SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SEDAR COMMITTEE

King and Prince Hotel
St. Simons Island, Georgia

March 3, 2015

<u>SUMMARY MINUTES</u>

<u>SEDAR Committee</u>

Ben Hartig, Chair
Chris Conklin, Vice-Chair
Jack Cox
Dr. Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown

<u>Council Members</u>

Mel Bell
Jessica McCawley
Anna Beckwith
Lt. Morgan Fowler
Chester Brewer
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Dr. Wilson Laney
Doug Haymans

<u>Council Staff:</u>

Bob Mahood
Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Mike Collins
Dr. Mike Errigo
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Chip Collier
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Amber Von Harten
Kim Iverson
Myra Brouwer
Julie O'Dell

<u>Observers/Participants:</u>

Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Erika Burgess
Pres Pate
Roy Williams
Spc. Agt. Tracey Woodruff
Iris Lowery
Barb Zoodsma
Dr. George Sedberry

Other Participants Attached

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in open session in the Sidney Lanier Ballroom of the King and Prince Hotel, St. Simons Island, Georgia, March 3, 2015, and was called to order at 8:45 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Ben Hartig.

MR. HARTIG: We'll give the public a minute or two to get back in and then we'll go ahead and go back to the original agenda. We'll go back to the agenda and the first item is approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Is there any objection to approving the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved.

The next item of business is approval of the minutes. Are there any changes, corrections, deletions to the minutes? Is there objection to approving the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That brings us now down to the activities update, John Carmichael. That is Attachment 2.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You have the schedule update in here, so I'll highlight a couple of things that are going on at the moment. One of the things is the SEDAR staff is working on our schedule of projects for 2016 and expect to have that cobbled together here in the next few weeks and then run by the Steering Committee. We'll have a handle on when things will take place then.

It is one of those things it is a little behind where we like it to be at this point, just as we dealt with some scheduling issues over the winter months, and there are consequences to all that and it slows us down in our planning, unfortunately, but it is underway now. We are hoping to make some progress.

One of the big things that is going on right now that crosses all of the SEDAR activities is the Procedures Workshop for Best Practices of Data. The idea here is to come up with some guidelines and some standards and some agreed-upon decisions to help streamline the data process. The overall intent is to address those things for which consistent decisions have been made across all the various SEDARs, so that attention at the workshops can focus more on the unique aspects of each species or the particular data sets that you're dealing with at a particular time and not spend so much time addressing things where the outcome is fairly well certain either because there is just simply not information or because there is fairly good practices for dealing with it.

We're in the planning stages now and it is kind of a different path. It is new territory we're covering here in terms of trying to get this done and it is really a big effort. The general approach is going to be to convene a number of working groups over webinars to just go through the types of data decisions that have been made at the various data category areas that we have within the data workshops such as life history, commercial/recreational statistics, and all of that.

Those guys are going to really do sort of the first triage or what are the issues that are pretty straightforward to them, what are the issues that are really complicated and may be beyond best practices, and what are the ones sort of in the gray area that might lead to more discussion? There is going to be four or five of these webinars.

They are going to come up with the first set of recommendations that will go to the Organizing Committee. Those will be used by the Organizing Committee to decide how to structure the actual workshop, which is going to be held toward the latter half of June. The idea is to sort of figure out what is the low-hanging fruit; what are the clear things we can agree to pretty quickly?

Then what are the things that we can probably reach some type of consensus to develop recommendations in the workshop framework? The idea in the workshop is that each of these groups will have technical groups related to these data areas, kind of a subset of those on a webinar. They will come together and they will do some work face to face at the workshop, and then we'll all get together in plenary along with a core group of 20 or so; with key representatives from the Science Center teams and representatives from all the SSCs and the cooperators; who will then make the actual best practices recommendations as a combination of sort of this core group to provide consistency as well as bring that big picture.

Because if you always work in the commercial group, you might not be aware of some of the next level decisions that are critical whereas this group of folks will be. Then hopefully come out of it with a series of best practices that will enable people to better prepare for the data workshops. If we have a consistent way of dealing with natural mortality at age, we can put that into place, we can go in and they have those documentation of that; it should reduce the amount of documentation that is necessary in our assessment reports.

There is an awful lot of what has become boilerplate, documenting consistent decisions, as well as reduce the discussion of things that is just plowing the same ground over and over again. It is kind of a big effort; it is an ambitious effort. We're up to maybe 60 some people possibly being at the workshop, with some of those obviously coming in maybe for a day or two, and then a core group that is there the whole time.

I think there is some hesitancy, a little nervousness as to how this is all going to come together; but in a lot of ways we're building on what we learned with our Shrimp Data Workshop we did for the South Atlantic. We did an inventory of data there and we have a similar effort here with all the people kind of inventorying data issues, using a spreadsheet tool like we used there.

I am pretty confident the folks involved in it are going to be able to pull it off. Julia Byrd has been really devoting a lot of her time to this. This lull while SEDAR 41 has been getting restarted has turned out to be very helpful for that, because she's had a full-time job dealing with this. One of the biggest challenges has really just been identifying what are the true issues that should be addressed here versus maybe what are the ones that are sort of more internal to different groups and affect their data policies.

To manage the scope, we've made it clear we're just dealing with the things that are really truly of a SEDAR nature and things that really deal with the data decisions that will actually form the basis of the workshop essentially.

MR. BELL: What you're describing is the June 2015 workshop. What is the 2016 above that? Is it two different things?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, the one above it is just the general workshop, all the projects going on in 2016. This is the third paragraph, the procedures workshop and the other workshops, June 15 to 19, 2015; webinars of these different groups getting started here pretty soon. We'll need to make appointments for the actual workshop. What I will likely do is approach the Executive Director and Council Chair to get appointments and approval for the desired participants once the Organizing Committee has identified them.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions of John the way it is laid out? It became quite a lot after I reviewed the outline. I was amazed. The schedule looks a bit ambitious, but we'll see how it works. Any questions of John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: About that schedule; it is absolutely ambitious and the Organizing Committee came down to – when they looked at the schedules of all the key folks involved and realized if it didn't happen by, say, June, then between the Beaufort folks being tied up with SEDAR 41 and the kick in of the ICCAT schedule and stuff that happens in the fall and a lot of SEDAR workshops already scheduled; if it didn't happen in June, it was probably going to roll over to like March of next year. That is where everybody sort of got on this ambitious schedule. We are well aware of that. It has definitely put some people in kind of a bind for a few weeks here, no doubt.

DR. PONWITH: I agree it is ambitious. I also agree that the bind is exactly as John described it. I just want to thank everybody who has pushed to get it this far along. This workshop I think is going to be really critical to dealing with at least one and possibly more of the recommendations that came out of the peer review on stock assessment processes this summer.

That is to find a way to look across the assessments that you're doing and take a more standardized approach to the way you handle those data, so that you're not revisiting those same decisions assessment after assessment after assessment and having to document independently each of those decisions.

Instead to take that standardized approach, pick the ones that are very stable over time and do represent the best practices and document the daylights out of those. Then from that point forward all you have to do is site that documentation. With that kind of a practice it can dramatically streamline the stock assessment reports with which we've been criticized for being too unwieldy and unapproachable.

With changes like this, it also addresses the through-put issue by making those stock assessments more efficient. I recognize this is going to be a lot of work on people who are already really, really busy; but I think it is an investment that will bring great returns going into the future. We really want to congratulate the group on their progress.

MR. HARTIG: I agree, Bonnie. I've got some things that are rather specific that I've written down – I didn't have time to type them down and get them to John yet – that I've been asking for quite some time in reviewing how we're collecting data; what species are we collecting too much data for?

Look at the ACCSP targets versus the MARMAP sampling across species and see where maybe in some instances you are collecting enough data in MARMAP for a specific species and you may not have to collect as much samples outside of that. You may be able to free up some of the port sampler's time to get to other species that we haven't addressed.

That is just one of the things, looking across the ACCSP sampling targets. The other thing is when we look across these samples, do we have enough TIP personnel to actually do the sampling to actually get the number of samples that we need based on ACCSP? Do we have the number of TIP samplers that will actually collect that information based on the priority species matrix we have? That is a question that I think we need to answer.

What are the priority species? I don't know what all the priority species are; those are things that I would like to know. When we talk about citizen science and we move forward to some of the species that we don't collect the necessary information for, we can focus on some of those species additionally through the citizen's science participation process.

How much we need, we talked about that one. The other thing is in the sampling matrix from ACCSP; try to avoid the targets during the closures. If you are setting up targets that you have during closed periods, like for the groupers, those are things that can't be realized. Whenever you evaluate this in the context that it is obviously evaluated, you need to remove that kind of samples.

If you want to give it some kind of grade; that is not necessarily what I'm getting at. Are we collecting enough data to monitor some of our fisheries? Remove those kinds of samples from that analysis that you're doing. We can't collect those samples during that time. The other thing is when we have vermilion snapper and golden tilefish, when we have these derbies and we know the fishery is going to only last six weeks; are we putting enough people on during those six weeks to get the samples we need to monitor the fishery for the whole year?

You are going to have to really construct your data gathering into that confined period of the fishery opening. You are going to have to collect more samples in a short time frame, and do we have the personnel available to be able to do that? There are a number of things that I've thought about to enter into this.

Then the trip sampling; Beaufort really focuses on the trip sampling. How do we make sure that we get enough trips for Beaufort to be able to do the analysis? The effort by species; that is the other thing; a shortfall of a number of these assessments in snowy grouper, we can't use. We had that one small fishery-independent index we use of abundance.

Okay we had the commercial fishery we can't use, because we don't have effort estimates by species from the logbook. That is a recurring theme in a number of assessments where we can't break out the effort for these different species. Trying to address that in some kind of redoing of the logbook, a discussion about, well, maybe some species are caught in groups, so we could actually give an effort to that.

Other species, there are single-species fisheries for snowies in some cases where you catch your fish in less than a half an hour. You catch your trip limit. All these things need to be known when you are trying to develop effort parameters for these assessments. These are things that I would like to see investigated in this effort. There are shortcomings that we need to address in the assessment. I am sure you've got something to say about some of this, Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Fasten your seatbelt; I agree with absolutely everything you said – did you get that, Joe – but there is a really big catch. That is that in my mind when we originally talked about this at the SEDAR Steering Committee, the purpose of this meeting wasn't on the collection side, it is on the data-handling side. I believe everything that you talked about needs to be done, but I think that the data collectors and the people who are the design experts on making decisions about how you manage variance in those data by a well-designed sampling regime are a completely different set of people than we envisioned having at this workshop.

This workshop, the data are already in our hands. These would be the people who are generating the indices from those data. Have the procedures for how those indices are generated been properly documented and properly peer reviewed and tucked away so that when we talk about an index, all you have to do is refer to that one document as opposed to reinventing the wheel.

If we use the MRIP data and convert that from numbers to pound so that those can go into a biomass-based assessment, has the procedure for how we deal with cells that are missing data; has that been properly documented? If adjustments have to be made on sampling because of unknown bias and we do a calibration on that; has that procedure been properly documented?

Then instead of doing it over and over and over again and discussing it over, you do it once. You decide this is the way we're going to do it. Then the only time you ever have to document it again is if you depart from what is the approved standardized way. What I hear you saying is absolutely correct.

I am working right now on trying to acquire some resources to do essentially a focused management strategy evaluation on our data collections for life history and that would tackle all the things that you talked about and it would tackle it with really the experts on that sample design as opposed to the data analysis. I would just ask and confirm with John; i just want to confirm is that your understanding of what we talked about at the SEDAR Steering Committee or do I have it wrong?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I agree completely with both of you. Yes, you have it exactly right. This is kind of coming at a stage after where Ben's issues really all lie within the data collection and the planning that leads into the data collection. I've been involved with the planning of this for a long time through being on ACCSP committees that set initial standards for many years.

That is a lot of folks getting together and even within our region we maybe aren't always on the same page with folks within the states who put in sampling targets, then the Science Center puts in sampling targets, and we're over here managing snapper grouper as the council, and everyone has got their hands involved somewhat in how many snowy grouper samples should be collected during this quarter and this area by this gear.

It's really complicated, and I've for a long time felt that some sort of data summit where all the folks from our region could get together and say this is our unified front that we want to go to ACCSP as sort of an overarching holder of these data standards and collection targets, but also then make the relation to let's have realistic targets that we then hold people to.

Because if you've been involved in that, you know there is a tendency for a lot of expansion of targets beyond, as we saw in snowy, sometimes reasonable levels. I think Bonnie mentioning in this funding to do some management strategy evaluation would be outstanding and it might give us an opportunity to the leverage of really getting the folks together from all the state agencies, from the Science Center, and figure out comprehensively how best do we go after these species? What are the priorities I think the council – you guys coming up with priority species would be huge in terms of adding efficiency to this process.

Because we know some species are just so rare; we shouldn't be trying to even attempt to sample those, to collect age samples to do an age-based stock assessment. We have been pushing that at the SSC for a while. We've gotten a little on the back burner, because we learned last spring that the agency has a national effort underway to prioritize species.

We're interested in seeing where that goes and if that truly gets us to identifying our priority species and characterizing them by stock assessment types, as we've kind of been hinting at in our research plan for many years; well, to me that is sort of the other piece to that puzzle. What are the target species? How do you want to sample each species that we manage?

Then how do we get all of our technical folks together to come up and have a united front in terms of the targets that we go to all these sampling groups such as ACCSP and then within the Center and figure out how we get there.

MR. HARTIG: I'm disappointed, but not quite as much. This is something we've had a lot of conversations about, Bonnie. This is something we've talked over quite some time. I'm heartened to hear that you're willing to put this workshop together to do that. I would like to see possibly what you envisioned the scheduling might be for that; what you are looking at. I am sure it is dependent on if you get the resources or not to do it. Maybe a letter up there to the head scientists saying how important this is for our region may help. I don't know; we'll talk about it.

DR. PONWITH: To that end; I've been in communication with headquarters, with Rick Methot, our ST for stock assessments, and he understands how earnest we are about tackling the problem that you've laid out. We've got an idea in the works that would help us tackle this on a fairly comprehensive basis. I don't mean just getting ACCSP and the Beaufort people together; I mean this would be for the region.

I would probably exclude the Caribbean just because of the idiosyncrasies of aging animals in that area. The deep-water species we can do good work on, but it would certainly include the Gulf. It would look at what is the distribution of port-sampling effort; how much natural variability is there in the age structure?

The whole purpose of this would be to look at it from a variance standpoint, how tolerant the stock assessment is of variance in the age structure, how reliant it is on an age-based assessment and use that to set sort of the major framework of how we distribute our precious effort across the entire enterprise.

That would be our collaborations with the states, with ACCSP, with the commissions, and with our own people and create that broader framework; and then you can tier down from that and get at the more nuance stuff of how do we set up a system that is resilient to regulations? Like you did a very job of articulating if there is a closed season, you shouldn't be looking for those fish; you can put your attentions elsewhere. The whole idea is to make sure that the strata we've developed from meaningful sampling are populated according to a very carefully devised plan that is not pie in the sky, where if you sampled every fish, you would hit your target because that is simply not realistic.

I liken it to this. This is what it's like. If you go to any blue mailbox in the universe, that blue mailbox has the last pickup time and say, well, we pick up at 1:00, but we also pick up at 5:00; 5:00 is the last pickup time. Every single blue mailbox in the United States says 5:00 o'clock. Where are all those letter carriers, I'm asking you?

You can't be at the same place at 5:00 o'clock at every blue box in the country. That is what it's like trying to get a 70 percent sample of snowy groupers. You can't be at the right place at the right time, because sometimes it is just luck of being at the fish house when that snowy grouper is going to be landed. Being realistic about how you distribute that sampling effort I think is going to be really important. I think this work will go a long way to tackling that on a systematic level.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that. I'll hold my tongue, but I appreciate the effort.

MR. BROWN: John, when you were talking it sounded like kind of an umbrella type of overarching plan to evaluate whatever species it was. Are you talking about an entire range of it; not just in our region but the range of the species or were you just specifically talking about in the South Atlantic? In other words, we have some species that are in the South Atlantic that go into other regions. Were you talking about incorporating those into the assessment and everything, too?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Are you talking about in terms of the sampling? Well, yes, we're obviously interested in things right here within our area; but when we have species that we manage that extend into other regions, then we're also interested in the sampling targets for those species in other areas.

That is where something like ACCSP gives us some voice to perhaps get some targets for species of ours that extend farther north. Ideally we do want to get samples from the entire range of these species and not just within our water boundaries. If the species goes to New Jersey, we would like to get samples of that species out of New Jersey.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee; but yes, John, that goes to the whole point that we were talking about yesterday, too, about climate change. You start picking some of those things up unless you are getting samples from outside the region to show – in some cases ranges are expanding and maybe in other cases ranges are shrinking, too. That to me just highlights the importance of that ACCSP process and putting that sampling matrix together.

MR. HARTIG: Any other questions for John about this particular item? We kind of need to move on. I burned up some time, sorry. Okay, what do you want to do next?

MR. CARMICHAEL: A couple more updates; things near and dear to everybody's heart is MRIP and the number of calibration efforts that are underway. The calibration for the changes in the Access Intercept Survey; the report is nearly done. I am waiting on like three numbers to complete that and get it out.

But we've seen the first interim transitions, things applied and went through the Gulf red snapper update assessment, which was done recently and will be going into the Gulf red grouper. Work is still underway for sort of the ideal calibration approach. That was scheduled to be done early this spring. Hopefully that is getting pretty darned close.

But, really, the big thing to be on the lookout for is the calibration for the effort survey, which is the part which has been taken through the telephone call since the beginning. That is going to be shifting to a mail survey and getting out to people in a lot better forum. We believe that this is likely to have some pretty big changes.

At least the preliminary pilot studies have shown some incredible changes in the catch estimates as a result of getting better information on the actual effort. There has been a transition group and most all of you have a representative on that that has been meeting weekly for the last several months and have a plan ready to go forward to the NMFS leadership based on two options for transition, really; a two year and a three year. The group has come out very strongly in support of the three year.

What that means is there would be side by side of the telephone survey and the mail survey is starting this year, so they will be side by side in 2015 and 2016. They will start working on the calibration when they've got just about the full two years of side by side, developing the model. The plan is then in the third year put it out for peer review.

Then in that third year in 2017, the side by side is still going on, because you don't have ACLs yet, but you are still managing your fisheries off of that; so that continues with the goal that by the end of 2017 you've got a model; it has been peer reviewed. It has been accepted; it has been used to develop the calibrations to go forward for managing the things that are on the old currency looking ahead for future assessments.

You can start putting ACL rules into place during 2017 ideally, have a lot of them going in 2018. Some that will be waiting for assessments may take a little bit longer. Our thought in terms of assessment planning, which really affects this committee, is looking to like 2017 what are going to be our priorities for the stocks that we think it is most important to get the new numbers updated into our assessments.

In terms of SEDAR planning, we'll probably have to start looking ahead to what are the key stocks that we'd like to do as a number of updates in 2017 to take advantage of this new information. Obviously getting the data, you're going to be the latter half of 2017 when you do that. Only so much people, limited time; there are only going to be so many assessments we can do.

Now if the two-year plan comes forward, then all this obviously starts a year sooner. They will do two, maybe three years of side-by-side benchmarking, but they will start developing the model without a full year of side-by-side data, go through the peer review and all of that and doing the assessment updates.

What really gives me pause with that is there is the idea that we could do assessment updates under the two year in like 2016, and then we'll get a little bit better estimates for them in 2017. Then we could fine tune is the language that was used. I've called on that a couple times like there is no such thing as fine tuning a stock assessment.

We put the new data in; we do it. It is not a fine tune in any sense of the word. If the two years should go, I think it is going to give us a lot of uncertainty in our schedule. It has sort of a fail safe that if the group doesn't think there is enough data half way through, then they can say; wait, we really need an extra year, which could throw all of our plans in upheaval.

Due to the uncertainty and the idea that I want to do an update once of, say, red snapper, and not do an update in 2016 and then get some fine-tuned numbers and do another update in 2017, because that really sets our net cumulative stock assessment productivity way back; so we favor 2017. Mel is on the plan and he has helped us in that regard in terms of putting forth this and the council's perspective on the realities of it.

We need to watch where this goes, and I'll keep you abreast of the developments there and let you know what the final decision is as soon as we hear it; but we're certainly hoping that the leadership is going to go with the three year and give us time to do this calibration the most technically feasible approach we can, armed with adequate information and let us make good assessment plans that we can then stick to.

I really don't want to end up in a knee jerk, assess black sea bass in 2016, and then turn around and update it again in 2017 because we've made a slight tweak to the numbers. Even a slight tweak, as we've seen, can have repercussions. It then makes people if they didn't like the outcome of that first update; well, you've got new numbers; so you've got best science, it is new numbers.

You are going to be in a really tough spot to not update again a controversial stock assessment. Even if we know scientifically it may just make the slightest change and not really affect anybody's regulations; it is the fact that you have dissatisfaction with an outcome and now you have different best science.

You've now armed those folks that are dissatisfied with a way to come back and leverage into doing another assessment in a subsequent year, which to me in terms of trying to make the most of our scarce assessment resources, that is just disastrous in my eyes. This is ongoing. The final report is expected to go to the NMFS leadership really soon, the next couple weeks if not later this week or next week.

We should hear back hopefully right quick as to how this is going. Then this transition team is going to keep working on this. They will be keeping up with the estimates; they'll be making some of the interim decisions. We're in this for the long haul, really, but it is worth paying attention to because we've done a lot with the changes in MRIP up to this point. Those have just been minor tweaks compared to what this is likely to do in terms of changing the estimates.

MR. BELL: I'm not on your committee, but both John and Mike did a great job of helping move this thing along. What was interesting in the whole process was in Day One I would have told you people were kind of leaning towards a two-year option or a quicker option. By the time we reached last week, I think it was unanimous in terms of the entire group.

That is the feedback that is going back to NMFS leadership. They will have to decide what to do with that. It was all of us operating independently kind of came up with that conclusion I think individually. We'll see what happens, but I really hope it works out that way.

MR. HARTIG: Any other questions of John about the MRIP initiative, how we're changing and moving forward? Seeing none; next item.

MR. CARMICHAEL: A couple updates from the Science Center, and, Bonnie, I will pull the presentations up. First we had the headboat data evaluation. I am assuming everybody recalls this. This was the issues with the historical early years of the headboat data and the reporting. The Beaufort Group and Bonnie's folks have been working on this for the last several months to try and come up with a way to evaluate it and have a good quantitative basis for any adjustments they make.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, that is correct. This is an in-depth QA/QC evaluation that we're doing. This isn't just a calibration looking at kind of before or after or two data streams. It is an in-depth QA/QC that we're doing based on some of the feedback that we've gotten from industry folks. This work will ultimately influence not just the indices of abundance, but it could potentially influence the actual landings.

That is landings now but also landings going back in time as well, because anything that influences the index, of course, is associated with the landings. Again, the purpose of this is to look at potential bias or issues that we had with some of the self-reported data in the Southeast Region Headboat Survey that came up during the Red Snapper Data Workshop.

We're taking two approaches to this. One is kind of a programmatic approach and then the other one is analytical. The programmatic is really going back and revisiting what those QA/QC procedures for the people who are running the program over the course of its history were and how those QA/QC procedures were exercised over time; were they consistent; did they change; were they pretty regimented in carrying those out?

The next part of it in the next slide is the analytical approach. This is to take a look at the three data sets we have that shed light on these landings and the indices that are based on them. Those are the actual catch records, the logbooks from the industry, dockside samples, which are used to collect biological samples from the fish that are brought in and also do some dockside validation of those self-reported data.

Then also starting in 2004 we had some headboat observers and those data are going to be invaluable. The plan is to flag vessels based on a set of metrics, which you can see here. If we see repeat values; if every single day the answer was 42 and it was 42 and it was 42; we might want to look into that to see if it really was 42.

If we see constantly rounding up, there is never the number 17 in these landings, it is always 10 or always 15; looking for species composition, catch rates, comparing the self-reported data against the dockside, also against the observer data and against one another, adjacent vessels and things like that; and looking for unusual patterns in these data, and then flagging those data where there seems to be kind of a consistent pattern, and then make decisions about what happens if those data are included and what happens if those data are pulled out; how different are they?

The result that we're looking for from this is the improved data sets where we've made decisions about these flagged records, whether they can be retained or whether they should be removed, and then recommendations for modifications to our procedures going forward to be able to catch patterns of potential bias and have some plans on how to deal with those.

This could, as I mentioned before, result in revisions to the historic catch, so that remains to be seen. Does a pattern exist; and if so, how influential is it in the status of those landings? Then ultimately the goal is we'll take what we've learned from this whole process and fold it back into our best practices for QA/QC procedures for communications with the industry to leave an indelible mark on how we run this program going into the future.

That was the last slide so that is the report. The timing of this is we're on track with this. We haven't hit anything that has slowed us down. We are exactly on track with where our expectations were. We anticipate those data will be ready for use in the upcoming stock assessments later this summer.

MR. HARTIG: Any questions for Bonnie?

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, I guess just one comment on like the flagging of differences between I guess observer data and reported catch. It seems like – I'm just thinking about a headboat and where an observer is. They can't be everywhere in the headboat at once, kind of going back to your comment about the blue mailboxes. It seems like there is always going to be some difference between what an observer reports and what a captain might report from his catch. I was just curious how you are addressing that.

MS. PONWITH: Certainly; it's just well understood there are things such as reporting error. A headboat is a chaotic place. That would be accounted for as reporting error. What we're looking for is outliers in that reporting error that have the look and feel of dry-lab data. Frankly, that is what we're looking for.

We're looking for data that were made over coffee six months later so that you didn't lose your permit. Our expectation is if those data exist, they would look significantly different than the typical reporting error of "I counted 12 fish and you told me you had 9 or 14." Those are the kinds of patterns that we're looking for.

MR. HARTIG: Are there any other questions? Thank you, Bonnie, for that update, and now stock assessment peer review.

DR. PONWITH: First of all, I would like to thank our SEDAR colleagues and council colleagues who made a point of coming to the peer review this summer. It was I thought just a really great opportunity to take a look under the hood programmatically at how these assessments are being conducted and the process we're using for determining how and when to do these assessments.

What I am going to do is first of all talk a little bit about the context for this stock assessment for this peer review that we did this year. As you know, this is a nationwide cycle of programmatic peer reviews that we're doing in each of those six fisheries science centers and the Office of Science and Technology.

The purpose is to get feedback on our science programs, to be consistently looking for ways to make them stronger and better. The first year in 2013 focused on data collections that support stock assessments under Magnuson Act managed species. 2014, last year, was our stock assessment programs; 2015 we're on track. In August we'll be doing a peer review of our protected species programs.

In '16, ecosystem and climate science program; '17 our economic and social sciences programs; and then '18 is our opportunity to step back and take a look at what we've learned from each of these peer review and the modifications we've made in our practices to correct things based on recommendations we received and then readjust our long-term strategic plan based on those learning's. Then we start all over again.

The terms of reference for each of the six science centers focused on these bullets. I won't walk through them; but we did this so that there was a common look and feel across the science centers; and the reason for that was so that after each of these peer reviews were done, we can look across all seven of those peer reviews and see if there were emergent learnings or findings from each of them to help us from a national scale in the way that we're setting our priorities and distributing our resources and distributing our efforts across these issues.

These were our august panelists. We had another federal employee from the USGS was our Chair; a scientist from the UK; Joe Hightower from the Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, who has a strong stock assessment background; Bob Atlas from within NOAA but outside of NOAA Fisheries, and he is a modeler so knows very little about fisheries biology but understands the basic precepts of modeling very, very well and was instrumental in this; and then Bill Karp, who is the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's Science and Research Director there, so has a very clear understanding of what it takes to run a program like this but is an arm's length away because he is in a different center.

If we can go to the next couple of slides, we'll show some of the key findings that were in this report. These are cherry-picked. We probably found 100 findings across the summary report that we had and then the individual reports. These reports were written by each reviewer independent of one another; and then the Chair looked across those for some commonalities and things.

What we did was kind of looked at highlights, and we characterized and prioritized them not in a way that was dissimilar to what you talked about in your visioning; things that were within our realm versus in someone else's control. Were they things that could be done quickly or would they take many years? Could they be done cheaply or would they take a lot of money?

We just characterized them all and then used those characteristics to look across these and select a handful of activities that we thought we could carry out over the next two years that would have measurable impacts on our stock assessment programs. These are not exhaustive. This is just a suite of examples of some of the findings that we had.

One of them that came up over and over again is to streamline the process to get those efficiencies gains that we're all longing for and also to put an emphasis on update assessments whenever possible to be able to increase that through-put. Simplifying the harvest control rules would go a long way toward interpretation of those results more simply and the analysis that it takes.

One of the things that we're working on right now is to adopt plans for a Methods Working Group to standardize the data inputs, and that is what this upcoming workshop is going to deal with; strengthen our communications with our stakeholders; in other words, when you're done, you are not done.

That is when another part of your whole work begins, and that is to get that message of those results out in a way that is approachable. That included making investments in programs like the MRIP program that our chairman is really excited about and has spoken about over and over again, and other mechanisms we have to be able to talk to our industry colleagues about the results of those.

I think another piece of that was how accessible the reports themselves are, putting an emphasis on having an executive summary in those reports so that the results you've got kind of a short summary of the status of that stock that is recognizable across stock assessments. Again, we want to simplify those assessment documents again to make them more accessible to the users.

We want to employ management strategy evaluation to optimize investments into the assessments themselves but also the data collections that support them. Our Chairman has already raised this and we had a good discussion. This maps directly to the type of input you were talking about on the age composition problems we're facing.

Then another thing that was raised was balancing the scientist portfolio between operational stock assessments and the ability to conduct the research to improve those assessments. We've heard presentations on ecosystem-based methods yesterday and also a lot of conversations about the importance of understanding climate change and its influence on the status of these stocks.

We can't turn stock assessments into research projects or you won't get the stock assessment done. The trick is let the stock assessment be a stock assessment, but get that research done as a focused research effort by bringing in the industry and their knowledge, bringing in the academics like we heard from last night, our post doc at the citizens science, and then bringing in the state and federal scientists to be able to focus on that research that makes it a one-time investment that brings returns over time. I think that is going to be very important.

What I've done is put some actions here that also include some target dates that we're shooting for. Over and over again in these reports they talked about focusing on how you set priorities for stock assessments. We've talked about that this morning. Across the country we're looking at a stock assessment prioritization tool that takes a look at a suite of considerations; the ecological considerations, the economic considerations, the stability of that stock over time, and uses those considerations to help make decisions about how frequently stock assessments should be done and at what level. Can you do an update or is there a demand for a benchmark?

Work is being carried out on that right now. We hope to be able to carry that product to the councils to adapt or adopt for their considerations to help in the deliberations in the SEDAR prioritization process. The second one in 2015 is a Data Methods Workshop to standardize and streamline these data-handling procedures; continuing to make investments in MREP.

Again, this is an organization by the fishermen for the fishermen, but we have people on the Steering Committee and have continued to be instructors on that. We've also expanded out into the Caribbean. The Caribbean Council themselves ponied up to help the fishermen start their own Spanish/English version of that. That happened this fall, so it was a good success.

Simplify the harvest control rules; this is something that we're doing in the Caribbean. We've had conversations in the Gulf on this. Revisit the stock assessment report and generate a streamline template; we've got some work to do on that. Then some continuous ones and that is the importance of data.

Even though the data evaluation, the data peer review was the year before, data are such an important foundation for a successful stock assessment that came up again and said you can't let down on your emphasis on continuing to get the good data. Then, of course, balancing the research and operational stock assessment investments, and that is going to be a continuous work as well.

I mentioned that each of the six science centers and the Office of Science and Technology went through the same kind of peer review. When Richard and our ST's for stock assessment and ecosystems and economics looked across these; these were the activities that they selected to be carried out and what the timeline is for that.

Again, the first one is the prioritization system and finalize the protocol. That is the stock assessment prioritization tool that we're working on. The intent is to get that to a point where we can make a data base available of the stocks and some of the characterizations of those stocks based on those criteria, so that the council then can begin familiarizing themselves with those and actually adapt and adopt in 2016 with the support of the team that has been working on this.

Convene a working group to address best practices to improve stock assessments; again, we're targeting 2016. We've got NOAA Fisheries' stock assessment toolbox that has modeling approaches that have been peer reviewed and put in the toolbox. The notion is if you can document the modeling approach and get that peer reviewed once, then all you have to do is spot check the products to make sure you carried out those assumptions correctly, the modeling code has been peer reviewed. We keep that in the toolbox.

There was a lot of discussion about the importance or the value of keeping that toolbox up to date. It takes a lot of care and feeding, so that is going to be looked at in 2015. We want to look at management strategy evaluations to evaluate the impacts of survey and sample sizes on stock assessment performances. Again, that will be looked at in 2015.

To get that done at the national level, there was a commitment to allocate staff time to conduct research to develop these management strategy evaluations as a tool. Then if you can make it generic enough, it can be passed from region to region; and so again you don't end up having to reinvent the wheel.

The other thing is to build the expertise within the science centers to do these management strategy evaluations and make some investments in that. Then the other thing that they are committed to doing was reinstating the National Stock Assessment Workshop on an annual basis to help deal with these national scale issues.

Richard Merrick has across the board made the recommendation that each stock assessment scientist be able to devote 20 percent of their time to improving stock assessment methods, doing these MSEs, publishing results; again to make those long-term investments in the status of the discipline.

Creating opportunities for stock assessment scientists to compare and contrast methods across regions, international collaborations and sabbaticals, again to make sure that we are on the cutting edge as opposed to lagging behind in how stock assessments are done and basically the state of the science.

Here is a commitment to hire one to two new assessment scientists per center in 2015. Continue to invest in creating a pipeline of stock assessment students, so that it is easier to find these people. It is very difficult to fill stock assessment positions. It is one of those situations where the demand is typically higher than the supply. And then also to develop opportunities to recruit these scientists through existing educational programs and authorities continuing through 2016.

These are the URLs for the Southeast Fisheries Science Centers, each of the individual peer review panelist's reviews, the overarching kind of summary of patterns that we saw in those reviews and then my response to that. Then also a URL for the national overview for the stock assessment overview written as a result of looking across all seven of those peer reviews and what those recommendations bubbled up at. I will stop there and see if there are questions.

MR. BELL: Thanks Bonnie; that was thorough. A quick question about towards the end there we were talking about the stock assessment scientists and 20 percent of the time being used for professional development stuff and improvement. That all makes perfect sense, but again I kind of go back to the concept of cranking out stock assessments as being essential to us.

If you think of that as kind of a factory, we're producing good quality stock assessments. What are things we can do to increase capacity? We've talked about maybe hiring a couple new folks and that would be great. Are there other things that we could do maybe like would it be possible through private funding or other kinds of funding bring in post docs to do certain things to help with kind of grunt work, if you will, to increase capacity?

Are we kind of open to those sorts of things? I know right now we're based on the funding you can get through the service or whatever; but are there other options you think available where we could somehow increase the output; again because our schedule is really demanding. We talked a little bit before with MRIP. With the changes there, we're looking at all of a sudden maybe throwing some more work in. I'm just looking at ways that we can get the people we need to keep production up at a high level.

DR. PONWITH: I can think of lots of ways that we could tweak the system. Of course, the thing that would give it a lurch forward is a significant increase in funding to bring in – I think what I hear you saying is we've got a team of pretty talented stock assessment scientists. If we could bring in a team of very talented analysts working with them, they could do a lot of the prep work and have the stock assessment scientists overseeing that as opposed to getting bogged down into the weeds. That would certainly generate some lift.

That would take a significant increase in resources. Well, if that model if logical, then what are some other alternatives? One thing that has helped us in terms of our through-put is the state of Florida has been very, very collaborative. We enjoy working with them. We appreciate their stock assessment expertise in helping with some of these stocks that are predominantly harvested in waters adjacent to Florida and in Florida state waters.

I think another possible thing that we could look at is are there people in the states who have those stock assessment chops that if there is a gap between a state assessment where they could actually come in and join the team in some capacity or another; that would be a way to increase the lift. It may be having the state agencies talk with the state of Florida about how they have organized and how they managed their state-managed species relative to these periodic leads that they've taken on council managed stocks. That is another one. Certainly, post docs; if we get money but the money is ephemeral, we can't hire an FTE, but we could hire someone under contract or as a post doc. In that capacity they would be functioning as essentially a member of our team and give additional lift to the effort.

MR. BELL: Just to follow up with the post doc thing; I would think there are people coming out of schools with the training and this is kind of an entry level foot in the door sort of thing; so I would think that would be attractive to folks. Also, I know you talk about Florida because Florida has some amazing capacity there, but the other states can also have people that have the skillsets and all that maybe we could bring into that mix to help out with things as well, the other state agencies as well as Florida.

I think that is exactly what – it is just how do we do that and how do we find those ephemeral sources of funding or whatever? It seems like there would be potentially some funding available out there to kind of do this thing, because it is so essential to our whole system. It is just foundational.

MR. HAYMANS: Along the same vein; what I saw that was disconcerting was the fact that there is one or two new assessment scientists being hired across all of the science centers when it has been recognized since I've been here that the southeast is so far behind everybody else; that if there were funds provided for a new assessment biologist across all the centers, perhaps we could have put that funding towards the real need, which is at least from my perspective here.

DR. PONWITH: I can't argue with you that we could have used all six of those new stock assessment scientists. Apparently I was not compelling enough to land that; but I will take the one to two. I appreciate the creative thinking. I appreciate Mel pressing on, well, if that is the idea, how do we make that happen?

Maybe what it is, is at this meeting or at the next meeting to plan discussion with the state representatives to talk about is there a way we can do a better job of melding the federal and the state capacity from a stock assessment standpoint? I know you guys are every bit as busy as we are assessing state-managed stocks.

But every now and again, there could be a hiccup in a schedule that creates some capacity that could be brought to bear on it or we could do kind of a stock assessment triage. One thing that we do have facing us, which we're going to have to get into when we get into the scheduling issue, and that is this 2016 or 2017 for the timing of those updates.

It is a challenge for us because we have to build what is our ideal schedule if we calibrate in 2017, but we also have to have sort of a Plan B. What would our schedule look like if it were '16? The answer might not just be you take this and move it here and shuffle; because if there is a one-year delay on a stock, it may actually change your notion of priority.

But when we look at stuff like that and we look out into the future for these stock assessments; maybe it is a matter of on an annual or semiannual basis getting together with the states and saying if you've got capacity, can we roll them in and help. Because if a stock assessment can get done more quickly, it creates an opportunity for being able to put in a procedural workshop that helps the system or slips in another update or something like that.

MS. McCAWLEY: Thanks for the presentation, Bonnie. I think that we all agree that the Southeastern U.S. just really has this great stock assessment need. We don't mind helping out with our state assessment scientists. Sometimes it's hard for us to even keep them on staff, because they can go find higher paying jobs pretty easily, so it is hard for us to keep people.

It has been my experience that maybe the other states don't have this capacity that we have here in Florida. If I think about even the Gulf states and how they do a lot of contracting with universities to get the same type of information that we're getting. I love the idea of thinking of creative ways to do this, but I guess I'm just concerned in thinking about the other states; how much capacity is really there to put it into this process?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, just to speak to Jessica's point, we have the same issues in North Carolina with trying to retain stock assessment scientists. Our budget just doesn't allow for the types of salaries that folks coming out with that type of education at a PhD level can support and they can go other places.

We have three stock assessment scientists right now and I don't know how many Florida has. I imagine at least twice that many people dealing with their assessments. I feel like we're kind of maxed out on the state level species, but I am absolutely willing to go back and talk to other folks to see where there might be places where we can help each other out. I like Mel's suggestion; it is just unfortunately those people don't report to me so I can't make commitments on their behalf.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I will just put in one plea for the foundation as always. When we sit down – I talked about planning for SEDAR. When we sit down and do that one of the true bottlenecks and the reason that schedules end up like they do quite often is juggling the data deadlines around the year, because there are a limited number of people that do a lot of the data compilations and preparing the data.

That is one of our most challenging bottlenecks now. As we add more analysts, we can't forget about the number of support people that it takes to keep data feeding to them. That is one of our biggest challenges now is keeping the data in that pipeline and it is tough. A caution about the updates, we're thinking about MRIP, but the commercial statistics, the indices have to be updated.

The life history data is all going to have to be updated and right now that is a huge bottleneck; but that is one area where reaching out to the states may pay us some real benefits. I mean we already do that a lot. Through MARMAP in South Carolina, they are instrumental in doing that. We've done that in some cases with like red snapper and getting a bunch of samples.

That might be something we really have to turn to our partners for is for some help in that life history work if we're going to do, say, six or eight updates in 2017. I think in the South Atlantic perspective there is no way with the people that are left working in life history at Beaufort with Jennifer Potts are going to be able to probably get up to speed on all that many ages.

MARMAP is going to be maxed out keeping up as well, so reaching out to some others, maybe universities, thinking now about getting people on board to do that, because it takes so long to get those contracts; it might be something we start putting our heads together and start working on.

MR. HARTIG: Anything else? I had a couple thoughts reading through the reviews. One thing was that the cooperators asked for more and more complex models. I don't know really where that came from. To me the system is evolved and the analysts, to move their careers forward has been the development of more complex models, basically. That is just an observation. The other thing is – and this is just an observation from attending a number of assessments – it seems like the models are evolving into models that can use less and less data.

MR. CARMICHAEL: For an update.

MR. HARTIG: It is just a general feeling that we seem to have overall looking at these assessments; they are able to do a lot with less and less. Somewhere in this I think we'll get there, I think we will. Based on your leadership and your telling me you want to go in this direction; I think there is a light at the tunnel for some of this.

But the councils want to see the appropriate model used for the stock, whether it is the SS or whether it is a production model that is easily capable of doing some of our stocks that are on autopilot. That was just one of my observations. I mentioned the models as well. It was a worthwhile process, our attending.

The professional development was an interesting thing that I hadn't anticipated. It talked about how to shift – you know, a tiered approach to me is the future of this where you have a couple of high-level assessment scientists, and then you have the people who run the assessments. This is not something we're going to get to today, but it is something to shoot for in the future.

As the center evolves into being able to crank out more assessments, looking towards this type of hiring of people, at what level do we need to meet the challenges of how many assessments that you have to provide for three jurisdictions – four when you add ICCAT and HMS. It gets to be pretty amazing. Those are just some of my observations.

MR. CARMICHAEL: There is the schedule table and then I guess the next thing is other business. I did have one thing. We've discussed some of the need for stock ID. Obviously, the most apparent example and glaring is the situation with blueline tilefish. We've had a lot of discussion about where the data are and where the fish are and whether or not all the different pieces of fish and groups of fish that pop up and contribute to landings over time, particularly as they're moving northward, are all part of the same stock.

It is a big question. We look at recent assessments of hogfish, cobia, the latest developments in king mackerel and realize that we're learning a lot about how these different stocks are structured, and that there are geographic variations and there are different unit stocks out there that are reproducing populations and can be modeled and managed as such.

It really underscores the need for having stock ID information particularly as we go into benchmark assessments. I just wanted to bring to your attention, I suppose, that we'll be working on the research plan that we do annually.

It will come to you in June and expect to see in there a suggestion that says before you do a benchmark stock assessment for the first time of a species, you go in armed with a stock ID and the appropriate research so that you can define the stocks that you are working with, lest we get into another situation where maybe we're doing a conglomerate of stocks in the stock assessment and not really knowing it until in some cases it is too late. That could potentially affect our benchmark scheduling; but I think I would rather do that than have more of these situations where maybe we've mixed stocks within a single assessment.

MR. HARTIG: I would take that one step further, and I talked to Bonnie about it yesterday. When you are starting to look at how much data you have to do an assessment with; you are struggling to complete an assessment with the data that you're looking at. To me, I think it would be of value to hit the stock hard the year before you do the assessment.

I mean go out there and have a cooperative research program where you go out and you hit the stock extremely hard and you get a whole suite of cohort analysis and ages from that particular sampling, which gives you a snapshot of what the population is now, but it also gives you the cohorts from the past.

It allows you to fill in who is producing what part of your population, so you get a different feel. That is another thing I think we should be looking at as we go through this process, stock ID, critical and then the amount of data we have. If we don't think we have enough, we should probably put the assessment off until we do.

DR. PONWITH: Directly to that point; I like what I'm hearing and I would amend it by saying not the year before or two years before; so that if you have biological sampling, you've got time to work up those data and it doesn't become this horrific crunch. The other thing is every year a call goes out for cooperative research projects.

There is nothing that prevents us from right now at this meeting or the next meeting having a discussion about what cooperative research would tackle a perennial problem we're grappling with that we could collaborate on; either the Science Center with fishing industry or academics with fishing industry, whatever approach the right tool for the right job; actually have a conversation about what is that cooperative research project that would answer the mail on that.

The other thing that has become an annual process is the SK call for proposals. This year was unprecedented in the level at which the council was asked to participate in setting the overarching priorities for that. I think it is important for the council to pay close attention to what happened last fall, be prepared not for a project by project but certainly overarching theme by overarching theme.

That theme might be a better job of stock delineation for these contiguous areas or something like that as a theme so that when projects come in, to address them they can be tackling some of our more pressing needs, and there is a source of exogenous funds to be able to tackle those problems based on priorities set by this council.

That is some really good leadership by looking ahead at what our next problem is going to be and solving it before we get there as opposed to having it sneak up behind us and nip us at the heels. I think these are really good approaches. I am certainly willing to collaborate with the council as the council contemplates what their priorities are, to help frame those up and guide grantsmanship going forward.

DR. LANEY: Well, just a question to John and Bonnie, I guess. For stock ID, are we talking genetics here? If the answer is, yes, that we have to have the DNA analytical work done to really nail down the stock ID, have we looked at what the genetic analytical capability is out there? Do the science centers have that capability?

I know the Fish and Wildlife Service Fishery Centers do have that capability in both the northeast and southeast. I know we have at least one person on staff, and I know those folks have done some work in coastal and marine settings with some of those species. If it is genetics, maybe that is another area where we need to look to academia and other sources for capacity to help out in that regard.

DR. PONWITH: The issue is less an issue of making a decision on who but the what. If we can get the “what” down, I think the “who” will follow fairly closely. We have stuff we’re really good at. We have areas where we need to do capacity building. We’ll be blatantly honest with you on those of you need to look for another for issues where we don’t have either enough hands or the right skillsets.

That is what cooperative research is about. We could be players and helping to frame up the question to make sure when we get the data, the data actually do answer the mail on those pressing needs and come in a format that can be plugged directly into a stock assessment without a lot of manipulation. But if it is somebody else who is doing the work, so be it. That is the nature of cooperative research; you find the right tool for the job.

MR. HARTIG: I appreciate that. One thing that has come to my mind, and I’ve been thinking about it for quite some time, is in cooperative research in Saltonstall/Kennedy. There was a lot of money available in Saltonstall/Kennedy this year. It really didn’t come to the forefront of my attention until late in the process.

Some way to maybe through the SEDAR; somewhere in the council process I think we need to alert the fishermen and the fishing public and the council as well about funding opportunities for the cycle; for whatever cycle we’re talking about, cooperative research, Saltonstall/Kennedy, MARFIN, whichever one.

The funding levels for each year that we know we are going to have and the outline of when we need to be able to put these projects together and when reviews are going to occur; I think that would help if we had that information, because it is a little bit disheartening to say, yes, I hope we have a lot of good proposals for Saltonstall/Kennedy when you are going, well, I really didn't know how much money we had for that particular venue. Some way to do that, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The idea I had written down in response to Bonnie mentioning this was in our cooperative research plan was to add a segment that highlights topics that you guys think are appropriate and deal with sort of compelling, ongoing issues that fit into cooperative research. That might be a way of highlighting that; that is a council document, it gets around.

If it gets a little more notice, it might then give us a way to maybe turn that into, once that is approved, maybe a note in the newsletter about these are a number of topics that the council is really interested in and thinks they are timely and appropriate for cooperative research. Genetic studies, the stock ID is a perfect thing for that and it is perfect for collaborating between a university and the fishermen because they need to get the samples.

Universities have this genetics' equipment. They need to use it. It is kind of short-term stuff. The trouble with any sort of cooperative research that delves over into the long-term monitoring is what happens when it's over? Stock IDs and these kinds of studies are just perfect in my mind. I think we can leverage a lot of interest.

We've got to let the university folks know, we've got to let our fishermen know, but I think we could get a long ways on that. I review CRP things and there has been a lot about stock ID recently. It is up and coming and maybe we're poised to sort of kick-start it a little bit, make it a big priority, which helps get our projects that we need funded.

MR. HARTIG: Is there anything else? I am an hour and six minutes over in my committee; however, it was a really, really good conversation. Bonnie, I can't thank you enough for your longer-term view and really starting to embrace this project and get these kinds of things rolling. The evolution that you have shown through this process will really, really truly help the process in the long term. I am really heartened to see that. Thank you for that. Any other business to come before the SEDAR Committee? Seeing none, the meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10: 06 o'clock a.m., March 3, 2015.)

Certified By: ____________________________________ Date: ________________

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
March 26, 2015

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IRIS LOWERY
SPC. AGT. TRACEY WOODRUFF
BONNIE PONWITH
ERIKA BURGESS
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
PRES PATE
JACK MCGOVERN

ROY WILLIAMS
BARB ZOODSMA

GEORGE SGOBGLMY

SEDAR

Ben Hartig, Chair
Chris Conklin, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
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: Chip Collier

SNAPPER GROUPER

Michelle Duval, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate/Dewey
Hemilright
Staff contact:
Myra Brouwer

SOPPs

Ben Hartig, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

SPINY LOBSTER

Jessica McCawley, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Staff

Executive Director
Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

Deputy Executive Director
Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer
Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist
Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist
Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist
Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist
Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist
Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

Staff Economist
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager
John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

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

Administrative Officer
Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary
Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator
Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants
Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

SEDAR Committee Meeting

Tuesday, March 3, 2015

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:	EMAIL ADDRESS:	MAILING ADDRESS:
Rusty Hudson SFA ECFS DSF	386-239-0948	DSF2009@aol.com	PO Bx 9351 32120-9351
Lora Clarke Pew	631-379-6718	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	
George Sedberry		George.sedberry@noaa.gov	
[illegible] AP	910-620-5847		
James Morley	717-858-2584	jw.morley@rutgers.edu	—
Emily Helmick	5616703397	ehelmick@pewtrusts.org	
Dick Brame	910-599-5245	dbrame55@gmail.com	
Will Heyman	301 335 3230	HEYMANWILL@YAHOO.COM	
Gary Zurn-Big Rock Sports	252-808-8306	gzurn@bigrocksports.com	
George Sedberry		george.sedberry@noaa.gov	

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

4

GoToMeeting | GoToWebinar | My Account | 24/7 Support | Log Out

My Webinars
Schedule a Webinar
My Recordings
Webinar History
Generate Reports
Settings

My Webinars Manage Webinar Registrant List

Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
☑	mershon, wayne	kenyonseafood@sc.rr....	Mar 03, 2015	3:11 PM EST
☑	white, holly	holly.white@ncdenr.g...	Mar 03, 2015	2:56 PM EST
☑	Lloyd, Vic	vic_lloyd@bellsouth....	Mar 03, 2015	2:33 PM EST
☑	Raine, Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov	Mar 03, 2015	1:49 PM EST
☑	williams, erik	erik.williams@noaa.g...	Mar 03, 2015	1:18 PM EST
☑	Engleby, Laura	laura.engleby@noaa.g...	Mar 03, 2015	11:26 AM EST
☑	Sedberry, George	george.sedberry@noaa...	Mar 03, 2015	11:16 AM EST
☑	Conley, John	thcjohn100@yahoo.com	Mar 03, 2015	10:39 AM EST
☑	HOLLAND, jack	JACK.HOLLAND@NCDENR....	Mar 03, 2015	10:35 AM EST
☑	Takade-..., Helen	htakade@edf.org	Mar 03, 2015	10:20 AM EST
☑	Mueller, Mark	mark.mueller@boem.gov	Mar 03, 2015	10:03 AM EST
☑	Bailey, Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	Mar 03, 2015	9:34 AM EST
☑	Powell, Jessica	jessica.powell@noaa....	Mar 03, 2015	9:21 AM EST
☑	L, I	captainira@att.net	Mar 03, 2015	9:12 AM EST
☑	Burgess, Tom	tbburgess@embarqmail...	Mar 03, 2015	9:07 AM EST
☑	Smart, Tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov	Mar 03, 2015	8:51 AM EST
☑	Clarke, Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	Mar 03, 2015	8:51 AM EST
☑	Lee, Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	Mar 03, 2015	8:45 AM EST
☑	c, m	mec181@yahoo.com	Mar 03, 2015	8:45 AM EST
☑	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.g...	Mar 03, 2015	8:33 AM EST

41 Selected | Deselect All Registrants

1-20 of 41

Cancel Registration Resend Confirmation Email

GoToMeeting | GoToWebinar | My Account | 24/7 Support | Log Out

My Webinars
Schedule a Webinar
My Recordings
Webinar History
Generate Reports
Settings

My Webinars Manage Webinar Registrant List

Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
☑	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfw...	Mar 03, 2015	8:27 AM EST
☑	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc...	Mar 03, 2015	8:26 AM EST
☑	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa...	Mar 03, 2015	8:23 AM EST
☑	Alvarado, Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noa...	Mar 03, 2015	8:21 AM EST
☑	Timpy, Dave	captdave@wavelengthc...	Mar 03, 2015	8:20 AM EST
☑	MacLauc..., Bill	billmac@charter.net	Mar 03, 2015	8:11 AM EST
☑	Swatzel, Tom	tom@swatzel.com	Mar 03, 2015	7:47 AM EST
☑	Neer, Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	Mar 02, 2015	10:09 AM EST
☑	Mansfield, Bill	billman@ec.rr.com	Mar 02, 2015	7:55 AM EST
☑	Wilber, Pace	Pace.Wilber@noaa.gov	Mar 01, 2015	12:06 PM EST
☑	Erwin, Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com	Feb 27, 2015	2:29 PM EST
☑	Gerhart, Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.g...	Feb 27, 2015	10:53 AM EST
☑	kilgour, morgan	morgan.kilgour@gulfc...	Feb 27, 2015	10:36 AM EST
☑	sminkey, thomas	tom.sminkey@noaa.gov	Feb 23, 2015	10:50 AM EST
☑	Herndon, Andrew	andrew.herndon@noaa....	Feb 13, 2015	8:12 AM EST
☑	Byrd, J	julia.byrd@safmc.net	Feb 12, 2015	10:04 AM EST
☑	Franco, Dawn	dawn.franco@gadnr.org	Feb 11, 2015	4:33 PM EST
☑	FARMER, NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	12:38 PM EST
☑	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	11:53 AM EST
☑	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.g...	Feb 11, 2015	11:47 AM EST

41 Selected | Deselect All Registrants 21-40 of 41

Cancel Registration Resend Confirmation Email