

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SEDAR COMMITTEE**

**Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel  
Wilmington, NC**

**December 3, 2013**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **SEDAR Committee**

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Jack Cox  
Charlie Phillips

Zack Bowen  
Dr. Michelle Duval

#### **Council Members**

Mel Bell  
Anna Beckwith  
John Jolley  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Chris Conklin

Jessica McCawley  
Lt. Morgan Fowler  
Charlie Phillips  
Doug Haymans  
Dr. Roy Crabtree

#### **Council Staff:**

Bob Mahood  
John Carmichael  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Anna Martin  
Amber Von Harten  
Roger Pugliese  
Myra Brouwer

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

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

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Dr. Luiz Barbieri  
Pres Pate  
Phil Steele  
Otha Easley  
Rich Chesler

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. George Sedberry  
Dr. Marcel Reichart  
Doug Boyd  
Dr. Michael Larkin  
Chip Collier

Other Participants Attached

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Cape Fear Ballroom of the Hilton Wilmington Riverside Hotel, Wilmington, North Carolina, December 3, 2013, and was called to order at 10:05 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: I want to call the SEDAR Committee to order. The first item of business is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions to the agenda? Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved. Next on our agenda is approval of the minutes. Are there any deletions, corrections or changes to the minutes? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Not a correction to the minutes but actually an opportunity to talk a little bit about National Standard 2 relative to the SEDAR protocols. It is simply a discussion on a requirement to document whether the SEDAR procedures meet the peer review standards as lined out in the revised National Standard 2 Guidelines.

MR. HARTIG: We will add that to the agenda. Any objection to approving the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us to SEDAR Activities Update; John Carmichael.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Following our normal protocol just to bring you up to date on what has been going on with SEDAR on the South Atlantic assessments; things that are noted there is that the blueline tilefish assessment was completed through SEDAR 32. That was reviewed by the SSC in October; and you'll be seeing the findings from that during the SSC Report coming up in snapper grouper.

SEDAR 36 was snowy grouper. This was a standard assessment. This was not reviewed by the SSC in October because no one was there to make a presentation of that. Just to refresh everyone's memory in the case of a standard assessment, the SSC provides the peer review. No one was there to make a presentation on blueline, but that is done through the peer review panel.

An SSC member is the chair of that; and the SSC member who chaired that walked the SSC through that assessment and highlighted some issues to us to handle that in that case. But 36 being a standard is a little bit different; and the SSC wasn't comfortable with moving ahead without having the ability for some interaction between them and folks who worked on the assessment in a face-to-face manner.

We will talk about that under Action Item 5 later about that situation. I know Ben had some things to say on that. The next one is Florida completing mutton snapper. Our plan is that this will be reviewed by the SSC in April. We thought we might look at that at the last SSC meeting but weren't able to. Another Florida assessment is hogfish. They're expecting to have that done in June; so the SSC will get that in October; and then you will get your recommendations in December.

The last thing that has been going on is the steering committee met October 1<sup>st</sup> through 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unfortunately, this fell during the federal government shutdown so none of our federal partners were there; in particular our Chair, Dr. Ponwith, and our regional office representative, Roy.

That led to the committee having the meeting but really just having discussions and coming up with some position statements but not considering them final actions until we can have a meeting of that group over a conference call to final everything that was discussed.

However, we have a lot of new faces on there due to turnover in the chairs and turnover in some of the council staff; so it was a good opportunity for those who could make it to have some good discussions about the SEDAR process and bring a lot of our new individuals up to speed in some of the more intricate protocols that we have and procedures that we follow for doing things like scheduling stock assessments and just dealing with its overall process.

We had a good discussion about a topic that we've mentioned a few times about changing the assessment workshop process and really making that more efficient and productive for all parties. There was a lot of support at the steering committee just as there was here at this committee back in September when we talked about coming up with some better ways of getting the analysts and the other technical representatives and the fishermen to be able to communicate about the issues of the assessments and solve some of these problems that come up and get the kind of feedback that the analysts need from those who are out there on the water; just to make that work better.

We have a lot of issues there we're going to have to work through; and this will be a developing process probably over the next year as we try to find the best way to make this happen; but everybody seems on board with recognizing that we have is very cumbersome and not really achieving some of our objectives in terms of getting participation and feedback and we're going to look at doing something different.

The next item is just to refresh you on the assessment projects. You made some recommended changes in September; and we were able to get those approved. We did a steering committee poll over e-mail before the closure and got those schedule changes that were discussed for 2013 and 2014, some of the shifts accomplished for all the councils, so that was good. What you see here in Table 1 is what we're looking for in the South Atlantic for the next couple of years in terms of stock assessments being completed. That concludes that section, Mr. Chair.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions on SEDAR activities, the assessment schedule changes and what the SSC did as far as those assessments? Seeing none; we will move into assessment planning and priorities.

MR. CARMICHAEL: This is the continuation of a topic we discussed in September. Remember we had the document to try to lay out a forward-looking, long-term plan for assessing our stocks on a regular schedule. We took this to the SSC for comment. It was well received by them; and I think they appreciated the effort to try and come up with a long-term look at how we plan our assessments and not be so much reacting to the situations as they develop.

They gave us some good feedback; one being that they thought five years between assessments was really too much. They brought up the idea of the terminal years that we deal with and the uncertainties and the fact that projections tend to fall apart as you look forward because we

simply don't know how many fish are going to be born; and they really thought that five years was stretching it and they would like to see that shortened.

They thought there were a lot of ways that we may be able to increase efficiency. Things that are listed there that they discussed are like species groupings; making wise groupings of species that get assessed together on a particular project; considering timing on a stock-by-stock basis; looking more into these data-poor methods; considering what are really the choke species that might be top priority.

What they would like to do is hold a workshop prior to I think it was our October meeting we talked about and try to really get into this in some detail and try to figure out what is a good way to – actually I guess we're going to do that earlier actually and try to have it in June – but try to come up with a real cohesive plan that lays out the next few years in terms of what gets assessed when and what the regular schedule is.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We had thought about going forward with the SSC giving some recommendations on that schedule and maybe approving that at this meeting. We'll be a little slower than that. We will probably try to do that in June just because the SSC wants to dig into that in some detail, which I think will be helpful, and we should get some good feedback from them.

What we'd be looking for in terms of some discussion from this group is do you support the SSC's request that they hold a workshop to dig into this in some detail; and then what are your thoughts on the workshop topics, which are the bulleted things under Number 4, and do you support those or do you have some other things to add to that list.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; I definitely support the SSC's request for a workshop; and I think even more so considering some of the presentations that the SSC received regarding management strategy evaluation of different data-poor methods and just thinking about some of the assessments that have come through lately.

I think I'm thinking specifically of blueline tilefish. We have different levels of stocks; and even SEDAR 32 for blueline was a Level 1 stock assessment, that is the same kind of Level 1 stock assessment as what we have for black sea bass. I'm hoping that a workshop such as this could help to hammer out some of those issues and particularly taking a more holistic look at the species for which some of these other data-poor methods could be applied.

Perhaps that would help us be a little bit more efficient with our SEDAR resources and with the analysts' time, quite frankly, as well as all the other folks who participate in assessments; state agency staff and whatnot. I am fully supportive of having that kind of workshop so that we can just make better use of resources that are not getting any bigger.

MR. HARTIG: I agree; and do we need a motion, John? It is an action item –

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes; I think that certainly wouldn't hurt.

**DR. DUVAL:** Well, then I move that the council support the SSC's request to devote a workshop to assessment planning in 2014.

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; seconded by Charlie. Discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? **Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: Is there anything to add to the list of workshop topics? That's the bulleted items under Number 4.

DR. PONWITH: I think the topics are really smart ones and certainly are issues that would come into decisions about not only a given year but also sort of the long-range planning on discussing periodicity.

The NOAA Fisheries Science Board is having similar discussions about how we set priorities for research cruises and for stock assessments; creating a series of criteria for kind of helping to make those decisions, things like vulnerability of the stock, how dynamic the population is and how stable or not stable the management measures are and things like that to help make decisions since the demand always outstrips the ability to supply those. I'd certainly be willing to share the documentation that has jelled by the time this workshop comes up to help in those discussions.

MR. HARTIG: Thank you very much; that would be very productive. Is there anything else?

DR. DUVAL: This just came to mind and may be more in the purview of the data workshop folks or the assessment workshop folks – and, obviously, we have had a lot of discussion about trying to modify those procedures to allow for more productive interaction between participants in the assessment and making the best use of those resources as well; but I was thinking of is there some kind of decision tree or something that would help inform the type of model that is used.

I'm thinking we have sort of our Cadillac, which is the Beaufort Assessment Model, which requires a lot of inputs; and we don't always have as much information as we would like to meet the level of inputs. Then we have a lot of these other data-poor methods that are being considered more and more.

I just don't know if that's an appropriate topic for the SSC to consider at this workshop since those decisions tend to be made I think at the data workshop or assessment workshop level in terms of what might be the most appropriate model given the information that you have. I just throw it out there while we're talking about this.

DR. PONWITH: It is an interesting point because you're right in your reflection on that; that the model that is used tends to be the most sophisticated model that is supported by the data. It is a data-driven decision. If you've got enough data, you use X; if you don't, you use Y; and you work your way down so that the modeling approach is commensurate with the data you've got available.

To be honest, there are other decisions that could be made; and you could make a conscious decision to use a simpler modeling approach to increase through-put. It is all an issue of tradeoffs; and those types of considerations could be brought to bear on those decisions. That may be worth raising just from a logistic standpoint.

MR. HARTIG: In other words, do you think it is worth another group of scientists looking at this and looking at a decision-tree approach possibly to suggest to the assessment group?

DR. PONWITH: What I think would be beneficial is if the council and the SSC is interested in evaluating the tradeoffs between through-put versus the absolute best you can do with the data that are given, that you may want to consider adding something like that in the terms of reference. The thing you want to be really careful about is making canned predetermined decisions about what model you get to use because that can be unnecessarily constraining and actually counterproductive.

DR. DUVAL: And to that point I definitely wasn't suggesting trying to constrain that, but really just to better inform that conversation because most of us here sitting around that table do not have the expertise offhand to just say, oh, well, if you use this model versus this model, what is the tradeoff in terms of could we get another species assessed this year versus if you use another model. I appreciate that input.

MR. HARTIG: We have had discussion to bring your item before the SSC and add it to these bullets. We've got John saying yes. I think that information that informed I think would help.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; and I think with what Bonnie has said about trying to inform a decision as to what your tradeoffs are going to be in terms of through-put versus the absolute best model you can support with the data; that's I think part of the conversation that I would the SSC might have during this workshop.

MR. HARTIG: So are you happy with direction to John to do that; and he is nodding his head in agreement that he has got it so we're good. Okay, moving on, we're done with that portion. SEDAR Assessment Presentations, Attachments 4 and 4; do we have Luiz available? He is available; very good. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: This is the item I had mentioned the SSC didn't look at the snowy grouper assessment and the chairman has asked that we have some discussion here about the presentation of SEDAR assessments to the SSC. SEDAR's expectation and the guidelines is that there is a presentation by the analysts to the technical body chosen by the cooperator. In our case that is the SSC.

This was done a number of years ago when there was sort of a creep of requests for presentations to go beyond technical bodies and heading in the direction of having an analyst coming to the APs and the council and everything and make these presentations. The compromise of the steering committee was let's have a presentation given to the technical body; and then at that point it becomes the cooperator's role in dealing with it to the rest of their levels.

What has happened due to various things and travel restrictions and other situations is that we haven't been able to get these in-person presentations. It was an issue at our earlier meeting this year. There was some participation by the analysts over the webinar, which worked to some extent; but I think most of the SSC kind of went out thinking, well, it is really not as effective as having a face-to-face type presentation. They dealt with it in that situation. In particular we were dealing with black sea bass; and the SSC said, you know, we really need to review the assessment and take what we've been given here in this situation; because otherwise the fishermen end up paying the brunt of not getting those higher catch levels.

It came around to this time having the same situation and the SSC had the frustration and our council leadership had the frustration; and the SSC just really was not comfortable in dealing with snowy grouper because the SSC meeting is the first really public time when this assessment is looked at.

We have some limited workshops where we don't have the peer review like we do with the benchmarks. The SSC really wanted to have more of an interaction and exchange and to really comply with that requirement of having a presentation. In this case in particular and partly due to the shutdown and other things, again there wasn't any presentation made available to the SSC to even go through on the webinar, which was another difference from earlier when at least the SSC had a presentation.

We just wanted to have some discussion about this and really try to move forward from this and make sure that the SSC is getting the kind of support that it needs and that it expects when it is faced with making in a lot of cases tough recommendations from these assessments and dealing with all the uncertainties that is inherent in them and having good interaction between those who are first-hand involved and most knowledgeable about these assessments and being able to really have good interaction with the SSC itself as they deal with this.

MR. HARTIG: And to follow up, we had lunch with Bonnie yesterday and it was very productive. We talked about the issues we had at that SSC meeting in particular; and certainly it was exacerbated by the government shutdown, for certain. The other point that she brought up, which I wasn't aware of, is that their travel has been cut 30 percent; and there is a ceiling on that. No matter how much money they got, they still can't pump anymore money into the travel part of it.

They're going to have some problems trying to deal with going into the future about bringing people to the different assessments. But having said that, I still think in prioritizing your people to come to these assessments; that for a standard where the SSC is the review, we absolutely have to have a face-to-face person at that assessment. I think that is critical.

Now, on the review assessments, I don't think it is too bad – you know, the SSC had some problems with it, but for me being at those meetings and watching how we progressed in the updates having the webinar and having all the analysts on the webinar, that's a bonus and that's great.

Let me go back to the standard assessment; having that person there as well as the analysts available by phone or webinar would be great as well. I think your Beaufort Team works very well together as far as addressing assessment questions. If there is ever one that somebody has a problem with, there is always somebody to pipe up to address that problem.

I don't think I've seen many cases where they couldn't address the problems that we've had. Knowing that we would like to have, first, presentations face to face – and the critical part are the standard assessments where the SSC is review; but given your travel considerations, Bonnie, you're going to have to make some decisions based on who you can send when. Do you want to follow up on that?

DR. PONWITH: Ben is correct that we did have a really productive conversation about this. I certainly agree that there is rarely a case where a webinar is a substitute for a face-to-face meeting. I certainly agree that those standard assessments are logical candidates for a face to face. I think it is just a matter of being in good communication with one another and working through and understanding that the SSC's priorities and the council's priorities in terms of when things rise to really warrant a face to face and be able to plan that out; but weight that against then the types of collaborations that may be forced to be by webinar.

You're right, the Beaufort Team is one of the most cohesive units. They enjoy working in a format where there is a lead stock assessment scientist, but a lot of that work is carried out kind of in a think-tank approach; so no one is working in a vacuum. They're problem solving in the collective and supported in that way.

It is a really beneficial approach to getting a good solid product out. The webinar creates an advantage that more people than would otherwise be able to participate can join in to be able to pitch in and you get kind of a multi-faceted viewpoint; but certainly for those standards, I hear you loud and clear, and that seems like a logical choice to be the ones that bubble up to warranting a face-to-face meeting.

I will say that in the snowy situation the timing of the shutdown could not have been worse in terms of being able to be prepared for that SSC meeting given that it was so close on the heels of the reopening and actually landed over the period where those briefing materials were due. It is an atypical situation, and I'm committed to working with the council chair to see to it that those top priority science requirements are met.

MR. HARTIG: Those travel cuts; they came in 2012 and I think we've had two meetings that have occurred since then. One we didn't have an in-person; we had the webinar which to me for an update doesn't work that badly. Those are things you're going to have to deal with and we're going to have to deal with them as well. As long as you know where our main priorities are – of course, I'm here talking about our main priorities; there are a number of other people that may have something else to say about those as well. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And one key thing in that is there was a presentation given at the earlier one; and in this case there wasn't one; and there wasn't one available. I think that is really why

the SSC particularly drew the line in dealing snowy; just not having the presentation. This isn't my rule or a council rule; this is from the SSC.

They ask for materials two weeks before the meeting and that includes the presentations. That has been a long-standing rule of the SSC. Not having the presentation I think in this case for any of those assessments really was a big issue with the SSC. They might have muddled through on the webinar if there had been some presentations ready.

I guess we could look and say, well, you're got the assessment report, just review that and go through it, but we all know in these meetings we don't expect people to do that. They have a lot of things to go through just as you guys have a lot of things to go through here. We know this meeting wouldn't be very effective if staff had said, well, you've got the SEDAR Committee Report; do you have any questions? It just doesn't work that well. They need that kind of get them going, point out some of the issues, fill them in on what challenges were that the analysts had to deal with and try to get to their feedback.

MR. HARTIG: And that's a good point about the presentations. Bonnie, I think if you could send that message to Beaufort that – I mean, if they could have them two weeks ahead of time, we have some top-notch assessment scientists on our SSC currently. Those are the kinds of people who are going to delve into that and look at that part of that part of the meeting.

Certainly, from that perspective, maybe your social scientists aren't, but they can certainly be involved in the discussions that go on around the table as those questions come up. To me having those two weeks ahead of time is critical for the assessment scientists to be able to review the assessment in detail, have their questions lined up and be able to bounce them off the other people at the table.

DR. PONWITH: And I agree, Mr. Chairman, that is a reasonable expectation and our default position will be to have those materials to you two weeks in advance. If there is any departure due to timing of data availability that influence the generation of projections or something like that, that would be part of the dialogue and negotiated; but the default position would be to have those materials there two weeks in advance.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any other questions or discussion about what we have been talking about? Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I should have jumped in earlier when John was talking about this; but John has also asked our office to get involved in looking at what is legally allowable and not allowable in terms of meeting perhaps scientists in between webinars or something of that nature to get some of the work done.

He has explained some of the difficulties and issues faced by many of the same people meeting to attend lots of these webinars and lots of these kinds of meetings for the SEDAR process. We're looking into that and seeing how we can help the SEDAR process really proceed even more rapidly sometimes than it is now. I'm not done looking into this issue; but essentially when

the AP – you know, this is an AP of the council, right, so when they meet as an AP and do AP business, that should be done in a public forum.

However, I understand that scientists frequently and the staffs in between meetings get together and discuss things. I think there is probably some room where we can work that out and I can give them some more clear guidance on, okay, you can do this, but you can't get into these areas. Anyway, that is evolving and I hope to get that guidance to John fairly soon.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that; and we have talked about that. We talked about it at the steering committee. We talked about the problems of having the notice problems and for certain portions of doing business it can be cumbersome. I appreciate you trying to find ways that we might be able to streamline it somewhat. Number 6, SEDAR approvals.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay, we've got a couple of items for approval. We have the terms of reference for the gag update which should be conducted this year. Then we have a schedule and terms of reference for SEDAR 41, which will be red snapper and gray triggerfish benchmark. Then we'll need to go into closed session when we discuss the participants for SEDAR 41.

We will start out with gag. There is a little text in there about dealing with gag. There are some questions about the terms of reference and making some changes in 41 I guess they were talking about; so I'll highlight that now. I think gag is pretty straightforward. We're dealing with an update assessment and a pretty straightforward process; and we hope to get these approved and get these guys turned loose on this assessment; and we'll get it in for you guys and the SSC to consider.

Attachment 6 is the gag terms of reference; and we'll discuss this item first and potential approval. I guess just for reference the last assessment of gag was in SEDAR 10; so these are just asking to have that base model updated as it was done before, using the most recent information that is available for all of the input things and then details on the projections that reflect things that we do now, which we didn't do then, which is like the P-star values.

We're giving them a starter of 30 percent and that is based on the SSC's preliminary evaluation of what the P-star could be under something like gag that was done when they first did the ABC Control Rule. We're asking for the 75 percent of Fmsy, which some of the councils have been kind of gravitating to in terms of a long-term, more stable recommendation. Then there is the standard if it is overfished; let's get the outline of the rebuilding program.

MR. HARTIG: I know, John, there was some discussion at the SSC about the two sets of TORs.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes; and that was in 41, so we'll get into that with them. Let's knock gag out first; I think it would be better.

MR. HARTIG: All right, we need approval of the TORs for the gag grouper assessment update.

**DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the terms of reference for the gag grouper assessment update.**

MR. HARTIG: Motion by Michelle; seconded by Jack. **Discussion? Is there any objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.** SEDAR 41, red snapper and gray triggerfish, TORs and schedule we need to approve.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That would be Attachment 7. This is where the SSC was given two versions of the terms of reference. The primary difference was in dealing with the review workshop and to what extent the review workshop is asked to provide some judgment on whether or not it thinks like the data are adequate and the model is adequate.

Now, the review workshop terms of reference are based on a set of framework terms of reference approved by SEDAR. These were developed a couple of years ago when we went through our last kind of big look at the SEDAR process. For that reason, we weren't really comfortable making some of those changes just outright at this time because they do change a little bit the tone of what we'd be asking the review workshop to do.

It really has a question do we just ask them to give me the pros and cons of what you do or do that and kind of tell me do you think that this acceptable. It is kind of a fine line there; it is a gray area, no doubt. That is where the SSC came in with their recommendations of saying they went with kind of the base ones that they were given, the alternative that gets into highlighting the pros and cons aspects, which was suggested, as well as still retaining the language that asked for them to give some comment on like adequacy and appropriateness.

The SSC thinks it would best to have the steering committee weigh in on this gray area topic of whether or not we continue to ask the review panel to tell us about if they think things are adequate and appropriate and handled properly. We have the terms of reference here to consider and then we also have the action of asking you guys if you want to remand that issue up to the steering committee and have them weigh in on kind of the tone of those terms of reference for a review workshop.

MR. HARTIG: Okay; we need a motion to approve the TORs for SEDAR 41. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: One of the things we heard a lot about from the public the last time we did red snapper were comparisons with the Gulf assessment. We're in a situation where the Gulf just completed a benchmark red snapper assessment; and we're getting ready to do a benchmark in the South Atlantic.

It sure would be nice to be better prepared to deal with those types of questions in terms of the Gulf did it this way and the South Atlantic did it differently and why and how did it affect things. I don't know if that's something that needs to be in the terms of reference or not; but I wish when we do this, folks would be more mindful of what has gone on in Miami and in the Gulf and do a better job of looking at the differences between the decisions they make and making sure there is adequate rationale and a clear explanation for why they did it different than on the other side; so that we could better explain some of these things.

Frankly, there weren't good explanations in my opinion for some of the differences between the assessments. I don't know, John, if that is something we could add to the terms of reference or exactly how to deal with this. I raised this quite often over the years; and it seems like it is forgotten when the assessment rolls around. I'm worried if we don't put it down somewhere, it will be forgotten again. If they make very different assumptions about things in this assessment than was done in the Gulf, I'm pretty sure we're going to hear all those same questions again.

MR. HARTIG: Yes; and that's a great point; but it is six of one and half a dozen of the other. I look at black sea bass and when we tried to just do comparison of a continuity run, we couldn't even do that in the same assessment; two assessments, two different steepness values; and I think there was some other value that changed; so you couldn't compare the two to see if you were even rebuilding based on the level in one assessment versus the other.

The people on the SSC tried very hard to try and do that and that wasn't possible. To try and get a comparison between a red snapper assessment on our side versus the Gulf is going to be even harder. I know the problems you're talking about, Roy, and I am very sensitive to them. I hate to even match this up – Bonnie is going to start cringing – but to have an assessment scientist from Miami participate at some level in our red snapper assessment I think would address some of your concerns.

I hate, Bonnie, to ask you to have a person for that assessment given the workload of your assessment scientists. I think it would be worth it. I think red snapper is important enough and I think that person could ask the necessary questions during the assessment and have some impact versus those different kinds of parameters. We could have those questions answered during the assessment and then bring those forward to the public as we move. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: What you suggest is not illogical. It is not illogical; it would be certainly way of maintaining some fluidity between the two sides of the Peninsula. The problem is it would basically take an assessment scientist from the Gulf and move them over to the South Atlantic; and I'm sure the Gulf Council would have some thoughts on that.

Here are a couple of thoughts. One of the things that – you know, speaking of think tanks, my colleagues in the center have been grappling with this issue of stock assessment through-put and trying to put their heads together on what ideas could we toss out to recraft the way we do stock assessments in a way that protects scientific integrity as our number objective but still as the same time maintains transparency but increases through-put.

One of the ideas they came up with was a methods' working group. My view is one of the ways of resolving the issue that Dr. Crabtree brought up, which is a legitimate issue, we spend a huge amount of analysts' time asking the questions why this here and that there; and that is time that could have been spent working on presentations and projections and other things.

I think it is a smart suggestion to be out ahead of that in advance, anticipating that those types of questions may come up again. That is also a logical request. A methods' working group could be a group of assessment scientists from both sides of the Peninsula that sit down and grapple with issues like steepness with recruitment, how to deal with recruitment, and answer those

questions generically to create some overarching best practices or guidelines so that decisions don't have to start from scratch for each assessment that some of those baseline decisions are grappled with and made and then you customize from there.

That would be a generic way of handling that. That would require a modification to the SEDAR protocols, which would start with a discussion in the councils and go to the SEDAR Steering Committee. That's a fairly long process and may not be the best solution for this imminent stock assessment.

The second approach is one of the things we talked about is if you want those assessments to be cognizant of one another, you can do one assessment for red snapper. That is when everybody cringes and it is because red snapper is by far and away our most complex and most controversial stock assessment that we do in the Gulf of Mexico and pretty close the same is true for the South Atlantic.

Merging them and doing them together and negotiating across the Peninsula about the timing and the strategy I think could make it buckle and implode under its own weight. It may be more complex than the benefits you would get out of it. But, certainly, a third way of dealing with that is to conduct the assessment in a way that is cognizant of what has been done in the past.

That is not an usual scientific approach; what has been done in the past, what has worked in the past; and if you depart from that, is there a logical explanation for why. I think it is reasonable. The place where I would draw the line is I would not want to constrain an assessment panel to saying you can only do this way because somebody else in a different place did it that way. Really, if you think about how science is done, the approach is that you do something, you toss rocks at it.

If it is still standing when all is said and done, that's a reliable approach. If it falters under scientific critique, then it is time to cast off that approach and evolve to another approach. It can be chilling of that sort of scientific process to actually constrain unnecessarily one assessment body to doing things exactly the way another assessment body did. Certainly, it would be reasonable to include a discussion of how it has been done in the past in your own region, how it has been done in other places, and include in that discussion rationale for why you may be departing from past practices.

MR. BELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee but just an observation. We look at this from a standpoint of we're the South Atlantic Council and we deal with the Atlantic and the Gulf deals with the Gulf; but a lot of times the fishing public just sees red snapper and red snapper are just red snapper.

Some of them in the Gulf and they fish in the Atlantic and there is a lot of back and forth, and it is a rather hot button fishery. Part of what I heard Roy said was when the assessments are done and the dust settles, we just need to be prepared to answer questions. If there are different outcomes, slightly different processes or something, we just need to be able to be sensitive to that. We know that we're dealing with two stocks basically or managing that way, but they just sort of see red snapper. We just need to be sensitive to that somehow.

DR. CRABTREE: I'm not trying to lock people in. I think as much as anything it is a problem with just not providing an explanation that holds up and thinking about why you're doing it differently. In some cases I'm not sure the panels are even aware necessarily that they're doing things differently.

Dr. Barbieri and I had a discussion at a recent Gulf Council meeting around lines where I essentially read a statement from a South Atlantic assessment that says choice of SPR implies an underlying steepness; thus choosing a proxy equates to choosing steepness; but that isn't what was done in the Gulf Red Snapper Benchmark Assessment. The proxy didn't imply the steepness and they chose a steepness that wasn't consistent with the proxy.

You get one group of scientists and they just make a different decision than another group of scientists over here; and that is just the nature of things. If that is going to happen, they need to provide a really good explanation as to why they're doing that or why they're doing something that is different than what we've stated should be done in other assessments. Too often I don't think that happens; and sometimes it has big implications for where we wind up with these things. Maybe there is nothing to put in the terms and maybe this is just something that we need to come back in the SEDAR Steering Committee and talk about it more.

MS. McCAWLEY: I agree with Roy; I think this is really important. I'm not trying to lock anybody in based on what I heard about to run the assessment; but Florida will be ground zero for this. This happened the last time; and it is really important to have those explanations ready or it looks like, hey, councils, why are you not talking to each other. This is such an important species, why were these assumptions made? We just need to have those things ready; and I think being cognizant of that when you're entering into the assessment is important to have those explanations ready.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I've put a little bit of language up here; and this might get at something that we can do. It seems to me the differences that we talk about are really with total life history traits, the productivity measures and perhaps the uncertainties that we have in the assessment. The data sets are different. The data available for the Gulf assessment is different than what is available for the South Atlantic. There are more indices.

They've had some different issues in the Gulf. The shrimp bycatch and the removals by the shrimp fishery have been much more influential in terms of what happens with the Gulf assessment over the years than within the South Atlantic. The last time we did this there was a look at the size of the habitat, the slope differences. The depth profile is very different in the Gulf of Mexico than in the South Atlantic.

The productivity on almost every species that has a stock in the Gulf and the South Atlantic is almost always higher in the Gulf than it is in the South Atlantic for snapper grouper. We know going in there are going to be differences. What I think maybe we can do to get at this, and what I've put up here just says request that the SEDAR 41 assessment compare and contrast life history traits, productivity measures and assessment uncertainties between the Gulf and South Atlantic stocks.

Some of this we kind of know going up front this is not the first assessment for any of these stocks. I very well see that working papers could be prepared in advance of actually getting into the assessment itself that look at the life history traits. Maybe we just need to look at the fecundity and the maturity and sex ratios, perhaps, that show us why maybe as an individual those species have different traits.

Discard mortality is something maybe to look at because of fishery and depth differences. I know that was looked at in the last assessment. The productivity; that gets at the steepness and the SPR levels; and just making sure that there is some consideration to the different areas. The uncertainties I think could be interesting because of the differences in the data availability, particularly with regard to the surveys.

I think this is something that seems to me feasible within this assessment without making anyone feel like they're asked to configure an assessment exactly like another assessment which just happens to be a species with the same name which occurs in a different environment.

DR. CRABTREE: I think something like that might be all right. Remember, one of the big controversies when we had our red snapper assessment was about the reference point, SPR. Some on the SSC felt strongly that it should be 40 percent. We ultimately stayed at 30 percent. But, remember, part of that argument was, well, the Gulf is at 26 percent and has been for a year; why does it need to be 40 percent in the South Atlantic but 26 percent is adequate in the Gulf. You hear a lot of dancing around the issue but it is difficult to explain that to anybody. Maybe something like that, John, gets at it and would be a step in the right direction.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We will have to be aware that kind of proxy stuff, that comes out of the SSCs; and those are fishing level recommendations. They're embodied in those coming from the SSC; so we still could end up with the chance that our SSC makes a different recommendation in terms of a proxy than the Gulf. Hopefully, we had that debate the last time and we won't be in that same situation here having to argue the SPR proxy.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, you're right about that; but we can go back to our SSC. Part of the problem with SEDAR is when the review panel hits the gavel and they're done; they're often done and there is no going back. What they do in those review panels often constrains everything that comes after it. At least that has been my experience.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee, but a question to Roy. I'm trying to tease out of the comments; did you have a similar comment to the Gulf Council during the most recent red snapper assessment; i.e., did the Gulf Council look at the most recent Atlantic red snapper and try to consider what was done there? Are there similar discussions from the Gulf Council?

DR. CRABTREE: I don't remember if we did or didn't. I've had discussions I think at both councils and I know at SEDAR Steering Committees quite a bit about trying to provide more consistency and more continuity among our assessments. We've had issues more in the Gulf as I recall with having a gag assessment done and then some months later a red grouper assessment

done and fundamental differences in the assumptions made about the two and had to come back in and reconcile those.

I don't know that we had this specific discussion when we did the benchmark on the Gulf. Part of the thing is the Gulf has been doing red snapper assessments going back to the early 1990's; so there is a long history of development of red snapper assessments; but we really hadn't had a modern SEDAR assessment in the South Atlantic until very recently.

I think these comments go well beyond just red snapper. I think it is a problem that we have that is in SEDAR is there is not enough – there is too much emphasis on doing the very best possible assessment and not enough emphasis on maintaining some degree of consistency and continuity among the assessments, whether it be South Atlantic and Gulf assessments or two different assessments both done in the Gulf. I see those problems.

MR. HAYMANS: So with there being one science center; could we begin to look at – I don't know what the right term would be, but assessment scientists who concentrate on species on both sides rather than just working in the Gulf or just working in the South Atlantic to kind of move forward in the future?

DR. PONWITH: Certainly, instead of keeping two pools of assessment scientists, one for the Gulf and one for the South Atlantic, we could open a discussion about the merits of having a red snapper expert who works on red snapper regardless of the geography. It is an interesting question because if you think about it, even in the Gulf of Mexico we don't treat that as one stock.

We treat it as two stocks and basically knit together two stock assessments because the demographics in the Western Gulf and the demographics in the Eastern Gulf are so completely different. You think about the difference in the South Atlantic to the Gulf, the South Atlantic actually includes the northern most edge of the range of the species; and so one could expect that there would be some differences in the demographics even in the South Atlantic relative to the Gulf.

Because of that reason, the Gulf is sort of on the bull's eye of the geographic range. The South Atlantic includes the edge. That is something we could discuss. There are multiple ways of looking at this. When we had this reference point question, one of the things that I did was went to the science enterprise across the nation and talked about how reference points are set, how recruitment processes are dealt with in stock assessments across the United States.

They had a nation-wide workshop dealing with some of those questions. Those results are informative by comparing and contrasting across the regions. Having a red snapper stock assessment scientist is one way of doing it. Another way of doing it is to hold these large-scale methods' workshops to iron out generically in the absence of an ongoing assessment how should we be looking at this?

Are there best practices in dealing with uncertainty and dealing with reference points and come up with some generic advice and tier down from that and customize relative to the needs of the

individual stock assessment. That would be a way to say this question has been asked, it has been answered, here is the baseline approach that has been agreed upon; and then from that point any departures from that would be justified in the process itself. The short answer is, yes, we could have those discussions.

MR. BOWEN: Correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. Ponwith, but wouldn't the genetics of the red snapper be more pertinent than the demographics of the red snapper?

DR. PONWITH: The genetics are certainly germane in terms of you're talking about differentiating the stock based on genetics?

MR. BOWEN: That is correct, yes.

DR. PONWITH: Certainly, the genetics of a stock are of interest; but the geography is as well.

DR. BARBIERI: Not to try to interfere, but this question I think is relevant; because it impacts a whole number of other stocks, you know, similar species in the Gulf and South Atlantic. Yes, genetics is an important component, but you have to keep in mind the genetics – when you look at genetics and think about genetics, you're thinking about evolutionary times and very, very long time scales.

Sometimes what the assessments are really focusing on biological processes that happened within ecological times; so you have population structure sometimes that these two stocks are still in the process of, from an evolutionary point of view, separating but we cannot tell them apart with the genetic techniques that we have on the table right now. They are subjected to different fisheries and they have different biological characteristics, demographics and other issues that actually call for them to be considered differently.

Throughout the world we have several stocks that depending on where the fisheries are operating and depending on the demographics – for example, red snapper in the Gulf of Mexico itself involves two separate models for the eastern and western Gulf because there are enough demographic differences going on to warrant treatment differently in terms of an assessment. I don't know if that addressed your question. I was just trying to clarify the issue that genetics is definitely important, but it is not the most fundamental point when you're looking at stock assessments.

MR. HARTIG: Well, let me ask you a question since you're here. You sit on both SSCs, correct, you're on the Gulf and ours?

DR. BARBIERI: Yes, sir.

MR. HARTIG: You do; so you get to look at the red snapper on the Gulf and the red snapper on the Atlantic. Do you think there is validity in going to one assessment side – doing both assessments?

DR. BARBIERI: What do you mean by one assessment side, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HARTIG: I'm saying either Miami does the Gulf and the Atlantic red snapper or Beaufort does the Gulf and Atlantic red snapper?

DR. BARBIERI: This is not one of those yes-no type of answers. I think there are advantages in having the two teams work together and exchange information. I see advantages in keeping some level of specialization so folks are actually familiar with the biological characteristics of the stock and the structure of the models and how everything – I can see advantages both ways. Some cross-breeding I think would be beneficial if there is available time for staff on the stock assessment panels to participate.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The Gulf isn't the only place we share boundaries with. We share boundaries with the Mid-Atlantic; and I don't anybody at this table wants to suggest that our black sea bass assessment be done by the Northeast Fisheries Science Center. But, in a way if you're not as involved in these issues as those of us around the table, you can look at that and say what is the difference? There is no magic to the boundary at Hatteras.

We're seeing expansions in a lot of stocks; and I don't think we would go there. I think the reality in dealing with SEDAR and seeing all these things over the years, there are a lot of differences in the basic data collection and the information that's available. Like it or not and whether or not it is ideal, there are just differences in this stuff between what goes on in the South Atlantic and what goes on in the Gulf of Mexico.

As Luiz mentioned, the eastern and western Gulf, that is why a lot of these things are different so I don't know that just assigning species to a person would necessarily get us any further. I think making sure that we give an eye toward what has going on the other areas and deal with things where we get – you know, where we have an uncertainty like a proxy for productivity; that we recognize that we are one region and when one group makes one recommendation and another makes another recommendation, it kind of adds to the uncertainty. It doesn't build a case for one or the other.

I think the SPR, as Roy mentioned, is a really great example. Discard mortality things can be a really good example unless you have good reason. Natural mortality; unless you have biological reasons to separate the differences, those are all things that we should look at. I fully support that but necessarily making it the same assessment scientist may not get you there.

MR. MAHOOD: Well, this is one of the things Roy said that the problem when we don't use the same parameters in the Gulf and the South Atlantic on some of these species is we get comment from people why didn't you? But if you look at it, the comments are always toward the Gulf because they're allowing more harvest and we're not.

Like Doug said, why don't they ever look at what we're doing in the Atlantic in the Gulf; well, why would they do that; we don't allow a fishery. You're not going to get comment from fishermen down there saying, well, why aren't you doing the same they're doing in the South Atlantic?

I think that most of the comments at least we got – I think gag grouper was maybe even more than red snapper – was how come you're not doing it; down there they're allowing more harvest, they're using different parameters, this type of thing. Generally when we get comments it is because we're not allowing harvest whereas with the same species in the Gulf they did a different type of stock assessment and they're allowing more harvest. I think that is where most of the comment comes from.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that is some of that, certainly, and I don't know that we'll resolve this anymore. I don't know about whether it makes sense to have one team that does the red snapper assessments on both sides. That is something I don't think we're prepared to sort out today. I'm not trying to say that – and John is right; there are differences in the South Atlantic and the Gulf; and there may be legitimate reasons for things being different.

What I'm asking for is an awareness that when you make a decision, you're making a decision that is different than what was done in the Gulf or in a previous assessment; and so if you're going to do that, you need to recognize that and you need to explain it. I suspect there are occasions in assessments when they would say, "Oh, well, I didn't realize we were doing something different."

We really don't have a good explanation and it could have led to a different outcome. The key here is not so much what the decision is. It is making sure that you provide a really good reason and you show an awareness that you're doing something different and here is why.

DR. BARBIERI: To Dr. Crabtree's point, what I'm hearing is basically that you're requesting that the assessment panels – and we do have SSC members participating in the assessment and the review panels – be more aware of those issues. I think it is a fair request.

I think this is the time really for that request to come up before the data workshop, the assessment and the review shop actually take place; that this is a request coming from the council that those panels be more aware of those similarities or differences of all the issues that could be brought up afterwards and that we provide some input to you regarding those potential similarities and differences and that we make sure that we have an assessment process that tries to address those proactively. If that would be what you had in mind, Dr. Crabtree, I can see that being something that the SSC would take very seriously and we will try to carry that forward.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think legally from and administrative record perspective, if you got challenged on this you would want to – and litigant could bring up, well, look, so what is the best scientific information available? They're doing it this way for the same species and they're doing it a different way for the same species in the geographic areas.

I would think it is better to have those explanations up front as to why different methods were chosen and those sorts of things. I think you're in a much more defensible position when you go into court and you have those kinds of challenges in addition to having the public – you know, they raise those kinds of issues as you've all just discussed; so being able to explain it to them puts the council in a much better position, too.

MR. HARTIG: And they raise them at a high level now. They address the different inputs in the assessment. To me if John's wording gets into natural mortality, steepness and selectivities that are critical – those are three real critical parts of the assessment. When we change those based on the Gulf, we should explain why in the assessment they were changed.

The assessment scientists should say this is why they are different in the Atlantic; so we can have that on the record going forward and on the record to deal legal and then to inform the public of why they were different, why the South Atlantic red snapper is different. I think, John, if –

MR. CARMICHAEL: Do you want me to read it?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I really think this level of discussion; we talked about how to get this in there and Roy brought up making terms of reference. I think with this level of discussion we probably should try to craft a term of reference that makes sure this is in there and not overlooked. What I have put up here on the screen is an attempt to try and capture this in a possible motion that someone may want to make.

It addresses adding three terms of reference, one for each workshop, so I will read through this now. **It is move to add a Term of Reference to the SEDAR 41 Data Workshop to compare and contrast life history traits between the Gulf and South Atlantic Stocks; to add a Term of Reference to the SEDAR 41 Assessment Workshop to compare and contrast productivity measures and assessment assumptions between the Gulf and South Atlantic Stocks; and add a Term of Reference to the SEDAR 41 Review Workshop to compare and contrast assessment uncertainties between the Gulf and South Atlantic stocks.**

MR. HARTIG: Would somebody like to so move that motion? Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. HARTIG: Anymore discussion; we've had plenty. I need to get a second first; second by Jack. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I just wanted to say that it would be a good idea if we could have all those explanations put in before it goes out for the peer review so you even further will be able to back it up; to have it get it looked at a lot more.

MR. HARTIG: You're absolutely right and this will do that. This will take it through the assessment process and so that will be included in every workshop we have. It will be a great addition. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: On the review workshop doing a compare and contrast to the assessment uncertainties; you mean just, for example, if the uncertainty is greater in the South Atlantic for a red snapper stock assessment because of the discontinuity in the fishery-independent data, that would be discussed; or, if biological sampling rates differed between those areas and it created

uncertainty in the age composition or the age structure in the assessment; those are the types of comparisons you're looking at to be discussed?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes; that is what I was thinking about there. We know we have the very stringent regulations that have gone on in the South Atlantic and that it affected our fishery-dependent data stream and that is probably going to contribute to an uncertainty. I think it will be helpful to have those guys comment on those kinds of things.

We try to focus the review panel on the uncertainty aspects. I'm hoping this sort of gives them leeway to kind of look at overall the whole outcomes and maybe point out data issues as well as related to monitoring that is done as well as how the regulations have affected our ability to estimate the stock with the methods we use; exactly.

**MR. HARTIG: Okay, is there anymore discussion? Is there any objection to this motion? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: That adds a term of reference and we'll make that change and then to approve the schedule and other terms of reference for SEDAR 41. I expect we'd be saying we want to approve the terms of reference as modified.

**MR. HARTIG: Okay, we need a motion to approve the terms of reference for SEDAR 41 as modified and the schedule. Motion by Michelle; seconded by Charlie. Discussion? Objection? Seeing none; that motion is approved.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: And the other one is considering forwarding to the SEDAR Steering Committee the SSC's recommendation to evaluate the terms of reference. I think guidance on that would be that you support the SSC recommendation would be fine.

MR. HARTIG: Do you need a motion?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think approval will be fine in this case.

MR. HARTIG: Okay, is there any objection to approving the SSC's – say it again, please.

MR. CARMICHAEL: SSC's recommendation to have the steering committee look into the terms of reference language for review workshops.

MR. HARTIG: Is there any objection to that? I don't see any, John, so we'll move ahead and do that at the steering committee level.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Do you want to do the other business before we get into the participants in the closed session?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay, there are a couple of other business items. The first is an update on the wreckfish process. The next will be to call your attention to some document on sampling and then Bonnie added National Standard 2. The first thing is the wreckfish. As you guys will recall, there has been a wreckfish assessment put forward.

We developed the process through the SSC and the council to review and handle such assessments coming from non-SEDAR sources. The SSC reviewed a proposal for that assessment in September. You supported having an ad hoc workshop get together as requested in that proposal to help provide some guidance to the analysts on the assessment configurations and assure they had the most recent data available.

That was held in November; and so you have been provided the SSC's review of that proposal as well as the report of that ad hoc assessment group. The nomenclature of this has been a little bit difficult in a way. We're trying to make sure it is clear that this is not a SEDAR assessment; this is not a SEDAR process.

This is the South Atlantic Council considering this assessment following the South Atlantic Council's process and having support from the SSC. That is kind of where we stand in terms of the nomenclature and calling this an ad hoc group to distinguish it from a SEDAR Assessment Workshop; because when we say assessment workshop, we have this thought now after ten or twelve years of SEDAR that is a SEDAR process.

The next steps in this is really probably the most important thing to discuss here. The goal has been to have this assessment to the SSC in April so you get recommendations in June. The process that we approved kind of stretches things out and it sort of envisions that you get the report, you look at it, you consider how to do your peer review, you hold your peer review that is held like six weeks before an SSC meeting, and that is time-consuming.

What we have suggested – and this was discussed at the workshop that we had – was that we need to kind of get ahead of this a little bit. A couple of things that we need to do at the SSC is we need to improve some terms of reference for the review; and we need to identify who would be the potential reviewers and kind of the process.

What I'm suggesting is that we have a conference call of the SSC in January where we could talk about the terms of reference for this review and the approach. We're suggesting that it be held over a webinar. I think that is going to be very effective and it is obviously going to be cost benefits there. They're not having to travel and must easier logistically to set up that type of meeting. Also have them suggest the peer review panelists; and the guidelines that we have for this suggests they're approved by the council and they could include SSC members as well as others, depending on who they think is appropriate.

In this case we're thinking a couple of SSC members, a chair – and Marcel Reichert, who took part in the workshop has agreed to potentially be the chair of this if the council should support that – and we could also consider others. In this case I think it might be good to have someone from the science center given their level of assessment expertise.

We need to have that; and then we expect to get the assessment report in mid-February. If we're going to go to the SSC in April, we need to have the review happen before then. We can't wait around until we get to the report in February and then try to get this going to have the SSC discuss the terms of reference and everything in April because then we're not reviewing this thing until October.

We're going to have to try and get ahead of it a little bit and kind of work in the cracks here with this process as I've laid out. The assessment report is expected in mid-February; that is what the analysts have agreed to. Then at the council meeting in March what we would like to do is get the final approval of the terms of reference and the participants; and then soon after that meeting – probably two weeks is likely when it would occur – we would have this webinar review.

At that time the SSC conducts basically a peer review of this document; and it will be a full assessment report and more detailed than any of the workshop reports that you have so far of the proposal review. I believe that we can handle this logistically if it is a webinar because there is no travel and I don't have to arrange meeting space.

We will have to notice this in the Federal Register as a webinar so we'd probably be doing that kind of before the council actually formally approves the term of reference. This allows us to get this to the SSC in April. At that point the SSC considers this document and develops their fishing level recommendations; and then that gets it to the council meeting in June,

One reason for trying to get this going is that this assessment came to us a year ago in October. We had some delay as we worked through the process to make sure we had a fair and open and transparent way of dealing with these assessments; and now we're trying to play catch-up a little bit and get back on track.

One of the things we will definitely do when this all wraps up is look back at this process now that we have been through it and see kind of what worked and what didn't. One of the first things that has come to my mind, considering where we are now, is that we probably really need to consider these review workshop terms of reference at the time the SSC reviews the proposal.

That is one change that I'm obviously going to recommend is that we should also recommend terms of reference at that time and consider reviewers so that we're out ahead of the process; because the timing of SSC meetings and council meetings makes this difficult; and to avoid us having to get into this, holding a conference call and having the SSC make the terms of reference and then the council approve them right before the review workshop occurs.

That is just kind of our lesson and I just want to make sure everyone is comfortable with this process that we have laid out here and you understand where we're going to be going and why we will be asking for things when we are over the next few months.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any questions? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Just a quick comment; this is certainly a much more involved assessment as a trial run of the new process than I would have expected. It is kind of a one-off situation. It is

different; and so I agree with John. I think doing kind of a debriefing at the close of this to say how did the protocol that was discussed at length – and the SSC obviously put a great deal of care in developing that protocol. I think that was a critical step to kind of protect the process – to be able to circle back and say what worked, what didn't, what modifications do we need to do?

The one thing that I'd make a point is because it is different than the SEDAR process, as the SSC contemplates the peer review terms of reference for this third party assessment, to do a quick read through the National Standard 2 Guidelines to make sure that the tests for that are met and to make sure that people that were involved in the workshop, which is the oddity of this one, that the SSC actually had involvement in the third party assessment, so that it sort of becomes a hybrid; that they recuse themselves from participating actively in the review or serving as a review panelist, I should say, because they can be involved in the review but not as a panelist – just things like that to make that review is really clean will be a smart thing.

MR. HARTIG: Is there any other discussion? John, what do you need from us?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think just acceptance for this process and an acknowledgment that you understand the scheduling and the timing and what we will be doing and when and that you know we're kind of squeezing the schedule a little bit. Ideally we'd more time between the SSC developing these terms of reference and you approving them and the workshop; but you just recognize the timing and realities and you have agreed to this process here.

MR. HARTIG: Do you want a motion or you just want a consensus?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Not particularly; I think consensus that sort of the sequence of events is acceptable.

MR. HARTIG: I see heads nodding; lots of them.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The other item is the sampling information. We had discussion of fishery-dependent sampling intensity at our September meeting and our chairman made a follow-up request to the science center for some additional information and really more detail about species-specific number of lengths, number of trips, number of age structures.

You received a couple of documents included in your Briefing Book 2 information for this committee. It was the protocol for TIP. It describes how the TIP sampling is conducted and the program itself is run. There are a number of tables which gave the number of lengths over like the last ten years or so for different species – this should reflect in the commercial sampling intensity – and then an update on the number of otoliths for a number of stocks that are sampled through TIP and really their status in terms of being read and not read.

Also included in there was I noticed a presentation that was given at the SSC on the SEFIS Program and their efforts toward getting the video indices and such developed. It talks about the expansion of the fishery-independent sampling. I think, Ben, if you have anything to add on these comments or as we further toward answering these questions about sampling.

MR. HARTIG: Bonnie, thanks again for having – I'll tell Jennifer when I see her next week. She will probably be at the king mackerel assessment data workshop that I appreciate the time she put into putting those numbers of otoliths together from the Beaufort Lab. Having said that, it still wasn't exactly what we asked for.

I think at this point what I want to do is probably put everything together we have gotten from you so far and then have staff go through the assessments and then pull out the necessary numbers we need to plug in to compare the targets on the lengths and the targets on age samples with what we've actually collected. That I think we need to do. Mike is probably listening intently because it is probably something that he will be doing. I just ask the committee what their take is on what we've gotten so far. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: The SSC had some discussion of this as well and they actually requested sort of a very general, broad overview of what is collected from the science center staff as well as different state agency partners; you know, who is exactly collecting what in terms of the biological samples in order to better understand who is getting what and how the targets are established.

The SSC reviewed the same biological sampling matrix that the ACCSP puts together and puts out there and I think had a number of questions about how those targets are established and also had some of the same I think conversation that we've had here with regard to the ability to be able to meet those targets and how regulations or low ACLs may impair our ability to reach a certain target number of samples.

If your fishery is closed, then it is closed and you're going to be able to go out and get fishery-dependent biological samples; or, if you have something that is very restrictive like a hundred pound trip limit, you may not be able to capture those samples. They had asked for a presentation – I don't recall if that was at their next meeting in April – regarding exactly how all the different pieces fit together, I think.

I think that is a good idea because there is probably some lack of clarity amongst the partners themselves about who is collecting what and what the level of staffing is from state agencies for collecting biological information to assist the science center and what science center staff are able to do. I do think that kind of broad overview presentation for the SSC would help them to understand why targets are maybe not being met or how they're even set in the first place.

DR. PONWITH: My request is that when requests come through like this we need to make sure that we have a dialogue so that the underpinning objective for the question is well understood. I'm sure it has happened to everybody where you get a question and you answer the question, but it may not be the best methodology for tackling the underpinning objective. I think understanding that underpinning objective is really, really important because then we're able to refine the approach to make sure that the exact data request is going as close to meeting that objective.

If the objective is do you have enough money for biological sampling, there may be a better way of getting at that than saying what was your target and how close did you come to it. As you

can remember from one of the presentations, either the last one or the one that was done in June, targets are set and some of things that influence achieving those targets are the distribution of sampling. In fact, often making sure that the geographic distribution of the sampling effort is proportional to the fishing effort can be important than hitting that target.

If you end up piling all your sampling into one area and those samples are not reflective of the distribution of effort across the coast, you could end up throwing a bunch of those samples away because you've actually oversampled in an area and your limiting effect is the lowest proportionally area and everything else represents an oversample.

It is a complex question and I think having really good dialogues about that underpinning objective of what are you trying to address will make sure that we're as efficient as absolutely possible in getting the answer to achieving that objective.

DR. DUVAL: I don't disagree with that at all and completely understand and acknowledge the point that you just made regarding just the geographic distribution of the sampling. I think one of the objectives is that perhaps the targets themselves are inappropriate in order – are too high to achieve that appropriate spread of geographic sampling.

I think if you look at that ACCSP Biological Matrix, you see a certain number of samples that are set as targets for particular states and particular sectors and particular gear types, I think if I'm remembering things correctly. It maybe that the assets that we have to conduct the sampling combined with regulations and things like ACLs result in targets being set inappropriately high so it has the end of result of looking like we're not achieving our sampling when really there are a whole suite of underlying reasons why that may not be so.

It then begs the question as to whether or not those samples are set appropriately. We're getting ready to do something similar in North Carolina, incorporating our stock assessment staff because they're very important to the process in terms of determining what your appropriate level of sampling is as we look at using different and more complicated models that require samples from different water bodies and different gear types at this time of year, so you're overlaying three different parameters into what is the optimum sample size that you need. I don't want to speak for the SSC but that would be one of my objectives or the information that I would be most interested in hearing and your assessment team needs to have input into that as well.

DR. PONWITH: Those are excellent points and in fact that was part of the presentation in June that raised all the eyebrows at the ACCSP discussions; and that was the mathematical methodology for determining the ideal sampling rate. Of course, the first start of that is looking at what are your desired confidence intervals, what kind of error are you willing to live with to answer the types of questions.

Then that would drive the first cut at what your sampling rate should be, but you can't stop there because there are times where that first cut exceeds what is logistically possible. Then you have to add your management regime on top of there to try and trim that. Yes, I think those discussions are good.

I think that those discussions are most productive by getting the data managers and the data collectors together with the stock assessment scientists, the potential end users of those data, to make sure there is like-mindedness and kind of a unified vision of what we're trying to accomplish and then go back and revisit those if there is a better way of doing it. The one thing you don't want to do when you are resource and time-limited, you don't want to oversample somewhere at the expense of being able to refine those targets. I think that is a smart idea.

DR. DUVAL: And I think in general most people assume that more samples are better but that is not always the case; and there is a balance there between your capacity and then having an ideal number of samples.

MR. HARTIG: Your comments, Bonnie, will segue great into John's idea that I think we have come up with; and if you'd like to explain that to the committee.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Hearing these discussions and trying to fulfill these different requests and work with the people working on them; one of the thoughts that I had was kind of took back to our efforts to come up with the fishery-independent monitoring program. A number of years ago the council said we have a real problem with the lack of fishery-independent sampling; and what we need is a cohesive plan.

We don't know where we're going to get the money, but let's come up with an approach that says this is the way we think we should be conducting this sampling and not just keep being reactionary. We got fishermen together and we got the assessment guys together, the data collectors together, the people experienced in the different independent sampling programs from MARMAP to those in the Gulf of Mexico and came up with that workshop report a couple of years ago for the fishery-independent monitoring program.

It took about a week's worth of work at Beaufort to hold the workshop and then an amount of work afterwards as people worked through kind of the realities. They considered, though, the whole range; the logistics of sampling and what it really means and sort of the council priorities; laid it out, as people might recall, the number of modules; discussed what gives you the biggest bang for the buck.

That kind of leveraged into what became additional money for sampling; and we have gotten the new video survey and expansion of that. I look at that as a really good example of what can happen when we get all these folks around the region working together and put them in a place, lock them up for a while and give them this task and terms of reference and say, "Solve this problem."

I think in a lot of ways – and I really thought about this when the SSC, being scientists from the state agencies, had a lot of questions about, well, who is sampling what. The guys in North Carolina don't necessarily know what Florida is doing in terms of contributing to the TIP Sampling Program.

It is a complicated amount of funding and grant opportunities that goes between the agency and the states and folks like ACCSP in terms of getting money out there for the sampling. It is

contrasting priorities between state species and federal species and interjurisdictional fisheries and cooperative research and all of these different levels that no one really seems to have a good grasp of what is going on. To think that people on the SSC aren't even clear of what maybe their state is doing in terms of collecting bio-samplings for federal-managed species is kind of an eye opening; and it says we do need to get everybody together first and foremost and just figure out who is doing what. It is not

The SSC had the request to get the center to come; but this picture obviously is much bigger than that. It is not just the center; it is the other agencies that are involved, the states themselves that are doing stuff. When we expand this beyond the commercial and TIP, we're dealing with MRIP. That is its whole complex layer in itself, but it is important especially in our region with growing recreational fisheries.

The thought that I had was to consider what has worked in the past, and that was that other workshop. I think the time is right that we hold some type of fishery-dependent workshop. Rather than more presentations to the SSC and more discussion here and more requests to look into things, let's go ahead and just get all those folks that we have discussed here in a space together and we can find the time and money to do it and come up with what is a good, comprehensive fishery-dependent sampling plan for the snapper grouper fishery.

I think we should stop there because that is where a lot of the issues are, but for the snapper grouper fishery in the South Atlantic. I know in my experience in dealing with the sampling of targets and ACCSP and just feeling the approach is not right for the snapper grouper fishery. This is not often a species-targeted type sampling thing; it is trip-targeted.

What we have learned in our assessments is collecting random samples from ages is the way to go. We don't do age/length keys like a lot of that sampling is designed to accommodate. Our situation is different; and I think the only way we're going to get anywhere is to get all the folks that are involved in that as well as the assessments and everything and say your job is to come up with the dependent sampling protocol that everyone can agree to, the assessment guys will meet their needs; and compare and contrast and discuss the pros and cons of different levels of sampling and prioritization of stocks and say how much can you do?

We keep reaching for the moon and we're not even getting there. Well, let's figure out kind of like we did with the independent program what is the biggest bang for the buck, what will it take if I put all my resources – how many species can I get a decent number of age and length samples for; 15, 20. That gives us something to compare then against our priority stocks that we want to manage and then we can figure out the best way to spend our money and know what everybody is doing.

DR. PONWITH: Yes; what he said. This is a smart thing to do; I think an opportunity to kind of regroup and knit together the patchwork and make sure that when we look at it comprehensively, it makes sense to fine tune, build stronger communication is a really smart thing. It is a week's worth of work to do the discussions, but there is going to be a pretty considerable amount of prep work to make sure that everybody is ready going in to get the biggest bang for the buck while they're there.

It is a non-trivial task to capture – you know, have the rapporteurs there to capture the results of that and get it into a really nice camera-ready report; so that when someone asks what do you really need, it is there. I don't want to trivialize what it is going to take to get it done. What I would say is just in light of the conversations we've had already, think about how this fits in from the council's perspective as a priority. If it is a priority, then let's talk about how would you fit that in and when is the ideal place to fit it in, which might come at the expense of, but I agree it is a very smart idea.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any other comments? We probably need a motion on this one on the committee's intent to move forward.

**DR. DUVAL: I move to convene a workshop to develop a comprehensive fishery-dependent sampling program for the snapper grouper fishery of the South Atlantic.**

MR. HARTIG: Seconded by Charlie. Discussion? Is there any objection? **Seeing none; that motion is approved with the understanding of Bonnie's** – we're going to have to look at this in some detail, define it as a priority knowing that it's going to take a lot of time, resources and prep time to be able to do this. To me this is critical for us. Bonnie, most of our species are fishery dependent. That is the data we use. If we're ever going to move forward on any of the species that aren't assessed at some level, we're going to have to start collecting that information for other species as well. Hopefully, part of that will come out in this. Mel.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say I think it is very important. It is foundational to so much of what we do, so we need to make it a priority. I commend you for coming up with that.

MR. MAHOOD: One kind of stark reality I might point out as we move ahead with these things; I think they're good ideas but the councils are looking at potentially taking some big hits. We, out of our administrative budget last year, funded SEDAR or supplemented SEDAR – I don't know the exact number, but it was close to a hundred thousand dollars.

Now, if we don't get more money somehow for the SEDAR activities; all these great plans we have of more assessments, more workshops, this type of thing is going to have to be reassessed at some point prior to the 2014 years. The budget and the SEDAR schedule you have or SEDAR activities schedule you have in the briefing book is pretty much based on level funding in the hopes that we will get that.

We will talk a little bit more about money at the Executive Finance Committee Meeting; but there is wind out there that the councils may be taking a 16 percent cut to help supplement NOAA overseeing us. We will try to learn more about that as time goes on. Some of the regions have been told that. Our Regional Administrator and the folks in the region have not told us anything about that; so we're assuming that Roy is taking care of us. We'll see how it all plays out; but just to point out to everybody money can become a problem here in the near future.

MR. HARTIG: All, what have we got left?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think the first step is getting approval to have the workshop and then we will try to convene a steering committee to figure out how we do this and who would come and when it would be, and then we'll have to consider the budget reality. I think what I'll do is look to contact

the SSC and then probably Bonnie; and if people have some other ideas somebody would like to see on the steering committee, some state folks to get representatives from all the people that have got their hands in that pie and try to get at least a preliminary plan underway in the next few months.

MR. HARTIG: I see heads nodding. Bonnie, National Standard 2.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, very briefly, National Standard 2 Guidelines came out in the Federal Register, and one of the provisions of the guidelines includes a pretty heavy component on peer review. One of the things it was careful to stress is there are stipulations that peer review need to meet; but that they also are adamant that peer review doesn't become redundant.

It is crystal clear that if a council has a peer review process and that peer review process has been scrutinized and deemed to have met the requirements of National Standard 2 Guidelines under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, then it is good to go. One of the things that we need to do is take a look at our peer review process under SEDAR – and SEDAR is called out by name in the National Standard 2 Guideline Revisions – to circle back and confirm that the peer review process we've established in the SEDAR protocols do indeed continue to meet the National Standard 2 Guidelines as revised.

If indeed that is the case, we would have to communicate that to the Secretary of Commerce; and the Secretary of Commerce then is required to post to the Federal Register confirmation that is indeed the case along with a very brief overview of what that peer review process is; not the whole protocol, just a very brief overview.

In addition to that, then the council is required to post the complete protocol to the website so that the public has access to that. With that as backdrop, the question is how would we like to have the confirmation from the Secretary of Commerce that the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council's Peer Review Process comports with the National Standard 2 Guidelines communicated?

As the Science Board with the NOAA Fisheries Service, my peers, the six fishery science center directors, the head of the Office of Science and Technology and our chief scientists had a discussion on this and our view on this was that it would be expedient to have one Federal Register Notice for the entire country that confirms each of the different peer review processes used by the fishery management councils have been reviewed and they meet the standards.

I've asked the Gulf Council if they concur with this view or whether their preference was to have a standalone; and they concurred that having one Federal Register Notice was expedient and clean, makes one-stop shopping for ourselves and for our constituents. I just wanted to hear your views on this. Do you concur with the notion that SEDAR process would be put in one Federal Register Notice nationwide?

MR. HARTIG: Well, personally I don't have a problem with it. It seems to be pretty expedient, timely and efficient and we should probably do that. My only question is what is the timing; when do we have to complete the review and be in compliance with when that needs to be in?

DR. PONWITH: Our goal is to have the Federal Register Notice ready to go within six months of when we looked at the guidelines, which those guidelines I think came out in August; so it would be an opportunity – I think one of the next things we're going to talk about is convening the full body of the SEDAR Steering Committee.

Since the federal component of that august were missing from the discussion due to the shutdown, to convene that, and that would be an opportunity to circle back, look at those protocols against the National Standard 2 Revised Guidelines, make that confirmation and then it is simply a matter of sending some sort of notification to headquarters saying this has been done and we deem that the SEDAR process as it currently exists meets those protocols.

MR. HARTIG: All right, thank you, we've got a way forward and we will do that. That concludes the business except for the closed session and we will hold the closed session after lunch. We will take care of the SEDAR business first and then go right into advisory panel selection. We will come back here at 1:30 to do that. The SEDAR Committee stands in recess.

(Whereupon, the open session of the meeting was adjourned at 11:55 o'clock a., December 3, 2013.)

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

Transcribed By:  
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.  
January 2, 2014

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

## 2013 - 2014 Council Membership

**COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:**

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

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

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

**VICE-CHAIRMAN**

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

**Jack Cox**  
2010 Bridges Street  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/728-9548  
Dayboat1965@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

**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

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

**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

**David M. Cupka**  
P.O. Box 12753  
Charleston, SC 29422  
843/795-8591 (hm)  
843/870-5495 (cell)  
palmettobooks@bellsouth.net

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

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

**LT Morgan Fowler**  
U.S. Coast Guard  
510 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Court  
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315  
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

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

*JACK MCGOVERN  
PAUL STEELE  
PRES FATE  
MICHAEL LARKIN  
GEORGE SEDBERRY  
MARCEL REICHERT  
LUIZ BARBIERI  
BONNIE PONWICH  
MONICA SMITH-BRUNELLO  
OTHA EASLEY  
CHEP COLLEER  
DOUG BOYD  
RICH CHESSLER*

**Zack Bowen**  
11 Kingsridge Court  
Savannah, GA 31419  
912/398-3733 (ph)  
fishzack@comcast.net

**John W. Jolley**  
4925 Pine Tree Drive  
Boynton Beach, FL 33436  
561/732-4530 (ph)  
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

## 2013-2014 Committees

### ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Chris Conklin  
Jack Cox  
Ben Hartig  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

### CATCH SHARES

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

### DATA COLLECTION

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

### DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair  
Zack Bowen  
David Cupka  
Doug Haymans  
John Jolley  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

### ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

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

### EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

### GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair  
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair  
Roy Crabtree  
John Jolley  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

### HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wilson Laney, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Doug Haymans  
John Jolley  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese  
Anna Martin- Coral

### HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

David Cupka, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Zack Bowen  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

### INFORMATION & EDUCATION

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

### KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

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

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

### PERSONNEL

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

### PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Michelle Duval  
LT Morgan Fowler  
John Jolley  
Wilson Laney  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

### SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

### SEDAR

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

### SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair  
Mel Bell  
Roy Crabtree  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Anna Martin

(Continued)

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

## Executive Director

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

## Deputy Executive Director

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

---

## Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson  
kim.iverson@safmc.net

## Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten  
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

## Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

## Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

## Coral Reef Scientist

✓ Anna Martin  
anna.martin@safmc.net

## Fishery Biologist

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

## Fisheries Social Scientist

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

## Staff Economist

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

## Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

## SEDAR Coordinators

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

## SEDAR Admin/Outreach

Andrea Grabman  
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

## Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins  
mike.collins@safmc.net

## Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher  
deb.buscher@safmc.net

## Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

## Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell  
julie.odell@safmc.net

# PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

## South Atlantic Fishery Management Council December 2013 Meeting

**SEDAR Committee:**  
Tuesday, December 3, 2013

<u>NAME &amp; ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE &amp; PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE &amp; ZIP</u>
Emilia Merrick Fed			
Leanna Fox SP	910-621-5847		
Randy Johnson SEFIS ECFIS	386-239-0948	rlj2009@aol.com	32120-9357
Mick Hopkins NMS	228-549-1767	michhopkins@nrc.us.gov	202 Delmar Av Pensacola
Blake Price NMS	228-364-8154	blake.price@nrc.us.gov	Beaufort, NC 285
Gretchen Markhi EDF			
Gene Sherry NOAA			
Bob Long CCA NC			WILMINGTON, NC
Chip Walker NC DWF		chip.walker@ncdwr.gov	Wilmington NC

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

68	Ballenger, Joseph	<a href="mailto:ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov">ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov</a>	80 min
62	Mehta, Nikhil	<a href="mailto:nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov">nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov</a>	59 min
59	Raine, Karen	<a href="mailto:karen.raine@noaa.gov">karen.raine@noaa.gov</a>	152 min
58	Gerhart, Susan	<a href="mailto:susan.gerhart@noaa.gov">susan.gerhart@noaa.gov</a>	51 min
57	Wynn, Chris	<a href="mailto:chris.wynn@myfwc.com">chris.wynn@myfwc.com</a>	16 min
55	holland, jack	<a href="mailto:jack.holland@ncdenr.gov">jack.holland@ncdenr.gov</a>	28 min
50	meyers, steve	<a href="mailto:steve.meyers@noaa.gov">steve.meyers@noaa.gov</a>	152 min
47	burton, michael	<a href="mailto:michael.burton@noaa.gov">michael.burton@noaa.gov</a>	69 min
46	E, A	<a href="mailto:annemarie.eich@noaa.gov">annemarie.eich@noaa.gov</a>	48 min
42	Moss, David	<a href="mailto:david@smoss.com">david@smoss.com</a>	93 min
42	Bademan, Martha	<a href="mailto:martha.bademan@myfwc.com">martha.bademan@myfwc.com</a>	109 min
40	Swatzel, Tom	<a href="mailto:tom@sustainablefishing.or...">tom@sustainablefishing.or...</a>	120 min
37	Cairns, Kalani	<a href="mailto:kalani1@bellsouth.net">kalani1@bellsouth.net</a>	126 min
36	Miller, Savannah	<a href="mailto:sgmill3@emory.edu">sgmill3@emory.edu</a>	49 min
36	merrifield, jeanna...	<a href="mailto:jeannam@wildoceanmarket.c...">jeannam@wildoceanmarket.c...</a>	152 min
35	DeVictor, Rick	<a href="mailto:rick.devictor@noaa.gov">rick.devictor@noaa.gov</a>	70 min
32	Bresnen, Anthony	<a href="mailto:anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...">anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...</a>	91 min
31	Takade-Heumacher, ...	<a href="mailto:htakade@edf.org">htakade@edf.org</a>	152 min
30	Byrd, Julia	<a href="mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net">julia.byrd@safmc.net</a>	152 min
30	Helies, Frank	<a href="mailto:fchelies@verizon.net">fchelies@verizon.net</a>	91 min
29	c, m	<a href="mailto:mec181@yahoo.com">mec181@yahoo.com</a>	150 min
29	Newman, David	<a href="mailto:dnewman@nrdc.org">dnewman@nrdc.org</a>	92 min
28	blough, heather	<a href="mailto:heather.blough@noaa.gov">heather.blough@noaa.gov</a>	58 min
27	Knowlton, Kathy	<a href="mailto:kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org">kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org</a>	77 min
27	Baker, Scott	<a href="mailto:bakers@uncw.edu">bakers@uncw.edu</a>	100 min
25	sandorf, scott	<a href="mailto:scott.sandorf@noaa.gov">scott.sandorf@noaa.gov</a>	66 min
24	Sedberry, George	<a href="mailto:george.sedberry@noaa.gov">george.sedberry@noaa.gov</a>	4 min
24	Denit, Kelly	<a href="mailto:kelly.denit@noaa.gov">kelly.denit@noaa.gov</a>	27 min

21	Fey, Kasey	<a href="mailto:info@keyskeeper.org">info@keyskeeper.org</a>	5 min
80	L, I	<a href="mailto:captaindrifter@bellsouth...">captaindrifter@bellsouth...</a>	247 min
78	Bademan, Martha	<a href="mailto:martha.bademan@myfwc.com">martha.bademan@myfwc.com</a>	209 min
76	Morgan, Jerry	<a href="mailto:b8ntackle@aol.com">b8ntackle@aol.com</a>	165 min
74	Moss, David	<a href="mailto:david@smoss.com">david@smoss.com</a>	108 min
64	Fey, Kasey	<a href="mailto:info@keyskeeper.org">info@keyskeeper.org</a>	27 min
64	Cairns, Kalani	<a href="mailto:kalani1@bellsouth.net">kalani1@bellsouth.net</a>	1 min
49	Raine, Karen	<a href="mailto:karen.raine@noaa.gov">karen.raine@noaa.gov</a>	102 min
48	holiman, stephen	<a href="mailto:stephen.holiman@noaa.gov">stephen.holiman@noaa.gov</a>	124 min
46	Mehta, Nikhil	<a href="mailto:nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov">nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov</a>	103 min
40	blough, heather	<a href="mailto:heather.blough@noaa.gov">heather.blough@noaa.gov</a>	92 min
39	meyers, steve	<a href="mailto:steve.meyers@noaa.gov">steve.meyers@noaa.gov</a>	62 min
37	DeVictor, Rick	<a href="mailto:rick.devictor@noaa.gov">rick.devictor@noaa.gov</a>	87 min
34	Knowlton, Kathy	<a href="mailto:kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org">kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org</a>	3 min
34	E, A	<a href="mailto:annemarie.eich@noaa.gov">annemarie.eich@noaa.gov</a>	124 min
33	malinowski, rich	<a href="mailto:rich.malinowski@noaa.gov">rich.malinowski@noaa.gov</a>	28 min
31	Gore, Karla	<a href="mailto:karla.gore@noaa.gov">karla.gore@noaa.gov</a>	38 min
31	Michie, Kate	<a href="mailto:kate.michie@noaa.gov">kate.michie@noaa.gov</a>	96 min
29	Baker, Scott	<a href="mailto:bakers@uncw.edu">bakers@uncw.edu</a>	80 min
29	Dale, David	<a href="mailto:david.dale@noaa.gov">david.dale@noaa.gov</a>	86 min
29	Denit, Kelly	<a href="mailto:kelly.denit@noaa.gov">kelly.denit@noaa.gov</a>	16 min
28	Bresnen, Anthony	<a href="mailto:anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...">anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...</a>	85 min
28	Lloyd, Vic	<a href="mailto:vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net">vic_lloyd@bellsouth.net</a>	50 min
28	Herndon, Andrew	<a href="mailto:andrew.herndon@noaa.gov">andrew.herndon@noaa.gov</a>	85 min
27	Helies, Frank	<a href="mailto:fchelies@verizon.net">fchelies@verizon.net</a>	77 min
27	Package-Ward, Chri...	<a href="mailto:christina.package-ward@no...">christina.package-ward@no...</a>	23 min
27	Tsao, Fan	<a href="mailto:fan.tsao@noaa.gov">fan.tsao@noaa.gov</a>	54 min
26	c, m	<a href="mailto:mec181@yahoo.com">mec181@yahoo.com</a>	127 min

26	Byrd, Julia	<a href="mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net">julia.byrd@safmc.net</a>	69 min
24	burton, michael	<a href="mailto:michael.burton@noaa.gov">michael.burton@noaa.gov</a>	75 min
24	merrifield, jeanna...	<a href="mailto:jeannam@wildoceanmarket.c...">jeannam@wildoceanmarket.c...</a>	94 min
24	sandorf, scott	<a href="mailto:scott.sandorf@noaa.gov">scott.sandorf@noaa.gov</a>	38 min
22	Takade-Heumacher, ...	<a href="mailto:htakade@edf.org">htakade@edf.org</a>	37 min