

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SEDAR COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, Georgia**

March 8, 2023

TRANSCRIPT

Committee Members

Carolyn Belcher, Chair
Andy Strelcheck
Robert Beal
Mel Bell

Trish Murphey, Vice Chair
Jessica McCawley
Kerry Marhefka
Tim Griner

Council Members

Gary Borland
Judy Helmey
Laurilee Thompson

Chester Brewer
Tom Roller
Spud Woodward

Council Staff

Myra Brouwer
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Nick Smillie

Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Judd Curtis
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Christina Wiegand
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Suzanna Thomas

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Frank Helies
Jamal Ingram
Nikhil Mehta
LT Patrick O'Shaughnessy
Dr. John Walter

Dale Diaz
Dewey Hemilright
Dr. Jack McGovern
Thomas Newman
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jeff Buckel

Other attendees and invited participants attached.

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Wednesday, March 8, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: We're going to go ahead and get started with the SEDAR Committee. The first item on the agenda is the Approval of the Agenda. Does anybody have any suggested edits that they would like to make? Okay. Any objection to the agenda as it currently stands? Seeing none, the agenda passes and is approved.

The second item is Approval of the September 2022 Transcript. Any edits needed to this document? Any objection to the document as it stands? Okay. Seeing none, the transcript is also approved. The first item is SEDAR 92, blueline tilefish, and SEDAR 89, tilefish, terms of reference, and Chip is going to walk us through that. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you. We do have tilefish assessments, and these -- What we're going to be going through, and this is going to be jumping through time, backwards and so, for this one, we're going to start off in 2024, and we're looking at some terms of reference for stock assessments for blueline tilefish and golden tilefish, or tilefish, as it's written.

We worked with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on these terms of reference, as well as the SSC, and these are a little bit different than how you've seen them in the past, and the first item is changed substantially from what we typically do. We typically just provide a terminal year, and that's been a little bit problematic, as we've developed these terms of reference, and sometimes the schedule for SEDAR gets rearranged, and, therefore, having just a fixed number on the terms of reference is problematic, but, as the SSC discussed, they also want a minimum year in there as well.

They want to make sure it gets up to a minimum time period, and that's why the language is written as it is in Item Number 1, where it basically states to provide data, adding all new and recent available data sufficient for use in the stock assessment through 2023, and so that gets at a minimum year of how much information to include, and then the next statement gets into provide as much information as possible, and so they indicate that data providers may decide to include preliminary or partial 2024 data that could be used in stock assessment models or projection analysis. That provides the data providers additional flexibility to give new information for 2024 and beyond, if they would like to.

The rest of it is talking about the information for the stock assessment, just remembering that blueline tilefish is a little bit different than most of the stock assessments that you all receive, are presented to you, and it is an ASPIC model, combined with a DLM model, and so the ASPIC model is a surplus production model for the information for blueline tilefish south of Hatteras, and then the DLM, or the data-limited method, that is used to estimate catch of blueline tilefish north of Cape Hatteras.

One of the reasons that they had to do this is there were world record reports of blueline tilefish being caught up off of Virginia. However, if you look into the recreational data collection program, there are quite often zero landings in the time period when a world-record fish was caught, and so it was highly likely that an individual world-record fish was the only one caught that year, and so they went in with a DLM Toolkit, trying to figure out the best way to estimate landings and estimate the time series of catch for that area.

The next part, and the remaining parts, are basically similar to how they've been done in the past, at least 2 and 3, and it's just rewording of how we've had items in the past. For blueline tilefish, it is important to note that the commercial and recreational landings and discards are included in there. With blueline tilefish, the landings from Virginia north is estimated through a Delphi approach, and so a group that's dealing with how to estimate landings is going to be needed for the stock assessment coming forward.

They also noted to note any particular problems with the 2020 and beyond, and that's getting into any issues with MRIP caused during the COVID time period, and then, looking at Item 3, it's just a list of variances, model uncertainties, and estimates of stock status and model benchmarks. As John had talked about, we do have a link right here, under Item 4, to the SSC's catch level projections workgroup, and they had a series of recommendations that they provided to the Science Center to include in future stock assessments, and so they want them to address as many as possible during the stock assessments.

Part of the new process for operational stock assessments is working through a topical working group on a dedicated topic, and we have two dedicated topics for blueline tilefish. We have the recommended catch and landings stream from north of Cape Hatteras, and there is also the SADL, the South Atlantic Deepwater Longline survey, for incorporation into the stock assessment, and we had talked about participants for these topical working groups, and the council had recommended a number of people for that, but they also recommended that a single workgroup address both of these topics.

Then the remaining is explore the CVs of landings to capture uncertainty in the model and then develop a stock assessment, and so, if you guys want to, we can adopt that through a motion, or we can go into the golden tilefish shortly afterwards and do a motion for both of those, if there's changes.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Just a question, and this may just show my ignorance, but this is an update of SEDAR 50, and so it's already been run, right? Okay, and so there's a DLM model that's used, and there seems to be some concerns of some of these models not being the best scientific information, and is this one still a good one, or has this fallen off as best -- Because I didn't know if that might have something to impact, you know, especially if we get down further and this gets run, and they say, well, that's not the best scientific information now, and so just a question to clarify if that particular model is still okay.

DR. COLLIER: The DLM Toolkit includes a series of models, and so, based on the information available, you can run different options within it, and so -- Mike is the expert on it, at least -- If I'm saying anything wrong, Mike, just let me know, and so it's based on the available data, and it

can do several different things, in order to estimate what is sustainable harvest in that area, and so that would be the model coming forward to the SSC for the review. If they're comfortable with it, at that point, it could be used for estimating an ABC for the stock, and sometimes an OFL can come out of it as well.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I've got Tim and then Dewey.

MR. GRINER: In this SEDAR 92, will this be one where we're able to look at the landings and the discards and then take the discards out by sector, this new approach?

DR. COLLIER: I am trying to remember back on how this stock assessment was set up, and I believe it was set up with a single landings stream for the catch. Landings and discards were not separated, but I'm not positive on that, south of Cape Hatteras. Let me -- Mike will have a comment, and I will look it up for you, real quick.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Mike, to that, and then Dewey.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: This was actually like more back towards Trish's question, and I just wanted to note, as far as the BSIA discussion, the reason why we had to move to a data-limited method is because we, at the last stock assessment, determined that the ageing was unreliable for blueline tilefish, and so, if there hasn't been an advancement in the ability to age blueline tilefish, then that would make it very difficult for the assessment team to be able to use some of the more data-rich methods, and so they probably would have to rely on that data-limited toolkit again, and so that's one of those situations where, you know, it's not your optimum -- It's not your best-case scenario, but it's the best scientific information that you are able to put together at that moment, with what you have.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that, Mike. Dewey and then Jessica.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It was my understanding that the DLM Toolkit was used because we had a lack of data north of Cape Hatteras and that -- This DLM Toolkit, are we referring to this DLM Toolkit to be from north of Cape Hatteras to New York, or are we referring this DLM Toolkit to be from north of Cape Hatteras to the Virginia-North Carolina line?

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Well, what we did last time is we evaluated the stock from Cape Hatteras north, all the way through the Mid-Atlantic, and then we looked at -- Because I think we had one year of the tilefish survey at that time, and we looked at the portion of blueline tilefish caught north and south of the Virginia-North Carolina line, and we took the -- What would have been the ABC for Cape Hatteras north, and then we allocated what came out of that survey south of the Virginia-North Carolina line and then north of the Virginia-North Carolina line, and so that's kind of how it was conducted, and you're right that there was also that lack of data that Chip talked about, in terms of the reliable landings data, and we didn't really have reliable tracked landings data for north of Cape Hatteras, especially that portion north of the Virginia-North Carolina line. That's another reason why we had to go with the DLM Toolkit, as opposed to south of Cape Hatteras, where we could use the ASPIC model, because we had tracked landings for south of Cape Hatteras.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I have been frustrated for a long time, and it's nothing new with this blueline tilefish, and I will continue on until I feel like I've had success, or we've had a successful outcome,

but the DLM Toolkit, when it split it up, was 44 percent to the south and 56 percent to the north, and so that south gave crumbs of 60,000 pounds between north of Cape Hatteras to the Virginia-North Carolina line, and, for all these years, the majority of the fish, from anywhere from 400,000 pounds to 800,000 pounds, has been coming out of this area north of Cape Hatteras, to the Virginia-North Carolina line, that the DLM Toolkit, and through a pilot program that the Mid-Atlantic did to separate out the percentage, was 60,000 pounds.

Since that period of time, we have watched the -- Since 2016 until now, we have watched a minimal amount, in some years, of 500,000 pounds being pulled out of this area, 300,000 to 400,000 pounds out of this area, and so I hope that, when we're going through with this stock assessment, that we're not going to be constrained to some DLM Toolkit, when there's been ample information available, and it can be validated through our landings, because I hope like heck that, when the outcome of this happens, we ain't sitting on an ACL for the commercial or recreational at 225,000 pounds again, because I'm watching the stock explode, and we're watching SADL show the stock explode, and so I'm worried about the methodology we're going to use going forward in the future is going to produce the same outcome, and I don't know how I can --

I guess I won't be assured of that until we go through the process, but I hope to be an active participant at the table to help vet, and give an explanation, a crystal-clear explanation, of the fishery that's been going on since about -- Before 2016, the last stock assessment, but I will leave it at that, but it's vitally important. We need some more fish, and the quota, unless something magically happens, should be producing that, and especially where the majority of the fish are caught is north of Cape Hatteras, and your data shows that.

DR. SCHMIDTKE: Thanks, Dewey, and I just wanted to note -- I mean, a lot of the pieces that you pointed out, potentially improved landings, tracking north of Cape Hatteras, the SADL survey, that's information that wasn't available during the last round, and so there is -- You know, there is potential for advancements. I am not the analyst on this, and so I'm not going to claim one thing or the other, but there is information that is available now that was not available during the last round, and so hopefully there will be appropriate improvements.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Mike. Jessica and then Chip.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just to kind of add-on to some of the things that Dewey is saying, and so it looks like Number 2 up there, that will consider new and updated information on life history, and so this would include any new information about fish that are north of Cape Hatteras, and so will that be able to be teased apart, like new life history information between the two different areas, if there is anything?

DR. COLLIER: With this group, they're not necessarily looking at age differences between the two different groups. This model, right now, does not use ages in it, and so age information could be considered, and it's going to be used in hopefully different ways, through some of the information that goes into a surplus production model, and maybe they can update some of the growth parameters, or some of those other ones that might be lying in the background, and so some of that information could be incorporated in there.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments from the group? Any recommendations or revisions of the TORs, as they are currently? Chip and then John Walter after Chip.

DR. COLLIER: One thing, to Dewey's point, is this is an operational assessment, and so it does come with constraints on it. You know, what we're allowed to do is pretty limited, and it's supposed to be, you know, get the new information and run the stock assessment, and there are -- The SEDAR Steering Committee is talking about different approaches, and a little bit more flexibility in the approaches, to do stock assessments. However, when this terms of reference was written, a couple of years ago, or just a few months ago, when we presented it to the SSC, that information was not available to us, and so we were going into this with a very strict mindset of operational assessments are basically strict updates, and you can't do dramatic changes to the stock assessment model that's being used, and so the previous model was a DLM Toolkit, and, therefore, it was recommended here as well.

DR. BELCHER: I've got John Walter and then back to Dewey.

DR. WALTER: I am -- You know, I think that this body, if they want to recommend something, and that's why this goes before the council, and I think that the comments from Dewey are apt, in terms of there's been a lot of extensive data collection that has occurred for that north of Hatteras area since then, and I think there is a topical working group that is supposed to evaluate any, or document any, specific changes to input data, or deviations from the SEDAR 50 model, and I would assume that would be deviations from the DLM, that maybe that DLM may no longer be as data-limited, and presumably could be one actual full stock assessment model for the whole area, or something that group, that topical working group, could consider. Then maybe they wouldn't be beholden to simply running a DLM, and I guess that could -- It seems, to me, that that's what where that topical working group could explore. I guess I will ask our analyst about whether that's something, but thanks.

DR. BELCHER: Chip, do you want to talk to that, procedurally, because, I mean, I was under the understanding that operational assessment pretty much -- If we ask for that, we would have to go back out and ask for something -- Not necessarily a research track, but whatever -- Is there something in between? I am kind of losing track of what our procedures are, but it seems like, if we're going to talk about a new modeling approach, then that's not an operational assessment.

DR. COLLIER: That has been my interpretation as well. John also sits on the SEDAR Steering Committee, and do you have an opinion on it?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that's the way it's been presented. You know, there's a process that starts, as Chip said, several years prior, and it starts with a scope of work, and it lays out what's going to be done, and the Science Center evaluates it and decides how much they can accomplish, and, you know, you get to this point, and a lot of this negotiating has already gone through, and so, if you're going to go in and bring in significant different things, that's going to require going back to the Science Center and the drawing board with a potential opportunity for a significant change in the scheduling of the work, and there's -- You know, there's already a request from Clay that we haven't gotten into, and haven't really fully evaluated, about potentially pushing some of these back even more, and so, you know, I think there is a concern.

It's just this stuff is kind of in flux, that we're having with the SEDAR scheduling process and trying to deal with the realities of the Science Center capabilities to do these assessments and the need to plan ahead, because sometimes, yes, we get into a box, and, you know, we've got to decide,

and do you go forward with this, and get more information, and is that better, or you try to do what is maybe, you know, a more advanced technique, and brings them some new information, and realize that that could slow up the whole process, and so, yes, it's up to this group to decide, but just realize that there could be consequences to the timing of this assessment.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I've got a few comments there.

DR. BELCHER: All right, and then we'll go to Monica.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: The thing about -- I understand that we've got a process here, but this blueline tilefish thing has been ongoing for numerous years, and has been really almost a thorn in the side to the South Atlantic Council, and you have an opportunity here -- Like, for instance, the State of North Carolina had to update their size to get a citation on blueline tilefish, because, in 2020, or 2021, they had so many that they had to up it a pound, and so you have like 1,100 citations given out in North Carolina in this one region, and so I don't want to limit -- You know, even if was to take an extra six months, and, regrettably, I'm saying that, and I can't believe I'm saying that, but, if it's got to take longer to finally get the best information that is out there to do something, and get it right, it will be worth that time.

I know people has got process, and they've got schedules, but darned if we ain't -- This here has been kicking the can down the road, and it should be able to be looked at everything that's been gathered. The data can be segmented out, and something else to think about now is, when you say north of Cape Hatteras, Hatteras Inlet, because it's in Dare County, is included in north of Cape Hatteras, and so you're under the auspices that fishermen leave Cape Hatteras Inlet and go seventy miles up the road to go catch blueline tilefish, and so there's a -- It's almost like, when you say north of Cape Hatteras, you need to have a dividing line, in longitude and latitude, because there is a difference between including Cape Hatteras, north of Cape Hatteras, as Dare County.

It is Dare County, but there is two different inlets, and there's two different areas that gets fished, and the area of Cape Hatteras coming out of Hatteras Inlet -- 99 percent of it gets fished out of south of Hatteras, if you do a determination of it, but, because of where Hatteras is located, that landings stream gets called into Dare County, which then gets decided, because it's convenient, and it's decided that's north of Cape Hatteras, but it ain't where the fish are being harvested from, and so that's maybe too much information, but I just -- Even if it takes longer, please let's do due diligence and get this opportunity for blueline tilefish and the fishermen that have been hamstrung by this lack of catch and the crumbs that these last assessments produced, and we need some relief, if possible, and I'm hoping the outcome -- Whatever the outcome of the assessment is, I will either know it's right, or else I will figure out something else, because I know it won't be right, and so, either way, I don't know.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you for the comments. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is kind of a different situation, right? When you're doing, normally, an operational assessment, you have -- You are basing it on the previous assessment, but part of the previous assessment here used a data-limited model, because the data was limited, but, if the data are no longer limited, it makes me wonder what's the best scientific information available, in terms of just the data you're supposed to use, and so this is kind of a really different situation than I think that we've had before with other operational assessments.

DR. BELCHER: I think this is the hard part for me too, because of the years I've spent between the SSC and here, and we have changed all of our functions of how we've done assessments. We used to have a hybrid that we could do in the middle of that, and the update was the one that was basically -- Which we've all tried to get away from the turn-of-the-crank, but it's new data in, and we just update it with the data as it comes up to the current time window, to the full-blown, where we basically dump everything out of the bucket, and we reevaluate all the key assumptions and rebuild the model, which is similar to what research is now, and then we had the one in the middle, where we might have had new surveys come online, but they hadn't been long enough in the time series, but we were going to reconsider them, but any of the major assumptions could not be changed in the model. You couldn't tweak the model again, and we've kind of lost that in-between, and so that's the hard part.

I don't know, without going back to planning, and I'm looking at John and Chip with this, how you would change. We've agreed to do an operational on this, and I don't know how we kick it back to determine -- Because it's going to go back in the queue, Dewey, and that's the biggest part of this, is that, for what we have in front of us for technique, and being able to go outside of the box, you're going to have to go back to something that's going to be a more lengthy process, which means that we're going to have to figure out how it fits into the schedule of everything else, and is that correct? I mean, I am looking to staff.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That is normally what we're told when we make a major change, and, you know, I don't know -- I don't know it will play out. You know, if there's new information, then you want it to be considered, and I don't know what is involved in doing an ASPIC model that covers a greater range, you know, but it certainly is beyond what is normally considered acceptable in these circumstances when we're dealing with an operational, because it maybe implies that there is a lot more data evaluation planned than what is existing here.

The topical working groups, the way they're set up is they kind of focus on a narrow part of the assessment. They are not involved in the entire, you know, assessment and giving advice all along the way, and they have a range of things that they look at, and that's it, and, you know, then the analysts with the Science Center go through and take their recommendations, as recommendations, and they're the ones that are running the models and doing all of this stuff.

You know, the way that some of these were done in the past, where there were perhaps multiple workshops, where the SSC was involved and the same group worked through multiple issues, is not how it's being done, and, you know, the Science Center has really set it up this way for increased efficiency, and that's sort of where we're hamstrung a bit now, and Carolyn is right.

If we go in and change it, there are potential consequences. We don't know what they will be, because I would imagine that Clay would have to go back and say, okay, specifically, what are you asking for that's different from what you asked for in your scope of work, reconsider that with his people and their workload, the consequences for all the other assessments, and then we would have to come back with new terms of reference, maybe a different topical working group, more appointments of people to be on that, and so it's a pretty cumbersome process. I think we need to try to see, you know, can we use what's here now and get better information that's more timely for the fishermen, that's at least better than the status quo.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, but I like your analogy of dumping everything out of the bucket, because, I mean, if Monica said this is not best science available anymore --

MR. CARMICHAEL: (Mr. Carmichael's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. GRINER: But how can you keep building on something when you know we have new data, and why would we not want to dump everything out of the bucket, even if it takes longer?

DR. COLLIER: So it comes into where your limitations are, and so sometimes you want to have as much information as possible, and sometimes there is other stock assessments that could be done that is sufficient to describe the population, and the trends in the population, to provide an ABC. Some of these techniques are available, and they work fairly well. The DLM Toolkit is not just a single method, and it's like fifty or sixty different methods that can be used to evaluate it.

One of the issues is there was a discrepancy in the age data for blueline tilefish during SEDAR 50, and they could not come up with an agreement on the proper way to age these fish, and, therefore, that information was not incorporated, and it was not used, and so we would need definitely a topical working group to address the ageing issues.

Then we would have to have data streams associated with those issues, and so you can see how it's got to build upon itself, and it's becoming much more complicated. As you get to that more complicated assessment, it might improve your reality, or it might get closer to reality, and it might not. If you still have issues with the ageing, because you're shoving it into a model that it wasn't necessarily meant to go into, and it wasn't thoroughly evaluated, it could result in consequences, negative consequences.

MR. GRINER: Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Monica and then Dewey.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just for the record, Monica did not say it wasn't the best scientific information, but what I was musing is what is the best scientific information to use, given that it sounds like there's more data, and so would you still use the data-limited methods, you know, just as John and Chip and Dewey have been discussing.

DR. BELCHER: Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Given that there's about fifteen points to a data-limited model, what new information do we have here, through SADL, even though it's only two years, in occurrence, and it is located and validates what has been happening prior that's in that area, and so I know we look at trends of abundance over time and certain things, but the SADL work that's been done in that area, that has been partially, or the majority of it has been, you know, randomly chosen areas to fish, and it shows what the fishermen has been saying, and it validates what's going on.

As far as ageing, to my knowledge, ageing has never taken place for blueline tilefish, because they're not able to do that, because it's so -- You can look at it, in SEDAR 32, where they went

into a lab, and three different groups looked at it, and three different groups come out with different ages, and so I don't believe -- I believe, with the Data-Limited Toolkit, what was some of the driving force of the outcome of that is that was a small reduction in size of the fish that were sampled, even though I raised questions about different fishermen fish different areas, and so, if their fish got sampled more, and they were in a small area of fish, they would override where the majority of other people fish that might be larger fish, and so there was some bias there, but I got kind of ham-locked in, and I didn't ask it to the right people, or that data wasn't requested, but I thought about that, when I looked at it, because I know exactly the fishermen and where they fish at and the reason why it would be smaller fish, and that's --

I looked at this, and, you know, even if we go through this exercise, and it spits out something worse than now, I just know it's a total failure, because of what's out there in that ocean and what's being caught, and so that's why I ask these questions, and it ain't to be an impediment, but, man, I'm just over our crumb fisheries, when I know we could be producing an ACL of 200,000 pounds, commercially, along the Atlantic coast, or if not more, and that's my reason for asking the questions, and hopefully -- I was chosen to participate as a whatever it is that I'm going to be participating in. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so I'm going to try to circle this back around, because I have a feeling what will happen is -- We kind of go through this all the time when we get into these assessments, and we would all love to come back and, as I said, dump out the bucket and restart, and we just don't have that ability, and so the first question I pose to the group is are there concerns with us going forward with an operational assessment? Is there anything that has changed that would change this, because, obviously, if there is enough concerns in the group, this has to go back someplace else and look at a reschedule and us talking about terms of reference for nothing. My question is, within the group, and I can report back who the committee members are in this, but is there concern, from the group, that we shouldn't proceed with an operational assessment for blueline tilefish? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I think you've got to proceed, and where the cards fall they fall, and, if they don't fall right, I would be vocal enough to make sure of the reason why they failed, but I think we just -- We've come this far, and we can't wait longer, and let's do this. You have questions up there about the SADL being used, and I hope that passes the peer review to be used, for whatever reason that is, and so I think we've got to go ahead with this, and maybe we can learn from it, because blueline tilefish is kind of unique than any other species, and where it's located, and I can't help that, where it's located, but that's just the way that is, and so I think we need to go ahead with this right here, instead of having any more time constraints of something. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: So, again, no objections from those folks that are on the committee about an operational assessment for blueline? Okay. Chip, do you have something that you want to speak to with that?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and, given the conversation at the table, you know, one of the things that we had thought about for blueline tilefish is a research track assessment, and, given this conversation, I feel like a research track assessment is definitely one that's going to be needed, or maybe a more flexible operational assessment that is able to tolerate some dramatic changes in the configuration of the stock assessment or the type of stock assessment that's used, and so we'll work on that, as staff, and try to get that worked into one of the SEDAR tables, when we're looking at the guidance,

but we're limited to one or two -- One research track assessment going on at a time, and so it takes us a little while to get those on there, and it takes up a spot for two to three years, and so it's definitely a consideration, when you're talking about putting a research track in there and the impacts on all the stock assessments.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. So, that said, relative to what's on the table for terms of reference, is there anything lacking in our terms of reference that we need to address? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I don't know how this falls in there, but how about the fact that the -- Maybe this would be under the data workshop, but like the increase of citations in this area north of Cape Hatteras that have increased, and I don't know, and I guess that's a data stream or something and not a term of reference, but I just wanted to make sure that everything is included that could be looked at in the future, because that's been a dramatic increase in the last few years, citations, and that has come from this area, which is north of Cape Hatteras, probably north of 35, 30.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so potential outside data streams. John Walter.

DR. WALTER: I just wanted to comment on a couple of things. One, hearing John's comment about Clay's desire for efficiency, I think that you've heard, loud and clear, and the message has gotten across on workload, but I don't know if efficiency only is the goal. I mean, the goal is the best science available, and under the timeframe and workload, but, in this situation, I think it is a little bit unique, in that we had a DLM for that northern area, and that there's a lot more data, and I think that topical working group could say there's enough information that something else could be applied, and that would be probably the due diligence that science should do there, in terms of -- To be honest, running a production model is easier than running the suite of models that are in the DLM Toolkit.

It's actually much faster to do just a production model, and so I think that allowing that topical working group the leeway to say does the SADL data, does the new landings data, warrant something, a better treatment, whether it's spelled out there or not, might be a compromise here, under this, and so --

MR. CARMICHAEL: I can't imagine that the council, or perhaps the SSC, would object if the analyst said, you know, after going through all of the new data, and decided that, oh, we think we can run ASPIC for the northern zone -- I don't think anyone would object to that, if that could be the outcome.

DR. WALTER: Perhaps the language should just be to explore whether this could be elevated to a higher-tier modeling approach, and that's simply the ask.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and I think, at the very least, you know, there is the potential for a lot of new data, and it's a good outcome, even if they're not able to do that, and they can give guidance for the next round that they do think the data are perhaps available, or maybe when SADL gets a few more years that will be available, which would help us be informed for the next round, even if it doesn't happen this time, and I would certainly hope this would be something that would just come out of this, in terms of, you know, the normal what's the next recommendations, what's the research needs, based on what you learned, but it never hurts to spell it out.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Is there further revisions from the group? All right. With that, I guess, as we go to move on, we have to have -- An action item would be for the group to put a motion forward as to accept the terms of reference, correct? Does somebody want to make a motion to that effect? My committee members are Trish, Robert Beal, Mel Bell, Tim Griner, Kerry Marhefka, Jessica McCawley, and Andy Strelcheck. Mel.

MR. BELL: Madam Chair, I would move to accept the terms of reference for SEDAR 92, Atlantic blueline tilefish, as modified.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Thanks, Mel. Do I have a second? Trish. Any further discussion on this? **Any objection to the motion? Okay. Seeing none, we can move on, Chip.**

DR. COLLIER: This one looks very similar, but it is very different. SEDAR 89 is Atlantic tilefish, or commonly referred to as golden tilefish, and this one is an age-structured model, and so it is a little bit different. Once again, we use that language on updating through 2023, giving the data providers the ability to provide additional information, as available. We are updating SEDAR 66, which is a BAM age-structured model, and it will include all recent advances in fisheries science, biology, population, and stock assessment science.

Number 3 is looking at the appropriate diagnostics, and then Number 4 is going into data input changes and model changes. Number 5 is looking at a series of topical working groups, and you can see those are mostly addressing life history, but it's also talking about incorporating information from the short bottom longline survey, as well as the South Atlantic Deepwater Longline survey. Beyond that, looking at developing a report, and that's the terms of reference for golden tilefish.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so is there discussion or revisions to the terms of reference, as currently written, for tilefish? Okay. No comments and no revisions, and everybody is fine with the TORs then? All right. For this item, then I will also need a motion from the committee as to our approval of the TORs. Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: I will make a motion to approve the TORs for Atlantic tilefish, South Atlantic tilefish.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I've got Mel for a second. Any other further discussion? Okay. **Seeing none, any objections? Still seeing none, those TORs are approved as well.** The next item on the agenda is the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting updates.

DR. COLLIER: I am not going to open up these documents. They're there for your reference, if you would like to read them. The one thing I do want to point out, in Attachment 2a, is there was discussion, in the September SEDAR Committee meeting, on the upcoming project grid for SEDAR, and there was potential changing of what species were going to be done in 2024, and so you guys had made recommendations on what species should be included, and, in fact, we were just talking about them, and they were blueline tilefish and tilefish, and, also, red snapper was discussed.

What the South Atlantic Council had recommended, as far as the species to be included in there, it was approved from the SEDAR Steering Committee, and so that's why you saw the schedule as it was, set up as it was and the species coming to you in 2024 for those operational assessments.

As far as Attachment 2, that just happened a couple of weeks ago, and so the summary is not available for that, and they're still working that up. However, there was considerable discussion on the SEDAR process and how to go through these research track assessments, operational track assessments, and so, since it's not finalized, I did not want to provide you guys a partial report on that.

The one thing I do want to point out is, in upcoming stock assessments, especially during the review track assessments and the review of those at the CIE, those will now be -- You will be able to stream those on webinar, and you will basically just be able to listen in, and it's not really available for comment, and then parts of the data workshop for research track assessments will also be available via webinar, and so it provides a lot more opportunities for people to at least listen in to the development of stock assessments, and also the review of stock assessments. Any questions on that, as far as the SEDAR Steering Committee, and, if I missed any highlights, Carolyn, you can fill-in for me.

DR. BELCHER: No questions or comments from anybody? Okay. Thank you for that update, Chip. We're now on to the update on SEDAR projects.

DR. COLLIER: What we try to do is just keep you guys abreast of all the SEDAR projects that are going along in the South Atlantic region. This is not the full list of SEDAR projects, but this is focused on items that would come to you for management, and so, starting off, we have SEDAR 79, and that's the mutton snapper benchmark assessment, and that's being done -- It's being conducted by FWC.

This one was delayed, for a couple of reasons, and one was COVID, and the other was doing the interim analysis for yellowtail snapper, and so it's going on right now, and the plan is to begin the assessment in 2023, and then have a data workshop in August of 2023, and we also have SEDAR 76, which is the black sea bass operational assessment, and that is scheduled to be completed and available to the SSC in April, and so we'll be getting the results of that stock assessment to the council in June.

SEDAR 82 is a research track assessment for gray triggerfish, and that's ongoing. They had the data workshop late last year, in December, and so they're working on the assessment approaches now. Red grouper is SEDAR 86, and there are no topical working groups for this, and we're expecting the stock assessment to be completed in December of 2023.

In the list of future projects, we have SEDAR 92 and SEDAR 89, which we just talked about, which were blueline tilefish and tilefish, and we have a research track assessment for red snapper that's planned on beginning in late 2024, in hopes of incorporating some preliminary analysis from the Great Red Snapper Count, or the Red Snapper Research Program, as it's now being called.

We have this new block of items called Other Assessment-Related Analysis Items, and so SEDAR goes through the process of delivering the stock assessment to the SSC for review and then to the councils. Once they do that, then that SEDAR is considered final, and so these additional analyses,

like we're talking about for Spanish mackerel, like you guys talked about in December, we're considering those other assessment-related projects, and so I just wanted to be clear, and so, underneath this, you're going to see SEDAR 78, which is the Spanish mackerel operational assessment. Since that's still being worked on, and trying to get you guys guidance, we do want to keep it in that list of SEDAR-related items, but it's not necessarily a SEDAR item at that point.

We also have the SEDAR 68 operational assessment, and that was just presented at this meeting, and that is the scamp yellowmouth operational assessment. The other item in here, or the last two items in here, we have the vermilion snapper interim analysis, and that's scheduled to be -- It was changed from an operational assessment, I think back in December of 2021, and it's hopefully going to be coming to the SSC in October of this year, in order to provide some information on the condition of -- To basically do a health check of vermilion snapper.

Then we have the SEDAR procedural workshop, looking at fishery-independent index development under changing survey designs, and we're looking at really incorporating some of the video data with some of the catch data, and that project was supposed to end I think sometime last year, but, due to COVID issues, and trying to get an in-person meeting, they had to stretch some things out, and so the reports should be available in May of 2023. Any questions on SEDAR projects going on in the South Atlantic region?

DR. BELCHER: Okay. I see no discussion from the group on that. Okay, and so, moving down the agenda, we now have project species for the 2026 slots.

DR. COLLIER: Okay. In May of 2023, of this year, and so now we're going forward a little bit in time, we're going to be looking at potential projects for 2026. Staff has put together a little bit of a recommendation for you all to consider, and then we also provide what's included in the research and monitoring plan for the list of species that we would like stock assessments for, and so the Tier 1 species that you'll see in Table 1, and those are species that we would like stock assessments for, but, starting off with the staff recommendations, for 2026, it's the snowy grouper operational assessment.

Originally, the South Atlantic Council had requested this to be reassessed in 2025, to track abundance, since the stock is overfished and overfishing is occurring. However, there is -- To accommodate the Atlantic cobia stock assessment, it was agreed, for -- For the Atlantic cobia stock assessment being conducted for ASMFC, it was requested to move the operational assessment back one year. One of the reasons to get this done in 2026 is dealing with snowy grouper, the overfished status, and overfishing, and making sure that that species is on track to rebuild. The terminal year for the last assessment was 2018.

The next item to consider is the research track assessment for greater amberjack. Similar to red snapper, there is a large project going on trying to estimate the overall abundance of greater amberjack, not only in the South Atlantic region but also in the Gulf of Mexico, and this data will -- The project will be completed by 2025, and the data should be available for a 2026 research track assessment. Going into some of the information that we've received from stakeholders, they have indicated that the population might not be doing as well as the stock assessment had pictured back in 2017, which was the terminal year of the previous stock assessment.

Then we have not necessarily a stock assessment, but looking at the dolphin management procedure and MSE, and so a management strategy evaluation is being conducted for dolphin in the South Atlantic, and along the Atlantic coast, as we manage the species. The MSE has not been used to develop catch level recommendations in our region, and so staff are recommending that SEDAR be used to review inputs and conclusions from the management procedure. Dolphin are currently -- The ACL and ABC are developed using the third-highest to set the catch levels, and some stakeholders have indicated that the stock needs a more robust method to set these catch levels.

Then, down below that, you guys are going to be talking about this in your next committee, but Spanish mackerel, and we did put this in here, the Spanish mackerel research track assessment, and the SSC requested additional analyses for Spanish mackerel. However, we didn't know -- When I wrote this, I didn't know if the analyses would be available, or sufficient, for the SSC to approve the assessment for use in management. If the SSC does not accept these, which assessment project, from the list above, should be replaced with Spanish mackerel? The terminal year of the current assessment being reviewed is 2019. If that gets rejected, the terminal year for the previous assessment was 2011.

What we need, mainly, is for you guys to provide guidance to Carolyn on, when she goes to the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting next month, which species do you think are most important for the 2026 slots, and I have a graph here of the slots, with the species that are getting assessed right now in green, or the green is approved through the SEDAR Steering Committee. Let's see. It's approved by the SEDAR Steering Committee and the SSC. A project schedule has been developed. Then, in orange, it's been approved by the SEDAR Steering Committee, but the schedule is not completed, and then yellow are preliminary projects, and then blue are future requests.

DR. BELCHER: So what does the group have to say about our proposed SEDAR projects?

DR. COLLIER: For the 2026, and so items before 2026 -- It's probably not best to touch those.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can we please take white grunt off the list, please? You laugh now, but, when it's found to be overfished and undergoing overfishing, it's no laughing matter.

DR. BELCHER: I guess the thing I'm struggling with right now is I kind of feel like we have an out-of-sync issue, because Spanish mackerel is on the Mackerel Committee discussion points, and I feel like we really need to have the conversation, and so I would actually like to see what the group thinks about us revisiting this in Full Council, once we've had the ability to talk through what's on the Mackerel Committee and then come back and revisit what you're asking for for 2026. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm good with that. I also thought that it was a little bit out of sync, but, either way, I'm still going to have the same opinion on white grunt.

DR. BELCHER: That wasn't a 2026 proposed one anyway.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I still -- Really?

DR. BELCHER: Mel, did you have something?

MR. BELL: No, and I think maybe the approach you were taking, and we are going to need to talk about Spanish.

DR. BELCHER: Spanish is going to require much more conversation than this.

MR. BELL: Right, and maybe it ends up twitching something off.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, yes, for right now, why don't we just hold off, and we'll bring this back up in Full Council, to talk about what we want to do with 2026. Okay. Next is Other Business, which incorporates SEDAR scopes of work. That's for the 2025 assessments.

DR. COLLIER: What I am going to be working from is Attachment 5c. 5a and 5b are basically provided to you guys as a record. 5a is what was originally submitted, and then 5b has the comments from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, as well as the SSC, and then 5c is looking at the completion of the negotiations, essentially making sure that we incorporate everybody's ideas into the scopes of work.

What we've done here is -- We'll start off with red porgy as our first one, and just remember these are species for 2025, and we were just talking about 2026 earlier, and 2024, and so just keeping you focused on what year we're in, and it's 2025, looking at red porgy, and we're looking -- The previous assessment was a standard assessment, and the terminal year was 2017. Similar to the language that I had talked about with blueline tilefish and tilefish, provide data through 2024, giving this idea of a minimum standard, and then, if there's more recent information, provide that as well, and it's going to be conducted through the BAM configuration.

Some of the requested updates include any new information and updated information to determine if modifying existing assumptions to life history, discard mortality, and steepness should be updated, and the one thing that I do want to talk about, or have the council talk about, is inclusion of additional information, and so we have the SEFHIER program that's going on right now, and it started in 2020, or 2021, and I can't remember which one, but that would be a new piece of information that could be evaluated, or considered, for red porgy.

There is also -- I think that's the main data stream, and we might need to request updates on how discards are calculated through the commercial fishery as well, and they have used a method, through the logbook reporting, to estimate discards, but there is the new observer program that could potentially be used, and so maybe we need to update how the information is calculated for those two as well and not just focus on only life history, discards, and steepness.

DR. BELCHER: Can you scroll down? I just wanted to see -- So we're talking standard?

DR. COLLIER: This is an operational assessment, is what is being recommended. That was the previous stock assessment, was a standard. We only have the research track and the operational assessments, and those are the two, and this one is proposed as an operational assessment.

DR. BELCHER: So what are folks' thoughts on this? Mel.

MR. BELL: So the question is what else might we include or --

DR. COLLIER: Well, it's not what else might we include, and this is the negotiated items, and then I had overlooked the ability -- The SEFHIER program as potential data source, as well as the commercial, and so I was just wondering if it would be good to include landings and discards through new methods, to incorporate that in there as well.

MR. BELL: So this isn't something -- We had this discussion about regime change. For red porgy, this seems to reek of that.

DR. BELCHER: Yes, and so I'm going to go into my comment, which is kind of similar to yours, but I saw that Andy's hand was up, and then Jessica.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, specific to SEFHIER, I mean, there's certainly, I think, data and information that could be provided, but keep in mind that it's not a certified program at this point. You know, we're running it side-by-side with MRIP, and we're going to have to ultimately generate estimates of catch and abundance, and, ultimately, compare those against MRIP and do some sort of calibration, and so it's worth exploring. Whether or not it can be used or not is to-be-determined, and I think SEDAR can certainly explore that, initially.

MS. MCCAWLEY: This is kind of thinking about the regime shifts, and so isn't there a recruitment issue with red porgy, and did we have a topical working group on gag, on recruitment, and, if we did that on gag, why wouldn't we do it here on red porgy, I guess?

DR. COLLIER: What was recommended by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center was looking at a procedural workshop to address some of the recruitment issues that we're seeing in the snapper grouper fishery, and so that's not necessarily -- It could be a recommendation from this council to do that, and then the other issue about regime shift -- That is one of the things that the catch level workgroup has recommended as something to look into.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Other comments? I know my gut reaction with this too is that, if we have the ability to be flexible under the operational, then I am not going to belabor it, but just the fact that red porgy has been struggling for as long as it has -- It feels like it deserves more love than that, but that's -- I mean, again, we're short-framing that, and I know that because it's 2025 that we're talking about, and we've already talked about it being operational, but -- Again, if the operational is flexible enough, based on the additional workshops and all, then I'm -- You know, I am not going to die on that hill, but I do think it needs -- It would be nice for it to have more scrutiny than an operational. Other comments? Other thoughts?

DR. COLLIER: Before we get done with red porgy, the other discrepancy was the inclusion of a potential schedule, and what I did was I removed anything in regard to a data workshop or anything like that, and so what we're looking at is actually a schedule of events that could be impacted by the council, and so that's what this schedule of events that's listed here is, and, you know, some of it is tentative, especially the due date for the assessment, but we want to keep that in here as a record for you guys, when we expect it, and then potentially when we get it.

DR. BELCHER: So do we need to change -- Where we have is a topical working group needed, should that be changed to something else? I just saw the no on the other one, and so I didn't know if the --

DR. COLLIER: Going down into gag, that has a topical working group, and I probably should have reorganized this to make sure it made some sense here, but we do have a topical working group listed under gag, and it's called the Low Recruitment Topical Working Group. The center recommends that a SEDAR procedural workshop be conducted in 2024 to examine the potential sources of recruitment declines in several reef fish species in the South Atlantic, including gag, scamp, and red porgy.

DR. BELCHER: So maybe we could just copy that language up at the other, where currently it says "no". Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm sorry if this is a dumb question, but is that list -- It says, "including, but not limited to", because I was wondering about red grouper, which I think we've heard a lot of those same issues, and I believe there's something coming up for that, and so I didn't know if that was part of that list of species for the workgroup.

DR. COLLIER: We could definitely add that species as one to note in there. I don't know if this is an exhaustive list, and I think they would go in with several species and looking into it.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so any other further comments or suggestions relative to the scope of work for red porgy? Okay. Seeing none, when you're ready, Chip, we can move down the list.

DR. COLLIER: My thought was we would just approve these all at once. The next species is gag grouper, and the last assessment was SEDAR 71, as an operational assessment, and it had a terminal year through 2019, and similar language for updating the terminal year, making sure we have a minimum, but more data could be added to it. For this one, review any new and updated information and determine if there's consideration for modifying the assumptions, life history, discards, and steepness, and I'm just wondering if we want to do landings and discards in that. For gag grouper, there would be additional information for that species, and do have that citizen science project, Release, and so it might be able to inform some of the size distribution on the released fish.

DR. BELCHER: Any other items that folks can think of?

DR. COLLIER: There is additional information on this one, as far as potential modifications, and one is to include the length composition from the video survey. The video survey does have stereo cameras on there, and so they're going to be able to estimate length of gag grouper, to see what the size selectivity of the traps are, as well as provide that size composition for the stock assessment. The other one is incorporating the catch level recommendations.

There were two topical workgroup recommendations for this, and I do have it highlighted as yes. In the discussion with the Science Center, they said they had indicated potentially. For the SEDAR planners, in order for them to be able to do anything, they have to have a yes or no, and they can't go with a gray area there, and so I went with yes, and it's better to plan for something and then not do it than it is to not plan and be caught unexpectedly.

The big issue is potentially looking at the reproductive dynamics, and it was recommended, in the last stock assessment, to better characterize some of the reproductive dynamics for gag grouper, including sex ratio, maturity schedule, batch fecundity, seasonality, and spawning frequency and sperm limitation. There is an indication that there might not be information available for that, but we would like to at least have it listed in there and be a topical working group, if possible.

An item that was removed from this list was a request to have gag grouper catch level recommendations explored with two different methods. One was looking at the spawning stock biomass with just female biomass included, and then one was looking at female biomass and male biomass, and the reason that this was brought up was, at the last gag grouper assessment in the Gulf, they had done it for both ways.

In the South Atlantic, we typically only do it for -- We do it for the female and male biomass, and the reason that is done is trying to account for that male limitation that has been noted for gag grouper especially, with low percentages, and, if you look at the last SEDAR stock assessment, there is a very low percentage of male biomass in the population, and so it's recommended to just keep it the way it is, with female and male biomass being used to estimate the spawning stock biomass. Then, looking at the potential schedule, it's very similar, going through the time series and hopefully getting the assessment to the SSC in late 2025, or early 2026.

Then the last species on the list is king mackerel, and that was updated through -- King mackerel was the SEDAR 38 update, and the terminal year was 2017-2018, and, once again, provide data through the 2023-2024 fishing year and additional information, as available, and this stock assessment is different from the other two species, where it is done with Stock Synthesis 3, and so it's a little bit different of a model configuration. However, when the two models are done side-by-side, they come up with almost identical catch level recommendations and finding and diagnostics, and so they are very similar stock assessments.

Once again, review any information and update, as warranted, and we can put the landings and discards in here as well, and then this one had a list of items to include. The SSC discussed this stock assessment in a little bit of detail at the last meeting, or when they last reviewed this, and so we have quite a few recommendations for this one. One is to provide means to model projected discards in a manner that relaxes the assumption that discards would increase and decrease in proportion to changes in landings, and so we had some of that discussion already, in regard to your earlier discussion.

There was also a suggestion to explore alternative age references, or age-specific time series, for the SEAMAP fishery-independent survey, and there's a lot of age-zero fish, and age-one fish, that are in there, and potentially changing that index a little bit, to be a little bit more flexible and incorporate some of the different ages. Explore model sensitivity to the exclusion of sub-legal fish observations and explore assumptions regarding size and age of discards and bycatch.

Evaluate sensitivity to the age data and explore alternative parameterizations, such as an inverse age and length key. Explore the high max gradient of the model to describe and implement improvements, as feasible, and then, as feasible, explore the possibility to include sensitivity runs with the FISHstory length data from 1950 to 1970. The reason to include that historic data is this model goes back to 1900 as the start date. Then, finally, incorporate catch level workgroup

recommendations. That's a long list, a very exciting list, and so we have a potential schedule for this, once again coming to you guys in late 2025, or potentially early 2026.

DR. BELCHER: Any comments or revisions on stuff that's in the SOWs, as stands?

DR. COLLIER: Then the final item that we include in here is an appendix, and it has additional and future research recommendations that may not be addressed by the 2025 operational assessments, and this is just a way for me to keep track of things that we included in there, and maybe got moved out, and, that way, we're keeping a record of what's been addressed and the reasons why it couldn't be addressed in the current assessments.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Chip. Okay, and so, with that, any further discussion needed on the statements of work for the species, as proposed for the 2025 assessments? Okay. What we need from the group is to have a motion that we are approving the scopes of work, and so Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I move that we approve the scopes of work for red porgy, gag, and king mackerel in 2025.

DR. BELCHER: Do I have a second for that motion? Tim. Any further discussion? **Any objection to the motion?** Okay. **Seeing none, that motion carries.** With that, we are at the end of the committee meeting. No other business from the group? Okay. With that, we will go ahead and adjourn this committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 8, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By _____ Date _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
April 17, 2023

SAFMC 2023 Mar Council

Attendee Report: Meeting (3/6/23 - 3/10/23)

Report Generated:

03/13/2023 08:45 AM EDT

Webinar ID

199-009-555

Actual Start Date/Time

03/08/2023 07:37 AM EST

Duration

10 hours 6 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended

Yes

Last Name

Addis

First Name

Dustin

Yes

Allen

Shanae

Yes

Bailey

Adam

Yes

Batsavage

00Chris

Yes

Beal

Bob

Yes

Bell

00 Mel

Yes

Berry

James "chip"

Yes

Bianchi

Alan

Yes

Borland

Gary

Yes

Brennan

Ken

Yes

Brouwer

Myra

Yes

Bruger

Catherine

Yes

Bubley

Walter

Yes

Byrd

01Julia

Yes

CONKLIN

00The real CHRIS

Yes

Calay

Shannon

Yes

Cenci

Chris

Yes

Cermak

Bridget

Yes

Chaya

01Cindy

Yes

Christoferson

Jill

Yes

Corbett

Ellie

Yes

Cox

Jack

Yes

Crosson

Scott

Yes

DeFilippi Simpson

Julie

Yes

DeVictor

Rick

Yes

Dixon

Michael

Yes

Dover

Miles

Yes

Dukes

Amy

Yes

Ferguson

Raven

Yes

Fernandes

Glen

Yes

Finch

Margaret

Yes

Fisher

Jeff

Yes

Fitzpatrick

Eric

Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Franco	Dawn
Yes	Franke	Emilie
Yes	Fredrickson	Ivy
Yes	GLOECKNER	DAVID
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Ghosh	Gautam
Yes	Glazier	Edward
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gray	Alisha
Yes	HARRELL	RYAN
Yes	HEMILRIGHT	DEWEY
Yes	Hadley	John
Yes	Harrison	Alana
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Helmey	Judy
Yes	Heyman	William
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Huber	Jeanette
Yes	Hudson	Joseph
Yes	Hull	James
Yes	Iverson	Kim
Yes	Johnson	Ethan
Yes	Kappos	Maria
Yes	Klasnick	01Kelly
Yes	Knowlton	Kathy
Yes	LARKIN	Michael
Yes	LaVine	Britni
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Locke	Charles
Yes	Lowther	Alan
Yes	Marhefka	00Kerry
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Meehan	Sean
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Morales	Harry
Yes	Muffley	Brandon
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Neer	Julie
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	OFarrell	Halie
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Peterson	Benjamin
Yes	Pierce	Brett

Yes	Pitts	Nicole
Yes	Poholek	Ariel
Yes	Ponte	Marisa
Yes	Pope	Scott
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Rathke	David
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Roller	00Tom
Yes	Salmon	Brandi
Yes	Sauls	Beverly
Yes	Sedberry	George
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Smart	Tracey
Yes	Snyder	Dave
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Uchino	Pepper
Yes	Vecchio	Julie
Yes	Walter	John
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	Waters	James
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Williams	Erik
Yes	blough	heather
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	collier	chip
Yes	griner	tim
Yes	hallett	robert
Yes	howell	steve
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sandorf	scott
Yes	thomas	01suz
Yes	vara	mary

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2023 COMMITTEE MEMBERS continued

MACKEREL COBIA

Tom Roller, Chair
Spud Woodward, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
Judy Helmey
Kerry Marhefka
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Mid-Atlantic:
Dewey Hemilright/Skip Feller
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

SEDAR

Carolyn Belcher, Chair ✓
Trish Murphey, Vice Chair ✓
Robert Beal
Mel Bell ✓
Tim Griner ✓
Kerry Marhefka ✓
Jessica McCawley ✓
Andy Strelcheck ✓
Staff contact: Chip Collier

SHRIMP

Laurilee Thompson, Chair
Mel Bell, Vice Chair
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
Jessica McCawley
Trish Murphey
Andy Strelcheck
Spud Woodward
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SNAPPER GROUPER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair
Robert Beal
Carolyn Belcher
Mel Bell
Gary Borland
LT Cameron Box
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
Judy Helmey
Trish Murphey
Tom Roller
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Spud Woodward
Mid-Atlantic:
Dewey Hemilright/Earl "Sonny" Gwin
Staff Contact: Mike Schmidtke

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Chester Brewer, Vice Chair
LT Cameron Box
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Andy Strelcheck
Laurilee Thompson
Staff: Christina Wiegand

Dewey Hemilright

FVTarbaby@embarqmail.com

Michelle Duval

Michelle@mellivoraconsulting.com

Scott Lenox

fishinoc@hotmail.com

Earl "Sonny" Gwin (MD)

sonnygwin@verizon.net

Skip Feller

Sfeller3@verizon.net

Jeff Buckel
Rick DeVictor
Jack McG
Nik Menta
Frank Helies

Roller
Dewey
Laurilee
Judy
Spud

Chester
Gary B.

Samal Ingran
O'Shaughnessy

Thomas Neuman
Monica Smit Brundto

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

John Carmichael ✓
john.carmichael@safmc.net
843-302-8435

Deputy Director - Science

Dr. Chip Collier ✓
chip.collier@safmc.net
843-302-8444

Deputy Director - Management

Myra Brouwer ✓
myra.brouwer@safmc.net
843-302-8436

Citizen Science Program Manager

Julia Byrd ✓
julia.byrd@safmc.net
843-302-8439

Fishery Scientist II

Dr. Mike Schmidtke ✓
mike.schmidtke@safmc.net
843-302-8433

Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya *web*
cindy.chaya@safmc.net
843-571-4370

Communication and Digital Media Specialist

Nicholas Smillie ✓
Nick.Smillie@safmc.net
843-302-8443

Quantitative Fishery Scientist

Dr. Judd Curtis ✓
judd.curtis@safmc.net
843-302-8441

Staff Accountant

Suzanna Thomas ✓
suzanna.thomas@safmc.net
843-571-4368

Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator

John Hadley ✓
john.hadley@safmc.net
843-302-8432

Fishery Social Scientist

Christina Wiegand ✓
christina.wiegand@safmc.net
843-302-8437

Fishery Scientist I

Allie Iberle ✓
Allie.iberle@safmc.net
843-225-8135

Citizen Science Project Manager

Meg Withers ✓
Meg.withers@safmc.net
843-725-7577

Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson ✓
kim.iverson@safmc.net
843-224-7258

SEDAR

SEDAR Program Manager

Dr. Julie Neer *web*
julie.neer@safmc.net
843-302-8438

Administrative Officer Kelly Klasnick ✓

kelly.klasnick@safmc.net
843-763-1050

SEDAR Coordinator

Kathleen Howington *web*
kathleen.howington@safmc.net
843-725-7580

Habitat & Ecosystem Scientist

Roger Pugliese ✓
roger.pugliese@safmc.net
843-302-8434