in the landings is apparent during the mid-1990s; no concern with current landings trend.

Recommend applying decision tree, condition 2. ABC=37,569 lbs.

No assessment, no biomass measures.

OFL is unknown.

SCAMP

Landings trend is flat. If looked at by sector, long term decline in commercial landings is offset by increased private landings, contributing to an overall flat trend. In the for-hire sector, 2008 and 2009 are the lowest in landings time series since 1986. Landings in 2009 were more than likely affected by the 4-month grouper closure.

MARMAP CPUE is available and shows a decline from mid 1990s, with the lowest values in the time series occurring during the last 3 years.

Assessment scheduled in 2013.

Concern over the fishery-independent CPUE trend suggests landings could pose challenge to stock.

Recommend applying the decision tree, condition 3. Directed species,

ABC=Median = 492,572 lbs.

Some biomass information exists from MARMAP, but no assessment.

Considered biomass info, but could not obtain OFL.

OFL is unknown.

SILK SNAPPER

Landings trend shows a decline since the mid-1990s. The last 4 years of landings have been below the 1999-2008 median.

Possible stock issues at current catch level.

Recommend applying decision tree, condition 3. This is a relatively rare species in the snapper-grouper complex off the Carolinas, but more common to the south. This species is not specifically targeted and is probably confused with red snapper.

Sillk snapper are deepwater fish, and would be affected by deepwater closures. Effort outlook is down, as regulations have increased.

Recommend applying the decision tree, condition 3. Recommend ABC = Median = 27,519 lbs.

No assessment. No biomass information.

OFL is unknown.

WHITE GRUNT

Decline in landings notable since early 1990s—this species was the third most abundant species in headboat landings in the 1970s behind red porgy and vermilion snapper, and was a staple species of that fishery. However, landings have been fairly stable since then.

MARMAP CPUE available. The SSC suspects the time series has been affected by low water temperature, which explains the 2003 data point. An increase in CPUE was noted for the early 1990s, but last 6 years of the series are the lowest of the series. CPUE indicates some concern.

Study comparing Manooch in 1970s to 2005/2006 at the same sampling locations was considered. A catch curve analysis indicated a higher current Z ratio for white grunt.

Temperature dependent, variable distribution, might explain some of the MARMAP trends (i.e., may not reflect farther south areas such as FL).

The SSC concluded it was likely that current landings, and possible increases, could impact stock.

Recommend applying the decision tree, condition 3. Typically this is a directed fishery. ABC=median = 635,899 lbs.

Have biomass trend but not OFL. No assessment.

OFL is unknown.

YELLOWEDGE GROUPER

Landings have been variable, but progressively declining, perhaps because of regulations on the deepwater complex.

Current regulations will prevent harvest.

Potential exists for landings to impact stock.

Recommend applying decision tree, condition 3.Considered a bycatch species.

Because it is a component of the deepwater complex, the amount of effort should be down as regulations are strong.

Recommend ABC = Median = 30,221 lbs.

No assessment, no biomass measures. Scheduled for assessment in 2015.

OFL is unknown.

5. Snapper Grouper Amendment 24

5.1. Documents

Attachment 6. Draft S-G Amendment 24
Attachment 7. SEFSC red grouper projection
Attachment 8. MSST Alternatives

5.2. Overview

Staff Contact: Myra Brouwer

SEDAR 19, using data through 2008, determined that the red grouper stock in the South Atlantic is undergoing overfishing and is overfished. The Council and NOAA Fisheries must implement a rebuilding plan by June 2012. Amendment 24 contains actions to implement a rebuilding plan. The amendment contains the following rebuilding strategy alternatives where fishing mortality is held constant throughout the rebuilding timeframe:

(1) 75%Fmsy
(2) 65%Fmsy
(3) The F rate required to have a 70% probability of rebuilding in ten years
(4) The F rate required to have a 70% probability of rebuilding in eight years
(5) The F rate required to have a 70% probability of rebuilding in seven years

NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center issued projection analysis for rebuilding strategy number 5 on February 11, 2011. As such, the SSC has not had an opportunity to review and provide comment on this projection.

MSST

The Council is considering modifying the current MSST definition for red grouper that was established in the Snapper Grouper FMP Amendment 11. The current definition requires MSST to be at least one half of SSB_MSY, but allows for it to be greater than this value if M is suitably low. Natural mortality M is relatively low (0.14) for red grouper. Alternative 1 (no action) would result in MSST equal to 4,914,053 lbs whole weight if M=0.14. This MSST estimate is close to SSB_MSY (5,714,323 whole weight) defined by the Council's current MSST definition. Therefore, if this definition is maintained, then MSST would be very close to SSB_MSY, which is the stock biomass expected to exist under equilibrium conditions when fishing at F_MSY.

Because M is small, the current definition of MSST would trigger a rebuilding plan if biomass fell slightly below SSB_MSY. However, natural variation in recruitment could cause stock biomass to frequently alternate between an overfished and rebuilt condition, even if the fishing mortality rate applied to the stock was within the limits specified by the MFMT. Therefore, Alternative 1 could result in potential administrative complications associated with setting MSST close to SSB_MSY.

At the December meeting, the Council requested the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) to provide an estimate of the minimum stock size at which rebuilding to the MSY level would be expected to occur within 10 years when fishing mortality is at the minimum fishing mortality threshold (MFMT) level. The National Standard Guidelines outline this as one possible method to estimate MSST. NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center issued a discussion paper on this MSST alternative and other methods on February 28, 2011. As such, the SSC has not had an opportunity to review and provide comment on the analysis.

5.3. Snapper Grouper 24 Schedule

Scoping Complete	Jan 2011
Council reviews options & makes recommendations	March 2011
AP's review	Nov 2010
SSC first review	April 2011
SSC provide ABC recommendations	April 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing	June 2011
Public Hearings	August 2011
Final Review & Submission	September 2011?
SSC Final review	Nov 2011?
Regulations implemented	by June 9, 2012

5.4. Presentations

None.

5.5. ACTIONS

(1) Reaffirm the current SSC OFL and ABC recommendations:
   (a) OFL=yield at Fmsy (669,000 lbs ww)
   (b) ABC=projected yield stream with 70% rebuilding success (665,000 lbs ww)
   (c) Maximum risk of overfishing (P*)
   (d) Minimum probability of rebuilding success

(2) Review the rebuilding strategies alternatives and provide comments as necessary. The Council has not chosen a preferred alternative.

(3) Review the projection analysis that sets F rate at the rate required to have a 70% probability of rebuilding in eight years and provide comments as necessary.

(4) Review MSST alternatives and SEFSC discussion paper and provide comments as necessary.

SSC Consensus Recommendations

The SSC saw no reason to reconsider the MSST values because red grouper had been previously rated as a Tier 1-assessed stock with a P of 30% (and hence a 70% expected success rate at rebuilding).*

SSC Discussion

The Council asked for input on extending the rebuilding time for red grouper to eight years rather than seven. The SSC accepted the basis for allowing this option because it used the same methodology that was reviewed and approved earlier for the 7-year time horizon. The SSC inquired about the effect of this rebuilding strategy on the combined ACL for red, black, and gag grouper and understood this process would gradually replace those ACLs with species-specific ones. As a result, the SSC saw no reason to reconsider the MSST values because red grouper had been previously rated as a Tier 1-assessed stock with a P of 30% (and hence a 70% expected success rate at rebuilding).*

With regard to the new MSST method derived by SEFSC, the SSC did not feel it could evaluate the technique at this time. The SSC also indicated the technique should be considered in the future, but at present did not recommend using it in a generic sense or specifically in the case of red grouper. The SSC recommended delaying the application of the new approach until the SEFSC could provide further information.

6. MSST Alternatives

The SSC was asked to consider alternative approaches for deriving MSST. Planned presentations and documents on this item are not available at this time, so the issue will be addressed in general terms at a later meeting. Specific application of alternative MSSTs is being considered by the Council in Snapper-Grouper Amendment 24, and will be discussed with that item.

7. Goliath Grouper Assessment

7.1. Documents:

Attachment 9. SEDAR 23 Assessment Report of Goliath Grouper.

7.2. Overview

Staff Contact: Julie Neer

A benchmark stock assessment for Goliath grouper was conducted through SEDAR 23 at the request of the State of Florida. The assessment team was led by analysts from the Florida Marine Research Institute and followed a condensed SEDAR benchmark process in order to complete the assessment in time for the Florida Wildlife Commission meeting in December 2010.

The assessment panel choose to use a catch-free model, as goliath grouper have been under a moratorium since 1990 and the historic catch streams are highly uncertain. The catch-free model employed was the same model framework used when goliath grouper was last assessed under SEDAR 6. One important caveat to the catch-free model is that it cannot produce absolute estimates of population parameters such as fishing mortality or abundance or stock status, but rather relative measures scaled to an assumed equilibrium biomass. The review panel raised a variety of issues with recommended implementation of the model and after much discussion, determined it could not recommend any population benchmark estimates or stock status.

7.3. Presentations

Assessment Overview: Joe O'Hop, FL FWC
Review Panel Overview and Recommendations: Luiz Barbieri (RW chair)

7.4. ACTIONS

- Review the Goliath Grouper assessment and evaluate its adequacy for supporting fishing level recommendations and management actions.
- Comment on the degree to which the assessment incorporates and addresses uncertainties

- Apply the SAFMC ABC control rule to the Goliath Grouper assessment and recommend a P* value.
- Provide fishing level recommendations for Goliath Grouper.
- Provide recommendations for the timing, methods, and data needs of future goliath grouper assessments

SSC Consensus Recommendations

OFL unknown.
ABC=0 for directed Goliath grouper harvest, i.e., no directed fishery.

SSC Discussion

The SSC supports conclusions of the SEDAR 23 Review Panel. Since the assessment was rejected, stock status is unknown (both for exploitation and biomass levels). Therefore, the SSC recommends setting OFL as unknown and an ABC=0 for directed Goliath grouper harvest, i.e., continue current regulations with no directed fishery. Because the

assessment is not adequate to support quantitative fishing level recommendations, no P value can be derived and the degree to which uncertainties are addressed cannot be properly evaluated.*
The SSC believes it is unlikely that overfishing is occurring, based on the effects of the existing moratorium and survey-based evidence of increasing stock abundance. There is evidence the stock is recovering.

Bycatch mortality: Current bycatch/discard losses are expected to be minimal, and it is unknown whether they are of sufficient magnitude to impact stock recovery. Release mortality is apparently low (<5%).

Future Steps/Timing/Assessments:
The SSC supports convening a panel in conjunction with GMFMC to explore approaches to move the fishery beyond the moratorium and collect information to support an informative assessment that will allow determination of stock status and possible recovery. This could be handled through a SEDAR procedural workshop. Further, the SSC supports development of a workshop within the South Atlantic to consider approaches to address Goliath grouper and other stocks that now face unassessed status and no directed fisheries (e.g. Warsaw grouper and speckled hind).

8. Spiny Lobster Assessment and Amendment 10

8.1. Documents

Attachment 10. Spiny Lobster Assessment Update Report
Attachment 11a. Spiny Lobster Amendment 10 Summary
Attachment 11b. Spiny Lobster Amendment 10/DEIS

8.2. Overview

Staff Contact, Amendment 10: Gregg Waugh
Staff Contact, Assessment Update: Julie Neer

The SEDAR 8 (2005) Spiny Lobster benchmark stock assessment was updated in 2010 to include information through 2008. Both ICA and DeLury models were updated. The Review Panel raised concerns with the performance of the models, and ultimately rejected both and determined that status of spiny lobsters is unknown. A primary concern is that the US population is one portion of a much larger stock extending through the Caribbean, and it is largely believed that recruitment to the US is primarily determined by spawning in other areas.

This issue was raised in the benchmark assessment also. Past management has largely focused on maximizing yield from the US portion of the population.

The Gulf SSC discussed spiny lobster in detail at an earlier meeting and developed reference point guidance reflecting the unique characteristics of this population. Luiz Barbieri will brief the group on these discussions and recommendations. Mike Tingali of FL FWC will provide a presentation on spiny lobster stock information and life history.

8.3. Spiny Lobster Amendment 10 Schedule

NOI	1/28/09
Scoping Complete	February 2009
Council review options & make recommendations	March 2009-March 2010
AP review	June 2010 & April 2011
SSC first review	April 2011
SSC provide ABC recommendations	April 2011
Council review & approve for Public Hearing	December 2010 & March 2011
Public Hearings	April 2011
SSC Final review	April 2011
Final Review & Submission	June 2011
Regulations implemented	by December 31, 2011

8.4. Presentations

Assessment Overview: Luiz Barbieri
Spiny Lobster Stock and Life History: Mike Tingali, FL FWC
Gulf SSC Actions Overview: Luiz Barbieri
Amendment 10 Overview: Gregg Waugh

8.5. ACTIONS

- Review the Spiny Lobster assessment and evaluate its adequacy for supporting fishing level recommendations and management actions.
- Apply the SAFMC ABC control rule to the Spiny Lobster assessment and recommend a P* value.
- Comment on the degree to which the assessment incorporates and addresses uncertainties
- Provide fishing level recommendations for Spiny Lobster.
- Provide recommendations for the timing, methods, and data needs of future Spiny Lobster assessments
- Review all actions and alternatives and provide input to be incorporated into the "Council Conclusions" section for each action. Provide a summary statement of SSC recommendations for each action.

SSC Consensus Recommendations

The SSC considered, and supported, the GMFMC catch level recommendations for spiny lobster.
OFL=7.9 mp (mean landings for the last 10 yrs + 2 SD)
ABC=7.32 mp (mean landings for the last 10 yrs + 1.5 SD)

SSC Discussion

The SSC agrees with the SEDAR Review Panel recommendations. The assessment model used in the update does not provide a basis to support quantitative reference points or determination of stock status. Primary issues identified are strong evidence of external recruitment (i.e., no indication of a separate Florida or US stock) and severe retrospective patterns that may be the result of changes in catchability (which the model used in the assessment update could not accommodate).

No value for P could be provided, and there is no accepted assessment, so the stock cannot be evaluated using the assessed stocks tier of the ABC Control Rule. After evaluating the landings-based OFL and ABC recommendations provided by the GMFMC (OFL=7.9 mp, ABC=7.32 mp) the SSC decided to provide consistent recommendations. It was noted that this is a jointly managed stock and this ABC value is in the range of what would be obtained by using the SAFMC Control Rule (Tier 4) which provides an ABC of 6.9 mp.*

The SSC agrees that major uncertainties were identified and addressed to the extent possible with information and techniques available given the constraints of an update assessment (i.e., limited to the same model and techniques used in the benchmark assessment). It is unknown how fishing on Florida/US spiny lobster would impact recruitment of spiny lobster in other areas, and how fishing in other areas is affecting the Florida /US portion of the stock. Other major sources of uncertainty discussed include the observed retrospective pattern, its cause, and whether a future assessment could address this problem through use of an alternative model.

Future Steps/Assessments:
Because the Florida/US stock does not seem to be significantly dependent upon self-recruitment, the SSC recommended that future stock

assessments of the Florida/US spiny lobster stock should consider the use of yield-per-recruit approaches. However, the committee noted that developing a meaningful assessment and reference points would require region-wide data that encompass the stock's full distribution (Caribbean, US, etc.). It is unclear at this point if obtaining region-wide data would be practical or realistic.

Amendment 10 Overview:
The SSC reviewed and discussed Amendment 10 but had no major comments or concerns.

9. ABC Control Rule Tier Assignments

9.1. Documents

Attachment 12. ABC Control Rule
Attachment 13. Landings trends for unassessed stocks (Spreadsheet) Overview
Staff Contact: John Carmichael & Mike Errigo

The SSC addressed ABC recommendations for unassessed stocks by adding tiers to the control rule that correspond to the level of information and harvest. It was recognized that developing ABCs from this approach would require multiple steps. The first step, planned for this meeting, is to allocate stocks to tiers. Various analyses will then be requested based on the tier assignments. Finally, the SSC will review the analytical results and consider revised ABC recommendations in November 2011.

Landings trends are provided for the stocks that are expected to remain in the FMUs once the ACL amendment is approved. The SSC is directed toward the Tiers included in the ABC control rule and the stock level tiers of the Methot table, addressed at the August 2010 SSC meeting. Documentation on the methods referenced in the ABC control rule tiers is provided in the references folder. Also provided are PSA evaluations of Gulf and South Atlantic stocks that have been referenced in earlier ABC discussions, and the 1998 (Restrepo et al) Technical Guidance.

Based on current preferred alternatives in the Comprehensive ACL amendment, 18 unassessed stocks remain in council FMUs. Landings trends are presented only for these species. Most of these are snapper-grouper stocks that are relatively minor in terms of their landings contribution to the overall snapper grouper fishery.

Cobia, in the Coastal-Migratory Pelagic FMP, is the sole stock from outside the Snapper-Grouper FMP. The SAFMC manages cobia through the Atlantic coast. Therefore, the landings presented reflect all states from Florida to Maine. This differs from the others in the Snapper Grouper FMU for which landings are limited to the South Atlantic area. As with other stocks in the joint SAFMC - GMFMC Coastal Migratory Pelagic FMP, the Council has selected a preferred ABC alternative for Cobia based on the GMFMC ABC control rule.

The landings trends in the attached spreadsheet are provided by sector and standardized to the mean to avoid possible disclosure of any confidential information. This preserves the trends but hides the specific landings information. Reference lines for

various alternative ABC levels are provided on the panel showing total landings by species. These include the current SAFMC SSC recommendation (median of 1999-2008) and the Gulf SSC control rule alternatives of the average plus 1 or 2 standard deviations. (NOTE: At this writing we do not have the Gulf SSC control report, and therefore do not know what criteria are considered to determine if a ABC or OFL should be based on the mean or some addition of the standard deviation.)

SAFMC SSC ABC Control Rule Tiers (Summarized)

Level 1 tier – Assessed Stocks.

ABC based on PDF of yield and P* derived from dimensions.

Level 2 tier - Apply Depletion based stock reduction analysis (DB-SRA) analysis (Dick and MacCall 2010; see references folder)

Requires full history of landings and other life history info. (Note: "Other Life History Info" is not specified in the rule)

Provides a pdf of OFL. Could apply P* or other risk/p level to derive ABC

Level 3 tier - Apply depletion-corrected average catch (DCAC) (MacCall 2009; see references folder).

Requires less data than 2nd tier (Note: Required data not specified in ABC rule)

Provides provisional ABC directly – OFL unknown

Level 4 tier- Catch only.

Requires judgment and careful consideration of all available sources, which may vary greatly between stocks falling in this tier.

NOTE: Could consider the Methot table to quantify catch level in this tier.

"Methot" Catch Evaluation Table.

Historical Catch	Expert Judgment	Possible Action
Nil, not targeted	Inconceivable that catch could be affecting stock	Not in fishery; Ecosystem Component; SDC not required
Small	Catch is enough to warrant including stock in the fishery and tracking, but not enough to be of concern	Set ABC and ACL above historical catch; Set ACT at historical catch level. Allow increase in ACT if accompanied by cooperative research and close monitoring.
Moderate	Possible that any increase in catch could be overfishing	ABC/ACL = f(catch, vulnerability) So caps current fishery
Moderately high	Overfishing or overfished may already be occurring, but no assessment to quantify	Set provisional OFL = f(catch, vulnerability); Set ABC/ACL below OFL to begin stock rebuilding

9.2. Presentations

Landings Summary: Mike Errigo

9.3. ACTIONS

- Assign unassessed stocks to control rule tiers
- Request analyses for unassessed stocks based on tier assignments

SSC Consensus Recommendations

The SSC further modified Tier 4 of the Control Rule, providing better guidance for deriving ABC. A decision tree approach is applied to determine the appropriate ABC value. In these situations OFL is unknown.

1. Are current catches likely to impact the stock?

NO: Ecosystem Species (Council largely addressed this already, ACL amendment)

YES: Go to 2

2. *Will increased catch (beyond current range of observed variability) lead to decline or other stock concerns?*

   NO: ABC = 3rd highest point in the 99-08 time series.

   YES: Go to 3

3. Is the stock part of a directed fishery or is it primarily bycatch with other species?

   Directed: ABC = Median 99-08

   Bycatch/Incidental: Go to 4.

4. Bycatch. Must judge the circumstance.

If bycatch in another fishery, issues that should be considered include: trends in that fishery, the current regulations, and the effort outlook.

If the directed fishery is increasing and bycatch of the stock of concern is also increasing, the Council may need to find a means to reduce interactions or bycatch mortality. If that is not feasible, the Council will need to impact the directed fishery. The SSC's intent is to evaluate the situation and provide guidance to Council on possible catch levels, risk, and actions to consider for bycatch and directed components.

SSC Discussion

This agenda item was discussed early in the meeting in the context of the Gulf Control Rule, Mackerel Amendment 18, and the Comprehensive ACL amendment. As such, some of the text presented in this discussion may be redundant.

The SSC discussed the use of standard deviation as a means to adjust ABC above the median landings. The issue that concerned the group the most was landings would be higher with more uncertainty (i.e., more variation in landings) and lower with less variation. Also, using a standard deviation approach would discourage collection of more precise (and accurate) landings data. Using a percentile of the landings values

would be a more uniform application and is not impacted by the variation in the data. Given 10 years of data, and being consistent with the 75th percentile (25% of the landings value exceed that value), the SSC recommended using the 3rd highest point or the 80th percentile of the data. This recommendation was integrated into a decision tree developed for landings only stocks as presented above in the consensus statements section.

10. Snapper Grouper FMP Regulatory Amendment 11

10.1. Documents

Attachment 14. SG FMP Regulatory Amendment 11
Attachment 15. Preliminary RA11 analyses presentation

10.2. Overview

Staff Contact: Gregg Waugh

10.3. Reg Amendment 11 Schedule

NOI .....
Scoping Complete .....
Council review options & make recommendations ..... Dec 2010
AP review ..... April 2011
Council review & approve for Public Hearing .....
Public Hearings .....
SSC Final review ..... April 2011
Final Review & Submission .....
Regulations implemented .....

10.4. Presentations

Overview: Gregg Waugh

10.5. ACTIONS

- Comment on the amendment and alternatives

SSC Consensus Recommendations

The SSC lacks adequate information to evaluate the alternatives, and feels it would be irresponsible to provide specific recommendations at this time.

SSC Discussion

With regard to Warsaw grouper and speckled hind, it was noted that these two species do not appear to co-occur with many of the deep- water species (i.e., these species occur on hard bottom habitat associated with the continental shelf break as opposed to the open shelf). The intent of the deep-water closure was to provide protection for these two species, yet it seems the opposite is true. Question: Is the 240 foot closure effective at protecting Warsaw grouper and speckled hind?

The SSC expressed concern about receiving the analysis for evaluation after the Council has seen the outcome of the analysis. A key issue that impacted the group's ability to have an in-depth discussion of the analysis was the absence of the analyst. The SSC had technical questions and concerns that only the analyst would have been able to address; yet the group had no means to get answers or draw inferences. A potential solution offered by the SSC is doing reviews via conference calls. This would allow for the SSC to review these analyses and provide feedback prior to the Council receiving them.

The SSC recommends the following:

Technical analyses should be reviewed through the SSC before presentation to the Council. SSC is willing to address via conference calls or webinar if necessary.

Analyses should indicate whether SEFSC has reviewed them and should provide the SEFSC review findings to the SSC.

The SSC also cautions that errors are more likely in last minute submissions that lack adequate time for review, especially with complex technical information.

11. Comprehensive Ecosystem Based Amendment 2

11.1. Documents

Attachment 16. Draft CEBA 2.

11.2. Overview

Staff Contact: Anna Martin

This amendment includes regulatory actions that specify management of the octocoral fishery, modify management of South Carolina's Special Management Zones, modify sea turtle release gear requirements for the snapper grouper fishery, and non-regulatory actions that designate new Essential Fish Habitat and EFH-Habitat Areas of Particular Concern for various Council FMPs. CE-BA 2 is an EA and under statutory deadline for specifying an ACL for the octocoral fishery.

Actions:

- Remove octocorals from the FMU under the South Atlantic Coral FMP
- Extend the FMU for octocorals into the Gulf Council's area of jurisdiction
- Modify the ACL for octocorals in the South Atlantic
- Modify management of South Carolina SMZs
- Modify sea turtle release gear requirements for the snapper grouper fishery
- Amend the Snapper Grouper FMP to designate new EFH-HAPCs
- Amend the Coral FMP to designate new EFH-HAPCs
- Amend the FMP for Pelagic *Sargassum* Habitat to designate new EFH
- Amend the FMP for Pelagic *Sargassum* Habitat to designate EFH-HAPCs

Note: At their December meeting, the Council added an alternative to modify the FMU to indicate that octocorals are included in the EEZ off of NC, SC, and GA. Based upon this alternative, an additional alternative was added to set the ACL for octocorals in the South Atlantic at 0.

11.3. CEBA II Schedule

NOI	None because EA
Scoping Complete	Jan/Feb 2009
Council review options & make recommendations	March 2009 – Sept 2010
APs review	Sept 09, Aug & Nov 2010, February 2011
SSC first review	November 2010
SSC provide ABC recommendations	April & Aug 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing	December 2010
Public Hearings	Jan/Feb 2011

SSC Final review ..... April 2011
Final Review & Submission ..... June 2011
Regulations implemented ..... by December 31, 2011

11.4. Presentations

Overview: Anna Martin

11.5. ACTIONS

- Comment on the new alternative (Action 3, Alternative 3) to set the ACL for octocorals in the South Atlantic at 0.
- Review all actions and alternatives and provide input to be incorporated into the "Council Conclusions" section for each action. Provide a summary statement of SSC recommendations for each action

SSC Consensus Recommendations

SSC Discussion

The SSC had no concerns with the final version of the CEBA II document.

12. Report and Recommendations Review

The Committee is provided an opportunity to review its report and final recommendations.

13. Information and Updates

Attachment 17 Regional Operating Agreement March 2011

13.1. FMP REPORTS

Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

13.1.1. Coastal Migratory Pelagic

13.1.2. Snapper Grouper

SG Amendment 18A

Document: None; waiting on NOAA GC and NMFS guidance
Summary: Extend FMP range, Data Collection, Black Sea Bass & Golden Tilefish endorsements
Actions:

Schedule:

NOI 1/22/09
Scoping Complete ..... Jan 2009
Council review options & make recommendations .....
APs review .....
SSC first review .....
SSC provide ABC recommendations ..... NA
Council review & approve for Public Hearing .....
Public Hearings ..... Oct 2010
SSC Final review .....
Final Review & Submission .....
Regulations implemented .....

SG Amendment 18B

Council was advised in December 2010 that Amendment 18B (extending the S-G FMU) is not needed.

SG Amendment 20

Wreckfish ITQ

Document:
Summary:
Actions:

Schedule:

NOI 1/9/2009
Scoping Complete ..... Jan 2009
Council review options & make recommendations ..... Mar 2009 -
APs review .....
SSC first review ..... April 2011
SSC provide ABC recommendations ..... NA
Council review & approve for Public Hearing .....
Public Hearings .....
SSC Final review .....
Final Review & Submission .....
Regulations implemented .....

SG Amendment 21

Comprehensive Catch Shares, Trip limits, and effort reduction

Document:
Summary:
Actions:

Schedule:

NOI .....

Scoping Complete ..... Jan 2011
Council review options & make recommendations .....
APs review .....
SSC first review ..... April 2011
SSC provide ABC recommendations..... NA
Council review & approve for Public Hearing .....
Public Hearings .....
SSC Final review .....
Final Review & Submission .....
Regulations implemented.....

SG Amendment 22

Long-term management of red snapper

Document:
Summary:
Actions:

Schedule:

NOI .....
Scoping Complete ..... Jan 2011
Council review options & make recommendations .....
APs review .....
SSC first review ..... April 2011
SSC provide ABC recommendations..... NA
Council review & approve for Public Hearing .....
Public Hearings .....
SSC Final review .....
Final Review & Submission .....
Regulations implemented.....

SG Regulatory Amendment 9

Trip limits for greater amberjack, vermilion snapper, black sea bass, and gag grouper

Document: Submitted for Final Secretarial Review.

Summary: In order to prevent the progressive shortening of fishing seasons for black sea bass, gag, and vermilion snapper, and to maximize the probability of achieving optimum yield for greater amberjack, Regulatory Amendment 9 proposes to establish harvest management measures for black sea bass, commercial trip limits for vermilion snapper and gag; and modify the current trip limit for greater amberjack.

Actions: Establish trip limits/split season quotas/spawning season closures and bag limit reduction for black sea bass, establish trip limit for vermilion

snapper and gag, and modify the current trip limit for greater amberjack under the current Framework Procedure.

Schedule:

Council review options & make recommendations ..... Sept 2010
APs review ..... Nov 2010 & March 2011
SSC review ..... Nov 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing ..... Dec 2010
Public Hearings ..... Jan/Feb 2011
SSC Final review ..... Nov 2010
Final Review & Submission ..... March 2011
Regulations implemented ..... by June 1, 2011

13.1.3. Golden Crab

Amendment 5

Schedule:

NOI .....
Scoping Complete ..... Nov 2009
Council review options & make recommendations ..... Sept 2009-Dec 2010
APs review ..... Summer 2009
SSC first review ..... April 2011
SSC provide ABC recommendations ..... April 2010
Council review & approve for Public Hearing ..... March 2011
Public Hearings ..... May 2011
SSC Final review ..... April 2011
Final Review & Submission ..... Sept. 2011
Regulations implemented .....

13.2. Upcoming Meetings

SAFMC APs

1. Mackerel AP. April 6-7, Charleston SC
2. Dolphin Wahoo AP. April 7-8, Charleston SC
3. Snapper Grouper AP. April 13-15, Charleston SC
4. Spiny Lobster AP. April 20, Key West FL

SEDAR

SEDAR 25, SA sea bass and tilefish
Data Workshop, April 26-28, Charleston SC
Assessment Workshop, June 21-23, Beaufort NC
Review Workshop, September 20-22, Charleston SC
SEDAR 21, Sharks
Review Workshop, April 18-22, Annapolis MD
SEDAR Steering Committee, May 2, Charleston SC

Others

4th Annual National SSC Workshop, October 4-6, Williamsburg VA

SAFMC Public Hearings

Spiny Lobster Amendment 10/DEIS & Mackerel Amendment 18A/EA – April 11-20

SAFMC Meetings

A. June 13-17, 2011 – Florida
Key West Marriott Beachside Hotel
3841 N. Roosevelt Blvd.
Key West, FL 33040
Phone: 1-800-546-0885 or 305-296-8100/Fax: 305-293-0205
B. September 12-16, 2011 – South Carolina
The Charleston Marriott Hotel
170 Lockwood Boulevard
Charleston SC 29403
Phone: 1-800-968-3569 or 843-723-3000/Fax: 843-723-0276
C. December 5-9, 2011 – North Carolina
Holiday Inn Brownstone Hotel
1707 Hillsborough Street
Raleigh, NC 27605
Phone: 1-800-331-7919 or 919-828-0811/Fax: 919-834-0904
D. March 5-9, 2012 – Georgia
E. June 11-15, 2012 – Florida
F. September 10-14, 2012 – South Carolina

G. December 3-7, 2012 – North Carolina

14. Next SSC Meeting

1. November 8 - 10, 2011, Charleston SC
2. Considering a meeting August 23-25, 2011.

15. Other Business

SSC provided names for attendance at the National SSC meeting. This year's meeting will be hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and will be held in Williamsburg, VA. Churchill Grimes has offered to participate as the ecosystem representative; Sherry Larkin has offered to participate as the social economic representative. Additional folks who will also be in attendance include Luiz Barbieri, Carolyn Belcher, John Boreman (serving is his capacity as chair for the Mid-Atlantic as well as chair of the National SSC meeting), Scott Crosson, and Jim Berkson. John Carmichael will serve as the Council representative.

15.1. Comment on SEDAR Assessment Schedule

Table 15.1. Planned SAFMC SEDAR Assessments, 2012-2015

31	SAFMC golden crab, *gray triggerfish*	2012	Benchmark
32	SAFMC greater amberjack, red porgy	2012	Standard
33	SAFMC/GMFMC CMP Complex	2012	Mixed
35	FL FWC Mutton Snapper	2012	Standard
36	SAFMC wreckfish, Warsaw grouper, speckled hind, *blueline tilefish*	2013	Benchmark
37	SAFMC snowy grouper, red snapper, gag	2013	Standard
43	SAFMC dolphin, wahoo	2014	Benchmark
44	SAFMC vermilion snapper	2014	Standard
49	SAFMC gray snapper, black sea bass, *white grunt*	2015	Benchmark
50	SAFMC black sea bass	2015	Standard

ACTION: Review and provide recommendations for Council and Steering Committee consideration. Guidance is desired on timing, workload, and planned assessment types.

SSC Consensus Recommendations

SSC Discussion

16.Suggested Agenda Items for Future Meetings

-MSST alternatives and MSY proxies
-SEDAR Approvals for 2012 assessments (participants, schedule, TORs)
-Fishery Independent data collection review – MARMAP report (draft at this meeting), updated on SEFSC expansions

17.General Procedural Issues

Additional Meetings

-Consider holding 3rd meeting each year.
-This may just be a busy year, and may quiet down next year; may not need to set a permanent 3/yr cycle, but only have a 3rd meeting on an as-needed basis

SEDAR Concerns

-Timing and availability of data—2012 workload possible issue for life history analyses and MARMAP. May not be able to accommodate changed schedules on short notice.
-Ensure that TORs for 2014 assessment include need for OFL and pdf for the OFL.

Meeting Flow and Needs

-Having notes/recommendations projected on the screen is helpful.
-All technical analyses should come thru SSC before going to Council (e.g., species groupings and Snapper-Grouper Regulatory Amendment 11 analysis).
-Restate-- documents should come to the SSC 2 weeks prior to SSC meeting.
-Reviewing amendments while document is not complete makes it difficult to provide advice; however, it does allow the SSC to interject concerns before the document is completed.

-Analysts should be available when research or analysis is presented, even if only by phone (but preferable to have analysts attend the meeting in person).