

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SEDAR COMMITTEE

**Charleston Marriott Hotel
Charleston, SC**

September 10, 2012

SUMMARY MINUTES

SEDAR Committee

David Cupka, Chair
Dr. Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Tom Swatzel

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Martha Bademan
Robert Beal

Council Members

Mel Bell
Anna Beckwith
John Jolley
Dr. Wilson Laney

Tom Burgess
Steve Amick
Lt. Mario Gil
Charlie Phillips

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
John Carmichael
Dr. Mike Errigo
Anna Martin
Andrea Grabman
Roger Pugliese
Julia Byrd

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
Anne Marie Eich

Monica Smit-Brunello
Otha Easley
Joey Ballenger

Other Participants Attached

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Topaz Room of the Charleston Marriott Hotel, Charleston, South Carolina, September 10, 2012, and was called to order at 3:55 o'clock p.m. by Chairman David Cupka.

MR. CUPKA: I'll call to order the SEDAR Committee. The first order of business is approval of the agenda. Are there any additions or changes to the agenda? Seeing none, then the agenda is approved.

The next order of business is approval of the minutes from our last meeting. Are there any corrections or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, then our minutes are approved. This takes us down to SEDAR activities update, which you'll find behind Attachment 1. John, I'm going to ask you to take us through that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: What we have underway now is SEDAR 28, which is South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico cobia and Spanish mackerel. This was planned to be completed by now and gone through review and heading into the SSCs, but as you recall there was some delay in getting the data together and some issues with the modeling.

It was rescheduled with the review workshop coming up here at the end of October and planned either to go to the SSC in April or perhaps consider running it through the SSC by a webinar review or some other approach than waiting until April. We'll just wait and see how things go with the review.

They have had a number of extra webinars for this project, primarily trying to deal with just data modeling issues within the Gulf of Mexico stocks. They've had a lot of challengers there, but the Atlantic stocks have been coming along quite well and don't foresee any issues with those going into the review panel.

The other things going on in the South Atlantic are updates for red porgy and vermilion snapper. These are scheduled to come to the SSC in October and I'm not aware of anything that will stand in the way. We expect to have those as planned. That's it for the SEDAR update. We will talk about things that are planned for next year, including black sea bass issues, when we get to the guidance for the SEDAR Steering Committee, because I know we're going to have some discussion about that.

MR. CUPKA: Are there any questions for John on any of the ongoing assessment activities? Tom, did you have something you wanted to bring up about the vermilion and porgy? We had talked about that earlier about how we might take some action if we get that through the SSC this fall.

MR. SWATZEL: My Chairman, it is just my hope that whenever the stock assessment gets to us in December for vermilion snapper and red porgy that we might be able to take some actions to adjust the ACLs; and if the stock assessments look good, obviously be able to maybe adjust some of the bag limits if possible in 2013. That is just my concern. Thank you.

MR. CUPKA: Other questions or comments for John on current SEDAR activities? Seeing none, then that takes us to our next agenda item, which is the SSC ORCS Workshop Report.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Okay, the SSC Chair, Dr. Luiz Barbieri, will come up and fill us in on the SSC's ORCS Workshop and where they got and what their next steps are planned.

DR. BARBIERI: What I thought I would do is basically to walk you through a summary of our report and sort of give you an overview of how we approached this issue, how much progress we made and what are the next steps going forward as far as providing catch level recommendations for unassessed stocks.

You may recall from the June meeting that we requested authorization to organize a workshop that would involve SSC members, industry representatives, council members to try to apply the ORCS approach for our unassessed stocks so we would have a peer-reviewed and well-established methodology to provide you with catch level recommendations for these unassessed stocks.

This is what took place back in very early August and this report is a summary of that work. Right there on the screen I have the terms of reference. I'm not going to read through them – you have a copy of this report – but I just wanted to walk your through some of the high points and let you know what we actually completed and some of the discussions and high points of what we dealt with.

Term of Reference Number 1; we set out to look at that table of attributes. The ORCS approach involves the application of a number of attributes. They are primarily qualitative in nature. These attributes allow you to assign stocks to three exploitation categories or in this case, as it turned out, to the risk of overexploitation; low, medium or high, with the idea that would guide us, provide us some guidance in applying the proper catch statistic and then following up with the scalar for ABC values.

We completed that part of the terms of reference. We actually reviewed the table. We adapted the table to better suit stocks in the South Atlantic. We have now as part of your report a more expanded, more complete table that has those attributes listed there in the outcome of our workshop discussions.

Then we proceeded to Term of Reference Number 2, which would be to look at the scoring method of applying that table. How are we going to weigh different attributes; are we going to treat them all equally, are we going to apply different weights to different attributes, how are we going to consider stocks for which we believe we don't even have reliable catch information?

We discussed some of those issues; an application of the table, development of a scoring procedure and then take into account – I mean, try to handle all these other weird stocks that don't necessarily fit this mode. That part we were able to complete as well. We developed a scoring procedure. We actually started in terms of the number of stocks that were being considered with about 20 to 22 stocks overall and about – no, we started with 40 stocks and we

ended up with about 20 for which we felt we didn't really have reliable catch information and for which application of the ORCS approach would not be suitable, would not be appropriate.

We are proposing that those stocks for which we cannot even apply ORCS, that we handle those as a new tier that will be developed for our control rule. Right now our control rule has four tiers and starts with stocks with have a quantitative assessment all the way through all the different methods that are less informative or less data informed, all the way down to Tier 4 where we have the ORCS.

Now we're going to have to create another tier, Tier 5, to deal with stocks for which we don't even have reliable catch information. Later on I'll show you the results of that assignment; the stocks that we removed and the stocks that we were able to assign to those exploitation categories.

But this was basically the extent – we did not realize that we would have so many issues to deal with and the discussions would be so intense that by the end of the second day we really could not finish application of the method. We have two items that we're going to still have to deal with, and our plan is to add an additional day to our spring meeting that would allow us to then resume application of the method and hopefully get it completed then. That will be in the spring.

In the meantime the catch level recommendations that we have on the table stay as they are. The tasks to be completed, then, are we're going to have to discuss what catch statistic we're going to use for OFL. There are several possibilities there to be considered and that will be quite a bit of discussion.

Then eventually we're going to look at scalar values that we're going to apply to that OFL to turn those OFL values into ABC recommendations. We're going to have some reductions in some cases and some others we won't, depending on the stock in question. The SSC will develop some set of recommendations, of course.

Application of this part needs to be informed by your risk tolerance for different exploitation level stocks. This would be your decision basically on the types of scalars or the level of scalars that you're going to apply to low risk, moderate risk and high-risk stocks. Hopefully, we will be able to bring some suggestions that go beyond the default suggestions that are already presented in the ORCS Technical Report that will give you some idea on how to handle this risk tolerance in setting ABC going from OFL to ABC.

In terms of the terms of reference, in summary we were able to complete numbers one and two and we're going to have to reconvene in the spring to resume work and complete numbers three and four. Here is the list of participants. We subdivided them into different functional groups to facilitate work dynamics there.

Again, we want to thank all the council members who were participating in this process. It was incredibly valuable to have council members there participating; and also the AP members were

able to attend representing different stocks, different FMPs, and give us some information there about those fisheries.

Here is the table and I'm not going to go into detail on that, but there is a table there on your report that describes the attributes and how we handle them. Here is the list of stocks. It is about half the total number of stocks that we had to deal with that we decided as a workshop – we reached consensus that those stocks didn't really have enough information on their landings to be able to support application of the ORCS approach.

On this table here we have the different stocks and the headings list the reasons why we thought that the information was not reliable; either because there was too much variability in the landings information that we felt was not really reflective of what population variability would be; so problems with sampling there.

Landings of data collection issues that we thought were not suitable for the landings to be considered reliable; and species identification that created problems on how you interpret your level of landings. As you look at this in more detail, you're going to see it is about 20 stocks altogether, about half of the total number that we dealt with.

Here at the very end is the list of stocks for which we were able to apply the ORCS method and come up with a final assignment to what we considered risk of overexploitation. This came out to be, when we applied the original ORCS method as it is described in the report, all the stocks were classified as having moderate risk of exploitation.

This is partly due to the fact that the ORCS approach is somewhat like a blunt instrument that doesn't really provide the level of detail in interpreting the landings that we would have to have to come up with more detailed assignments of stocks. Given this problem, we decided to look at our working group assignments that we had made for those stocks; and then based on further discussion as a consensus group involving all the sectors, all the workshop participants, break down these assignments into new assignments that were in more fine scale, in more detail; not just as low, moderate and high risk of overexploitation, but actually in cases moderate/high or moderate/low – you know, trying to provide a little more resolution there on the level of risk of overexploitation.

Two points, then, that I wanted to make before I close; one is to remind you that we could not complete the analysis at this time. We're going to reconvene in the spring and finish it then. Second is to point out that we have here even for those stocks for which we were able to apply the method, a number of those seemed to have enough information to actually go through a quantitative stock assessment; application of a stock assessment method.

Our recommendations at the completion of the ORCS method application would be interim in the hopes that we can actually proceed and complete a quantitative assessment for those stocks; that we will make some recommendations on stocks for which I think the SEDAR Steering Committee and you as the council can perhaps weigh in and try to raise the priority level of those

stocks so we can actually have a quantitative assessment. That, Mr. Chairman, completes my report.

MR. CUPKA: I had an opportunity to sit in on that workshop and I think one of the things that I liked a lot that came out of it is we've always had discussions in the past on how do we incorporate some of the knowledge and experience of fishermen into some of these issues. This workshop actually provided that opportunity by having the chairmen of some of our APs there. They provided a lot of input and it does provide an opportunity to look at some of these things from a quantitative sense but incorporate that knowledge and experience that they have from all their time on the water. That I think was a very positive aspect of this workshop. Ben and Charlie and Michelle were also there. I don't know if they want to add anything at this time.

Unfortunately, we didn't get through everything. It was a lot more to undertake than we realized at the time we put it together, but hopefully it will be finished up this spring. I did want to give the other participants an opportunity if they want to add anything to this before I open it up for questions.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with the chairman that having participation from our APs was fantastic. We had also discussed near the end of the meeting that it would probably be a good thing once the SSC has completed the ORCS approach to actually farm those results out to the different APs to actually try to acquire more of that fishermen knowledge with regard to the results that are produced.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, I was extremely pleased with the way the meeting went and how everybody interacted. I think it made it a much more productive meeting having the advisory panel chairmen and council member and everybody there, understanding what everybody else's part was doing. I think it went really well.

MR. HARTIG: Just the high quality of our AP chairs was great; the amount of knowledge that they brought to the table was phenomenal actually. All the expertise was used in the formulation of these qualitative categorizations. The qualitative characterization was a great move. It was different than what we had started out doing and we ended up doing that in the end. That is when I thought this was really going to work. Once we got to that point, I figured that we had a chance of this actually working in our management. I'm optimistic.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, any questions for Luiz on this presentation? All right, it is obvious there is still work to be done and we still have this issue of this Tier 5 that somehow is going to have to be addressed and also trying to maybe do an actual assessment on a couple of those species that were included in this group. It is a work in progress, but I think it is moving in the right direction and hope to get some very useful information out of it. I want to thank you, Luiz, and all the people who participated and John for leading us through that. All right, SEDAR Steering Committee recommendations, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: All right, the next item is to get recommendations from the council for the SEDAR Steering Committee. What we have here is a summary of the conference call the

steering committee had in August to settle the schedule for 2013. As you recall, there were some issues about trying to get work done on Gulf menhaden and some tradeoffs to be done in terms of the species list. Let's start with that.

What resulted from that meeting was to stick with the blueline and gray triggerfish benchmarks; to do the Gulf menhaden as a benchmark with one of the – you know, we talked about our assessment slots – one of the five of the Beaufort team going toward that; snowy grouper proceeding as a standard and added black sea bass an update. Black sea bass had been out there lurking a bit. We had an update plan or that in 2014 with the hopes of getting some preliminary analysis and some projections perhaps to support doing the fishing level recommendations for 2014 and '15. What has been decided based on your discussions – and I think it was the last meeting where you saw the survey CPUEs and you see what is going on.

In the black sea bass fishery the request was made to try and get the black sea bass update done as soon as possible in 2013. What we looked at was to go out and talk to the technical folks, get the Science Center involved in that and see if it was possible to get a black sea bass update done and to the SSC in April and to the council in June.

The outcome of that was that the analysts believed that was possible and they could certainly handle the analytical side and the holdup ended up being getting all the age samples done from the MARMAP Program. That goes to often discussed budget cuts that have happened within MARMAP and they're down a couple of people.

They lost folks that were specifically aging black sea bass and other things. We could have a general CPUE but as far as having the information on the age of the fish within the survey and having all of the age samples done and getting it to the SSC in April wasn't going to happen. As you know, there has been some discussion around different members of the council – and thanks to Tom for really spearheading this issue to bring it to light – is that there may be other solutions, and what it comes down to is getting the resources for getting those age samples read so that you can then take action on this fishery early within the next fishing year.

As opposed to perhaps tacking something on to the very end, you may be able to take action sooner. I think, David, I'll turn it over to you for discussion about black sea bass and where we want to head. One last thing is that the council made it clear at the steering committee and the steering committee agreed about getting black sea bass done as soon as possible.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, I think we all would agree that we need to get this update on black sea bass. It is an extremely important issue and one that we need to take a look at. We're going to have to find the resources if we're going to do an update next season to try and get these otoliths read. Are there any comments or questions regarding that? Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I just wonder if Mel or John, if you have checked with some of the other state agencies that have an interest in seeing this assessment done to see if perhaps they could pick up some of the load of processing and reading otoliths. I know Florida has a pretty good capacity to

generate ages and things. Maybe there is a way with some sort of sharing the labor we could get this done.

MR. BELL: I know Marcel has been talking amongst folks that are in the know on that. I don't claim to be an expert. Michelle may know more about that, honestly, but I didn't think it looked too promising at the state level, but she may have something else to offer.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I have been authorized to happily offer resources from North Carolina's Aging Lab to help get some of the backlog done. I guess it would be good to know what the volume of the backlog is at this point, but we're more than happy to help out.

MR. BELL: My understanding is there are about 5,000 otoliths I think that MARMAP has at the moment that need to be read. In terms of the backlog, I think that is what we're dealing with. I think it makes some sense in terms of consistency in reading and all that if MARMAP could do that, that would be great.

John mentioned they're dealing with budget cuts; and what we were hoping is that maybe if there was some way of plusing up their manpower right now where they could take people off of cruise rotation and put them ashore and let them do the reading. These are people are already doing the reading so for consistency sake within the reading of the otoliths, that is an option. Now, that is, of course, assuming that the resources are available to bring some people in to do that.

MR. HAYMANS: My original comment was going to be, well, can we retask – it sounds like that could happen, but I seem to remember having this conversation a couple of years ago do we really need to read 5,000 otoliths? John, can we subsample those 5,000 otoliths and use that for the assessment or do you need all of them?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Possibly; in some situations it comes down to like how many years they're spread over and how many different places that they're taken from. Because of the nature of these resources, subsampling and trying to get down to a couple hundred otoliths usually isn't as practical as it might in other latitudes where you're dealing with more cohesive stock units that just get sampled in different areas.

They have looked at that in some cases and generally they would rather not. Another reason is that most of the time these otoliths are used as a direct representation of the age structure and not as, say, in an age/length key, which in those cases you need far fewer otoliths, but for our fish length is informative about age, so we've learned that is very misleading. I guess the short answer is maybe they could trim it back some, but there are still probably quite a few that should be aged.

MR. MAHOOD: Mel, I know that MARMAP got cut 50K, but what would be the actual cost of getting that done?

MR. BELL: I think the actual cut was like \$400,000 or something like that, but the figure we were working with is what would it take to hire one or two biologists to throw them into the mix there and that \$50,000 was just an approximation. Joey Ballenger with MARMAP is actually here and he may be able to speak to that more specifically.

But that was the plan in discussing I know with Marcel was to try to get some folks to come in to relieve the actual few black sea bass otolith readers we have left, take them off sea rotation and put them on the shore and let them read. That what that was, to basically hire a couple of people to throw into the cruise rotation.

MR. CUPKA: Joey, did you want to add anything to that?

MR. BALLENGER: I'll try to address that issue. Yes, talking with council staff, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff, and looking at what time commitment it took to try to get these sample age readings completed, that is where this \$50,000 came from. Currently we're not waiting necessarily on this funding to come through to actually begin the otolith aging process. We have already begun pulling manpower from other project goals or project objectives to begin getting this black sea bass aging done.

It is not necessarily that it is just the aging that has to be completed prior to the update assessment, but also our field season is not scheduled to be completed until the end of October. After the field season we generally had to have a period of time to do QA-QC of our data that we are then using to update age comps, catch-per-unit effort and things like that.

With a very tight schedule, that puts a lot of strain on our data-based managers as well to get all that data and coordinate it between multiple projects, the MARMAP Project, the SEFIS Project and SEAMAP South Atlantic Reef Fish Project as well, so there is a lot of effort that is going into coordinating this data-based management as well into the sampling season.

MR. CUPKA: Let me ask you, John, I know North Carolina has offered to help with some of that and I also know the ideal thing is to have the same people do all the aging, but would it be possible for another group to do some of it or would it would have to be checked or what?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Certainly, it is ideal to have fewer hands in the pot when it comes to the interpretation for consistency sake, but then again there is turnover in staffs and people deal with this and they can do some comparison readings of structures and see how the different people handle them.

If you're talking about, say, North Carolina with experienced age readers, it is probably far less likely that you're going to have significant bias coming in that than if you are with someone who has never dealt with these species before or not with a lot of experience. You kind of mentioned that maybe people who would otherwise be going to sea could be brought in to do this if someone else were hired to go to sea, maybe could volunteers come in and help with that – if professors have students or agencies have people who want a nice vacation out on the Palmetto or what have you for a couple of weeks.

MR. BELL: I would let Joey speak to that, but I know recently we were scrambling around trying to find somebody that wanted to go out with MARMAP and it wasn't that easy to do. It is not that we don't like them or we like going to sea, but in terms of our staff there we're stretched in about ten different directions. That is not quite that easy, and plus just pulling somebody green off the streets is not necessarily a good idea sometimes.

MR. BALLENGER: We do generally take volunteers on MARMAP cruises, SEAMAP and South Atlantic cruises. SEFIS also takes volunteers on the cruises. We try to limit the number of volunteers to a certain number if they have any field experience doing our sampling technique or if they do have some substantial experience maybe on previous MARMAP cruises, we can rely a little bit heavier on volunteers. That pool gets ever increasingly smaller when we talk about people that have prior experience with our sampling techniques. When they get on the cruise, we're expecting to be up to speed and hit the ground running immediately.

MR. CUPKA: This is a very important issue and we need to try and resolve this somehow. It is having a huge impact on a lot of fishermen within our area of jurisdiction. I guess, Michelle, I would ask – there has been some indication there about what the backlog is. I don't know what North Carolina is, number one, willing to do or, number two, able to do. It seems to me we would have to know that at some point to see how we might want to proceed.

DR. DUVAL: Just to that point, I think my boss would say he is willing to do whatever it takes to get these otoliths read. I can certainly check back in with him and check back in with Randy Gregory, who runs our aging lab, and just see what the capacity might be for reading those additional otoliths. I will talk to Mel about what he thinks his staff might be able to do currently in terms of digging into that 5,000 otolith backlog. Perhaps we can talk offline and maybe get back to everyone in the next couple of days.

MR. CUPKA: Okay, so we may be able to have some indication before the end of the council meeting and obviously we would need for North Carolina to work very closely with South Carolina to try and make this happen if we could. Again, I think it is important that we try and find somebody to work this out, if we can.

DR. BARBIERI: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to put out there that Florida can participate in this joint effort as well. Our folks usually talk – Joey knows this – fairly often. From time to time we actually have some of these calibration meetings to keep the aging sort of standardized. I don't think it would be an insurmountable task to find the folks that would keep the aging process fairly legitimate and stable. I guess it is a matter of coordinating with Michelle and with Marcel when he returns and see what we can do to help.

MR. CUPKA; Yes, I would ask you to get with the people from North Carolina and South Carolina and see if we can't resolve this issue somehow. It may not be by the end of the council meeting but as soon as we can. Again, we need to move ahead on this. Other comments? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I had a question for Bonnie and a little bit of disappointment. There was a note in here if black sea bass is done as an update the new survey will not be included. It needs to be

done as a standard to allow inclusion of the new survey. Now, what does the new survey mean? Does it mean that none of the SEFIS information will be used? Will the trap survey stuff that is the same protocol as MARMAP not be used? All that new CPUE stuff we saw that was so encouraging last meeting; does that mean none of the SEFIS would be used? What does that mean, Bonnie?

DR. PONWITH: I'm glad you asked. What we won't be able to use is any of the video because that represents a brand new data stream that would have to be brought in via a benchmark. Because the trap data are collected according to a pre-existing protocol, we believe that we can include the expanded geographic range of the trap data that SEFIS, in conjunction with MARMAP, affords us.

The reason for that is because the protocols for collecting the data are standardized and because we even with the MARMAP data used a GLM analysis to compare – actually to bring a state factor into the analysis, so that is already controlled for, so increasing the geographic range by including additional states can be also controlled for. The bottom line is we can use the full range of traps data. We cannot include the video.

MR. HARTIG: I think that is real encouraging. Black sea bass, they trap very well. I don't know how much more the video is going to inform us on black sea bass in particular. I know on a lot of other species it will be very important, but black sea bass may be one of those that the trap survey will give us a pretty good indication of what is going on. Thank you for that.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments or questions? I really want to thank the states for their willingness to try and work together on this and resolve this issue. Again, as I say, it is very important and I appreciate their willingness to step forward and we will leave it up Michelle and Mel and Luiz to put their heads together and see if we can't come up with a way to move ahead on this. It is really important that we do that, so again thank you for your willingness to try and work together on this on behalf of the fishermen and everyone it is impacting. John, did you have any other issue you want to bring up on menhaden or anybody just to bring everybody up to date.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we have covered the 2013 stuff. I wanted to see if anyone had any guidance or discussions on 2014, because the other thing to point out is that you will notice what is missing from the 2013 list is gag and red grouper, which you had penciled in for possible standards to be considered. Those are going to have to come back into the mix at some point, and perhaps if you want to discuss what guidance you give to your steering committee representatives to go to the next meeting in October and talk about what the next priorities will be, say, for 2014 and beyond.

MR. CUPKA: Again, I want to remind everybody how important it is to schedule these things and to try and stick to them. It is easy to say, well, we're going to switch this for that, but it is not that easy for the people who are working to provide the data that goes into these assessments. We've had a bad history I guess of jerking these people around and changing priorities all the

time. We need to get to a point where we set a schedule and priorities in out-years, and we need to try and stick to that schedule. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, to me to start talking about the priorities for 2014, it would be very helpful to have a list of our assessed stocks, when the last assessment was done and how many years remain in the rebuilding plan and that kind of thing. It is kind of hard to just pull them out without knowing when was the last assessment done. I think that is something we need to see before we'll be very effective coming up with a list of stocks. Do we have that, John?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Somewhat; what I have here up on the screen is what we currently have penciled in for 2014 and 2015. Right now what we had for 2014 was red snapper being done – I guess I wrote that as an update; I meant to write that as a benchmark; so a red snapper benchmark to try and bring in all the new data and do something with that stock. When we removed that preliminary analysis from 2013, we said commit to 2014 for a benchmark, which we shall do.

And then there is white grunt, which is considered to be two stocks and it is going to require two analytical slots to get that done, so that is two and three. The other one has been scamp, which has been on the list for quite a while identified for 2014. I also point out that there was Gulf menhaden in 2014, which has become 2013, and there is lots of discussion about Atlantic menhaden being done in 2014.

I would anticipate that one of the five that we often work with will be devoted to Atlantic menhaden to 2014 in some way or another. Then that leaves black grouper, which Florida FWC is planning to do as an update and all to be done in 2014. The other things we had on there were things like speckled hind and Warsaw grouper, which have been down at the bottom of these lists each year without having the resources devoted to them.

And then the 2013, which I listed as the bumps, gag standard and red grouper standard, red grouper is kind of in the early stages of its rebuilding as one of the reasons why you were willing to give that up for the time being. Gag was not overfished and not overfishing was the reason you were willing to let that one go.

Now, the other things that are out there are red porgy and black sea bass, which are the ones under the rebuilding plan. Red porgy you're getting this year, but its rebuilding is expected to be done in 2016 and the same with black sea bass. You had those penciled in for perhaps 2015 or 2016.

I guess an important question on those two, given the time and the rebuilding, is – and that is over that box there – do we need an assessment that verifies B is greater than B_{msy} to declare the stock rebuilt and let the council then just move out of the rebuilding phase of management. And if so, does that mean we should do those assessments for red porgy and black sea bass in 2016?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, we do need an assessment to confirm that they're rebuilt. Otherwise, we won't be able to get them off the list.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So then perhaps we need to do those assessments with data through 2016 because that is when they should be rebuilt. We should do that at the point when we think the stock should be rebuilt so we can look at declaring those.

It might not make sense to do it the year before you expect it to be rebuilt because that wouldn't help you in terms of making the declaration if it is really close and you turn around and have to do the next year to be sure. Maybe those should be planned for, say, 2016 because we have plenty in 2015 that we want to do; and a lot of those in 2015 have never been assessed.

DR. CRABTREE: Back to white grunt, John, it concerns me to devote two benchmarks to it. Can you tell us the north and south – where is the break and what proportion of the white grunt landings come from the two areas?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I understand roughly it is North Carolina and Florida and broke somewhere in between, and I don't know about the allocation and landings between the two. In terms of planning for 2014 and down the road, we're told by the Science Center analysts that being two stocks it will take two. I kind of agree with you; there might be other stocks in 2015 in that box that people think are much more important than dealing with those two. If so, now would be a good time to identify them.

MR. HAYMANS: We have kicked the poor white grunt down the street many times, but what is the harm in combining them as one stock assessment?

MR. CARMICHAEL: The expectation of the Science Center analysts is that they will have to treat them as two entirely separate assessments much as we treat separate stocks as separate assessments. It would be like Spanish mackerel where you have the Gulf and the South Atlantic with two analysts working on it. They're two separate assessments. They believe that these are two separate stocks so you would be doing two separate assessments and that means two people to work on it.

MR. CUPKA: Well, all this gets back to our never-ending problem of through-put and how are we ever going to get enough assessments done to meet the requirements. That's why we keep changing these things around and kicking them around and switching them out. Somehow we have got to get to a point where we're able to do more assessments. We all know the problems there. We probably won't see any additional money in any time soon coming in but it is important that we somehow deal with that or we're going to be facing this same issue every time we get together. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: John, vermilion, when was the last time we did vermilion?

MR. CARMICHAEL: You're getting vermilion this fall.

DR. CRABTREE: That's this year, all right.

DR. DUVAL: John, when is red grouper supposed to be rebuilt?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It was lime 20-some years, I believe. Myra, do you recall, it was like 24 years or something. No, wait, I'm wrong about that. It was ten years, but you were able to rebuild if within ten years by fishing at basically your OY level. It is one of the reasons you chose ten years and a fairly conservative rebuilding strategy.

It is one of those that you're rebuilding and what you think your sustainable harvest is probably going to be more or less when you get there, at least your F rate. It is ten years and it started last year? Yes, maybe 2011 it started because that was what – Amendment 24, that is why I was thinking 24. It was just Amendment 24, which maybe this year is the first year under those rules.

DR. CRABTREE: What about amberjack; when was that last assessed?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Amberjack, based on where we stand now, is probably the oldest one that is out there, and it was done about 2009, maybe. Amberjack is going to be the oldest one. It was preliminarily in there for, say, 2014.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, that sure seems one that we need to find the slot for, to me.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You may want to consider gag and amberjack updates/standards as opposed to white grunt as a new stock benchmark.

MR. CUPKA: That is just how easy to make it so. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Yes, it is easy to make it so, but there is just a grave concern about some of these unassessed stocks, that things are happening beneath the wrappers that are going to end up by delaying our ability to do a benchmark stock assessment end up requiring more stringent management measures. It is just a balance here where ignorance really isn't bliss on some of these, and I do think that it deserves our attention to try and get them in the queue and keep them in the queue.

MR. CUPKA: Yes, but unfortunately we can only do so many and that is the problem we get back to. Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I think gag, the last time we did it was approaching an overfished condition and we've got all these stocks in rebuilding plans. I don't see how we're going to get to these lesser stocks until we can increase our capacity to turn out stock assessments. We almost have to keep focused on the stocks that we know we have problems with until we can show that we have adequately dealt with them.

MR. HAYMANS: If I could ask a rather naïve question of Bonnie; is there any way to increase the productivity of the lead biologists or lead assessment scientists? Can they do a species and a

half or something and let's try to get at least one or more stocks a year without additional personnel?

DR. PONWITH: The answer to that is yes. Our assessment scientists are working right now on kind of a white paper that again takes a look at the system on how we're set up and is making some recommendations on things we could do to improve efficiency. As you know, over the last three years SEDAR has made some pretty sweeping changes in the way we do business; and that is adding the standard in as an interim step; changing the way we deal with updates.

By keeping an update as pure to the protocol as we can, doing that enables us to conduct an update without the level of rigor in terms of the peer review because there are no judgment calls being made. We have made some sweeping changes. We're going back to the drawing board again and looking at things that we can do to increase the through-put, balancing with it our desire for the SEDAR process to be transparent and not giving up on that desire and then also being attentive to the peer review requirements that good science demands. They have been in discussion about this and my hope is to be able to get the fruits of their labor to the SEDAR Steering Committee in time for the pre-briefing package for that meeting.

DR. BARBIERI: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make some remarks or get a clarification regarding the timing due to council for hogfish and for black grouper. That has to do with the availability of the recreational data. We in Florida changed a bit our timing for starting assessments now in the fall and to get them completed in the spring.

That gives us the ability to use the latest recreational data that is finalized and confirmed by the MRIP folks. We are beginning assessments in the fall usually and completing them by spring. If not possible to do it that way and we start them in the spring, it is difficult to get the most recent data.

MR. CARMICHAEL: When do you see having hogfish, June 2014?

DR. BARBIERI: For sure, yes, that will be the preferable.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And then black grouper, June 2015?

DR. BARBIERI: Exactly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CUPKA: Other comments? Well, I think we have got what we need at this point.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, and of the list that is in there for 2015 and beyond; looking at scamp, which is in 2014, people believe that scamp is the one to keep there?

MR. CUPKA: When was the last one done, John? It has been a while ago; isn't it?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, it has never been through SEDAR so it is a new one. Yes, if you guys are comfortable with that, then this will be what is in the report and what your steering

committee representatives will take when we have the discussions on October 3rd about 2014 and long-term priorities.

MR. CUPKA: That brings us down to our next agenda item, which is SEDAR 32 approvals, and part of this I guess will have to be closed, John, for the appointments. Do you want to take us through the first part?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, we can take through the schedule and then our normal practice is to go into closed session to talk about appointments. Here is the schedule that has been worked through the technical folks and SSC and such for SEDAR 32 and the highlights are a data workshop in February; assessments to be conducted through a series of webinars, concluding, say, August 2013; review workshop to be held August 26-29; so the end of August. That allows it to get to the SSC at their 2013 meeting. If there is any objection really to that general timing or any questions, I would be glad to entertain them. If not, we're open for your approval on the schedule.

MR. CUPKA: Any discussion? **Can we have a motion to approve the schedule? We have a motion by Doug and second by Ben. Is there discussion on the motion? Any objection? Seeing none, then that motion is approved.** Okay, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Then the next action is to discuss appointments to the workshop, so if you'd like to take a brief break and go into closed session to do that.

MR. CUPKA: Let's take about a ten-minute break and come back and try and fishing this up.

(Whereupon, the open session adjourned at 4:37 o'clock p.m., September 10, 2012.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
October 14, 2012

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2012-2013 Committees

AD HOC DATA COLLECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Tom Burgess
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Tom Burgess
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
David Cupka
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Cheuvront

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Tom Burgess
Roy Crabtree
David Cupka
Ben Hartig
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Tom Burgess, Chair
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

John Jolley, Chair
David Cupka, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Tom Swatzel
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION

John Jolley, Chair
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Mel Bell
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Steve Amick
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Tom Swatzel
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair
David Cupka
Mario Gil
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

PERSONNEL

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

SEDAR Committee

- ✓ David Cupka, Chair
 - ✓ Ben Hartig, Vice Chair
 - ✓ Roy Crabtree
 - ✓ Michelle Duval
 - ✓ Doug Haymans
 - ✓ ~~Jessica McCawley~~ MARTHA BADEMAN
 - ✓ Tom Swatzel
 - ✓ Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
- Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP

Charlie Phillips, Chair
David Cupka, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Tom Burgess
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Anna Martin

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

2012 - 2013 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

Steve Amick
6902 Sandnettlles Drive
Savannah, GA 31410
912/429-3537 (ph)
912/898-0361 (f)
SteveAmicks@aol.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

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

Tom Burgess
P.O. Box 33
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460
910/327-3528
tburgess@embarqmail.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

Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell St.
PO Box 769
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

Lt. Mario Gil
U.S. Coast Guard
Brickell Plaza Federal Building
909 S.E. First Avenue
Room 876/ DRE
Miami, FL 33131-3050
305/415-6768 (ph)
305/415-6791 (f)
Mario.g.gil@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)
Doug.Haymans@dnr.state.ga.us

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

Robert E. Beal
Acting 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

Charles Phillips
Phillips Seafood / Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-3149 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

Tom Swatzel
P.O. Box 1311
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/222-7456 (ph)
tom@swatzel.com

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

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

JACK MCGOVERN
BONNIE POWERS
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
JOEY BALLENGER
OTHA EASLEY
LUIGI BARBERI
ANNEMARIE EICH

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.

SEDAR Committee Meeting
Charleston, SC
Monday, September 10, 2012

NAME &
ORGANIZATION

AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER

P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP

FRANK HEVIES GSAA

Felhelias @ verizon.net

Pennington Johnson JSF - ECFE 386-238-0448

PO Box 9351 32120-9351

Tacey Smart SPDNR 843-953-9224

CHS, SC

Holly Binnig DEG 850-322-7845

Tallahassee, FL

Bire Keyes EKEFA 305-619-0039

PO Box 1404 Maitland FL

A. VENTRELL - SDA 912-222-8796

ventrelli @ampalliance.com

Ken Stumpf 202-358-9520

AKA DC 2008

Susan Shipman 912-222-9206

SusanShipman@aol.net

Melinda Locke 919-881-2909

mlocke@edf.org

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201

North Charleston, SC 29405

843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

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.

SEDAR Committee Meeting
Charleston, SC
Monday, September 10, 2012

**NAME &
ORGANIZATION**

**AREA CODE &
PHONE NUMBER**

**P.O. BOX/STREET
CITY, STATE & ZIP**

Gretchen Martin

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201

North Charleston, SC 29405

843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

Attendee Report GoToWebinar

Generated

Sep 17, 2012 06:11 AM PDT

General Information

Webinar N: Webinar ID

SAFMC Co: 9.76E+08

Actual Star Actual Duration (minutes)

Sep 10, 2012 229

Clicked Reg Opened Invitation

64 54

Total Attended

32

Session Details

Attended	Interest Ra	First Name	Last Name	Registration	Join Time	Leave Time
Yes	35	Ann	Martin	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	26	Charlene	Ponce	Sep 06, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	31	Richard	Malinowski	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	33	Katie	Andrews	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	24	David	Gloeckner	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	43	Mike	C	Sep 05, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	30	Heather	Blough	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	36	Karla	Gore	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	37	Helen	Takade-Heumacher	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	24	Carolyn	Doherty	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	31	susan	gerhart	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	47	Michael	Travis	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	41	stephen	holiman	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	38	Kate	Michie	Aug 28, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	59	william	Harvey	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	28	miguel	lugo	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	31	Carolyn	Belcher	Aug 22, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	27	Jim	Atack	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	57	rick	hart	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	71	Wayne	Mershon	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	28	Sherri	McCoy	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	26	Erik	Williams	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	52	ira	laks	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	69	Larry	DeLancey	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	32	Rick	DeVictor	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	31	deb	buscher	Aug 22, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	28	Phyllis	Miranda	Sep 06, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	44	mike	murphy	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	26	D	Gregory	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	33	Mac	Currin	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	28	scott	sandorf	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
Yes	46	Nikhil	Mehta	Aug 22, 2012	Sep 10, 2012	Sep 10, 2012
No		Janie	Thomas	Sep 10, 2012	08:59 AM EDT	

No	Anne	Eich	Aug 22, 2012 02:24 PM EDT
No	Dawn	Franco	Sep 10, 2012 12:21 PM EDT
No	Cindy	Chaya	Aug 22, 2012 11:53 AM EDT
No	NICK	FARMER	Aug 22, 2012 12:55 PM EDT
No	Bill	MacLauchlin	Sep 10, 2012 05:07 PM EDT

*If an attendee left and rejoined the session, the In Session Duration column only includes their first vis