

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SEDAR COMMITTEE**

**Marina Inn at Grande Dunes  
Myrtle Beach, SC**

**September 13, 2016**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **SEDAR Committee**

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair  
Zack Bowen  
Ben Hartig

Chris Conklin, Vice-Chair  
Mark Brown  
Charlie Phillips

#### **Council Members**

Anna Beckwith  
Doug Haymans  
LTJG Amy Hockenberry  
Chester Brewer  
Jessica McCawley

Tim Griner  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Mel Bell  
Dr. Roy Crabtree

#### **Council Staff:**

Gregg Waugh  
Dr. Brian Chevront  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Chip Collier  
Amber Von Harten  
Myra Brouwer  
Roger Pugliese

John Carmichael  
Mike Collins  
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
John Hadley  
Kim Iverson  
Julie O'Dell  
Julia Byrd

#### **Observers/Participants:**

Dr. Erik Williams  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
ASAC Jeff Radonski  
Rick DeVactor  
Dewey Hemilright  
Dr. Marcel Reichert

Nik Mehta  
Erika Burgess  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Leann Bosarge  
Jocelyn D'Ambrosio  
Tony DiLernia

Other Participants Attached

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Mariana Inn at Grande Dunes, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Tuesday morning, September 13, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I will convene the SEDAR Committee. Just to refresh your memory on the committee members, it's myself, Chris Conklin, Zack Bowen, Mark Brown, Ben Hartig, Charlie Phillips, and Bob Beal, who is our ASMFC representative, who is currently not here right now. Before I turn things over to John, I just want to recognize a couple more of our liaisons. We have Mr. Tony DiLernia here, to my left, from the Mid-Atlantic Management Council. We're very happy to have you here, Tony, and then Madam Chair, Leann Bosarge, from the Gulf Council finally was able to make it through the weather and make it in, and so welcome, Leann. We are happy to have you here.

All right. I am turning things over to John to take us through the SEDAR Committee, but the first order of business is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda stands approved. The next item of business is approval of our minutes from the June 2015 council meeting. Are there any modifications to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes stand approved. Now, the next item of business is the SEDAR Projects Update and John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. I have a couple of projects to bring you up to speed on. Probably first in most people's minds is blueline tilefish. There was an age workshop held on blueline tilefish, and there was a stock ID workshop held on blueline tilefish since we last gathered. In the stock ID workshop, the idea was to look at the differences in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic stocks initially, but they gathered data from blueline tilefish all around, and the conclusion and recommendation of the group was a single stock exists from the Mid-Atlantic through the South Atlantic around Florida up through the west coast of Florida, and so that expanded the range expected for this assessment as a result of that recommendation, which led to the next step, and I am looking at the ages, and consideration of a much broader range, in terms of ages, and potentially bringing in more age samples.

A workshop was held to look at the age situation on these fish, to consider what work needed to be done to get the age structures evaluated and evaluated properly, and the recommendation of that group was actually a lack of confidence in the ability to age those structures to reliably assign age evaluations to the individual otoliths. Part of it went back to some validation work based on bomb radioisotopes, which revealed some discrepancies and potential bias in the age determinations, and so the recommendation of the age workshop came that the assessment should not proceed on an age basis and should not use those age structures, because of the uncertainties, and they have a number of research recommendations that will be coming forth in that report when we get it, the details of what could be necessary to get us to a point of being able to reliably age these critters.

We anticipated the need to bring in more structures as impacting the schedule, as alluded to here in the overview, but it turns out, since that's not going to be necessary, that the schedule can proceed as planned, which is, beginning with late October, some data scoping webinar issues, but a data workshop in January and a review workshop in August, and ideally coming to the South Atlantic's SSC in October and others based on when their SSCs meet.

By expanding this into the Gulf, we needed to reach out to the Gulf Council and give them an opportunity to look at terms of reference and schedule and that sort of thing and make

appointments, and so Julia Byrd, the coordinator, has done that, and the Gulf Council is doing their darnedest to get their SSC to review those materials at a meeting, which I believe is next week, their SSC meeting, and so they're going to do what they can to get that in there and get up to speed with the other councils on this project, and so our hats off to them for the willingness to jump in on the SEDAR 50, blue-line tilefish bandwagon and try to keep things on track.

DR. DUVAL: Are there questions for John about the update on SEDAR 50? I will say the folks over at the NMFS Beaufort Lab were kind enough to let me poke my head into the aging workshop, and, if you have ever looked at otoliths under a microscope -- My really only previous experience was with black sea bass otoliths, which are an entirely different situation compared to these deepwater species, and so I absolutely understand the difficulty in trying to determine an age from those structures, and so no questions for John? Then let's roll right along.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next project underway is the assessment of red grouper. There was a data scoping call, and the assessment is being done now. The plan is to have it reviewed by the SSC in April and then get to the council in June, and we haven't certainly heard anything to the contrary, that that's not on track, and so it looks like things are moving along nicely there. Any questions on that?

DR. DUVAL: All right. Let's keep going.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay. We have a steering committee meeting coming up next week. It will be in Charleston, and so our next order of business is to get guidance from this group on things coming before the steering committee. One of the important things that's coming to the Steering Committee is discussion of the research track proposal, and we've mentioned this a number of times before, and it's been reviewed by the SSC and the council.

It's really a proposal to somewhat change how the SEDAR assessments are categorized and how things like the benchmark are conducted, and so Bonnie had planned to give a presentation on what's called the research track proposal. Since she's been unable to be here, I have Erik Williams on the webinar, and so I will go ahead and turn it over to Erik, and we will get him up here and we will go through this presentation on the research track proposal.

DR. WILLIAMS: I am here to talk about the SEDAR stock assessment proposal for transitioning from basically benchmark, standard, update to research and operational track. The issue at hand is we're not really getting enough throughput. There is always this pressure to produce more stock assessments, and the current SEDAR process is very good at being transparent and thorough, but it's not very timely, and so what we're showing here in this slide is a little bit old data, but, if you combine the FMPs from the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic, there still remains a large portion of unassessed stocks, and there is a strong desire to try and get to those.

Right now, again, this is just a hypothetical table shown here. If we had twenty stock assessment people, we're looking at how many stocks that could be assessed, but, right now, with our current process, the average is really only about one assessment per person per year, and that's just not very efficient. If we look at the number of stocks that we have to assess, we are looking at a gap of five years or more between assessments, and so that's not very timely.

The existing process, which most of you are familiar with, is composed of benchmark, standard, and update stock assessments, the benchmark being the most complete and thorough of the three and the standard allowing some changes and an update being an attempt to try and do as little as possible and get a quick turnaround on the analysis.

The issue there is that the benchmark has caused some problems for us in the last few years. We have data providers that had difficulty meeting deadlines sometimes and results get criticized at the review workshop, but there is nothing we can really do about it at that point, and sometimes it forces sort of a thumbs-up or thumbs-down pronouncement from the review workshop, which is not really ideal. We would like to be able to make the changes the review panel recommends and proceed on.

Also, we have seen, in a lot of recent benchmark assessments, that deadlines often get pushed back and missed, and so that puts things under a crunch, and sometimes we don't get to do all the steps that we would have liked to have done, and so that's been creating some issues. Then there's just this notion that the word "benchmark" implies a better assessment, and so I think that has kind of pushed this desire to have more benchmarks than standards or updates or maybe do another benchmark for a species when it may not be necessary.

Again, standard, the issue there is it's just been criticized because they like a benchmark better, and the same goes for updates, and so there's been this pressure to do more updates, but the updates come at a cost of time and even efficiency, in some ways.

The proposed change is to go to this structure where we transition to two categories of assessments, research cycle and operational assessment. The big difference is that the research cycle would not provide immediate management advice, and so it's not under a time crunch, but it would still remain a thorough analysis of the tool that we're trying to use or the stock that we're trying to assess, and then, once that's done, that assessment or that species would move into an operational assessment, and that's designed to be more or less like a combination of our standard and update, but hopefully more like our updates right now, where we've developed the techniques thoroughly through a research cycle and all we're really doing is updating data sources and rerunning the model and hopefully producing a quick, and perhaps even shorter, report that gets us into a more timely situation, where we're providing more timely updates on the assessments.

Again, I started to talk about this, but some of the key features of the research cycle is it doesn't necessarily need to focus on a single species. The whole idea is to actually review assessment approaches and develop the tools that we then want to apply to certain species and make sure we have vetted them, that we've simulated them, if we have to, that we've tried many configurations, and to get these things to the point where we're comfortable and confident that we can just plug data into them and we're going to get robust results.

The research cycle would still allow plenty of transparency and input. We would involve external participants, and we would still run it through a CIE review, and so nothing is being lost in that aspect, but the key feature is that we're not putting it under a time crunch. Therefore, hopefully, it allows us to be more thorough in the analysis and getting this thing set up, so that it then can be run more routinely in the operational phase.

Again, the operational assessment, the idea there is to provide that timely management advice, and hopefully we can get these things down to a quick turnaround, so that we can do multiple ones per person in a year, maybe as many as two per person per year, which would essentially almost double our assessment output at this point, and so that's the goal.

Again, the way we're going to achieve that is hopefully get these things set up in a way that we're all comfortable with, and then we just plug in the latest data and rerun the model and hopefully have a standardized report that we can generate out of this and this thing will hopefully then become a lot more routine. Even the council and the SSC will become, hopefully, more comfortable with the format that everything is being pushed to them in and be able to look at these documents and see exactly the output they're looking for and hopefully just speed up the whole process.

Again, I think this is just reiterating -- I'm sorry if I'm going a little off topic, but I'm just kind of not following the slides exactly, and hopefully you guys have read through them, but, again, this is the whole idea here is really to try and gain some efficiency in the way we're doing assessments and hopefully improve timeliness and throughput.

Again, this is just an example of how it might work. This is a hypothetical example, and so let's look at if we have five analysts here, how might we structure these operational and research assessments, and, below, you can kind of see a two-year timeline.

Under this scenario, we would be able to complete three research track assessments and ten operational assessments, whereas, under the normal system, where we're only getting one per person per year, we would probably only get ten assessments out of that, and I'm not sure how many benchmarks would be included in that, but, again, the advantage here is if we dial down on the number of research track assessments we do over a time period, we can obviously fill that time with more operational assessments. The idea here is hopefully to get to a point where we are judiciously using these research track cycles to set things up appropriately and focus mostly on getting these assessments into an operational mode, where we can just keep crunching through them.

Why are we making this change now? Well, we're getting close to SEDAR 60, and that's a lot of assessments under our belt, so to speak. I think it's time that we start to step back and learn from the knowledge we've gained and the experience we've gained from doing sixty SEDARs. Hopefully we have gained enough experience that we can start to be more efficient with the way we're doing things.

The other reason is, thinking really long term, where do we want to be in twenty years? It's probably not unreasonable to think that we should shoot for the goal of having annual population estimates for every managed stock. Maybe it's not achievable, but maybe that should at least be our goal, and so I think this is one of the steps in that direction. I think that's my last slide. I will take any questions.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any questions for Dr. Williams about the operational assessments versus the research cycle?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Erik, I have a question. Benchmarks, as we know them today, that word sort of goes away, and the research cycle assessments, if you will, or the research cycle whatever we're calling that would inform then either a standard or an update, through this operational cycle, because those would be the two kinds of assessments we would be doing, standard or update?

DR. WILLIAMS: No, we would do away with standard and update. Standard and update would then become, essentially, operational. We would have just two categories. We would either run a species through the research cycle or we would be doing an operational assessment.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, and then the kind of operational assessment that would be done would just depend on the facts and the information you have at hand?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes, and, essentially, it's like our update assessments now. You essentially have a functioning model in place. Either it's been through the process enough times or we have run it through one of these research cycles, and the idea is all we need to do with those is update the time series of data and we rerun the model. Really, the research cycle is probably going to be reserved mostly for new stocks and for maybe major changes, and it doesn't even have to be stock-associated.

Let's say we have a new data source coming online that's going to be applied to probably multiple stocks. We could run that dataset through the research cycle to determine the best way to incorporate it into our existing stock assessments. The research cycle would come up with the recommendation to get reviewed and determine how to best fold that data into the existing assessments, and then the next operational cycle for those assessments would just fold that data in and proceed on.

DR. DUVAL: Other questions?

MR. HARTIG: Thanks, Erik. I appreciate that. Where are the stakeholders going to be involved? I see, under operational, there is an advisory body comprised of scientists and stakeholders with local expertise, and how do you see that working and how -- Is it going to be kind of like a data workshop or not?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes, and, in fact, it may be multiple data workshops, but, yes, the research cycle phase is where we see all the input and stakeholders and all of that involvement coming in. That's going to have the highest input and transparency, is in that process.

Much like our updates are now, the updates now are more or less just being run by the Center and then reviewed by the SSC, and we kind of envision the operational assessments sort of falling into that same category, where it would just be the analysts rerunning the model and then the data would come before the SSC for review, which actually I should mention that one of the SSC comments, when they looked at this, was they were concerned, because they are the only review body then for a lot of these operational assessments. If we really start ramping it up, it's going to put a burden on the SSC, and I can't disagree with their concerns.

MR. BOWEN: Erik, thank you so much for the presentation. I have a couple of questions and a statement. You mentioned in here about the five lead analysts, assessment analysts. Do we have that many now or is that something that we need to beef up?

DR. WILLIAMS: No, we don't. I think we have about four, and that fluctuates, depending on staff that are coming and going, and also depending on other workloads that may impact, but, roughly, we've been around four for the last two years for the South Atlantic. I can't speak for the Gulf.

MR. BOWEN: Is there a desire or are we looking for another lead analyst, so we can fit what we're trying to do here?

DR. WILLIAMS: That's a conversation probably above my pay grade.

MR. BOWEN: Then kind of a second thing, a statement, is I really like the goal of annual population estimates. That is something really to strive for, but is there or have we considered -- I think a problem stems in the SEDAR assessment process now where our constituents or stakeholders lack the faith that the SEDAR process is accurate, and so, with the goal of having annual population estimates, is there also a goal of trying to build faith in the system for our stakeholders?

DR. WILLIAMS: That's an interesting question, and it gets into how do you best build that faith, and one way we've tried to is to put these things through a review. That doesn't necessarily buy a lot of faith in this, but it at least hopefully provides some confidence that what we're doing is meeting the standard for the field of fisheries science, but I would hope maybe, and this is where, again, like you mentioned, getting to these annual estimates or getting to more repeated analyses, the faith might get built in what the stock assessments are saying will start to mimic what we're seeing on the water a little better.

With more updates, hopefully it will be recognized that, yes, the models have their ups and downs, because there is error in those models, but hopefully, over the long trend, we will start to see that, yes, these models are actually picking up on the real trends that people are seeing on the water. That's the hope, is time will tell. Sort of what we're hamstrung with right now is we don't get enough repeated measures from the models to verify what we're seeing on the water.

If we start doing more of them, hopefully we can see, over time, the behavior of the models, and maybe we'll even see where there are ones that are clearly off the mark. If we see enough of that, we'll all have to step back and say, wait, there is something wrong here and kick it back to research or start to look into it more, to figure out why is this assessment telling us something that's just so different from what the perception is.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, sir, and I appreciate it, and I appreciate what you do. Thank you.

MR. WAUGH: In terms of the South Atlantic evaluating this, if you look at page 11, Slide 11, this example here, assuming that you all get up to five analysts, then this could be the expected work output that the council could expect under this new approach for our stocks? Is that a way to interpret this?

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes, it's kind of our best guess at what we might expect to see from this. There is a chance that actually these operational assessments might even take less time than what we're proposing here. I don't know, but it's just a matter of seeing how things go. One of the obvious concerns that comes out of this right away is, if we're going to start doing that many assessments,

is the data providers are going to start to become the next bottleneck. They already are, in some ways, but certainly if we start ramping up the schedule with this many, then the data providers are going to become the next bottleneck, but that's kind of the nature of the beast. There is always going to be some bottleneck somewhere, and we've got to try and balance the whole system as best we can.

MR. BELL: You actually answered one of my questions. I was kind of looking for -- We certainly have been arguing for increased output, increased output, and this is great, but then, under this new model here, where are the bottlenecks? You mentioned one, that certainly the data providers and all the people at the frontend of this, and then you mentioned the SSC having to then deal with reviewing all of these. Then let's take it a step further. Imagine a world where we've got annual updates on things, and then there's the actions that we as a council might feel we need to take. Increased input is certainly welcome, but we do need to be mindful of these other potential bottlenecks and things that we have to manage, but this is great.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other questions for Erik?

MR. HARTIG: Erik, how about management strategy evaluations? Are you guys going to do more of those or are any of those coming up? I think you've got some people working on some right now.

DR. WILLIAMS: Yes, and that's sort of been an independent sort of research path that's been sort of paralleling our assessments, is probably the best way to put it. We have staff that are actively doing MSE analyses, and, most recently, we just advertised a full-time position for the Center to coordinate MSE analyses throughout the Center, and so there is clearly a commitment to doing MSE analyses, and I think we'll see a lot more of those coming out. Then perhaps we'll get to the point where we can seek out some advice from the SSC or the council in terms of which types of MSEs might be more valuable for us to do to provide you guys timely information.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Are there other questions or comments on the research track proposal? This is going to be discussed at the SEDAR Steering Committee next week with all the rest of the cooperators, and so, John, I assume that what we're looking for here is a measure of support for this type of approach that we could carry forward to the Steering Committee or, if there were any particular concerns or questions, that we get those laid out right here, so that those can be brought forward to the Steering Committee next week as well.

I think what I'm hearing around the table is support for the goal of annual population assessments and for greater throughput. I think maybe a couple of the concerns I heard that we want to make sure are expressed is that the public still has the opportunity to participate in this, particularly during the research track phase, so that any and all questions with regard to the data sources, the data quality, questions about model use or whatever, would all be brought forward at that time, so that there's still that public participation in the process. Would those be accurate? I am not seeing anybody shaking their head.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I had a question about how state staff from the various state fish and wildlife agencies are going to be used, and I guess I have a concern that there would be a bigger



time commitment with this methodology than with the former methodology, and so I'm wondering about that. Also, since FWRI, or FWC, had been completing a number of stock assessments on our own and then putting them through the process, I am kind of wondering how those assessments are going to fit in here.

DR. DUVAL: Erik, is that something you could address or John, one of you?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I can address it from what the Steering Committee has discussed so far, and this would be intended to be applied to the assessments done through the Center and not to the assessments done through other partners. It's not clear if this approach would be applied to the shark assessments that they do or to the commission assessments, whether they're Gulf States or Atlantic States, both of which have their own process. The idea would be, since SEDAR provides a peer review of the Florida assessments, then we would continue to do that and you wouldn't be bound by this approach.

DR. DUVAL: I think Jessica's second question was the participation of state agency staff in this process. I think Erik touched on that with regard to data providers, because we have state agency staff that are providing commercial landings information. We often have our recreational statistics staff who are there as well, even though there are MRIP staff, as SEDAR exists right now, at the data workshop. Erik, do you have any thoughts on that or have you all discussed the burden on state agency staff?

DR. WILLIAMS: We've talked about a little bit. I think, in many ways, it wouldn't be much different than their involvement now. In benchmark processes, they're involved at the various workshop stages, and I think they would still contribute in that way to the research cycle, and it's just a matter of whether some of the stocks that they typically work on -- If we have operationalized that model, then they would just fall into that operational mode, and, in many ways, it probably would make things more efficient for their staff, like we're hoping it will for our staff, doing those operational assessments.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that. Any other comments or questions about the research track proposal? John, do you require anything else from the committee? Would you like a motion that there is support for the research track proposal going forward?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I think the discussion we've had has been good. It's just a chance for you guys to ask any questions of Erik, as the Center representative on it, which we've done, and it will be talked about at the Steering Committee, which rolls into sort of the next stuff we're doing.

If you look at Table 2 in your overview, where it shows the schedule, the S/RT stands for the scamp research track assessment, and the idea is to do that with the Gulf and South Atlantic together, to do the research track pilot in 2018 with the assessment of scamp.

Then, at that point, once it's done, to get together with representatives from all the cooperators of SEDAR and evaluate that in probably an assessment best practices type of workshop and evaluate that research track process and decide what works well and what maybe needs to be modified a bit and come up with the guidelines for SEDAR that would apply and modify what we have now to reflect this research track approach. We're going to try it here coming up in a little over a year.

Then, once it's done, we'll evaluate it. I think, at that point, we'll certainly have more discussions about the particulars. Here today, having just support to move forward with that is good.

DR. DUVAL: Okay. If there is no more discussion or comments on this topic, then we can roll right into the next item, which is really our priority, and so I think John will pull up the overview again.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The other big issue at the Steering Committee -- We're going to talk about the process and the research track, and they will get reports on the various activities that SEDAR has been working on, but the other big issue that we always deal with in the fall is establishing the assessment schedule.

This being the fall of 2016, we're hoping to finalize the assessment schedule for 2018, and there is a few things that are maybe up in the air a bit in terms of 2017 that actually need to be talked about, and so, when the Steering Committee gets together next week, each council has a list of requests and priorities that they would like to see done.

The South Atlantic, in Table 2, you see -- The things that are in black are the ones that are on the Steering Committee list and have been approved by the Steering Committee to be done. The items that are in red are the items that you guys added to the schedule back in June. At this point, we don't know the Science Center's ability to deal with some of those, such as cobia, the black sea bass standard, and filling in the blanks like greater amberjack and red porgy and all of that.

A lot of discussion at the Steering Committee is going to center around what can be done here in 2018, what are the priorities looking farther down the road, and whether or not say the black sea bass assessment can be done in 2017. We had hoped that Bonnie would be here to give you guys some feedback, in terms of what the Science Center can do, in case there was a need for you to clarify your needs and your priorities, perhaps, and I don't know if Erik is in a position to talk on any of that at all or to address any of your questions about that.

DR. WILLIAMS: About the only thing I can say is we are looking hard at actually folding in that black sea bass assessment, and we think it may actually work out. We maybe just have to shift the timing a little on that, and possibly vermilion snapper, but I think we're going to be able to fold in black sea bass. That's probably about all I can say at this point.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that's helpful. That was one of the biggest short-term questions, certainly.

DR. DUVAL: I think, at this point, any other input from the committee with regard to the priorities that you see on the chart that are in red -- We had expressed concern about the declining indices on black sea bass, and so that's why that's in there, and I think it's listed as a standard to potentially be able to use the CVID index, and is that my understanding?

Then a red porgy standard in 2018 and greater amberjack standard in 2018, and, of course, a cobia benchmark that would follow after the stock ID workshop, which we have requested cobia be included for, and it's my understanding that we'll be talking about that stock ID workshop next week as well.

MS. BECKWITH: I just feel the need to continue to speak my reservations to having a cobia assessment in 2018. I think, with the overage in 2015, and we don't know what has happened with 2016, and with new management coming into place, I don't have high hopes for that assessment going well, and I guess my preference would be to stabilize the fishery a bit before we went into an assessment, but those apparently are just my personal reservations.

DR. DUVAL: I think those points are well taken, Anna. I think it's balancing perhaps stabilizing the fishery and some of the management changes that we're going to be considering in a couple of days along with I think the stakeholder input that we're getting with regard to reexamination of that stock ID boundary and then following up on whatever the outcome of that stock ID workshop is, because my sense is that stakeholders are going to want to see something, follow-up, on that in short order, whether that boundary changes or not. If the boundary changes, they're going to want to see a new assessment. If the boundary doesn't change, they're likely going to want to see a new assessment, simply based on six, or, at that point, seven additional years of information.

Any other input on assessment priorities? Okay. I am not seeing. I think that was our last agenda item, if I am correct, and one item under Other Business, or does this have to do with assessment priorities?

MR. WAUGH: Just one question for us here. If you look at 2019, there is quite a bit of space without any species identified in there, and do we have anything that you want to give us direction on to approach Bonnie with next week or do we have everything on the list, going through 2020, and we're happy with what's there?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think one way to look at is are there any stocks that someone can think of that you don't see listed in this table that hasn't been assessed in 2014 or 2015 or maybe even needs an update or anything that you see as like when are we going to consider that one, because that would be good to get out there as a potential for 2019 and beyond.

DR. DUVAL: SEDAR 38 was king mackerel, and the terminal year of data in that assessment was 2012?

MR. CARMICHAEL: King mackerel, the plan the Center proposed is to do an assessment in 2018, and that's sort of set aside of the Beaufort group, because there is a separate team that has done the king mackerel assessments in the past, and they actually have hopes at that time to bring in Mexican data, which will be a first for this stock. It's very important, because the landings could be greater than what they are even in the U.S., perhaps.

DR. DUVAL: That's right. I had forgotten about that. Thank you for that reminder.

MR. CONKLIN: What about with the recent reduction of the golden tilefish and starting that benchmark at the midpoint of 2019 instead of 2020, just bumping it up earlier and creating some space in the latter part of 2020?

MR. CARMICHAEL: So potentially doing tilefish sooner, if possible?

MR. CONKLIN: That's correct.

DR. DUVAL: I am not seeing any negative shakes of the head around the table, and so it sounds like folks are supportive of suggesting that golden tilefish be moved up for a benchmark. If there is anything else that comes to mind between now and Full Council, I would say come see John or I, and we can make sure that that gets in there. Is there any other business to come before the SEDAR Committee? Seeing none, the committee will adjourn.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 13, 2016.)

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By:  
Amanda Thomas  
October 12, 2016

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2016 COMMITTEES (continued)**

**INFORMATION & EDUCATION**

Mark Brown, Chair  
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chester Brewer  
Michelle Duval  
LT Tara Pray  
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**

Mel Bell, Chair  
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Zack Bowen  
Ben Hartig  
LT Tara Pray  
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

**MACKEREL COBIA**

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Mel Bell  
Zack Bowen  
Chris Conklin  
Roy Crabtree  
Doug Haymans  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Rob O'Reilly  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Dewey Hemilright/  
Tony DeLernia  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

**PERSONNEL**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair  
Mel Bell  
Ben Hartig  
Doug Haymans  
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

**PROTECTED RESOURCES**

Wilson Laney, Chair  
Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair  
Mark Brown  
Zack Bowen  
Michelle Duval  
LT Tara Pray  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Chip Collier

**SSC SELECTION**

Charlie Phillips, Chair  
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair  
Chris Conklin  
Chester Brewer  
Roy Crabtree  
Michelle Duval  
Staff contact: John Carmichael

**SEDAR**

✓Michelle Duval, Chair  
✓Chris Conklin, Vice-Chair  
✓Zack Bowen  
✓Mark Brown  
✓Ben Hartig  
✓Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: John Carmichael

**SHRIMP**

Charlie Phillips, Chair  
Mel Bell, Vice-Chair  
Roy Crabtree  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Chip Collier

*(Continued)*

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP**

**COUNCIL CHAIR**

Dr. Michelle Duval  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
3441 Arendell Street  
(PO Box 769)  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/808-8011 (ph);  
252/726-0254 (f)  
[michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov](mailto:michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov)

**VICE-CHAIR**

Charlie Phillips  
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms  
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.  
Townsend, GA 31331  
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)  
[Ga\\_capt@yahoo.com](mailto:Ga_capt@yahoo.com)

---

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

Anna Beckwith  
1907 Paulette Road  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/671-3474 (ph)  
[AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com](mailto:AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com)

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

Zack Bowen  
P.O. Box 30825  
Savannah, GA 31410  
912/398-3733 (ph)  
[fishzack@comcast.net](mailto:fishzack@comcast.net)

W. Chester Brewer  
250 Australian Ave. South  
Suite 1400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33408  
561/655-4777 (ph)  
[WCBLAW@aol.com](mailto:WCBLAW@aol.com)

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

Chris Conklin  
P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
843/543-3833  
[conklinsafmc@gmail.com](mailto:conklinsafmc@gmail.com)

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

Tim Griner  
4446 Woodlark Lane  
Charlotte, NC 28211  
980/722-0918 (ph)  
[timgrinersafmc@gmail.com](mailto:timgrinersafmc@gmail.com)

Ben Hartig  
9277 Sharon Street  
Hobe Sound, FL 33455  
772/546-1541 (ph)  
[mackattackben@att.net](mailto:mackattackben@att.net)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

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

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

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

✓ ~~LT Tara Pray~~ LTJG Amy HOCKENBERRY  
U.S. Coast Guard  
909 SE 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.  
Miami, FL 33131  
305/415-6765 (ph)  
[tara.c.pray@uscg.mil](mailto:tara.c.pray@uscg.mil)

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

DR. ERIK WILLIAMS  
RECK DEVICTOR  
NIK MEHTA  
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO  
ERIKA BURGESS  
LEANN BOSARGE  
DEWEY HEMELRIGHT  
DR. JACK MCGOVERN  
ASAC JEFF RADONSKI  
DR. MARCEL REICHERT  
JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO  
TONY DILERNIA

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**COUNCIL STAFF**

**Executive Director**

✓ Gregg T. Waugh  
[gregg.waugh@safmc.net](mailto:gregg.waugh@safmc.net)

**Deputy Director – Science & Statistics**

✓ John Carmichael  
[john.carmichael@safmc.net](mailto:john.carmichael@safmc.net)

**Deputy Director - Management**

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront  
[brian.chevront@safmc.net](mailto:brian.chevront@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

✓ Myra Brouwer  
[myra.brouwer@safmc.net](mailto:myra.brouwer@safmc.net)

**Public Information Officer**

✓ Kim Iverson  
[kim.iverson@safmc.net](mailto:kim.iverson@safmc.net)

**Financial Secretary**

Debra Buscher  
[deb.buscher@safmc.net](mailto:deb.buscher@safmc.net)

**Fisheries Social Scientist**

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
[kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net](mailto:kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net)

**Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
[cindy.chaya@safmc.net](mailto:cindy.chaya@safmc.net)

**Purchasing & Grants**

✓ Julie O'Dell  
[Julie.Odell@safmc.net](mailto:Julie.Odell@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

✓ Chip Collier  
[chip.collier@safmc.net](mailto:chip.collier@safmc.net)

**Senior Fishery Biologist**

✓ Roger Pugliese  
[roger.pugliese@safmc.net](mailto:roger.pugliese@safmc.net)

**Administrative Officer**

✓ Mike Collins  
[mike.collins@safmc.net](mailto:mike.collins@safmc.net)

**Fishery Outreach Specialist**

✓ Amber Von Harten  
[amber.vonharten@safmc.net](mailto:amber.vonharten@safmc.net)

**Fishery Biologist**

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo  
[mike.errigo@safmc.net](mailto:mike.errigo@safmc.net)

**SEDAR Coordinators**

Dr. Julie Neer - [julie.neer@safmc.net](mailto:julie.neer@safmc.net)  
✓ Julia Byrd - [julia.byrd@safmc.net](mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net)

**Fishery Economist**

✓ John Hadley  
[John.hadley@safmc.net](mailto:John.hadley@safmc.net)



Timestamp	Full Name	Email	Mailing Address (if your address is already on file, just type "on file")	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)
9/13/2016 11:19:53	Rusty Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com	On file	Fisheries Consultant
9/13/2016 11:45:12	Lora Clarke	ldlarke@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 11:45:58	Yasmin Velez	yvelez@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 11:47:16	Dean Foster	dean@pewtrusts.com	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 11:48:16	Alison Johnson	aljohnson@oceanana.org	On file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 13:03:33	Tim Sartwell	tim.sartwell@noaa.gov	on file	NMFS
9/13/2016 13:06:44	Leda Dummire	ldummire@pewtrusts.org	205 Taylor Lane Morehead City, NC 28557	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 13:12:41	Roy and Dianne Poston	royselectricreels@gmail.com	2623 Pheasant Ct W St Johns, FL 32259	Private Recreational Angler
9/13/2016 13:15:30	gary zurn	gzurn@bigrocksports.com	on file	Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer
9/13/2016 13:18:35	Gary Jennings	gjennings@asafishing.org	6514 Sawyer Shores Lane, Windermere, FL 34786	Private Recreational Angler
9/13/2016 13:20:48	John O'Hern	johncohern1@gmail.com	2731 Euston Road Winter Park, FL 32789	Fishery Observer
9/13/2016 13:32:53	David Bush	davidbush@ncfish.org	on file	NCFA
9/13/2016 14:03:04	Robert Lorenz	rlorenz@ec.rr.com	On file	Private Recreational Angler
9/13/2016 14:11:44	Scott Whitaker	swhitaker@ccasouthcarolina.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler, Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 14:24:01	Bill Kelly	fkcfat1@hotmail.com	On file	Commerical fishing representative
9/13/2016 14:53:23	Trip Aukeman	taukeman@ccafflorida.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 15:22:24	Holly Binns	hbinns@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/13/2016 17:23:12	Kenny Moore	kennmoore@coastalanglermagazine.com	on file	Private Recreational Angler, Press

TUESDAY 9/13/16

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Ashton	Brandon	bcashton@gmail.com
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Cheshire	Rob	rob.cheshire@noaa.gov
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net
Helies	Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Hull	James	hullsseafood@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Kemp	Brian	kempbrian6971@gmail.com
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Larkin	Michael	michael.larkin@noaa.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov
Lindh	Ryan	nativetrade@bellsouth.net
Mahood	Bob	rmahood@mindspring.com
Martin	Gretchen	gbmartin71@gmail.com
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Siegfried	Katie	kate.siegfried@noaa.gov
Smith	Hanah	hsmith@ccasouthcarolina.com
Spanik	Kevin	spanikk@dnr.sc.gov
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Walia	Matthew	matthew.walia@noaa.gov

Whittington	Jim	Jim.Whittington@myfwc.com
Williams	Erik	erik.williams@noaa.gov
bubley	walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov
colby	barrett	bcolby3@cfl.rr.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
malinowski	rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
rios	adyan	adyan.rios@noaa.gov
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov