

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SEDAR COMMITTEE

**Town and Country Inn
Charleston, South Carolina**

September 12, 2023

Transcript

SEDAR Committee

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair
Kerry Marhefka
Andy Strelcheck
Tim Griner

Trish Murphey, Vice Chair
Jessica McCawley
Mel Bell

Council Members

Gary Borland
Judy Helmey
Laurilee Thompson

Robert Spottswood, Jr.
Tom Roller
Spud Woodward

Council Staff

John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
Myra Brouwer
Julia Byrd
Dr. Judd Curtis
John Hadley
Kathleen Howington
Allie Iberle
Kim Iverson

Ashley Oliver
Roger Pugliese
Michele Ritter
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Nick Smillie
Suzanna Thomas
Christina Wiegand
Meg Withers

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Clay Proch
Nikhil Mehta

Shep Grimes
Monica Smit-Brunello
Bob Gill

Other observers and participants attached.

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened The Town and Country Inn, Charleston, South Carolina, on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Carolyn Belcher.

DR. BELCHER: If everybody can come back to the table, please. The plan, moving forward, is we're going to recess the Habitat Committee, for Stacy to be able to talk with us at 1:30, and we are going to convene the SEDAR Committee at this point, and so Chip is going to walk us through that committee. We'll see what we can do between now and noon, and, at noon, we'll recess and then go back into Habitat after lunch, if needed.

The first item on the agenda is to approve the agenda for the SEDAR Committee. Is there any objection in the group about the agenda as currently published? Okay. Seeing none, the agenda is approved. The next item is Approval of the Minutes from the March 2023 Meeting. Does anybody have any discussion or comments relative to those minutes? Any objection to approving the minutes as currently published? Okay. Seeing none, the minutes pass. The next item on the agenda is the April 2023 SEDAR Steering Committee meeting report, which will be from Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you. Attachment 1 is the SEDAR Steering Committee report from May 2023, and just a reminder that what we've decided to do with these Steering Committee reports is, as opposed to having them right after the committee meeting, is to have them right before the next committee meeting, and this is to help refresh the Executive Director and the Chair's memory on what happened at the last meeting, so they're prepared for this upcoming meeting.

The main highlights for this are just in this meetings outcome summary page, and it begins on page 4 of Attachment 1, and the first one is thinking about, in that assessment portfolio, evaluation and recommendation, and, if you look at the second line down, or the second paragraph, it says the committee agreed that a benchmark assessment category would be a valuable addition to the options for cooperators.

If you guys all remember, we're in a research track and operational assessment framework right now, and we did not have this benchmark option, and so, basically, you would have to go through a research track assessment and then form an operational assessment afterwards.

This new approach allows a bit more flexibility for assessments that may be getting a little bit long in the tooth, that may need some significant changes, and so a benchmark might be available to the councils, or the cooperators, in order to get management in place a little bit more quickly than a research track process. Operational assessments were designed to be extremely limited in their flexibility, and it was basically minimal modifications, and so this benchmark approach allows a bit more flexibility. You might recognize the terminology, and it is coming back from the previous way that stock assessments were done in the Southeast.

Scrolling on down, when they were talking about the research track process for the 2024-2025 assessments, one of the key items that came up was right-sizing, trying to figure out what assessment approach is going to be the best for these different assessments that we have coming forward, and this is for all our cooperators in the Southeast Region, which includes the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, ourselves, Atlantic States, Gulf States, and HMS, and so it's a variety of people, and it's definitely appropriate to say that right-sizing is something that's needed.

We might not need stock assessments for all these, and we might just need a management strategy evaluation, or just simple data-limited approaches that don't need to go through a SEDAR process, and so that was a bit of the conversation in regard to that, and then the last bit of business that was discussed, or another bit of business that was discussed, was the use of hybrid meetings for SEDARs.

The committee did not reach consensus on having a hybrid for all SEDAR workshops. There was some discussion. SEDAR is now being -- Webinars are being used to broadcast the review workshops, and it doesn't necessarily mean that there's a public comment option in there, but you can now view these. Previously, they were not broadcast, and so that is a different approach, and, if people do -- If some of the cooperators do want a truly hybrid approach, we might need more admin staff, in order to accommodate that. SEDAR has had a pretty fixed budget, and doing a hybrid-type meeting can be intensive for staff, to get everything going, and so we might need additional admin staff in order to make this possible.

Finally, going into the assessment schedule review, I will just highlight what we have for the South Atlantic. It was -- Projects were approved by the committee. For the South Atlantic, it included a gag operational assessment and a king mackerel operational assessment. It was also discussed for a red porgy operational assessment for 2025, if an Atlantic States Atlantic migratory cobia could not be accommodated, and we got an email last night, or yesterday afternoon, that it appears that the Atlantic migratory cobia stock assessment can move forward, and so that means that the red porgy might be moving out of this, is there is no longer space available in order to conduct this assessment.

Finally, for black grouper, and this is going to be a benchmark stock assessment that's being conducted by Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission, and it was originally slated for 2025. However, due to some of the other stock assessments moving back, including mutton snapper, and that was delayed, as we tried to get an interim analysis for yellowtail, and that's leading to delays for hogfish, and, therefore, leading to delays for black grouper. There are limited staff at FWC in order to accommodate all these stock assessments that they have going on. With that, that's all that I was going to go over, as far as the summary for this meeting. If there's any questions, we do have four people that attended the meeting that can probably fill me in, if I misspoke on any of these.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Just a couple of comments on the report, and so I really like the idea of going back to more benchmarks, and getting away from the research track assessment, and can you expand, a little bit more, on this discussion about the expansion of the role of the SEDAR Steering Committee that was part of the discussion that I saw, and it looked like there was discussion of making that more like the NRCC, and I guess that I would have some concerns, if that body is going to try to make regional management suggestions, versus like regional research recommendations, but can you talk about that part of the meeting a little bit?

DR. COLLIER: I will call in a friend.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jessica, that's something that was raised, and it had been talked about at the Steering Committee some years before, and then we felt like there was some pretty good discussion that was had on that BSIA guidance document, and so it was discussed relative to using the Steering Committee as a place to maybe talk about regional guidance of that nature, and it does go into the details of what all the NRCC does, but at no time do we really discuss taking on that level of coordination and responsibility in particular, and I don't think there was any interest, and I see a couple of members at the end of the table as well, but of, you know, getting the Steering Committee really engaged and trying to have any role in the management side, and the coordination in particular, and so, yes, that's not really an intent, but just thinking are there opportunities when we have something of a technical nature that involves all of us, and maybe we can use that as a place to review documents and guidance and such.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Also, I see that my friend, white grunt, is still on the schedule, and I would love to make a motion to remove white grunt from the schedule. I feel like we don't have any declining trends, and we saw some data yesterday, but, seriously, I think that this -- Also, in light of the FES data, I think that this needs to come off the schedule, and I'm willing to make a formal motion to get this off the schedule.

DR. COLLIER: I feel like you made that at the last meeting, and it came back on, and so I will knock it back off, or, as we get into Other Business, I did put another proposal up there for white grunt that might not be as onerous as what we currently have.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions? Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I have a question, and so there's a bullet here that says that the committee did not discuss or provide any guidance on accepting public comment remotely, and so this is a webinar, and I assume that the availability of accepting public comment is there, and has the SEDAR -- I don't know that much about the SEDAR Committee, and have they never accepted public comment, or, if somebody wants to make public comment, do they have to journey to wherever the meeting is taking place? This looks like it was a webinar, and so, if somebody wanted to provide comment, would they have to drive to, I don't know, the South Atlantic Council office? How do you make public comment?

DR. COLLIER: So this wasn't necessarily for the SEDAR Steering Committee meetings. This was for SEDAR workshops, and so, in the past, data workshops have not been -- There has not been an opportunity to provide public comment, or even have it be observed via webinar, or presented via webinar, or broadcast, and the same thing with review workshops. They were not presented via webinar, and so this allows -- Now that they're presenting some of this via webinar, the question is do we allow public comment via webinar, and Kathleen can probably speak to this much better than I can, since she came up to the table.

MS. HOWINGTON: I will just clarify that SEDAR has always accepted public comment on our website. However, like Chip said, for workshops, if you want to have any kind of public comment, you do need to be -- For in-person workshops, you need to be in-person, and so this is for the broadcasting links that we are now offering, and we have not gotten clarification on whether or

not the Steering Committee would like us to also have an open public comment, because they are not a hybrid link, and it's meant just to be listening in.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or questions at this point, relative to the report? Okay. Seeing none, Chip, we'll move on to your next item, which is the update on the SEDAR projects, which is to your point, Jessica.

DR. COLLIER: Okay. Attachment 2 includes all the South Atlantic projects that are going on in the region, and these South Atlantic projects might be a combination, or a joint assessment, for both the Gulf of Mexico and the South Atlantic. Starting off with the first one, we have mutton snapper. It was originally rescheduled from 2023, and so now it has a terminal year of 2022, and they're talking about pushing that back, in order to get one more additional year of the State Reef Fish Survey, in order to have a calibration dataset for that, and so that might result in some delays for this benchmark assessment, but hopefully it is -- We're going to get a new timeline soon and understand how it's going to change the schedule, but I believe that it should not be too much of an impact, maybe just a few months, in order to do that calibration with the State Reef Fish Survey with the new FES numbers and the potential issues with bias.

The South Atlantic gray triggerfish research track assessment, that's SEDAR 82, and that was originally set up for a schedule, or a review workshop, in October of 2023. However, there was a request for additional webinars, and so now a review workshop is trying to be set up for early 2024, and then the assessment completion date is going to be shortly there afterwards, and so we can expect either a stock assessment for gray triggerfish research track coming to the council in either June -- Somewhere around June or September.

Red grouper, SEDAR 86, this was an operational assessment. If you listened to the SSC meeting last week, they talked about changing this operational assessment from a single-stock model to a two-stock model, and so there needs to be additional conversations on exactly what's going to happen with this, but, based on those conversations, it is not likely that anything will be delivered in December of 2023, like originally planned, and this one is going to be delayed as well.

Upcoming stock assessments, we do have the South Atlantic tilefish operational assessment, or an operational assessment for tilefish, and this one is planned to start this year, with data through 2022, and it's expected to begin just in a couple of months, and potentially be done within six to eight months, and so delivered either mid next year, or halfway through next year.

SEDAR 90 is the research track assessment for red snapper, and we're underway for planning for that stock assessment. There has been several meetings to develop the terms of reference and a schedule, and now we're in the search for participants for this. The terms of reference and a list of participants will be provided to the SSC in October of 2023.

In 2024, we have the blueline tilefish operational assessment, and that's going to have a terminal year, likely, of 2022, and the assessment is going to begin in April of 2024. This one is going to be a little bit of a joint assessment that's going to include members from the mid-Atlantic, because we do have the tilefish going up into the Mid-Atlantic Bight, based on the last research track, or benchmark, assessment.

Hogfish, SEDAR 94, that's going to be a benchmark assessment conducted by FWC. The terms of reference are being developed right now, and they should be ready for approval this fall, and then we have our 2025 operational assessments. I just mentioned that those got approved by the SEDAR Steering Committee. However, we have not developed -- A schedule has not been developed for them, and so the 2025 assessments are gag grouper and king mackerel, and then I also have red porgy listed here. Given the email yesterday that cobia is good to go forward, this is likely going to lead to a delay in the red porgy assessment. I do have Atlantic cobia on there, and that one is -- The roadmap has been discussed, and it will be presented to the SEDAR Steering Committee next month for final approval.

Other assessment-related items, we have a vermilion snapper interim analysis that's going to be provided to the SSC in October, and new -- Hopefully new catch level values will be provided to the council in December, and then the fishery procedural, or the SEDAR procedural, workshop, which is looking at fishery-independent developments, under changing survey design, that is still be completed, and hopefully everything will be finalized by the end of this year, in order to have the report on the website, and so that's all the projects that are going on in the South Atlantic region.

There are several more going on through SEDAR, either for the Gulf of Mexico, HMS, or Caribbean, or Atlantic States, or Gulf States, and I did not provide those, and those are -- You can find those linked on the SEDAR webpage.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Chip. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm definitely thinking out loud here, and so I hope this comes across as coherent and making sense. I'm thinking about where we are with the triggerfish assessment, and we're still in the data workshop phase. If I recall correctly, you said, and I'm on it, and so I should know there is one more data workshop call, or there's not one more call?

MS. HOWINGTON: (Ms. Howington's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MARHEFKA: What she said, and so my question is, given that it's a really -- Looking at allocation of triggerfish, which is going to be important, because it's a pretty close -- It's 43/56 right now, and where are in the assessment with this one, where we have a serious conversation with the people working on that about the FES situation, before we get further down the road, and how does that get handled from this point, but that's of concern for me.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I share that concern, and we have State Reef Fish Survey data for gray triggerfish, and I think the terms of reference and other things would have to be updated, in order to bring that in, and is there a way to try to look at that data and see if it can be brought in here, to kind of add to what Kerry is saying, or the whole assessment postponed, or moved back, a little bit?

DR. COLLIER: Thinking about gray triggerfish, it might be possible to get some sensitivities to different landings streams for the recreational side of things, but I don't know if we could bring in a whole new data stream. Just scaling up or scaling down the recreational landings seems like it

would be a fairly simple sensitivity to run, just to see how it is, but the other thing to remember is this is a research track, and so we have a benchmark that follows it, and so we could use that benchmark as an option to potentially get some new recreational data put in there, as long as it's not extreme changes in the recreational estimates, and Clay is nodding his head, and so I'm not completely crazy.

DR. BELCHER: Clay, and then I've got Mel.

DR. PORCH: We do have to be careful, and we couldn't just substitute something in, because you have FES in other parts of the range, and it's not just a Florida assessment, and then we would have to make sure we did the review properly, that we had a time series that went back in time, and, since the east coast one isn't as mature as the Gulf coast, I don't see us being able to do anything in a timely way with that, but we could run some sensitivity analyses.

DR. BELCHER: Mel, did you -- No? Okay. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm good with the sensitivity analysis and look and see if there's a scaling issue here, and then considering if you want to bring in the State Reef Fish Survey data, and hopefully this would be after it's looked at for mutton, et cetera, in the benchmark process.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I appreciate the comments made about triggerfish, and I guess I had a similar thought with regard to gag, and kind of two areas, and one is, obviously, the FES and pilot results emerging in 2025, and possibly considering pushing that assessment back slightly. The other aspect is we're just implementing management now in 2023, late 2023, and so we're only going to have maybe one year of data with new regulations, and so it might benefit from actually pushing that assessment back, and that's something the SEDAR Steering Committee could discuss.

Then, while I have the mic, Jessica has mentioned, several times, use of the State Reef Fish Survey, and I'm certainly supportive of that, and clay just mentioned that, you know, it's not as mature as the Gulf one is, and has that been kind of reviewed and presented to the SSC, and I assume it's certified with MRIP, but I don't know the answer to that, and so how is that working right now?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I'm not sure that it's certified yet. We had a lengthy discussion about this at the mutton assessment workshop, and so I believe -- That's part of the reason why we were suggesting that the next workshop be pushed back a little bit, because I think Luiz and Bev are working on that data, and we need to figure out how many months is the burn-in period, et cetera, and so that was why they were suggesting the next step in mutton be pushed back a little bit, and so they're definitely doing that on mutton, but they're trying to focus just on mutton.

I think that I like the idea of doing this for gag, and then I think the data is ready, and so we really wanted three full years, minus whatever the burn-in period is, and is it six months, or is it -- However many months it is, but ready to go, and I think that we'll have two really good years of SRFS on the Atlantic, or possibly three, and, if you can push some of these back -- The timelines back a little bit, you'll have even more, but, yes, we're trying to determine where that cut-off is on the burn-in period, and Luiz and Bev are all over it.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or suggestions at this point for Chip with the workplan or projects? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so I just got a note from staff that we should have three full years of data, minus the burn-in, in early 2024.

DR. BELCHER: So other suggestions or comments from folks? Okay. Moving on, the next item is statements of work for 2026.

DR. COLLIER: This is Attachment 3, and so draft statements of work for the 2026 South Atlantic stock assessments. This helps me keep my mind sane, in order to develop all these documents that you guys have to review for SEDAR. There is statements of work, and there is terms of reference, and there is different levels of review for this, and so I developed this little schematic to let you know exactly where we are in regard to the level of review, and so what we're doing right now is the committee, the SEDAR Committee, recommends stocks for the upcoming SEDAR Steering Committee meeting in March, and it follows that the SEDAR Steering Committee approves the list of species to develop a statement of work for, and then we provide that statement of work to the SSC for their review.

It's coming to you in September, and then we send it to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center for their review, and then we're going to bring the statement of work, after all these reviews, back to you in March, for the final approval, from which we will develop terms of reference that you guys will also review, and so it's a very review-heavy process that we have for these, because it's very important that we get everything that you want in these stock assessments and addressing all the needs.

I do have some background information on where we are for this. We're presenting here three statements of work, one for snowy grouper, and that was originally provided to the SEDAR Steering Committee as a species of interest, and we added Spanish mackerel in this, for a 2026 stock assessment, given the level of concern from the SSC, and not all the items that the SSC was concerned about -- They were not all addressed in the stock assessment.

Then the third species we have is dolphin. We have a management strategy evaluation that's being conducted by NOAA Fisheries, and we feel like this probably needs to go through a CIE review. When we were originally thinking about this, we didn't know what kind of process SEDAR was going to have for it, and so we had a block set aside for it, and now it's -- As we have thought about this more and more, we're thinking that the management strategy evaluation can be done through a review by the Center of Independent Experts, and no other additional workshops would be needed through the SEDAR process.

In the document, I do have a couple of things that are highlighted that we would like guidance from the committee on, and so I will get to those. If I do forget them, they are highlighted in yellow, and so please remind me.

For snowy grouper, this is going to be an operational assessment. The previous assessment was the SEDAR 36 update, which was conducted in 2021 with a terminal year of 2018, and so we're going to add, potentially, six new years of data. If you remember, snowy grouper is overfished, and overfishing is occurring.

For some of the updates, we indicate to include any new and updated information on life history, discard mortality, and steepness, and then we have a series of model modifications to the previously-approved stock assessments. One is to separate landings and discards for this species. It was assumed that all released fish were dead, and there has been some research that has indicated that that is not the case, and so we might need to separate landings and dead discards into two different data streams.

There is indices of abundance that need to be developed for snowy grouper, and there is the new South Atlantic Deepwater Longline Survey, which could be a piece of information in order to inform this stock assessment, and then develop other techniques to develop indices of abundance for some of the current studies going on. Tracey gave a presentation on the chevron trap study yesterday, and they also do a short bottom longline survey within that program, and so some of that information might be useful as well.

There is a bullet to use MRIP-recommended approaches for recreational landings, to reduce PSEs below 50 percent, and snowy grouper is a data-limited species, and a rare-event species for the MRIP survey, and, quite often, their year estimates of landings exceed the 50 percent benchmark, and so it's recommended to figure out the most appropriate way to estimate landings for that. Explore using average recruitment, instead of relying on the Beverton-Holt stock-recruit relationship, and I believe there was some discussion on this yesterday, where some of the stock assessment models are switching more to an average recruitment, instead of trying to rely on the stock-recruitment relationship, just because of the amount of noise that we have typically in our stock assessments.

Consider estimating commercial discards with the observer program, versus commercial discard logbook, and the commercial discard logbook has been discussed several times on the record here, indicating that it might not be the best use of information, or might not be the most reliable source of information, for commercial discards, and so developing some of the estimates of discards with the observer program might be useful for this species. Consider using different methods of estimating snowy grouper natural mortality, including a subset of Then et al., and this is getting into the weeds of how they estimate some of the natural mortalities, but, if you remember, back from the SEDAR 36 update, they used a new estimate of natural mortality, and it resulted in a significant change in the stock status for the species, and so just really evaluating this estimate of natural mortality would be useful.

The SSC had a catch level projections workgroup, and they developed several recommendations for operational assessments and research track assessments, and so we just provide that as an item to include in the update assessment. Address recommendations of a stock-recruit relationship workgroup, and this workgroup has not been formed yet, but this stock assessment is not going to be conducted until 2026, and so the workgroup is going to be formed, and it's going to have a report done by 2026, and we hope those recommendations are going to be included in this assessment report.

The final one, this was added late into the game, which was develop sensitivities to explore potential impact and bias in recreational landings, and that's to address some of the discussion that Richard Cody talked about yesterday.

The SSC recommended one topical working group, and this is mainly a placeholder, in case the stock-recruit relationship working group recommendations are not completed, but, if it is completed, they're not recommending a workgroup, and then we have a draft timing for snowy grouper, and this is just for the developments of statements of work, and so, if there's any questions or comments on the statement of work for snowy grouper, and hopefully it made some sense to everyone.

DR. BELCHER: Any questions or discussions from the group on what Chip has proposed? Anything you want to consider further? Clay, you look like you wanted to say something.

DR. PORCH: I just wanted to remind the council that, you know, we approve statements of work at the spring meeting, but, if there are changes made subsequently, it often requires changing the schedule, because we don't build-in a lot of buffer in there, and so there's not a lot of free time, and so, when we go, and the SSC, or others, recommend adding other complexities to it, it takes more time, and then we have to go back and re-jigger the schedule, which is something we would rather not do, and so we have to be very circumspect, when it comes to looking at additions to things that weren't in the original statement of work.

One of the things that we talked about, during the Steering Committee meeting, is making sure that we have all those discussions before we approve the final statements of work, and so let's make sure the statements of work that are submitted are thorough and minimize any changes after they're already approved, but, obviously, think about it. Does it make sense to give a statement of work, and we approve it, and then we go, okay, now we've got to add a bunch more, and, you know, expect the schedule not to be changed.

DR. BELCHER: The one question that I will ask is just back to the group, and it could be to Clay's group as well, but, given what we know with the FES, do you think the statement of work covers -- That it gives us enough latitude to be able to have a conversation about that? I mean, I know there's -- As Chip indicated, the bias was added to that, and so is that -- How does that fit into the scope of what we're proposing?

DR. PORCH: I think, where it's clear that the FES might have a big impact, at least for some assessments, we can make the run without too much trouble, as a sensitivity run, and, again, we don't know what the percentage adjustment would be, and so we just come up with sort of a default. That is part of that triage exercise that I think we need to go through, looking at where we're going to need to do that.

Again, it depends on how thorough a set of sensitivity analyses we're doing. If it's really just a scaling thing, and you're just changing -- Say assume whatever, a 30 percent change in private recreational or something like that, and it's not a huge lift, and we can probably accommodate it. When you start talking about, okay, could we mix SRFS for part of it, and adjustments to FES for another, you could be talking about a much more complicated series of sensitivity analyses, and we would have to consider readjusting the schedule.

DR. COLLIER: Based on the motion that was made by the council yesterday, in order to -- Thinking about some of these species in relation to the SEDAR, I went through and looked at the allocations for snowy grouper, and it's 83 percent commercial and 17 percent recreational, and so it's a pretty small recreational, and then, in addition to that, the private recreational component and

shore component, which were the two components that were identified to have some of the issues, they only account for 25 percent of the recreational landings. That was an average over the past five years, and so 2018 to 2022. The private recreational component of the recreational side will have a much smaller impact than other species, and so it might not be a huge impact on this stock assessment, and, just looking at the potential, some minimal sensitivities to the potential bias for this species might be sufficient to address some of the concerns.

DR. BELCHER: I just feel like that's good to have that on record, for that purpose, and I would hate for us to go into something and not have at least talked about the potential that we need to expand it or contract it. Does anyone else have comments on the statement of work for snowy? All right, and so moving to the next one you've got.

DR. COLLIER: For Spanish mackerel, this is a new statement of work, and we're requesting a benchmark stock assessment. We have not had a statement of work developed for benchmarks yet, and so we're not exactly certain of all the processes that will be done, and it was just suggested as a potential mechanism at the last SEDAR Steering Committee, and so we're going to be working out the kinks as we go along here.

The prior assessment was just reviewed by the SSC last year, and it was SEDAR 78. The terminal year for that was 2020, and so, in this new benchmark assessment, the terminal year would be 2024. We have the normal request for updates to life history, discard mortality, and steepness, and then, under these model modifications, and these come directly from either the stock assessment review by the SSC or previous stock assessment reviews, and so we have indices of abundance, to reinvestigate the recreational index methods. There were two different recreational indices that were considered for this stock assessment, and they had very different outcomes in the terminal year, and so it was suggested to reinvestigate those.

It was also suggested to investigate other sources of indices of abundance, including NEAMAP and state surveys. The reason for this is Spanish mackerel are -- There is thoughts that they might be moving northward, and so getting some more information from the northern side of the North Carolina-Virginia border might be beneficial, in order to inform the stock assessment.

It's also a recommendation to compile and consider all observer data collected on Spanish mackerel. There is a substantial amount of observer data that is collected on Spanish mackerel in the North Carolina northward, on some gillnet trips, as well as some other fisheries, and so it's recommended to get that information included into the stock assessment.

It's recommended to consider different methods for estimating Spanish mackerel natural mortality, similar to snowy grouper, and there is these new, or these other, methods that could be considered for this, and that was a substantial topic for the SSC, during their last review of this species. Investigate distribution changes. In the current commercial, it's indicating catch in northern versus southern regions, and it looks like there's been changes. The potential impact of this distribution change on the biomass and stock abundance and whether or not this could be climate-induced changes to distribution and whether or not we should be looking into regime shifts. If a stock is moving northward, and is having a successful move northward, and keeping their southern boundary the same, this could be an increase in productivity.

We have the two items to address the catch level projections workshop in the assessment report, as well as the -- I forgot to put it in there, but it's the stock-recruit relationship workgroup for Spanish mackerel, and then develop sensitivities to explore the impact of bias in recreational landings. This species is much more reliant on recreational data. As you all know, there is a substantial portion of Spanish mackerel that is caught either from shore or from private recreational vessels, and only a small portion is coming from either headboats or charter boats.

The suggested process for this is to have an in-person workshop and include federal, state, and stakeholder participants north of the North Carolina-Virginia border, and also work with ASMFC, as well as MAFMC, the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, in order to get representation. The assessment workshops would be held through webinars, as they always are, and then this is one piece where we need guidance from the committee, is what type of review you would like to see for this type of stock assessment, whether it is an in-person CIE, Center for Independent Experts, review, with an SSC review to follow that, or just the SSC doing a review of the stock assessment, and that is all for Spanish mackerel.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so comments from the group or discussion from the group? Toni.

MS. KERNS: I just had a question. In terms of would we be reaching out to the Northeast Fisheries Science Center as well, since -- Clay and Andy and I, I think, have talked about, for cobia and Spanish mackerel, the collaboration between the two Science Centers, since we are seeing northward landings. We have, in our compliance reports, landings in the commercial fishery, from Rhode Island and New Jersey for Spanish mackerel, consistently since 2012 at least, and so I just wanted to see if that is a part of the federal group that's in there or not.

Then I guess a second question would be is the plan the same, in terms of looking at FES for Spanish, considering that I would assume this assessment would be utilized to help with the allocation amendment, and so you want to make sure we have the right data in there?

DR. COLLIER: So this one is going to be -- It's going to be conducted in 2026, hopefully when the calibration of everything is investigated for the recreational data, and hopefully those issues will have been addressed by then and we'll have a good recreational data stream. Yes, I was imagining the federal referring to the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, as well as GARFO, if needed.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I don't know how much we'll need to depend on the Northeast Fisheries Science Center. We'll have to explore that and see how much data that they might contribute to it, but certainly the states. In the previous Spanish mackerel, we needed data from the states, and so we would expect that, and so Atlantic States and the individual states we certainly would want to participate. As far as a review goes, if you're talking about in general for the benchmark process, I think we do want the participation of CIE.

DR. BELCHER: Trish.

MS. MURPHEY: Just to get it clear in my mind, since this is a benchmark, we'll be able to pull in different data streams, and you're not going to be held to -- You will get that flexibility that you

really didn't have in that operational, right, and so you'll be able to at least consider datasets from the other states, and, you know, I like the -- If I'm correct, only the commercial landings from Florida were used, and you really couldn't pull in the landings data from the other states, but you'll have that opportunity to look at that and see if that will be useful data in coming up with any indices or whatever, and so I'm just trying to get that clear in my mind. Since this is a benchmark, you've got that flexibility to pull in data, so you can actually address that, if there's a distribution change.

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and that's why we were recommending, as staff, that this be a benchmark assessment, in order to provide that flexibility to go up to the Northeast and get some of the information. There was a definite desire to get some of the information from the observer program, and that was limiting in the last stock assessment, and so this provides that opportunity, as well as develop indices of abundance, if needed, for those more northern regions.

MS. MURPHEY: Then my other question, talking about what kind of review you need, only SSC or the CIE, since it's a benchmark, would it be better to have both reviews, or does it matter? I'm not quite sure how that process works, but I didn't know if that actually might be a better way to go, having both reviews, but that's really more of a question on this process of review.

DR. COLLIER: I would leave that up to Clay, on giving the response for a CIE review, other than me, if you feel comfortable giving the response to that, Clay.

DR. PORCH: Yes, and so, I mean, the CIE would participate in the technical review. The SSC still gets involved, because they're looking at all the materials and how they're going to use it to set up the ABC, and so there's still a review role, but the SSC subsequent review would recognize that there had been a previous technical review, and presumably some SSC members would have been on the assessment team for the benchmark assessment, and so, you know, we don't want to have a duplicative review, but the SSC has to review all the material to make their ABC advice.

In this case, we are talking about potentially expanding the types of data that are coming in, because it's becoming a coastwide assessment, and so we'll have more data partners in there, but it also means this is potentially going to be a very complicated assessment, and so it may end up taking a longer timeframe than you might normally expect, especially when we're trying to gather data from other partners, and they're not used to providing us data, and it certainly was a challenge the last time we did it.

DR. BELCHER: So, knowing that this SOW is kind of in its planning stages, I guess back to the question I asked with the other one. The robustness of what we're asking, is it well represented? Are there other things that we need to think about in the scope of it? That's the question I would put to the group. Is it adequate? Are sensitivities relative to the FES enough, or is there something else that we need to suggest in that? I'm throwing that out there, and I'm not landing on anything.

I'm with Clay. I mean, as far as if we back the support of whether it's a CIE or an SSC, I think the CIE is a good -- You know, that's classically how we've used the benchmarks, to make sure that that science, that other level, because we are going outside of the scope of what an operational is, and it gives you that higher-level evaluation. Do folks have anything else, topic-wise, that you think we need to add in? Toni.

MS. KERNS: I guess, just conferring with Spud, and I apologize that I'm less familiar with the SEDAR process, but, if this is a 2026 assessment, does work start in 2025 on it? I'm just thinking to the FES, because I don't think we will have a real answer until 2026, and I will look back to Richard, and, if work is starting in 2025, and I assume that's why the terminal year is 2024, you won't have any of that information for the FES, and so I feel like we'll be in a little bit of a tough spot.

DR. COLLIER: We generally start the stock assessments at two different time periods, either at the beginning of the year or halfway through the year, when the stock assessments are started, and that provides some flexibility in timing, given the staff workload that's going on, and so some of the data scoping will occur in 2025, figuring out what data streams we might need, but actually finalizing the datasets would not occur until a data workshop occurs, and that could be set up in the fall of 2026, in order to make sure all the recreational data is available and the calibrations have been completed.

MS. MURPHEY: Just from the discussion we just had, I guess, if you're looking for an answer on that SSC and CIE review, it sounds like both would be beneficial for this.

DR. BELCHER: Toni.

MS. KERNS: Sorry, and so then would it be better -- If you're not going to have a data workshop until the fall of 2026, should the terminal year of data be 2025? I like to use the most recent data, as close as I can, and my science staff hate me for it sometimes, but --

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and so what we have done, in these stock assessments, as opposed to just say the absolute terminal year is 2024, what we do is include this other statement afterwards of include all or partial data from the most recent year, in order to accommodate some of the delays in stock assessments that might occur, and you've seen some of our stock assessments are getting pushed back, and we're trying to put these things in three years in advance, and so we're trying to get some flexible language there.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just to be clear on the calibrated recreational data to deal with FES, if the intent is to use the calibrated data that addresses whatever comes out of the next study, I think that should be part of the statement of work, to make it clear, because we would not want to start this -- If they get behind, and they're not going to have the data until November of 2026, we wouldn't want to get started on this, and it's such an important recreational species, if the evaluation shows there is really a bias, and this is a species that's impacted, and we had a lot of shore mode landings the last round that were of concern, and then be getting rolling on a data workshop two months before the data come out, and so I think we could include a statement in here that just says the intent is to incorporate calibrated FES information.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments or discussion on this? Okay. Seeing none, Chip, we can move on to dolphin.

DR. COLLIER: All right, and dolphin is another new one for the statement of work process. We have not done a management strategy evaluation in the Southeast, or the South Atlantic region, and so what we're considering is this is going to be like an operational model, and so given the model and additional years of data.

We do not have a stock assessment model for dolphin, and so there is no prior terminal year, but, currently, an MSE is being developed. A management strategy evaluation is being developed by NOAA Fisheries, and so it's very limited in the request for modifications, because we haven't seen the final model yet, and there isn't a final product to review, and we don't know what needs to be changed.

However, we do want to make sure that they explore the evaluation and see its robustness relative to the potential biases in recreational data. One of the reasons that management strategy evaluations are used for stocks like this is you can test its robustness to your management strategy, given the inputs of the data, and so this is definitely one of the benefits of doing a management strategy evaluation, and I believe they are going to be looking at the robustness of their findings relative to the recreational landings.

The big question for the group is what type of review you would like for this management strategy evaluation, whether it is a CIE review with SSC members present, and then following up with an SSC review, in order to set the ABCs, or just an SSC review, and the SSC did not have a preferred recommendation for this.

DR. BELCHER: So the question I will have is has any other region done an MSE, and, if they have, how have they gone through their review? Has it been through an independent review? I mean, not knowing what your actual output is, it's kind of hard to say what we're evaluating, if that makes sense. Clay.

DR. PORCH: There's been a couple of regions that have done MSEs, and I don't know, you know, exactly how they did their reviews, whether they used CIEs or not, and we could find out, but, for instance, in, you know, the New England Fishery Management Council, they're dealing with herring and an MSE there, and so there's a couple of examples. In my case, I think, if we did an MSE like this, and we have a couple of things in the works, then a CIE review would be sufficient, a desk review even, and I don't think it needs to be an in-person review.

DR. COLLIER: I will say that the SSC did not like the idea of a desk review, and that was the one thing -- We actually gave them three options, and they said get rid of the desk review, please, and kept the other two.

DR. BELCHER: Other thoughts on this, since this is the first time out of the gate? I know we kind of have more blank faces on that, but go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I mean, I guess my thought is and, well, you just stated it, right, and, given this is the first time out of the gate, I'm thinking that it might worth doing a CIE review, having a more rigorous review process. The other question I had, and I was a little surprised in the requested model modifications, not having kind of a similar statement with regard to looking at changes in spatial distribution and climate, and whether or not that's maybe integrated already in the MSE, but it seems like that's an important consideration as well for dolphin.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I am thinking an in-person CIE review may be best here.

DR. BELCHER: So can you provide clarification on Andy's question about climate and distribution changes relative to the model? The question came up about whether or not we were going to highlight -- Does the model account for, intrinsically, the potential of climate change or distributional change, climate effects and distributional change, or is that something that we should consider as part of the statement of work, and that was Andy's question.

MR. HADLEY: I think so -- I'm speaking kind of on the outskirts of it, but Science Center staff has done a great job of keeping council staff informed, and so I'm basing my comments on that, and I believe that there is several different uncertainties that could be built into the model, and I do know that recreational landings, and uncertainty in landings, is one of the items that has been mentioned. I'm not sure about climate change specifically, but I believe it's something that the council could make a comment on, and that could be incorporated into the model runs.

DR. BELCHER: Okay, and so, based on that, Chip, can we make that suggestion to at least talk about -- Have them address the issues of potential distributional shifts or impacts of climate? I've got Trish and then to Clay.

MS. MURPHEY: Actually, when Andy suggested that, I had actually had that note made to me, about asking about climate-induced distribution changes, if there was a way to add that in, and I didn't know if there was a way just to add the life history in, as far as since they're so quick-moving, and they are pelagic, and so I didn't know if there is ways to add that as well, and those are just some thoughts I had in reviewing this.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I was just going to point out that John Walter, who is our MSE lead, has his hand up, and he wanted to comment on a couple of these issues.

DR. COLLIER: Go ahead, John.

DR. WALTER: Thanks, everyone, and I'm sorry that I couldn't be there in-person. This is great conversation and discussion, and is exactly what needs to happen, what the key uncertainties that the council wants addressed in this MSE, and so I think now is certainly the time. I think that the impact of biased recreational landings is exactly spot-on, and the distributional shifts and impacts of climate is certainly something we've been considering, and I think hearing it from the council is a key uncertainty. It helps to motivate how we would construct the operating models.

Then, if there are other key uncertainties that are the things that keep you up at night, in terms of having to make management decisions, those are the things to evaluate in the MSE, and so I want to keep this conversation going. If there are any others, and I think certainly those two that are listed are going to be in-person, among several others that are already going to be evaluated, like probably life history uncertainty, and potentially different migratory pathways, because I think that's also an uncertainty we have, and so there are -- Just on the climate impacts, and I will get a little bit into the weeds, we can either do that by trying to explicitly account for climate drivers in the operating models, or we can abstract that to allow for changes in say productivity, like a change in the stock-recruitment relationship within the operating models.

I don't know that we need to be specific about how that's done, but it's just that sometimes we can simplify the process to distill it down to what is the main impact of climate change going to be on the population, and probably some sort of changes in migration movement for productivity, and so I think this is perfect.

My other comment would be that, because the MSEs operate best with iterative contact with decisionmakers, that is repeated opportunity to get information in front of people, and what would be really good is to schedule some conversations with the SSC, for them to evaluate their parts along the way. For instance, to allow the SSC to say that the operating models meet the biological needs and are suitable for this assessment, and I think that kind of iterative process -- Once we get the operating models accepted, then we can move on to the management procedures, and then that becomes a conversation with the council, as I know that we've outlined that process of how it would fit in. Anyway, thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, John Walter. I've got Mel and then Kerry.

MR. BELL: I was just going to say I think definitely we should be -- If we can, and it sounds like we can, pay attention to climate-induced impacts in the model, and, in this case, it's not so much of a sort of north-south thing that we're dealing with with other species, and it could be changes in their patterns, inshore or offshore, migratory routes, that sort of thing, but we've got quite a record of having discussed that over the past several years, as something that may be at play, and so definitely, and, based on what John Walter said, it sounds like we can include that for consideration.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I know that, recognize that, the commercial portion of this fishery is very, very small, but is -- We don't have any fishery-independent index for dolphin, correct? So, therefore, if any index is included from the commercial sector, it would be fishery-dependent, and has it been -- Well, I guess we haven't done a stock assessment, and so I guess my thing would be, if there is one included, I would be interested in sort of recognizing that there may be a shift, and how could we recognize that there may be a shift in fleet dynamics, given that we have heard, at previous meetings, that maybe some of the South Atlantic boats are shifting south, to the Caribbean and Puerto Rico, and maybe landing there. I would just hate to -- If it used, if there's any commercial data used, I would hate to see it look like there's a dip, when there hasn't been a dip as much as there has been a shift, and I don't know a better way to articulate that, but --

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: Just on that point, I wanted to agree that, you know, that's something that they need to look at, and I think they are, and I would also point out that probably the best candidate is going to be the pelagic longline data, just simply because of the breadth of coverage, and consistent operation, and they are actively looking at that, and I think that's the primary candidate now.

The other thing, and maybe, John, you were going to talk about this, but we're at a stage where we want to get more stakeholder engagement, and we wanted to form a small working group that we would like the council to help us put together on that and select the individuals that would participate.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Clay. All right. At this point, what I think is obviously -- Because this is a new thing for us, and I think we've got some stuff there for Chip to consider, and, as it develops, I'm -- I guess the question will be, once we decide what it's going to frame-up to be, looking to Clay to see do we have it appropriately compartmentalized the way it needs to be, and is it too much stuff, too little stuff, and we don't want to undersell it, but we want to make sure we've got enough time built into it that we can address things as they pop-up, and so I think we can continue conversations on this in the future.

At this point, we're at the end of Item 3 in this agenda, this committee agenda, and what we're going to do is we're going to go ahead and break for lunch, because our 1:30 back to Habitat is very time-constrained, and so we're going to hold as close to 1:30 as we can for lunch, so that we can get Stacy on the mic to do what she has to do, and then we'll close out Habitat, and then we'll come back into SEDAR after that, and so it's ten after twelve. Come back at 1:30, and we'll start back into the Habitat.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

DR. BELCHER: Chip, we're going to finish up all but the closed session for SEDAR. We'll have a closed session first thing tomorrow morning, to discuss filling some of the spots that we have open, because of outgoing folks, but we're going to finish up with Other Business, which is talking about SEDAR 86.

DR. COLLIER: All right, and so SEDAR 86 -- We had already talked about that a little bit under the projects update, and so the SSC had a meeting, last week, to talk about the potential of changing the stock assessment from a single-species, or a single-stock model, to either a multiple-stock or two-stock -- Two different stock assessments. That is going to be discussed tomorrow during Snapper Grouper, and that's when Jeff Buckel, the chair of the SSC, will be here, and we felt like it would just be better for him to be in-person, to have that discussion with the council.

The next item, you guys have talked about it quite a bit already, and you had a presentation on it, but the impact of the Marine Recreational Information Program pilot study evaluating measurement error. In response to your motion yesterday, and some of the discussion, I did pull up, or I did put together, the -- I just took the information that's currently on the SEDAR webpage and just made a spreadsheet with it, just in case you wanted things moved around.

That way, I could move it around a little bit easier, but I also have the allocation for each of these upcoming stock assessments over here, as well as the amount of private recreational landings in the recreational sector, and so, when I say private recreational landings, it's coming from vessels. For most of these, there is no shore-based landings, with the exception of Spanish mackerel, and I do have that noted a little bit separately, and I will make this bigger, now that I've gone through the whole thing.

Gray triggerfish, we've already talked about it a little bit, where it's a research track assessment, and it is going to be followed up with an operational assessment, maybe beginning in late 2024, and so there could be some potential for exploring some sensitivities, as we had noted, into the recreational data, to make sure that the findings of the stock assessment are robust to some of the

information, or, if you guys would like to, this could be one of those stock assessments that is moved down.

If you look at the allocation for gray triggerfish, it is 56 percent recreational, and there is a substantial portion of the recreational harvest that has occurred over the past five years, and, by past five years, I'm referring to 2018 to 2022, and it's about 75 percent of the recreational harvest is coming from the private recreational vessels, and these numbers might be different than anything you're seeing as far as ACL monitoring, and these are FES numbers, and so just thinking about when the new stock assessment comes forward, that's what it's going to be based on, is it's going to be based on FES numbers. Any questions?

MR. GRINER: So the blueline tile, that you have showing an average of 36 percent, is in new FES numbers?

DR. COLLIER: The blueline tilefish, when I'm showing that 36 percent, that means private recreational vessels account for 36 percent of the recreational catch, and so the majority -- 64 percent of the catch is coming from charter boats, and charter boats are not impacted by this change in the MRIP -- Or the observed change in the pilot study.

MR. GRINER: Okay, so say it one more time, what the average percent, 2018 to -- That's not average percent caught of their allocation, right?

DR. COLLIER: No, and this is, of the landings -- I am not looking at what they're achieving, according to their ACL, because you cannot compare FES numbers to an ACL. Right now, their ACL is in CHTS units, and you can't compare the two.

DR. GRINER: So that's private?

DR. COLLIER: It is private rec compared to basically charter boat for most of these species. Sorry for the confusion. That was an 11:00 project last night.

DR. BELCHER: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: So I'm still not understanding it. So, for hogfish, it's got a 99 percent, and does that mean that the charter boats only catch 1 percent of the catch, of the recreational -- I guess these numbers are for the recreational ACL, right, and it has nothing to do with commercial?

DR. COLLIER: These are not ACL. These are landings values, and so, looking at hogfish there, the private recreational sector is catching 99 percent of the recreational catch of hogfish. You were right that charter boats only catch 1 percent.

MS. THOMPSON: All right, and so, in looking at these numbers, we can assume that, if it's 100 percent, that these numbers only represent the private recreational, and so it's then assumed that charter boats catch the other portion of the 100 percent? Okay. Thank you.

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and it's a combination of charter boats and headboats, because those two surveys are not impacted by the change in the MRIP design. Any other questions on gray triggerfish? We talked about that a bit, and the next species beside it, red grouper, we've talked

about, and it's going to be talked about a bit more tomorrow. The next one in line, according to the temporal here, is mutton snapper, and Jessica has already mentioned how that one is being addressed, as far as dealing with some of these recreational estimates. They're going to be comparing or trying to develop a calibration for the State Reef Fish Survey that they have done in Florida, in order to take that back in time, and that should alleviate some of the issues for the recreational side, where it is a heavily-recreational fishery, and, also, a very significant portion of it is coming from the private recreational vessels.

Tilefish, most people refer to this as golden tilefish, and it's almost predominantly commercial, and only 3 percent of the ACL goes to the recreational sector. However, 90 percent of that recreational landings are coming from private recreational vessels.

We just talked about hogfish, and then, switching over to blueline tilefish, we've also talked about that a little bit, where a lot of the recreational landings, even though it's about 50-50 in the ACL, a lot of the recreational landings are coming from charter boats that aren't impacted by the recreational estimates, and so, looking at these, at least those first five, it seems like a lot of the issues have been addressed, or can be addressed, in the stock assessments and have minor impact.

The other ones coming up, looking at something like maybe the gray triggerfish operational assessment, that could be an issue, and the king mackerel operational assessment could be an issue. Looking at king mackerel, we're talking about 63 percent of the ACL goes to the recreational sector, and 73 percent of that recreational sector catch is from private recreational vessels. Gag is another one that was mentioned to potentially move down, to hopefully account for some of these 2026 changes in recreational landings, and so, if there's anything that the group wants to talk about, please just raise your hand.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Jessica and then Wes.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just wanted to try to slow us down for a second, and so let me just back up a little bit and try to reiterate, and so mutton snapper is already underway, and we are -- This mutton snapper assessment covers the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and there was already State Reef Fish Survey ready and available on the Gulf side, and this is just about getting it ready on the Atlantic side, and the timeline will be pushed back just a little bit, so that it can be incorporated on the Atlantic side.

I think the same thing for hogfish, and so there's multiple hogfish stocks there, and we can get the State Reef Fish Survey in that, and then I guess I would ask Andy, and can you remind me what you were saying earlier about the Atlantic gag stock assessment and the State Reef Fish Survey? I think I might have missed that.

MR. STRELCHECK: Well, I wasn't necessarily referencing the State Reef Fish Survey with my comments, and it was more an issue of the assessment timing could benefit from the FES pilot results, if we pushed it back a year, and then the fact that management changes are only going to go into effect late this year, and so we would potentially have one year of data that reflects any sort of regulatory changes.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So, I guess, at the end of this, do we need to make a motion that would say something like what Andy is suggesting, to reorganize the schedule here? I would like to push gag back.

DR. COLLIER: Is this something like you were thinking about, move it back a year? Red porgy is not likely to occur, and this was on the docket, just in case things were not going to be possible to be done for Atlantic migratory cobia, and so that is going to disappear. It's really looking like, after the gag is moved back, it's potentially gray triggerfish that could have some issues, as well as king mackerel, and that would really be the only two stock assessments that do not necessarily have a good work-around, it seems like, and we could potentially request a delay in the king mackerel assessment, to hopefully get the recreational estimates, and I'm sorry, and I forgot that Wes had his hand up before I started speaking.

DR. BELCHER: Wes.

MR. TOWNSEND: Thank you. This is semi-off-topic, and I'm just curious, and this is from a Mid-Atlantic Council speaking, I guess, and, on your tilefish, do you have any recreational mandatory reporting?

DR. COLLIER: We do not.

MR. TOWNSEND: I was just curious, because I know we're going to get an update in October, because we have mandatory reporting, and, last year, I think we were about 7 percent, is what they were estimating, and so I was just curious, since we're going to be talking about it at our next meeting. Thank you.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Did you still have -- Then I've got Tim.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm still trying to wrap my brain around triggerfish. Will we get management recommendations out of the research track? Not until the operational assessment? But, still, what's in the research track will be the OA? I am nervous about triggerfish coming up, when it comes up, but, I mean, I realize all we're doing is pushing everything down, and, while I have the floor, I'm also -- I meant to ask this earlier, and not on this list, but on what we looked at before, and there was a vermilion -- What are we calling it? An interim assessment, or interim analysis, in a couple of years or this year?

DR. COLLIER: It's October, is when it's coming.

MS. MARHEFKA: So, in my mind, that's another place where this FES could present issues or no? Am I not thinking about that correctly? That makes me nervous as well, and so I don't know what the solution is, but I'm just telling you how I feel.

DR. BELCHER: I've got Jessica, to that, and then Tim.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I share those concerns about triggerfish as well, and I feel like we had some concerns with the triggerfish assessment, for other reasons last time, and do we really want to in another thing in the mix here? Would it be better to push it back? It seems like the answer is yes, but I guess I would put it back to you guys, to see what you think.

DR. BELCHER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: This is just a follow-up for Wes, and, Wes, was that mandatory reporting -- Was that charter boat and private rec? Does private rec have mandatory reporting?

MR. TOWNSEND: Yes, and you have to get a GARFO permit, and, yes, it was supposed to be mandatory reporting.

MR. GRINER: So GARFO has a private rec permit?

MR. TOWNSEND: It's in there. It's in the -- Whatever their permit is, yes.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Wes.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we know, from experience last time, dealing with these changes in the survey, one of the issues you get into, if you consider the timing of the assessments and then when you would be acting on the information -- If you're acting on something, and it becomes controversial, and you've got new information coming out when you're in the middle of it, it becomes really hard for the council to proceed, you know, because you're potentially using the information, and, I mean, it's fair enough to say, well, this is what you knew at the time, but, you know, in this case, you may not be waiting on new information, and you may have new information in your lap that shows that's a problem, and I think that is quite different.

You know, we do often talk about you can't not act because you're waiting on something, but it's very different when something has come to you than when you're just saying, oh yeah, we might get this new study down the road, and we're not going to do anything, and so I think that you're right to be concerned about triggerfish. You could be right in the midst of taking action on that when new numbers come out, or maybe just potentially putting something forward in 2026, when new numbers come out, and it seems like we could potentially delay on the operational until we know more and get at least the results of the pilot done, and, if the pilot says, oh, well, the numbers aren't as bad as maybe they look, then you could go ahead and jump right on that operational, and, if it does look like the numbers are potentially as biased as suggested, then, you know, you have the operational to get the new numbers, you know, and you're not in a place of dealing with any management at that point.

I think king mackerel is another one to consider that as well. You know, the stock is in good shape, and the fishery is in good shape, and is there really an urgent need to jump onto king mackerel and getting an assessment, when it's been a number of years since you've had one, knowing that you're potentially getting data that may change by the time we get the results.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: You're blowing my mind here with throwing all these assessments out, but why would it not also be a concern for red grouper? When I look at the numbers, and the percentages, on the board there, why would we not have the same argument on red grouper?

DR. COLLIER: I think red grouper also has a similar issue, and, I mean, you look at the allocation is heavily skewed towards recreational, and then private recreational is a large component of that. I don't have it necessarily, right here, as highlighted to move, just because of potential requests from the SSC. The discussion from a single stock to two stocks is going to be a substantial change to that stock assessment, and it may lead to delays in it, and so we don't know necessarily where to put that on the schedule.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so help. I think that they're suggesting that that needs to be a benchmark, and is that right? So then another question, just to make sure I understand, is there's a lot of operational up there, and will bringing in this new data affect things so much that some of these assessments can no longer be operational, and now they would need to be a benchmark, and we would need to change the assessment type, or does that not come into play here?

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: I would have to say that definitely would not raise it to being more than a benchmark, because it's not conceptually that hard, and it's just putting in some different numbers, but it's not something that you need a special CIE review or anything.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's right, but what we got into last time with this, and, you know, it could be different this time, and the directionality may be different, but there were a number of stocks where we had set up to do like basically updates, pretty straightforward, without a whole lot of SSC involvement, and then, when there was such a drastic change in the MRIP catch estimates, the SSC became concerned, if you guys recall, and started saying, well, you know, we need an SSC panel on this, and we need to look at this more involved, and we need to have a more robust standard assessment process, and not just the real streamlined update, and that became kind of an issue for a number of assessments that we had planned, because we did have the SSC telling us that, you know, no, I'm not going to accept that, and I need to have a bigger look at this, because this could have bigger changes.

I do think that is something we have to be concerned with, and we don't have to be able to do it as a benchmark, but the SSC may say, you know, we want a little more robust process, and we want a technical working group that's going to look at these estimates and how they could be impacted, which then affects the timing and the workload.

DR. BELCHER: Chip, did you have something else to that?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and, just to build upon that, although there was a lot of concern with it, when we're looking at some of these more recent operational assessments, they were changing from CHTS to FES, which would be a similar process, and hopefully it's not as dramatic of a change.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Procedure-wise, it always confuses me between the SEDAR Committee and then the SEDAR Steering Committee, and do we make recommendations in the form of motions, or do you just take the direction over to the Steering Committee, because like what are you all going to suggest about gray triggerfish and red grouper timing, and then possibly king mackerel? I think that the Gulf stock might not be in as great shape as the Atlantic stock, and so then I'm afraid that the Gulf is going to be concerned about pushing back king mackerel, but just how do we do this, and don't forget about my favorite white grunt.

DR. COLLIER: I will not forget about that. With king mackerel, in the past, those stock assessments have not always been done together, and, in fact, last time they were done, and I believe ours was done a year later, and so it's not uncommon to get results of those presented at different times.

I did come down here, and, if you look at white grunt, it used to take up basically eight slots, two years for two analysts, and now I dropped it down to one, and hopefully that would be better, because, if we're talking about an operational assessment for red grouper, having just a single analyst, it seems like that could be the same case for white grunt, a single analyst handling two stocks of white grunt. White grunt are an interesting species, and they do have genetic differences along the coast, along the Atlantic coast, but I still see the remove.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: That did not convince me. I'm serious. I want white grunt off this list. I just feel that there are so many species that we could get in front of white grunt, and then, now that we've got these issues, and things are going to be pushed back, I still would like to see white grunt come off the list, and then, based on this discussion, I would like to see triggerfish, red grouper, and Atlantic king mackerel pushed back, also.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: A couple of things. One of things we talked about in the SEDAR Steering Committee was the potential of doing some assessments outside of SEDAR, where they could be done, you know, faster. SEDAR is intentionally a very, very thorough process, and it also makes it very slow, but SEDAR, when it was conceived, was never intended to be the vehicle that we do every single assessment for. They knew it would be a slow, thorough process, and so the other way we can do it is something like white grunt outside of the SEDAR process.

You can still have an independent peer review, and it might not be as thorough of an assessment as is done through SEDAR, although the quality may be just as good, and you're just not chasing down every little piece of data, like we try and do with SEDAR, and so there are alternative ways to move forward on that.

The other thing that I wanted to bring up was we're talking about shifting schedules down, and, I mean, from the Science Center's perspective, that's not necessarily a bad thing, if it creates gaps in the schedule, because there are a lot of procedural improvements that we would like to make, and that frees up some of our time. What I would worry about is, if we move stuff down past 2026, but then just found ways to fill up the spaces with other types of assessments, and we haven't scheduled for them, then you end up getting a real mess.

DR. BELCHER: Tim, did you still have something?

MR. GRINER: I completely lost my train of thought, but I did want to concur with Jessica that white grunt is not what we need to be looking at right now whatsoever.

DR. BELCHER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: It sounds like, as council members, we're on the same page, and I haven't heard anyone not be on the same page, as far as triggerfish, red grouper, and king mackerel. I'm still waiting to figure out, and maybe someone can help me figure out, what the implications of the vermilion interim assessment are going to be, and that's a species that's not overfished, and not undergoing overfishing, and maybe that needs to get punted down the road, because I would hate to have biased information sort of -- I don't think I've been here since we've had an interim assessment, and so I don't know, and is it just looking at trends, and so, therefore, it won't be a big deal, or could it significantly -- Could something more significant come out of that? It might be my ignorance.

DR. COLLIER: So, to that, vermilion, right now, is still being assessed in CHTS units, and so I'm not certain exactly how this issue with the survey questions and potential bias would impact that one, and so, yes, I don't know, and I'm not positive if they're going to update to FES. We did ask that question, and it was indicated that it was going to remain in CHTS units, and so the recreational values are -- I'm not certain what to say about it.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We haven't had an interims, and so it's not something you missed. I guess, as I look at this, Chip, one question I have is the dolphin -- The review of the dolphin MSE and MP, and I feel like we scheduled that there based on workload, and it's sounding like it might be done in 2024 or something, and so, Clay, is that something that we could possibly move up into some of that 2025 slot, while we're waiting on this data situation to work itself out? That may help ease some of the impending workload.

DR. PORCH: It makes sense, and I would just have to double-check on the progress, but, as you say, if it's expected to be finished in 2024, it makes sense to move up the review, and we do want to establish those stakeholder working groups, because there is some input that needs to happen yet.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So that could be something we could -- You know, probably, Clay, you guys will know more about that when we get to the Steering Committee meeting, but that is something that could take some of that, and there are a number of other things we're interested in, and we talked about updating the prioritization of our stocks as a way of looking at current climate conditions, and it's been a long time since we did the prioritization, which was part of NMFS' stock assessment improvement program, and so that could be something else that I think we could possibly work on here in 2025 and 2026.

DR. BELCHER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I need to just bring up some concerns of the stakeholders regarding king mackerel. I've been hearing from a lot of fishermen that they're concerned about kings currently, right, that they're catches and distribution of the fish have not -- Are not reflective of the more rosy stock assessment, and it's one reason why we're doing a fishery performance report in November at the AP, and so I just want to urge caution in moving that.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I would just ask Tom if it could move back just a little bit, so that we could get this new data stream in there.

MR. ROLLER: That's very fair, and I agree with that, but I also have to bring that up, just for the many stakeholders who are reaching out.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I wanted to go back to red grouper, and I have significant concerns with moving it, as late in the schedule as it is, and it's under a ten-year rebuilding plan that we implemented in I think 2019, and so we would be essentially not getting assessment advice, scientific information, on the status of the population until the very end of that rebuilding plan. If we're going to do this, I think we have to have some sort of interim analysis, or something else, that is done for red grouper well before then.

DR. BELCHER: Chip.

DR. COLLIER: During the discussion for SEDAR 86, there was some indication that a single-stock model was not going to be considered the best scientific information available, or consistent with best scientific information available, and that's why we're suggesting to potentially move it back, because we don't know -- We're not going to be able to use the rebuilding plan anymore if we're going from a single stock to two different stocks.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I fully understand that, but we assessed the stock previously, and at least a portion of the stock was not in good shape, and whether the whole portion of the stock is in bad shape is to be determined, right, but we shouldn't just ignore our previous scientific advice, and we should look to get some science to guide, obviously, our management and whatever rebuilding plan changes would need to be based on that new information.

DR. BELCHER: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You know, I think that's right, but the SSC had a lot of discussion about it, and that was one of the points that I made, and, you know, like in an ideal world, it would be nice to get the operational completed with a single stock, so we could evaluate the rebuilding plan, and that's not going to happen.

You know, the Science Center said that's not the way we're going to do this, and it's not going to be considered best science, and so that's not an option, and so we're going to have to come up with

something else to evaluate that rebuilding plan, unless, you know, the Science Center changes its opinion and says, okay, well, we'll go ahead and wrap this operational assessment up, and it's pretty close to being completed, and you can evaluate the rebuilding plan, but the SSC meeting response was, no, that's not going to happen, and so that puts us in a real quandary here, as far as evaluating that rebuilding plan, absolutely.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I guess I'm wondering, since you guys on the Steering Committee are going to have to take all of this and take it to the next meeting, and would it be helpful if Chip wrote this out, instead of us just moving things around on the spreadsheet, to talk about the reasons why we're moving different things to different spots, et cetera? Do we need to do that this week, and then maybe look at it in Full Council, in addition to just looking at the table? Would that be helpful for the Steering Committee folks?

DR. BELCHER: I am looking to John on that. I mean, I think, for us to keep things straight, it's a good thing. The question, I guess, would go to -- I mean, does the Gulf need to do that as well, and do our other partners need to do that as well? I guess because it's a slip-slide of the tiles on the schedule, right? So maybe it would be good for us to capture ours, and then have that discussion with the other groups to do the same with theirs?

DR. COLLIER: I was thinking that everybody was going to do their own thing, and, if they want to move back, they can. What we're not doing is trying to move some of our slots into their assessment slots, and so we're trying to keep everything aligned within what we are currently allowed, as the South Atlantic Council, and so I feel like this is an okay approach. I will move red grouper up to just below snowy grouper, and I'm having some issues with merging cells right now, but that one will move up to that location, but I feel like, as long as we're moving things down, and you guys realize that we're not going to get some of the assessment advice that we've been used to getting through the SEDAR process, and I think it will be all right, but it's going to be a heavy workload come 2026.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I want to go back to Jessica's comment, and I really like that idea. I find this very confusing and hard to follow, and it doesn't provide, obviously, the rationale as to why we're recommending moving things, or whether or not there's agreement by the council of whether we should move things, and so I think it would be better if we could at least put together an outline of which assessments may be moved and the reasons for moving them.

DR. BELCHER: Are you agreeable, Chip, for that?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and I will get it done by Friday.

DR. BELCHER: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I am going to make a big display of my ignorance here, but, you know, in listening, and I've been trying to figure it out for the last two years, but we talk about operational assessment, benchmark assessment, research tracks, interim analyses, management strategy

evaluations, SEDAR, and I can't -- Like, when you look at the fisheries glossary, those things are not there, and is there -- Could there be some place on the website where all of those things are like put together and described, for some dummy like me to be able to put my finger on it, because it's hard to follow the discussion when I don't have an understanding of what we're talking about. That would be helpful for me.

DR. COLLIER: We will definitely add those pieces of information into the glossary and then also provide links to some of the webpages that are available for those projects.

DR. BELCHER: Shep.

MR. GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I was going to note that a lot of that stuff, I think, is defined, or discussed, in the SEDAR SOPPs, at least as to the different assessment types. I will note that it is out-of-date, because it does not include research track, at least the last time I checked, but the other concepts are discussed and defined.

DR. BELCHER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can Chip also send us this version that has the numbers and the percentages on the side, so that we can look at that a little bit closer before Full Council?

DR. COLLIER: No problem.

DR. BELCHER: Other comments and discussion on these? Chip, what else can we help with with this? I mean, I guess we kind of addressed 86 in this process as well. I'm just saying as far as that was under the other item, and we had that out to the side, and I'm just making sure that you had enough for that. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I'm just wondering, and are we going to be able to have the updated information in front of us when we look at the overall workplan spreadsheet, because that's going to shift everything there too, isn't it?

DR. COLLIER: I will try to get it to you tomorrow.

DR. BELCHER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Clay mentioned it, but, you know, depending on, obviously, how this ultimately shuffles out, to me, the Science Center is going to have an opportunity to work on some things that will benefit the stock assessment process, going forward, and some of the things that we might want to capture, with Chip's, you know, work with the next couple of days would be things like preparing for the FES pilot results and outcomes of that, to better integrate into future stock assessments, integration of State Reef Fish Survey data into future stock assessments.

I've had conversations about dynamic reference points and kind of preparing the council for that, and so I think there's a lot of opportunities here, where even if we're not getting as many assessments from the Science Center, we could better position this council for future stock assessments and management.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks, Andy. Clay.

DR. PORCH: The thing I would add though is, as we're contemplating moving some things around, there may be some options, and, for instance, red grouper, and potentially we do some sort of interim analysis, if we were going to push it off, but it's hard to commit on the fly, and we need to step back and see what we can actually produce, and probably we could produce something in time for the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting, and we could have, in the meantime, some interaction with council staff, but it's hard to sit here now and say, oh yeah, we'll do this and this and that, without really taking a hard look at what all the options are.

DR. BELCHER: Thanks for that. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: For red grouper, I would say, as opposed to conducting an interim analysis, just do the operational assessment, I mean as a single stock, and, I mean, all the data has been pulled, and everything has been looked at. It's all aggregated, and it's ready to go as a stock assessment, but it's just it was identified with potential issues, when they were putting all the data together, that it could be two different stocks, and so I would hate for us to go forward with an interim analysis when we could potentially go forward with an operational assessment, when all the data has already been pulled.

DR. BELCHER: Clay.

DR. PORCH: The only problem with that is both my folks, who would conduct the assessment, and the SSC agreed that it's not the best way forward, given the evidence that we have now.

DR. BELCHER: That gives folks something to talk about come SEDAR Steering Committee time, but, anyway, we appreciate you guys being willing to look at that, Clay. All right. Any other discussion, or questions or comments, about what we're doing under SEDAR? Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I just was going to thank Chip for putting together this table, and with the percentages and stuff up there, and it's super, super helpful.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Any other discussion? All right. Seeing none, as we started earlier, tomorrow at 8:30, we will go into closed session, and we shouldn't need probably more than fifteen to thirty minutes, and so just to, again, where we have some outgoing folks on some committees, and it's repopulating those committees. Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's right, and, to be clear, the closed session is just to make some SEDAR appointments.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. Chip, go ahead.

DR. COLLIER: I did want to introduce a new SEDAR employee, and we have Meisha Key back in the audience back there, and she is our new SEDAR Coordinator, and she's taken over for Kathleen, and she previously worked with the California Department of Fish and Game, and she was a stock assessment analyst, and she was also chair of the Pacific SSC, vice chair of the Pacific SSC, and so she's got a lot of stock assessment experience, and we're very excited that she's going to be working with us as a SEDAR Coordinator. Welcome, Meisha.

DR. BELCHER: Okay. We're going to go ahead and do a ten-minute break, and we will come back, and Jessica gets to take the floor for Snapper Grouper.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 12, 2023.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
October 30, 2023

SEDAR Committee
Tuesday, September 12, 2023
3:00 PM - 5:00 PM

| SEDAR Committee | Attended |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Chair | ✓ |
| Trish Murphey, Vice Chair | ✓ |
| Robert Beal | |
| Mel Bell | ✓ |

| SEDAR Committee | Attended |
|------------------|----------|
| Jessica McCawley | ✓ |
| Kerry Marhefka | ✓ |
| Andy Strelcheck | ✓ |
| Tim Griner | ✓ |

| COUNCIL | Attended |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Gary Borland | ✓ |
| Judy Helmeý | ✓ |
| Lt. Cameron Box | |
| Tom Roller | ✓ |

| COUNCIL | Attended |
|------------------------|----------|
| Laurilee Thompson | ✓ |
| Spud Woodward | ✓ |
| Robert Spottswood, Jr. | ✓ |

| SAFMC STAFF | Attended |
|--------------------|----------|
| John Carmichael | ✓ |
| Dr. Chip Collier | ✓ |
| Myra Brouwer | ✓ |
| Julia Byrd | ✓ |
| Dr. Judd Curtis | ✓ |
| John Hadley | ✓ |
| Kathleen Howington | ✓ |
| Allie Iberle | ✓ |
| Kim Iverson | ✓ |
| Kelly Klasnick | |

| SAFMC STAFF | Attended |
|--------------------|----------|
| Michele Ritter | ✓ |
| Roger Pugliese | ✓ |
| Ashley Oliver | ✓ |
| Dr. Mike Schmidtke | ✓ |
| Nick Smillie | ✓ |
| Suzanna Thomas | ✓ |
| Christina Wiegand | ✓ |
| Meg Withers | ✓ |
| Julie Neer | |
| Meisha Key | |

| OTHER | Attended |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Rick Devictor | ✓ |
| Shep Grimes | ✓ |
| Dewey Hemilright | |
| Dr. Jack McGovern | ✓ |
| Lt. Patrick O'Shaughnessy | |
| Monica Smit-Brunello | ✓ |
| Dr. John Walter | |
| Kristin Foss | ✓ |
| Luiz Barbieri | |
| Stacie Crowe | |

| OTHER | Attended |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Richard Cody | ✓ |
| Earl "Sonny" Gwin | |
| Michael Lind | ✓ |
| Wes Townsend | ✓ |
| Karla Gore | ✓ |
| Nikhil Mehta | ✓ |
| Thomas Newman | ✓ |
| Jessica Stephen | ✓ |
| Paul Townsend | |

Clay Porch ✓
Chris Bradshaw ✓
Bob Gill ✓

Attendee Report: SAFMC September 2023 Council Meeting (9/11/23 - 9/15/23)

Report Generated:
09/18/2023 08:56 AM EDT

| Webinar ID | Actual Start Date/Time | Duration | # Registered | # Attended | Clicked Registration Link |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|
| 284-120-835 | 09/12/2023 07:30 AM EDT | 9 hours 13 minutes | 178 | 115 | 284 |

Staff Details

| Attended | Interest Rating | Last Name | First Name | Email Address | Role |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Yes | Not applicable for staff | Council | South Atlantic | administrator@safmc.net | Organizer |

Attendee Details

| Attended | Interest Rating | Last Name | First Name | Email Address | Registration Date/Time |
|----------|-----------------|------------|--------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Yes | 62 | Anderson | Christopher | chris.deepseafoods@gmail.com | 09/12/2023 01:25 PM EDT |
| Yes | 49 | Anderson | Dustin | dustin.deepseafoods@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 05:21 PM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | Aukeman | Trip | taukeman@ccaflorida.org | 09/12/2023 11:38 AM EDT |
| Yes | 41 | Bailey | Adam | adam.bailey@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT |
| Yes | 90 | Batsavage | Chris | chris.batsavage@deq.nc.gov | 09/06/2023 10:13 AM EDT |
| Yes | 78 | Bell | 00Mel | BellM@dnr.sc.gov | 09/05/2023 05:23 PM EDT |
| Yes | 35 | Berry | James "chip" | chip@chipberry.com | 09/05/2023 06:11 PM EDT |
| Yes | 43 | Bianchi | Alan | Alan.Bianchi@deq.nc.gov | 09/11/2023 09:40 AM EDT |
| Yes | 32 | Bianchi | Akan | alan.bianchi@ncdenr.gov | 09/11/2023 03:04 PM EDT |
| Yes | 88 | Blosser | Brooke | brookeb@scccl.org | 09/11/2023 02:21 PM EDT |
| Yes | 39 | Box | Cameron | boxcameron06@gmail.com | 09/06/2023 07:05 AM EDT |
| Yes | 37 | Bradshaw | Christopher | christopher.bradshaw@myfwc.com | 09/10/2023 09:04 PM EDT |
| Yes | 39 | Brantley | William | william.brantley@deq.nc.gov | 09/11/2023 08:24 AM EDT |
| Yes | 57 | Brouwer | Myra | myra.brouwer@safmc.net | 08/18/2023 10:33 AM EDT |
| Yes | 39 | Bublely | Walter | bublely@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 09:26 AM EDT |
| Yes | 89 | Buckel | Jeff | jabuckel@ncsu.edu | 09/12/2023 10:45 AM EDT |
| Yes | 41 | Bunting | Matthew | matthew.bunting@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 08:19 AM EDT |
| Yes | 41 | Byrd | Julia | julia.byrd@safmc.net | 09/08/2023 09:36 AM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | Calay | Shannon | Shannon.Calay@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT |
| Yes | 89 | Clinton | Haley | haley.clinton@deq.nc.gov | 09/11/2023 09:05 AM EDT |
| Yes | 41 | Cody | Richard | richard.cody@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 01:12 PM EDT |
| Yes | 63 | Coggins | Lew | lewis.coggins@NOAA.gov | 09/07/2023 05:03 PM EDT |
| Yes | 86 | Crowe | Stacie | crowes@dnr.sc.gov | 09/10/2023 08:13 AM EDT |
| Yes | 57 | Curtis | Judd | judd.curtis@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT |
| Yes | 51 | DeVictor | Rick | rick.devictor@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:37 AM EDT |
| Yes | 44 | Dukes | Amy | DukesA@dnr.sc.gov | 09/12/2023 09:08 AM EDT |
| Yes | 97 | Dunn | Tracy | TADunn76@gmail.com | 09/12/2023 09:56 AM EDT |
| Yes | 37 | Dyar | Ben | dyarb@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 01:51 PM EDT |
| Yes | 42 | Farnell | Paula | paula.farnell@deq.nc.gov | 09/11/2023 09:25 AM EDT |
| Yes | 68 | Finch | Margaret | walkermf@dnr.sc.gov | 09/01/2023 09:19 AM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | Flowers | Jared | jared.flowers@dnr.ga.gov | 09/11/2023 09:48 AM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | Foss | Kristin | Kristin.foss@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT |
| Yes | 36 | Franco | Dawn | dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov | 09/11/2023 11:55 AM EDT |
| Yes | 92 | Gentry | Lauren | lauren.gentry@myfwc.com | 09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT |
| Yes | 63 | Gill | Bob | flosprey1@gmail.com | 09/12/2023 02:16 PM EDT |
| Yes | 55 | Glazier | Edward | Edward.Glazier@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 03:18 PM EDT |
| Yes | 50 | Gloekner | David | david.gloekner@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 09:07 AM EDT |
| Yes | 54 | Gore | Karla | karla.gore@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT |
| Yes | 39 | Gray | Alisha | alisha.gray@noaa.gov | 09/12/2023 09:01 AM EDT |
| Yes | 43 | Guyas | Martha | mguyas@asafishing.org | 09/10/2023 08:24 PM EDT |
| Yes | 32 | HILDRETH | DELAINE | DELAINE.HILDRETH@DNR.GA.GOV | 09/12/2023 02:00 PM EDT |
| Yes | 49 | Hadley | John | john.hadley@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 11:38 AM EDT |
| Yes | 95 | Harrison | Alana | alanaharrison22@gmail.com | 09/12/2023 08:59 AM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | Helies | Frank | frank.helies@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:07 AM EDT |
| Yes | 82 | Helmey | Judy | judyhelmey@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT |
| Yes | 59 | Huber | Jeanette | jeanette.huber@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 10:01 AM EDT |
| Yes | 64 | Hudson | Joseph | jhud7789@twc.com | 09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT |
| Yes | 43 | Iverson | Kim | Kim.Iverson@safmc.net | 08/28/2023 12:29 PM EDT |
| Yes | 35 | Karnauskas | Mandy | mandy.karnauskas@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 09:49 AM EDT |
| Yes | 96 | Kersting | Anne | anne.kersting@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 10:17 AM EDT |
| Yes | 50 | Key | Meisha | meisha.key@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 01:52 PM EDT |
| Yes | 98 | Klasnick | 01Kelly | kelly.klasnick@safmc.net | 08/30/2023 12:18 PM EDT |
| Yes | 50 | LaRoche | Kelcie | kelcie.laroche@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 09:20 AM EDT |
| Yes | 97 | Laks | Ira | captainira@att.net | 09/11/2023 11:46 AM EDT |
| Yes | 35 | Larkin | Michael | Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 01:32 PM EDT |
| Yes | 73 | Lazarre | Dominique | Dominique.Lazarre@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:48 AM EDT |
| Yes | 35 | Lee | Jennifer | Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov | 09/12/2023 04:26 PM EDT |
| Yes | 34 | Lee | Max | maxlee@mote.org | 09/07/2023 11:43 AM EDT |
| Yes | 45 | Lind | Michael | michael.lind@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 09:15 AM EDT |
| Yes | 98 | Locke | Charles | obxlocke@aol.com | 09/12/2023 09:10 AM EDT |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Yes | 37 | Lorenzen | Kai | klorenzen@ufl.edu | 09/11/2023 02:45 PM EDT |
| Yes | 64 | M Borland | Gary | gborlandsafmc@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 08:14 AM EDT |
| Yes | 42 | Malinowski | Rich | rich.malinowski@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 09:37 AM EDT |
| Yes | 99 | Marhefka | 00Kerry | kerryomarhefka@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 08:31 AM EDT |
| Yes | 90 | Maroney | Bradley | captainbradleymaroney@gmail.com | 09/12/2023 10:31 AM EDT |
| Yes | 48 | McCoy | Sherylanne | sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com | 09/11/2023 09:51 AM EDT |
| Yes | 54 | McGovern | Jack | John.McGovern@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:30 AM EDT |
| Yes | 93 | McWhorter | Will | wdmcwhorter@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 03:30 PM EDT |
| Yes | 59 | Meehan | Sean | sean.meehan@noaa.gov | 09/12/2023 03:42 PM EDT |
| Yes | 80 | Mehta | Nikhil | nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov | 09/07/2023 12:55 PM EDT |
| Yes | 34 | Menegolo | Jean Paul | jpmenegolo@gmail.com | 09/12/2023 01:15 PM EDT |
| Yes | 37 | Merrifield | Jeanna | jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com | 09/11/2023 10:08 AM EDT |
| Yes | 74 | Murphey | Trish | trish.murphey@deq.nc.gov | 08/28/2023 11:26 AM EDT |
| Yes | 91 | Neer | Julie | julie.neer@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 11:47 AM EDT |
| Yes | 97 | Newman | Thomas | thomas.newman03@gmail.com | 09/06/2023 09:27 PM EDT |
| Yes | 47 | Oliver | Ashley | ashley.oliver@safmc.net | 09/06/2023 08:39 AM EDT |
| Yes | 91 | Olsen | Edward | butchnett@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 06:19 PM EDT |
| Yes | 41 | Owens | Marina | marina.owens@myfwc.com | 09/06/2023 08:15 AM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | Porch | Clay | clay.porch@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 09:32 AM EDT |
| Yes | 79 | Rathke | David | execdir@resiliencyflorida.org | 09/10/2023 12:22 PM EDT |
| Yes | 60 | Records | David | david.records@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 01:31 PM EDT |
| Yes | 38 | Rinaldi | Mike | mike.rinaldi@accsp.org | 09/12/2023 02:35 PM EDT |
| Yes | 100 | Ritter | Michele | michele.ritter@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 07:45 AM EDT |
| Yes | 79 | Roller | 00Tom | tomrollersafmc@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 08:35 AM EDT |
| Yes | 53 | Seward | McLean | mclean.seward@deq.nc.gov | 09/05/2023 12:25 PM EDT |
| Yes | 43 | Sinkus | Wiley | sinkusw@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT |
| Yes | 37 | Smart | Tracey | smartt@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 08:55 AM EDT |
| Yes | 38 | Smit-Brunello | 00Monica | monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov | 09/07/2023 03:36 PM EDT |
| Yes | 90 | Soss | Alison | alison.soss@noaa.gov | 09/12/2023 10:10 AM EDT |
| Yes | 45 | Spurgin | Kali | Kali.Spurgin@MyFWC.com | 09/11/2023 08:03 AM EDT |
| Yes | 33 | Sramek | Mark | Mark.Sramek@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 07:23 AM EDT |
| Yes | 90 | Stam | Geoff | grstam@att.net | 08/31/2023 09:20 AM EDT |
| Yes | 48 | Stemle | Adam | adam.stemle@noaa.gov | 09/05/2023 11:24 AM EDT |
| Yes | 52 | Sweetman | CJ | Christopher.Sweetman@MyFWC.com | 09/06/2023 08:29 AM EDT |
| Yes | 41 | Takade-Heumacher | Helen | helen.takade-heumacher@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 12:17 PM EDT |
| Yes | 62 | Thompson | 00Laurilee | thompsonlaurilee@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT |
| Yes | 97 | Townsend | Wes | pakafish1@yahoo.com | 09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT |
| Yes | 43 | Travis | Michael | mike.travis@noaa.gov | 08/30/2023 12:23 PM EDT |
| Yes | 34 | Tuohy | Chelsea | ctuohy@asmfc.org | 09/12/2023 08:19 AM EDT |
| Yes | 66 | Uchino | Pepper | pepper@fsbpa.com | 09/12/2023 10:00 AM EDT |
| Yes | 58 | Vara | Mary | mary.vara@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 10:23 AM EDT |
| Yes | 81 | Walsh | Jason | jason.walsh@deq.nc.gov | 09/05/2023 04:22 PM EDT |
| Yes | 48 | Walter | John | john.f.walter@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:17 AM EDT |
| Yes | 61 | White | Shelby | shelby.white@deq.nc.gov | 09/07/2023 10:59 AM EDT |
| Yes | 33 | White | Geoff | geoff.white@accsp.org | 09/11/2023 09:54 AM EDT |
| Yes | 37 | Wilber | Pace | pace.wilber@noaa.gov | 09/12/2023 08:23 AM EDT |
| Yes | 43 | Williams | Erik | erik.williams@noaa.gov | 09/06/2023 08:36 AM EDT |
| Yes | 59 | Withers | Meg | meg.withers@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 08:34 AM EDT |
| Yes | 42 | collier | chip | chip.collier@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 08:20 AM EDT |
| Yes | 94 | griner | tim | timgrinersafmc@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT |
| Yes | 88 | kramer | rob | rkramer@wildoceans.org | 09/12/2023 09:52 AM EDT |
| Yes | 36 | poston | will | will@saltwaterguidesassociation.org | 09/11/2023 03:52 PM EDT |
| Yes | 40 | sandorf | scott | scott.sandorf@noaa.gov | 09/05/2023 04:52 PM EDT |
| Yes | 38 | stephen | jessica | jessica.stephen@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:36 AM EDT |
| Yes | 100 | thomas | suz | suzanna.thomas@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 07:08 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Aines | Alex | aaaines@oceana.org | 09/08/2023 11:02 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Anderson | Stacey | stacey.anderson@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 01:39 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Appelman | Max | max.appelman@noaa.gov | 09/06/2023 10:54 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Baker | Marion | marion19@ufl.edu | 09/10/2023 04:40 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Baker | Scott | bakers@uncw.edu | 09/11/2023 02:27 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Barbieri | Luiz | luiz.barbieri@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 09:19 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Beaty | Julia | jbeaty@mafmc.org | 09/11/2023 02:33 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Benevento | Tony | 43tonyb@gmail.com | 09/07/2023 03:43 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Binion-Rock | Samantha | samantha.binion-rock@noaa.gov | 08/31/2023 08:07 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Bogdan | Jennifer | jennifer.bogdan@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 12:59 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Buckson | Bruce | bcbuckson@aol.com | 09/07/2023 08:59 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Cimo | Laura | laura.cimo@noaa.gov | 09/10/2023 05:06 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Corbett | Ellie | Ellie.Corbett@MYFWC.com | 09/06/2023 11:14 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Cox | Derek | decox@sfwmd.gov | 09/07/2023 09:51 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Cross | Tiffanie | tiffanie.cross@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 01:13 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Dancy | Kiley | kileyjd@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 04:37 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Dancy | Kiley | kdancy@mafmc.org | 09/11/2023 10:22 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | DeJohn | Frank | frank.dejohn@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 02:15 PM EDT |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| No | 0 | E Brown | Julie | julie.e.brown@noaa.gov | 09/07/2023 03:11 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Gahm | Meghan | meghan.gahm@noaa.gov | 09/05/2023 02:42 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Govoni | Beth | beth.govoni@deq.nc.gov | 09/11/2023 01:08 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Griffin | Aimee | aimee.griffin@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 01:42 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Haymans | Doug | doug.haymans@dnr.ga.gov | 09/11/2023 03:11 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Heffernan | Katie | katie.heffernan@mail.house.gov | 09/05/2023 04:41 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Horn | Calusa | Calusa.horn@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 01:54 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Hugo | David | david.hugo@safmc.net | 09/11/2023 09:39 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Juliano | Jocelyn | jocelyn.juliano@scseagrant.org | 09/11/2023 08:40 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Kalinowsky | Chris | chris.kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov | 09/11/2023 12:02 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Kappos | Maria | maria.kappos@myfwc.com | 09/06/2023 03:32 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Kean | Samantha | samantha.kean@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 02:18 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Kittle | Christine | christine.kittle@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 01:11 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Knowlton | Kathy | kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov | 09/11/2023 08:26 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Kumar Ghosh | Bijoy | bkgghoshbuet7@gmail.com | 09/05/2023 04:39 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Mackesey | Brendan | brendan.mackesey@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 03:38 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Masi | Michelle | michelle.masi@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 08:38 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Menzel | Terri | terri.menzel@myfwc.com | 09/11/2023 03:49 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Moore | Jeff | Jeffrey.N.Moore@ncdenr.gov | 09/11/2023 03:53 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Muffley | Brandon | bmuffley@mafmc.org | 09/11/2023 10:44 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | O'Malley | Rachel | rachel.o'malley@noaa.gov | 09/10/2023 09:43 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Pierce | Brett | Brett.pierce@bluefindata.com | 09/11/2023 11:04 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Pikula | Kyle | bkpikula@yahoo.com | 09/11/2023 01:23 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Privoznik | Sarah | sarah.privoznik@noaa.gov | 09/07/2023 02:44 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Rainey | Dan | rainmand63@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 06:48 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Ralston | Kellie | kellie@bonefishhtarpontrust.org | 09/11/2023 10:06 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Ramsay | Chloe | chloe.ramsay@myfwc.com | 09/04/2023 09:12 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Reding | Brandon | redingb@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 02:04 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Reichert | Marcel | mreichert2022@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Sabo | Mary | msabo@mafmc.org | 09/11/2023 02:59 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Salmon | Brandi | brandi.salmon@deq.nc.gov | 08/31/2023 08:34 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Sartwell | Tim | tim.sartwell@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 02:58 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Sauls | Beverly | bevsauls1@gmail.com | 08/31/2023 09:42 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Schwaab | Alexandra | aschwaab@fishwildlife.org | 09/06/2023 09:02 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Seramur | Mark | mark.seramur@saltwaterinc.com | 09/11/2023 01:41 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Spanik | Kevin | spanikk@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 01:07 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Stewart | Mark | mstewart@gmail.com | 08/31/2023 10:22 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Sweeney Tookes | Jennifer | jtookes@georgiasouthern.edu | 09/11/2023 02:42 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Turner | Steve | scturner160@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 02:35 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | Vecchio | Julie | vecchioj@dnr.sc.gov | 09/11/2023 10:51 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Wagner | Warren | whwagner@southernco.com | 09/01/2023 08:31 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | Waine | Mike | mwaine@asafishing.org | 09/11/2023 02:31 PM EDT |
| No | 0 | White | Shelby | shelby.white@nc.deq.gov | 09/06/2023 09:58 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | mroch | ray | ray.mroch@noaa.gov | 09/11/2023 09:21 AM EDT |
| No | 0 | white | geoff | Geoff.Kir.white@gmail.com | 09/11/2023 03:13 PM EDT |