

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SEDAR COMMITTEE**

**Villas by the Sea  
Jekyll Island, Georgia  
March 6, 2025**

### **SEDAR Committee**

Trish Murphey, Chair  
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair  
Dr. Carolyn Belcher  
Amy W. Dukes  
Tim Griner

Kerry Marhefka  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal  
Jimmy G. Hull, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck

### **Council Members**

Tom Roller

Judy Helmey

### **Council Staff**

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

Dr. Julie Neer  
Emily Ott  
Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
Rachael Silvas  
Nicholas Smillie  
Suzanna Thomas  
Christina Wiegand  
Meg Withers

### **Attendees and Invited Participants**

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. Shannon Cass-Calay  
Sonny Gwin  
Shepherd Grimes

Rick DeVictor  
Dr. John Walter  
Nikhil Mehta

### **Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The SEDAR Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Villas by the Sea, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on Thursday, March 6, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman Trish Murphey.

MS. MURPHEY: All right, everybody. We're going to go ahead and get started, since we're kind of lagging behind a little bit. We'll go ahead with the easy stuff. The approval of the agenda, does anybody have any additions, or objections, to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. We need to approve the December 2024 minutes. Any substantial edits? Any objections? The agenda is approved. Now I'm going to hand it over to chip, who is just going to give us an update on the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting. Go ahead, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Thank you. The SEDAR Steering Committee met in January, or February, just last month. We do not have a final report, and so what you have in front of you is the briefing book materials, but what I'll do is highlight a few items that they discussed at the meeting, starting off with the SEDAR projects that are going on right now.

They had completed three projects, as reported in this. Since then, they've completed one more project. Three were associated with the South Atlantic. There was one for mutton snapper, a stock assessment that was completed, a golden tilefish stock assessment that was completed, and, just last week, or the week before, a yellowtail stock assessment review was just completed, and so all those projects were done.

Projects in progress, they have nine projects in progress right now, two associated with the South Atlantic. We have red snapper and blueline tilefish. Blueline tilefish is getting ready to go for review, and so that's going to be presented to our stock assessments. It's a little bit of a complicated process, because part of the stock assessment is dealing with the Mid-Atlantic, but we're working with Mid-Atlantic staff, in order to get the proper reviews and all the eyes on it that we need in order to set an ABC for that stock.

Then the final part that they have under projects is they have upcoming projects. They're planning for five projects right now, one of which is hogfish down in the down in Florida, with the east Florida stock/Florida Keys stock, and so that will be assessed, and so any questions on ongoing projects in the South Atlantic region or within SEDAR?

All right. The next part that they discussed were revisions to the SEDAR process, and we have that under 3a. Shannon is going to be talking about that, and so I'm not going to go into any extensive discussion on that. Just know that it was talked about, and you're going to get an update shortly.

The next thing that was talked about was the assessment schedule, trying to set an assessment schedule going forward for South Atlantic stocks. We have some good news, and we have some bad news for this, and so I'll start off with the bad news, and then we'll end with some better news. The bad news is, for 2026, red grouper was taken off of that assessment list, and the reason for that is the lead analyst had left the agency, and so they were no longer able to do red grouper, and so that also means, right now in the South Atlantic region, we have three primary analysts doing stock assessment work. Usually, we have four, but, right now, under the hiring freeze and budget cuts, we're down to three.

The other thing, and so going on to the good news, and the good news is the cobia stock assessment is being scheduled for 2026. That stock assessment had been canceled, due to the lead analyst leaving the agency, and then we also have king mackerel that was originally scheduled for 2027, and that got moved up to into a slot in 2026.

The Gulf Branch is agreeing to help with that stock assessment. It's currently coded, right now, in Stock Synthesis, and their staff is more familiar with that, and that's why they're taking on that stock assessment, and so that's great news, that the agency is providing two additional stock assessments that we might not be getting for the region.

Then, for our 2027 stocks, I'll be going over that with the statements of work, but that's pretty much -- Then there was some discussion on some of the budget issues that you've already been briefed upon. One of the big things that they were talking about were the impacts to the headboat survey, and so any questions on that?

MS. MURPHEY: I am not seeing any hands, and so we can move on to the next topic. I've got Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you, and I kind of want to circle back to what you just said a hot second ago, that there was information provided to you guys about the Gulf SEFHIER information, or the headboat stuff in the Gulf, and I just -- For the record, and what have you, is there any potential risk for changes to the Southeast Headboat Survey in the South Atlantic at this time?

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, John.

DR. WALTER: Yes, and so I was going to chime-in here. There's no changes to the survey. The headboat survey is still ongoing, and so I think there's been concern about what's going on, and that's the headboat port agents in the Gulf, and so those are the port agents that collect the biological information, and we don't have the funding for that. That was funding that we were able to either use from remaining funds from SEFHIER, or due to some retirements, but we don't have the funding for that for Alabama through Texas.

The port agents in the Atlantic are currently federal employees, and so we have coverage there, and the survey will continue, and that -- So vessel owners will continue to report, as they're required to report, and so the main part of the survey is that self-reporting from the vessel owners.

The dockside surveys right now in the South Atlantic are okay. However, the challenge being we don't know what the future budgets may hold, as we've noted that there's a lot of uncertainty, and possibly budget cuts, and one of the things that could happen is that port agents get reduced, if that's something that has to happen, the rationale being that the biological information, while valuable, is a small fraction of what actually goes into the stock assessment, because the removals from the headboats are quite small.

We have a letter that we'll be submitting to the Gulf Council, and there was a request to talk about the impacts. That letter is being drafted, and will be submitted to the Gulf Council, and we're happy to share it with this council too, if they're interested.

MS. MURPHEY: That would be great. Thank you, John. Any other questions, before we move on? All right, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: All right. Going on into Attachment 2, this is statements of work for 2027 stock assessments. Like I said, we were limited to just a few stock assessments for this. Hopefully red snapper will be completed in 2027, and so we'll have all our slots open, and, with our statements of work, this was something that was created during the research track process.

That process is no longer going on, but staff here felt like it was important to keep these statements of work. Basically, it's a rough draft. When we're starting to develop the terms of reference, we want to communicate with the council, and the SSC, basically making sure we're including all the things that they're concerned with into the stock assessment as we develop the terms of reference.

You're going to hear about some of the changes to the SEDAR process. Right now, there can be a lot of different components that go into a SEDAR stock assessment, and what we would like to do is make sure the council is comfortable with where we're stepping out with our negotiations, saying this is what we're thinking the stock assessment is going to look like, and does it need a stock ID, does it need a data workshop, does it need an independent review beyond our SSC, and so trying to make sure that we have those communications early on in the process I think is very important to make sure we get what -- Or the council gets what they want at the end.

With that started, you're going to see these statements of work, and then we're going to develop terms of reference from this that will basically be reviewed by the Science Center and the SSC prior to it coming back to you, but we want to get first to the council, get information, and then we'll take it to the Science Center, talk with them, and then bring it to the SSC and talk to them as well, making sure everybody gets a chance, before we start developing terms of reference.

There are three different species that we have listed here. What I'll do is I'll stop after each species, to make sure that we're covering all the information. I'm going to start off with red grouper. That is going to be probably the most in-depth stock assessment that we're proposing here, and, with that, we're going to be updating from the previous terminal year of 2015, and we are talking about doing a two-stock model. I'm not exactly certain what the process will be for that, but, given that we are potentially splitting the stock along the Atlantic coast, it's going to be important to have a stock ID workshop, and so that's going to be an important factor for this one, and also a data workshop.

Some of the other modifications that are being discussed for this is review and update any life history and discard information, as well as steepness, include some of the -- Follow the procedural guidance of the 01-101-11 document, and provide a model run for configuration, including the most recent years. Because this stock is in a rebuilding plan, it's going to be important to have that basically continuity run, just to see how that stock is rebuilding, before it is split into potentially two different stocks. Finally, include information, if possible, on the State Reef Fish Survey, the Florida State Reef Fish Survey that is, just to see if that is a valuable source for recreational catch estimates.

Other requests, if you remember from a previous presentation, there was connectivity indicated between the Gulf and South Atlantic, and potentially investigate that connectivity, that larval connectivity, update the indices of abundance. Currently, this species is tracked in CHTS, and so

we need to update the recreational catch estimates, and then we also want to make sure it's going to be following guidance to reduce PSEs below 50. They are -- The agency does have a workgroup addressing this, and so you'll see that in all three of our stocks.

This is another species that we've had the recent recruitment has been lower than the long-term recruitment, at least in past stock assessments, and so we do have in there to include the short-term and long-term stanzas, as far as looking into non-stationarity. Then, with most of our stock assessments, we have information included in there on looking at different ways to estimate natural mortality.

The final piece is a catch level projections workgroup report, making sure that includes all the components in there, and so, with that, those are the issues that we had identified for red grouper to include in the stock assessment. We do provide information on the research recommendations and uncertainties from the latest stock assessment. Those are -- We include the research recommendations as well as the SSC discussions in there, in case you want to see why we made some of these selections. With that. I'll pause and see if there's any questions on red grouper, or any suggestions to modify it.

MS. MURPHEY: Do we have any questions, or comments, on red grouper? All right. Seeing none -- I'm sorry. Go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: So is this where -- The terms of reference, is this where we need to go back and talk about discards and landings?

DR. COLLIER: Are you referring to how you want the -- You want the split to occur by sector prior to changing -- Yes, I think this is a place to put that in there, and the other thing I think we need the council to start thinking about is the allocation of discards, right, and how do we do that. Right now, we have landings allocation, landings based on weight, for almost all our species. In order to move forward with something like this, I think it would be helpful to have some allocation discussion on landings, and discards, potentially in numbers of fish, as opposed to weight of fish.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and that is always confusing to me too, and I guess -- This goes back to, you know, Mike's comments earlier, and I guess -- I guess it's the same with all species. There's always going to be a difference in the average weight per sector, and so I don't really know how you do that, but that's what you're alluding to right, is that's going to be the difference you're looking at, and how to break that out? Yes, but, I mean, we've got to start somewhere.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Tim, and I think Chip is capturing that, right? Okay. I think I had Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Apologies if you covered this. I had to step out for a call. Maybe a question for John of the Science Center. With the two-stock model for red grouper, and given kind of resource limitations, do you see that as being a challenge with red grouper at this point, or do you have the capacity to maintain the two-stock model for red grouper at this point?

DR. WALTER: I guess the question is will we have the capacity for any of what's on here is going to be one of our questions, but we feel the two-stock model is really necessary, from looking at the data, and we're prepared to do that, and so I think that's something that we feel that we'll make the

capacity for, but I caveat that with there are going to have to be a lot of capacity decisions that come up that may require some revision to the timelines, and deliverables, but the two-stock model seems pretty well supported by the data that our analysts looked at.

If I could just -- Because I think I'm next, unless, Andy, you had something else to follow-up on, but I was going to make two suggestions, based on current conversations we've been having around the table here.

The first one I think relates, and it actually is captured here, and it recommends splitting the catch by sector, and so, when we create the stock assessment, we often look at is the length composition different between one sector or another, and, if it's similar, then sometimes we combine it, but, given that there's conversations here around the table about needing that split out for management decisions, then I think that's a good consideration, that this council might say please split it out, and we can always lump it later, but split it out, so that we can at least see things later on, in case there's some discussion, or desire, to look at say discards by sector, mean size by sector, and it sounds like, from what I'm hearing, the answer is, yes, we would like that.

The second one is because we -- Our favorite conversation on SPR, and I think one of recommendations coming out of that was to evaluate SPR on -- An appropriate SPR on a stock-specific basis, and so I think the recommendation could indeed be to consider the appropriate SPR level for each of these stocks as it's done, and I think that's just being consistent with yesterday's conversation and recommendation. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, John. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So I think that the Gulf just kicked out shore mode for Gulf red grouper. Do we need to put that on the list to consider for this assessment, because they said that red grouper weren't caught from shore, and so I was just trying to put that out there.

DR. COLLIER: We could -- What I think would be a good thing to do is recommend, at the data workshop, that they investigate potential anomalies, I guess, in the shore mode for red grouper.

MS. MURPHEY: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, and I want to thank John for bringing up SPR. I guess what I would want to add to this is not only evaluate, but, you know, kind of provide guidance on a plausible range of SPRs, right, because, if they're selecting a proxy, I would like to understand how they came about that proxy and what that range around that proxy may or may not be.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Andy. Anybody have any other questions, or comments, to add to the list for red grouper? All right. I'm seeing none, and we'll let Chip catch up on his notes.

DR. COLLIER: All right, and so the next one is going to be snowy grouper. This one had a prior terminal year of 2018. Much as with the last one, what I'll do is I'll come down here and add some of those additional comments that was just that were just discussed, with the exception of shore mode. Given that it's snowy grouper, they might rarely be seen in the shore mode, and there won't be a data workshop for this, or we're not recommending a data workshop for this.

The big change that we have here, two big changes potentially for this, is to develop an index of abundance, based on the deepwater longline survey that's currently ongoing. We have information since 2021, and so, given that the likely terminal year of the -- Or the terminal year for this stock assessment will be around 2026, and we should have five or six years of data that could be used to inform an index of abundance.

In addition to that, the SADL survey, the South Atlantic Deepwater Longline survey, will have a lot of ages of snowy grouper as well along the coast, and so that that's going to be a valuable source of information. For this stock assessment, we're only recommending just doing assessment workshops, and you're going to hear from Shannon on how these assessment panels, workshops, are changing, and so what we're recommending is a workgroup that could potentially help the Science Center as they're navigating including this new index of abundance into the stock assessment, but let me hold on one second and incorporate those other recommendations from red grouper into this.

All right, and, once again, just like red grouper, we have the research recommendations, the discussions of the SSC, as well as other groups, if there were concerns with the stock assessment. That's provided after the statement of work. Any questions for snowy grouper?

MS. MURPHEY: I am not seeing any hands, and so shall we move on?

DR. COLLIER: All right, and vermilion snapper, and this one is basically going to be kind of an update. The council is -- In the past, we had recommended like a strict update. Basically, the Science Center goes and does it and then provides a report to the SSC, and, at that point, that's when the stock assessment would be reviewed.

We're along the same lines of that. We have no new information for the species that could be incorporated into the stock assessment, with the exception of what you all just recommended, the range of SPRs, as well as -- I wish my brain worked better. As well as splitting the ACL and ABC by sector, prior to removing any of the discards. Any questions on vermilion snapper? Any concerns with this just being kind of being done by the Science Center, with very little input from anyone else?

MS. MURPHEY: Any concerns, comments, questions? I am not seeing any, Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Okay, and so that's all we needed for statements of work. Like I said, what we'll do is we'll talk with the analysts on where we need to go next in developing the terms of reference, present these to the SSC in April, and then bring it back to you as a terms of reference for your review before a stock assessment starts.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Chip, and so moving along to our favorite, identifying key stocks, and so, again, I'll turn it over to Chip, and then we'll hear from Shannon.

DR. COLLIER: Well, I'll just turn it over to Shannon. She'll start. Shannon, if you just want to say next slide please, and let me unmute you.

DR. CASS-CALAY: Hi. Can you hear me?

DR. COLLIER: Yes.

DR. CASS-CALEY: Excellent, and so I can start by addressing the question that was just asked. I think with the new concept that we are proposing -- There really is no longer a need to ID key stocks. We will be able to continue to assess the stocks that we have assessed in the past and, you know, there is a slide, at the end of this presentation, about what data might be available for additional assessment work, but I think it's no longer urgent. I can go ahead and give this presentation, and then hopefully I can address your questions.

Okay, so this was a presentation that has been abridged at least from a presentation made to the SEDAR Steering Committee meeting in February, and, of course, in February, we had about thirty-three more employees at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and so I hope that, you know, these changes that we're intending to make to improve efficiency, you know, will be sufficient and that this schedule, or this concept, will remain robust.

I am presenting this, and it was requested by the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. They wanted me to discuss the proposed revisions to the assessment process and also to include information about different types of stock assessments, or analyses, that might be used to provide the scientific basis for catch limits. They also wanted me to identify stocks that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center considers as having sufficient information for an age-based stock assessment.

A little bit of background information about the need for this change. We have noted that both the timeliness of our stock assessments, in terms of the recency of the terminal year of data and the throughput of management advice, is not where we would expect it to be. Unfortunately, our resources for stock assessment are not increasing, and in fact they are decreasing, quite rapidly, and therefore, at this point, we need to increase efficiencies by reducing the time it takes to conduct a stock assessment, but, if you look across history, the duration of our SEDAR projects has actually increased substantially.

This is just a schematic that I put together of the timelines of SEDAR stock assessments since SEDAR 10, which is quite some time ago, as we're now on SEDAR like 101, and you'll see that, for the first many years of our projects, they were about a year long. Some were somewhat longer. The part of the project that is in blue reflects, in general, the amount of time that's spent on the data component of the project, and the part in green is the assessment webinars, and the review workshop, and then the dark green is essentially the quarter that we put together the assessment report.

You'll see that, beginning in the middle of this time series, we started to have longer projects. They were approximately two years in duration. That largely happened as new information about MRIP became available, and so the projects got longer as we started to evaluate MRIP and its consequences on our stock assessments.

Then where the projects get very, very long, some in excess of three years, those are research track assessments, and, oftentimes, you'll see that there's a secondary part of the project that starts again in blue, towards the end of the time series, and that's the operational assessment that followed research tracks, and that actually produced the management advice, but, for several of these projects, they were in excess of three years long, and that did not include the operational



assessment that followed, and so this was not a successful concept, and we recommended abandoning it.

We entered upon a series of discussions with the council staff, and trying to determine how we could better meet their objectives, and both councils talked about the need to improve the recency of the terminal year of the stock assessment, because, for most of our projects, you know, they might already be one to two years out of date by the time they're complete, and that's not very acceptable.

The South Atlantic Council also talked about a need to improve the flexibility of our processes, so that we could address issues as they emerge and not have to wait three to four years to get them onto a SEDAR calendar.

We talked about throughput, and the South Atlantic Council, at that time, expressed an interest in having updated catch advice every one to two years, but it recognize that that could be done through a variety of different approaches. It could be done by simply updating the projections, it could be done by updating the stock assessment, it could be done through management procedures, or interim assessments, if they were accepted by the council and the SSC, and it could be done by data-limited approaches, and it could be done also by looking at the available data, through some kind of a SAFE report, for example, and allowing the SSC to review its guidance.

The South Atlantic Council also talked about the need for some transparency in this process, and also recognize that there's a desire to be thorough, and to be accurate, and, of course, they recognized that we need to do the assessment project that is appropriate for the data that's available, and so we don't want to do, you know, a three-year project if in fact the data are quite limited in nature. The Gulf Council had similar needs, but I won't be specific about those, in the interest of time, but you can review them here.

There were some primary concerns expressed by the South Atlantic too, and I kind of talked about them already, but it's the insufficient frequency and timeliness of management advice, the lack of flexibility, or bandwidth, to respond to emerging issues. It's too long -- It was too long to put an assessment into the SEDAR queue, and there was a need to improve statements of work and terms of reference, and the Gulf has some similar recommendations.

All right, and so we made a series of recommendations, some of which are already complete. We recommended to eliminate the research track and operational assessment process. It was simply not performing as we expected it to, and so that has already been done. We also recommended that we essentially eliminate the nomenclature and the slot concept, and the reason for that was mostly that it seemed to lead to some inflexibilities in the process that were causing confusion, and it was better to probably try to remain as nimble, and flexible, as possible.

We pointed out that not all assessments need to be the same, that an age-structured assessment with minimal changes could be completed in as little as six months, that additional features require additional time, and so, if you want a stock ID workshop, or an in-person data workshop, assessment webinars, or TWIGs, a CIE review, these all take a little bit of additional time, and they need to be worked into the schedule.

At one point, we had strongly recommended a key stocks concept, but that does not -- It didn't -- We really couldn't get consensus on that, and it doesn't really seem important now, with the new process that we're recommending. The last one is that we could still address a number of stocks, using less time-consuming approaches, and, in particular, stocks that have not been assessed before, but might have enough data to try, for example, a data-limited approach, or some of the stocks that are currently using catch-only approaches, and we could certainly try to see what could be done to update that advice.

This is kind of the big deal. This is the big change we're proposing, and so, in cooperation with SEDAR itself, and with the councils that we have had conversations with, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is proposing to take responsibility for the assessment component of the SEDAR process.

The reason for this change is really that assessment webinars became largely inefficient, and often did not produce the kind of useful and consistent scientific advice that's needed. We also found that we rarely gained sufficient technical insights during those webinars, and that they created a logistical workload for us, ourselves, as well as for those who participated, and that could be better spent on model work.

We found it was not really an efficient, or useful, way to engage our stakeholders, and we think that there might be better ways to do that that would be more sensitive about their time as well, and it was also very difficult to find times when all interested parties could attend. Then, also, there's just a changing workforce, and so, you know, there's a need to do something that is more efficient than the webinar process.

How are we planning to maintain transparency if we, the center, takes over the assessment process? Essentially, we intend to do it by a couple of different processes, and so one is that, for many assessments that are of particular interest, we would host data workshops, and those data workshops hopefully would be in-person. and could be -- That would be open to the public.

If there is no need for a data workshop, or if a data workshop is not scheduled, we can hold data webinars, upon request by the council, and we can make those public as well. We also want to really leverage the power of the SSCs better, and so what we intend to do is present at least some -- The major decision points, and anything that we feel requires additional technical review and guidance, we propose to present that work to the SSCs themselves, and, of course, that is a public comment opportunity as well.

Then there will be a review workshop for most assessments, and it could be a CIE review or just the SSC reviewing the final product, and that is also a public process, and so we are aware that -- You know, that we'll need to be better about documenting the technical input that we receive along the way, and so we do propose to provide those progress reports, to ask for input on issues that arise, and we will also make sure that is well documented in a written record that we make available on the SEDAR website and in our assessment reports.

Some recent examples of this process have already taken place. I mean, we've done this with Gulf yellowedge grouper recently, and red grouper in the Gulf, as well as South Atlantic snowy grouper, and so we think that this process can work, and, frankly, we're pretty excited to increase the interaction with the SSCs in the assessment process.

Just a few things to keep in mind, and, you know, we do not want to lose transparency, but transparency is not really the same thing in the assessment process as participation, and so we do think that transparency that's proposing -- That we are proposing meets the requirements, facilitates valuable participation, and also does not extend the assessment schedules to, you know, to the same extent we had seen before.

We do think that it can be worth a longer schedule at certain times, but it's certainly not something that every single project we need has to have the same very lengthy calendar. We hope that some of the projects can be done through more streamlined approaches, and we have received feedback from SEDAR that they have noted a recent decline in the participation of the panel meetings, and that is both assessment panels, technical team meetings, and TWIG panels, and so they did note that, that they had been less valuable in recent years.

Just a few procedural details, and this is still a bit of a draft format, but this is the beginning of creating more of a SOPP document, and so, for the South Atlantic, Gulf, and Caribbean Fishery Management Councils, we propose this process which I will discuss, and so the SEDAR process we propose to use only for those assessments that have sufficient new information to require external participation and review, and so, for assessments that are strictly done through update approaches, and for any interim assessments that we conduct, those would be done internally by the Science Center and reviewed by the SSC.

For SEDAR assessments, and, frankly, for all assessments, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center proposes to take responsibility of the assessment component of that process, but the data and review components of SEDAR will remain unchanged.

For SEDAR assessments, the specifics of any given project will be negotiated between the center and the council staff, with input from the SSCs and the councils, and, if the council chooses to, they may elect to prepare a statement of work, which is done in this council, and that's fine, or to communicate verbally, as some councils prefer to do.

We do ask that the councils establish a standing technical team with diverse scientific experience and, in particular, fishing experience, as appropriate, and what we would like to do is reach out to those members of that technical team, whenever the need arises, through informal processes, and perhaps we can talk about the logistics that would be needed to support that process.

Just a little bit more about the details, and so for all SEDAR projects, SEDAR will organize the data scoping call, as they have, and the data workshop, or data webinars, and the public will be encouraged to participate during those processes. After the conclusion of the data component, the center will then take responsibility for the stock assessment component, and we will develop the assessment internally, but we will coordinate ad hoc meetings with members of the council appointed technical team, as needed.

Then the center will provide a record of those communications for inclusion in the assessment report. These ad hoc meetings could focus on a technical issue, or on stakeholder input, or outreach, and so we will be expanding the role of the SSC in the model development, and the council staff we ask to schedule pre-decisional briefings with the SSC, where they can provide us feedback on key decision points, and the center will then revise the assessment, as appropriate,

based on the guidance from the SSC, and then we will move into the review process as usual, and so that SEDAR review process will remain unchanged.

All right, and so there are a number of optional components that we will negotiate with the council, and the council staff, and so, for some projects, you may choose to have an in-person data workshop. We think this would be most appropriate for new assessments or for assessments when many new data inputs must be considered or when there is a need to substantially modify an existing assessment.

Data webinars could be used, instead of an in-person data workshop, and we think data webinars would be appropriate when there is limited new information available, and so these data webinars we think would function similarly to a topical working group.

External CIE review can be selected, and that would be appropriate for new assessments, or when many data inputs must be reconsidered, or a substantial change to a stock assessment, and then you could also review an assessment through your SSC only, and that would be appropriate for assessments with limited changes or for update assessments and interims.

There are a number of assessments that we would intend to conduct outside of the SEDAR process entirely, and so those would include update lights, and an update light is essentially when the center updates everything, all of the information we can, within a stock assessment, but sometimes series might not be available through the terminal year, and an update light would provide brand new status determination criteria and brand new OFL and ABC recommendations.

We could also do just update the projections of a stock assessment, based on the observed landings data for example, and so we rerun projections and replace those assumed removals with the observed information, but, if we didn't update projections, it would retain the status determination criteria and only give you updated catch advice.

We could, theoretically, use interim assessment approaches. In most cases, that would be a data-limited approach, which would be used to adjust the existing ABC. For example, we could use an index to adjust the ABC. That approach would also retain the status determination criteria. We could use another type of management procedure, if one was approved, and those would typically come from some MSE simulation process, and that might be used to provide your management advice, based on some empirical harvest control rule, or from a model basis, right, and these probably do not provide status determination criteria, but they could provide short-term catch advice. The use of any one of these approaches to inform management, of course, would be subject to SSC evaluation, feedback, and review.

The second part of this request, and this is just, I think, a single slide, was to provide some information about what South Atlantic species can be assessed using age-structured approaches. A reminder that this question was also addressed in a previous council request in the fall of 2024, and the document name is there. I think that's in the briefing book of your fall 2024 meeting.

It is somewhat difficult to speculate what new species could be assessed, because, if we are to add species that have not been aged before, or require new ageing protocols, that would typically require some kind of an ageing workshop with the data partners, but we do believe that white grunt is the most obvious candidate for a stock assessment that we have not done before.

We can also continue to do the age-structured approaches that we've done in the past, and so we're not asking you to remove, necessarily, any of the projects we've done before from consideration of the SEDAR calendar, but, you know, we would be -- How many of these we can do in a given year is largely going to depend on the length of the projects, and so, if we're able to achieve more projects that are shorter in duration, and more efficient, we'll be able to do more assessments in a year. That might be the last slide.

DR. COLLIER: That was the last slide.

DR. CASS-CALAY: Excellent, and so I know that was a lot of words, and a lot of concepts thrown at you all at once, and I'm sorry that I'm not there in person, but I'm very happy to try to answer any questions that you have.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thank you, Shannon. Does anybody -- Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks for this presentation. There are some interesting things in there. I guess I would also say that I have some concerns, and so I appreciate the slide about how you intend to maintain transparency in the assessment process if it's run by the Science Center, but, I mean, it just sounds like -- We heard earlier in this committee that you all have staffing issues, capacity issues, and so I just question whether this is the most efficient and transparent way to do this, that maybe there's some pieces now, based on this information, you know, less staff, that maybe go back to SEDAR.

I do like the back-and-forth, the more back-and-forth, with the SSC, and I look forward to a discussion with the committee about establishing this council technical team, but, yes, I know SEDAR was created for transparency in the process, and making sure that the public, and others that wanted to be involved, could be at the table, and so I just -- I share some concerns about this. Also, we are talking about taking white grunt out of the complex, and so I don't think it's a candidate for a stock -- For an age-based stock assessment.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Jessica. Any other -- Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Just to fill in, when Shannon was talking about, you know, removing parts of the -- Of the Science Center taking over parts of the stock assessment process, what they're talking about is really -- I don't know if you've attended some of those assessment webinars, and it really -- That's what they're talking about, maybe having a specialized group that can address real technical issues on a more timely fashion.

In the past, that hasn't been all that successful. You know, the analysts have to put together presentations every time for that, and it just did not seem like it was a very effective approach in order to get things accomplished, and we feel like maybe having a technical team, that is there more consistently over time, and so we would have a standing group that they could call upon, and they would be familiar with the stock assessment model, the data inputs, and I think they would learn, over time, more about the stock assessments, and the analysts -- I think both would potentially learn with each other, in order to make a more effective process.

MS. MURPHEY: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So a couple things. So does that mean -- I think we talked about having these working groups that would work on special issues, and does that mean that concept is going away from this process? I have another question too, after this one.

DR. COLLIER: Shannon, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but we're not talking -- So what you're talking about are those specialized workgroups, or she calls it TWIGs, topical working groups, and they go by many different names, and so those would still stay in place. If there's something that is a specialized piece of information that's coming in, we could put together something that would address that, and so let's say we had a dive survey that was coming in, and we might have a specialized group that knows the dive survey well and could potentially get that incorporated.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead. You have one more, Jessica?

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and so then we're not suggesting that all the species that are assessed by FWC are now going over to the Science Center and going through this process, and so the process that exists at FWC, for all the extra stock assessments, primarily for Florida-specific species, that would remain intact. It would, you know, basically say stay the same and interact with the SEDAR portions of the process in the same way?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and this proposal that Shannon presented was just for the SEDAR-based NMFS federal stock assessments.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So then -- I appreciate that, and so then, also, I feel like maybe they've lost staff, since maybe they prepared these materials, or since the SEDAR Steering Committee, and I guess my question would be do they still think that they could execute this plan, and the robustness of this plan, the same way that they did, you know, when maybe presenting this to the steering committee, or earlier in 2025?

DR. CASS-CALAY: So I can address that question, or, John, do you want to go ahead?

DR. WALTER: No, and, Shannon you go ahead.

DR. CASS-CALAY: I'll start, and so, to date, SFD has lost three staff, and so, right now, we're down about 10 percent, and, with some grace, and probably a little bit of flexibility, you know, we think we can continue to support projects that we've promised. However, we have this pending deadline for a RIF. On March 13, they're meant to submit a plan, and we don't know what that's going to look like, you know, and so I will let John finish um his comments now, because that could change everything.

DR. WALTER: Yes, and so what is clear if we can't continue with the status quo, and the status quo really wasn't working very well, and so can we cover this plan, and, well, this plan is a step in the right direction, for sure, in terms of I think being able to provide the throughput, while maintaining enough transparency, but also leaning on like the SSC for more input, and this expert group, and so it', I think, a necessary step for us. Whether we can continue to fully meet the timelines, that's going to be a conversation we're going to have to have as we find out more about what's going on and whether we can backfill positions that we might have lost, et cetera. Thanks.

h MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, John. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess I'm a little confused on a part of it, and so, in the normal SEDAR process, the SSC comes back and deems the outcome of that assessment, or the outcome of that work, as BSIA or not, and so, under this scenario, does the Science Center deem its own work BSIA, or how does that work?

DR. COLLIER: No, and so it's still going to be going through the normal process for the stock assessments, update assessments, and different things. When it's -- When you're looking at different changes in catch levels, it will be reviewed by the SSC, in order to provide you an ABC.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other questions? Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you for this presentation. It was enlightening. I'm still trying to process everything, and I'm kind of going back and forth in my head a little bit. I guess I would say that the role of the SSC in this modeling development being expanded is probably likely, in my opinion, one of the best features. It's going to perhaps -- If I'm understanding it correctly, it provide the opportunity for the SSC to provide input well before the final product is then sent to them.

I kind of want to swing back to the technical team. Chip, you were talking about it, and I wasn't quite there with your brain, and so are you -- Can you clarify who would be on that technical team? Would it just be Science Center folks, or is it going to be a broader team, like perhaps state folks or what have you?

DR. COLLIER: It would be a broader team, and so it might be, you know, stock assessment scientists from the states, other stock assessment scientists from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, but it could also include some stakeholders in the group too that know that the different fisheries all along the coast that could provide some input. As they're doing a stock assessment, you know, there's questions that come up, and they might want a fisherman in the room to help verify some of the data.

MS. DUKES: To that, that's -- You kind of hit my next thing, is, yes, this process is going to be transparent. I think it's the navigation, to ensure that it's going to continue to be transparent, is just something to take into mind. We often have fishermen who are always the same ones kind of coming to the table, but what they bring to the table is really valuable, and so I just want to make sure that, in that communication process, we're really focusing some of that energy to make sure that those folks are still involved in this process. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: So back on that technical team concept. Does it change with each assessment? Are there people that stay on that team, kind of throughout, you know, all of these different stock assessments? I'm just trying to think about, whether it's fishermen, whether it's state agency folks, and I'm just trying to think about how it comes together, how it's formed, the added workload that would be -- Like if we just selected one FWC person, and we couldn't really change that member of the technical team, do you have more insight on those thoughts?

DR. COLLIER: I do not, but I feel like we could set it up in such a way that, you know, the state identifies that, you know, they want a seat, maybe, something along those lines, and so, that way, it would be a bit more flexible, and the stakeholder part is a little bit more difficult, right, because somebody that is fishing for Spanish mackerel with a gillnet might not be fishing longline for golden tilefish, and so that is a bit more of a challenge, and we'll have to figure out the best way to do that, but maybe it's a suite of people that are approved, and then they can they can attend as possible.

MS. MURPHEY: I was going to add, real quick, and I was like you, Jessica, when I first came into that SEDAR Steering Committee. I was concerned about the transparency, but I thought they explained it very well, and I felt much better. The other thing, and, Chip, do we have -- Do you have that flow chart, that kind of showed the -- Well, I call it a flow chart, where they have the different processes lined out? Do you have that? They kind of made that at the end of the steering committee, and do we have -- That might be helpful. Do you have it? You don't have it?

DR. COLLIER: No, I don't have that one, and so what Trish is talking about is the different -- So, as the stock assessments are being put together, whatever the name might be, the most basic one would just have kind of a data scoping, and then the Science Center would potentially do a stock assessment and get the SSC involved towards the end.

The most complex is something like what we're going to be doing for red snapper, which is going to have a data workshop, and it's going to have that CIE review, likely, and then go to the stock assessment -- Or go to the SSC for their review as well, and so it's a process that's not all that different than what we had before, with different names, but it seems like it's going to be much more effective.

The big difference between what we had before, also from the research track, is really getting rid of that assessment panel portion in the middle, which, you know, was taking up a lot of time, as John had mentioned, and Shannon had mentioned.

MS. MURPHEY: Can you send that around, if you find it?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and we'll send it around.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. Did I see John's hand?

DR. WALTER: You did. Just on that panel, it probably is going to be a fair bit of time for the panel members, but they're also going to have a lot of expertise in being able to see, and rapidly diagnose things in assessments, because a lot of the assessments have similar diagnostics, and, once you get experienced with them, then you can pretty much clearly pinpoint the kind of things that our analysts are asking for guidance from, and so we're hoping that that's much more efficient, because those people will have that kind of expertise to say, you know, hey, your selectivity needs to parameterize a little differently, and we get that kind of rapid feedback, rather than the long, drawn-out process, and we think that getting a little bit of expert advice can go a long way, in terms of maximizing and being much more efficient with the process. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, John. I have Carolyn.



DR. BELCHER: So I'm -- Just for a point of clarification, because, again, I'm thinking back to when we were on the SSC, and going through those early assessments, and you had volunteers that were at the data workshop volunteers, that were at the assessment workshop, the review workshop, and that was kind of the oversight and involvement.

We're talking about now expanding the capacity of people for that technical review beyond just the SSC folks that volunteer for the assessment, and so it's similar to like what HMS does with their SEDAR pool, and HMS has that, where I used to get pinged for that, to see your availability, your interest in being, and then they would tap you as they needed resources to come into that, and is that kind of what you guys are thinking or --

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and my little bit of confusion there is because we do have a SEDAR pool as well, but this would be a technical team that's really -- I would hope it would be a little bit more consistent, like John said. That way, people are really familiar with these models, and they can diagnose them a little bit more, but we also want to make sure that we have the proper stakeholders engaged, to look into any, you know, anomalies that might be coming up in the stock assessment, and so I think it's very similar to the HMS process that you're talking about.

MS. MURPHEY: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes, and I was also going to bring up the whole -- This was on the slide about the optional components, about the CIE review, and so I see here that it's listed appropriate for new assessments, when there's a lot of new data inputs to be considered, but I guess it wouldn't be used every time, and so I guess I'm partly used to the CIE reviewers like deeming the stock assessment suitable for management, and so then, if there is not a CIE review on a particular assessment, then just, once the assessment is completed, we just assume that the SSC will make that type of determination and I'm just trying to resolve, in my head, how that would work without the CIE review.

MS. MURPHEY: Is that a question for Shannon? That was a question for you, Shannon, if you can answer that.

DR. CASS-CALAY: Yes, and that's exactly what we had in mind, that, for those assessments where there were limited changes from an assessment that had already experienced CIE review, then the SSC would be sufficient to determine whether the assessment was useful for management.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you. I've got Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I was just going to follow-up with, again, back in the earlier years, when I was on the SSC, that was kind of what happened. We would go through the CIE review, when everything was relatively brand new out of the box, and then, once we were doing the updates, the updates just had everybody coming in and having the discussions and pushing it forward. There was no CIE, and it was just the SSC.

MS. MURPHEY: Thanks, Carolyn. I had Chip, and then Kerry.

DR. COLLIER: This is similar to the process that's ongoing now, and so we've always had this. If it's a big assessment, a new assessment, then a CIE review might be requested, and so that's one

of the things that, as we're going through the statements of work, if you all feel like we need a CIE review, or the SSC will say that they feel like they need a CIE review, we would get that added into the component, just recognizing that, you know, that is going to be an additional time during the development of the assessment.

MS. MURPHEY: I have Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I think you just answered my question, but let me make sure I understand, and so we would be the determining body of what is considered --

UNIDENTIFIED: (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

MS. MARHEFKA: No, no, no, no. Not that. I know we're not that. We would be the determining body of what is considered rising to the occasion of needing a CIE review, because like I understand if you're incorporating like SADL data for the first time, and that rises to the occasion, but there are -- How do we determine what that level is? Is it ten new years of landings that we didn't have before, and like we get to determine that?

DR. COLLIER: So I think this is going to be some of those negotiations that we have with the Science Center on whether or not a CIE review is needed, and I think I would rely heavily on the SSC for giving guidance on that, just because, if they're comfortable with doing the review, and it is a pretty expensive process to do a CIE, and so, if they're -- If the SSC is comfortable, I think we rely on them. They're quite often familiar with the stocks, the data that goes into them, and so I think they would give the adequate review that's needed.

MS. MURPHEY: Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you. Is this presentation going to go to the SSC at their April meeting for input as well?

DR. COLLIER: We have planned on putting this on the SSC. I think it's an important thing for them to be talking about. When we talked about it at the SEDAR Steering Committee, that's one of the things that we had suggested, was it be brought to our SSC and make sure they're comfortable with the process.

MS. DUKES: Thank you. I concur, and, as kind of a follow-up from that, so, in here, it says we're going to schedule additional briefings with the SSC, and is that going to be in addition to their typical two AP meetings that will be specifically focused on a review of an ongoing assessment?

DR. COLLIER: Yes, and we have two regularly-scheduled SSC meetings each year. We've been having four to five SSC meetings, for the past four or five or six years, and so, yes, we have two, but we regularly schedule outside of that, in order to get all their work done, and so that is the plan, is we would likely have those webinar meetings outside of the in-person meetings that we typically have.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other questions? All right. Well, thank you so much, Shannon, and so we don't have to come up with key stocks anymore?

DR. CASS-CALAY: That's right. You do not.

MS. MURPHEY: Okay. Cool. I'm sorry. John.

DR. WALTER: Well, I guess what would be really good is if the council agrees with this plan to move forward, or has other thoughts, but, I mean, it does seem like it would be very good to get that feedback.

MS. MURPHEY: All right, John. Jimmy.

MR. HULL: Thank you, and my question is for John, and so, under the category of interim assessment approaches, so the advice that those would give us would -- Because of those type of approaches, would the uncertainties in those projections be higher in something like that assessment approach? Are we going to see higher uncertainties because these are quicker, less - intensive, and they're -- Basically, that's just like an update, I assume, and you're just going to update the information, and then we'll get updated catch advice, and will the uncertainties be higher?

DR. WALTER: Not necessarily, because what it's going to do is it's going to take the recent index, or recent information, and, if we do like an assessment update light, that might bring the landings, discards, and indices up to the current time, but maybe wouldn't have the full age composition, and that's sort of the flavor of an update light.

An interim that's an index-based interim might use the index, and the value of the index, if we develop that methodology, and so, in terms of -- Because it's more current, and more reflective of the most recent information, it may actually have less uncertainty than a projection that is multiple years in the future, and, actually, we've simulation tested that a couple times and seen that it actually does, in some cases, do a lot better than just a projection over multiple years requiring a lot of assumptions, and so we think that that's one of those things that we need to start incorporating more, as people say, hey, that assessment is a little bit late, and it's kind of stale, and it's missing what's going on in the water, and developing and implementing these interim approaches might get us -- Make us more current, meaning that the throughput is actually more relevant to what's going on. Thanks.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, John. Chip.

DR. COLLIER: Not to suggest what you all should do, but, like we said, it's going to be going to the SSC in April, and so I wouldn't encourage you to hear their feedback before making a final decision, but I think, if you guys want to give a soft approval that this is the right direction to begin to go, I think that's good, but I think we definitely need input from the SSC.

MS. MURPHEY: I concur, Chip, but, as far as soft supporting this at this point, and we would like to -- Actually, just go and say we want -- We would like to hear what the SSC has to say as well, but I think we do have support for this, based off input from the SSC. Is that good enough? Do I see -- Is everybody good with that? Okay. I see thumbs-up. I think -- Are we done on this topic or --

DR. COLLIER: Well, one thing I wanted to look at in the key stocks document that I put together, and so Attachment 3b, is Jessica wanted -- You wanted to see a timeline, basically, of everything that was going on, and so this -- This incorporates all the projects that are going on right now, and so it's color-coded, kind of indicating what process it's using, and so, right here, we have Quarter 1, which is referring to the review that just occurred for mutton and yellowtail snapper.

You'll see that, and then we also have, for blueline tilefish, and that is going to be presented to our SSC in April, as well as South Atlantic tilefish. We're going to be having a data workshop next quarter for red snapper, and so just trying to put together all these pieces that are going to be going on. Then, you know, it's color-coded, based on exactly what kind of process it is, and you'll see that purple in there, that I hadn't talked about before, and I apologize for forgetting to mention this, but the Science Center has agreed to do an update light for black sea bass, and that's going to be presented to the SSC in April, and so we're excited to have an update light for black sea bass.

Then you'll see the copper that's in there, and that indicates that it was discussed at the SEDAR Steering Committee, and it just hasn't been put into the official SEDAR schedule, and then other documents that are further down the line, and you'll see some gray, and that's indicating more of a management strategy evaluation process, and then some blues, which are future requests.

I know there's some terminology that is being used that's new, and we tried to do a description of what exactly all this these new terms are. I do have a presentation that we could go through after this, if people want to stick around and try to figure out what they are, but I think we can move on to the next topic. If that schedule is helpful to you, we can figure out where how to do that and how often to update that.

MS. MURPHEY: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: I was trying to figure out the best time to backtrack for a second, and it seems, Chip, if you could go back to the schedule, that maybe this is it. Don't be mad, but we had a side discussion about our first topic about the statement of works that we went through at the beginning of the meeting, and there was quite a bit of discussion about really the utility in doing the vermilion quick -- What are you calling it? The light, assessment light, given --

DR. COLLIER: So I don't think that that one is going to be an assessment light. It's going to have full age data, and it's going to have index updates, and it's going to have all the pieces of information. It's just not going to go through a data workshop or anything like.

MS. MARHEFKA: Well, that's, honestly, almost even more reason. It sounds like it's pretty labor intensive, and it doesn't -- We're not -- A lot of us aren't sure if that's really of highest priority right now. I'll let other people speak to it, but it's probably something we should have caught the first time around, and then it just kind of stuck in our head, but I don't know if anyone else wants to speak to that, but --

DR. COLLIER: Do you mean a different stock or a different type of stock assessment?

MS. MARHEFKA: Different stock.

MS. MURPHEY: Does anybody have any more comment, or have any comments about vermilion? Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes, and I would be supportive of that. I mean, I don't really see that that's a pressing issue right -- You know, in 2027, and so, you know, given the workload, I think that can move on out a lot further.

MS. MURPHEY: I've got Charlie and then Jessica.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes I concur. We may have some other species that have more pressing needs. Vermilion have been pretty steady, and, unless we get some green, cold water or something, you know, you pretty much know what you're going to do, and I would be more than willing to move some species around and open that slot up.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Charlie. Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Ditto. Just I support removal. I'm not hearing anything from fishermen of concerns, or anything like that, and so, yes, I would support it if it's going to free up a spot.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thanks, Jessica. How -- Is everyone good with that, or is there anybody that objects to removing vermilion?

DR. COLLIER: No objection from me, and I'm just curious which species you would like to put in there, if you are removing them.

MS. MURPHEY: Does somebody -- Anybody have any thoughts on what to protect, or do we have time to --

MS. MCCAWLEY: Pick it in June.

MS. MURPHEY: Jessica says pick it in June.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Well, I say that because we're, you know, working on removing species from the fishery management unit, and all that other stuff, and I would want to look at the table again, think about what species are coming out, and have a broader discussion, and it just -- I don't want to make a hasty decision. I feel like this is an important decision.

MS. MURPHEY: It is, Jessica. John. John wants to say something.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We just need to know by the next steering committee, which I think is probably August or somewhere, and I feel like it's after June we were looking, so that Trish and I know what to swap into that spot, if there's not a major devastating blow to the work capabilities.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Well, you guys sleep on it, and we'll talk about it in June. Okay. I think we're almost caught up, and we've just got to change the name of this committee.

DR. COLLIER: All right, and so, looking at Attachment 4 for SEDAR, we do have a potential change of scope, and change of name, and this was brought up just because of this suite of different

pieces of information that could be brought to you, and so not all of them are going to be going through SEDAR.

You saw that scheduling piece, and I feel like it's very important for staff to know, as well as the council to know, exactly what's going on, when catch advice might have to be changed, and I think that's important for overall scheduling, right, and we don't want to overwhelm the system with too much information coming in at one time, or maybe we do, and figure out how to do it more efficiently, and that is one of our projects that we have with climate readiness, is trying to figure out how to get some of these projects through a little bit more quickly from start to end.

What we're proposing here is how to deal with this, and what the adjusted roles of the committee might be, and, in talking with staff, as well as others, you know we talked about what some pieces of information that might be extremely important, and one is the scheduling and not just SEDAR stock assessments, but, you know, considering all the assessments, or harvest control rules, interim analysis, update models, and how all those might be coming together.

We want to ensure that there's adequate review by the SSC, in order to provide ABCs, and develop terms of reference for some of these different products, making sure that they're coming to you, and they're vetting the pieces of information that you had concerns with, and you're getting the best scientific information available.

The other thing that came up was, previously, there was a data collection committee that the council had. It started off as an ad hoc data collection committee, and then it became a full-bore data collection committee, and then it went away, and so do we want the data collection committee to be wrapped up into this process too, and one of the reasons that I'm thinking about this is we have a review of our standard bycatch reporting methodology that's going to be coming up in the end of 2026, and just figuring out -- Just trying to figure out which committee would be helpful to address that, and this could be an option in order to do that.

With that, those are our thoughts, and then we have a variety of names that we put together, and whatever you want to call it, and I'm not big on names. I don't care. Just tell me what work to do, and I'll try to get it done for you.

MS. MURPHEY: I think the most important part is going to be the cool acronym we get out of this, right, and so here's mine. I've got one. Catch Advice and Data, CAD.

DR. COLLIER: Could we put an "S" in front of that for SEDAR Catch Advice and Data, and now it would be SCAD?

MS. MURPHEY: We could do -- Yes, SCAD.

DR. COLLIER: But, more importantly, it's a fish.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I know.

MS. MURPHEY: Go ahead, Amy.

MS. DUKES: I'm going to back up from the naming options for a hot second. I'm the fishery-dependent data girl, and so I absolutely see the need to make sure that we have some sort of data component moving forward, with whatever the hell this thing is going to be called. Just because we've got more stuff coming up, I want to make sure that that is that is still relevant, and front and center, as we move forward with this.

I think it's really important to make sure that it's utilized in a way that can be advantageous for us, perhaps building back some trust with our constituents and things like that, and so I would really appreciate a data role moving forward in this, and I know it was sort of an open-ended question, but I'm answering your question and saying, yes, please.

MS. MURPHEY: Thank you, Amy. So you added the SEDAR Catch Advice and Data, SCAD. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I'm just -- If we're throwing votes on the table, I do kind of like the Data, Assessment, and Catch Advice, only because it stays more generic, and so it covers more things, as opposed to getting descriptive, but, if you've got SEDAR and -- I just thought that one kind of fit in general.

MS. MURPHEY: All right. Thanks. Charlie.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, and, just as I was kind of scrolling over that, before we got to -- You know, I kind of felt the same way, that Data, Assessment, and Catch Advice covered everything, and it's -- But I'm not having heartburn over anything, but that seemed adequate.

MS. MURPHEY: Any other suggestions? I've heard DACA, which was that was Carolyn and you, right? Okay. Carolyn, you had DACA, and I had whatever I had, and I forgot, but are we going DACA or --

MS. MCCAWLEY: DACA.

MS. MURPHEY: DACA. Okay. All right, and so I'm not seeing any -- Okay, and it sounds like everybody is done with this meeting, and so I guess we're going to go with DACA, and, unless anybody has any other business -- Seeing none, look at that, and we caught back up on time. We'll adjourn for the day and meet back here tomorrow at 8:30. Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on March 6, 2025.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
April 8, 2025

**LAW ENFORCEMENT**

Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Tom Roller, Vice Chair  
Judy Helmey  
Kerry Marhefka  
LT Tom Pease  
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

**MACKEREL COBIA**

Tom Roller, Chair  
Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Gary Borland  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Kerry Marhefka  
Jessica McCawley  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Mid-Atlantic: Skip Feller  
Mid-Atlantic: Joe Grist  
Staff contact: Christina Wiegand

**SEDAR**

✓ Trish Murphey, Chair  
✓ Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair  
✓ Robert Beal  
✓ Carolyn Belcher  
✓ Amy Dukes  
✓ Tim Griner  
✓ Jimmy Hull  
✓ Kerry Marhefka  
✓ Charlie Phillips  
✓ Andy Strelcheck  
Staff contact: Chip Collier

**SHRIMP**

Carolyn Belcher, Chair  
Amy Dukes, Vice Chair  
Gary Borland  
Jimmy Hull  
Jessica McCawley  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Andy Strelcheck  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Allie Iberle

**SNAPPER GROUPE**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Kerry Marhefka, Vice Chair  
Robert Beal  
Carolyn Belcher  
Gary Borland  
Amy Dukes  
Tim Griner  
✓ Judy Helmey  
Jimmy Hull  
Trish Murphey  
LT Tom Pease  
Charlie Phillips  
✓ Tom Roller  
Robert Spottswood, Jr.  
Andy Strelcheck  
Mid-Atlantic: Anna Beckwith  
Mid-Atlantic: Joe Grist  
Staff Contact: Mike Schmidtke

**SPINY LOBSTER**

Jessica McCawley, Chair  
Robert Spottswood, Jr., Vice Chair  
Tim Griner  
Kerry Marhefka  
LT Tom Pease  
Tom Roller  
Andy Strelcheck  
Staff: Christina Wiegand

Shep Grimes  
Monica Smit-Brunello  
Nikhil Mehta  
Rick DeVictor  
Dr. John Walter  
Dr. Shannon Cass-Calay  
Sonny Gwin



SEDAR  
3/4

~~FC2 Fri~~  
3/7

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**COUNCIL STAFF**

**Executive Director**

✓ John Carmichael  
[john.carmichael@safmc.net](mailto:john.carmichael@safmc.net)  
843-302-8435

**Deputy Director - Science**

✓ Dr. Chip Collier  
[chip.collier@safmc.net](mailto:chip.collier@safmc.net)  
843-302-8444

**Deputy Director - Management**

✓ Myra Brouwer  
[myra.brouwer@safmc.net](mailto:myra.brouwer@safmc.net)  
843-302-8436

**Citizen Science Program Manager**

✓ Julia Byrd  
[julia.byrd@safmc.net](mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net)  
843-302-8439

**BFP Outreach Specialist**

Ashley Oliver [Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net](mailto:Ashley.Oliver@safmc.net)  
843-225-8135

**Admin. Secretary/Travel Coordinator**

✓ Rachael Silvas  
[Rachael.silvas@safmc.net](mailto:Rachael.silvas@safmc.net)  
843-571-4370

**Fishery Scientist II**

✓ Dr. Mike Schmidtke  
[mike.schmidtke@safmc.net](mailto:mike.schmidtke@safmc.net)  
843-302-8433

**Quantitative Fishery Scientist**

WA ✓ Dr. Judd Curtis  
[Judd.curtis@safmc.net](mailto:Judd.curtis@safmc.net)  
843-302-8441

**Communication and Digital Media Specialist**

✓ Nicholas Smillie  
[Nick.Smillie@safmc.net](mailto:Nick.Smillie@safmc.net)  
843-302-8443

**Fishery Economist & FMP Coordinator**

John Hadley  
[john.hadley@safmc.net](mailto:john.hadley@safmc.net)  
843-302-8432

WB **Staff Accountant**

Suzanna Thomas  
[suzanna.thomas@safmc.net](mailto:suzanna.thomas@safmc.net)  
843-571-4368

**Habitat and Ecosystem Scientist**

✓ Kathleen Howington  
[kathleen.howington@safmc.net](mailto:kathleen.howington@safmc.net)  
843-725-7580

**Fishery Social Scientist**

✓ Christina Wiegand [christina.wiegand@safmc.net](mailto:christina.wiegand@safmc.net)  
843-302-8437

**Fishery Scientist I**

✓ Allie Iberle  
[Allie.iberle@safmc.net](mailto:Allie.iberle@safmc.net)  
843-225-8135

WB **Citizen Science Project Manager**

Meg Withers  
[Meg.withers@safmc.net](mailto:Meg.withers@safmc.net)  
843-725-7577

**Public Information Officer**

✓ Kim Iverson [kim.iverson@safmc.net](mailto:kim.iverson@safmc.net)  
843-224-7258

**SEDAR**

**SEDAR Program Manager**

WB Dr. Julie Neer  
[Julie.neer@safmc.net](mailto:Julie.neer@safmc.net)  
843-302-8438

**Administrative Officer**

✓ Kelly Klasnick [kelly.klasnick@safmc.net](mailto:kelly.klasnick@safmc.net)  
843-763-1050

WB **SEDAR Coordinator**

Emily Ott [Emily.Ott@safmc.net](mailto:Emily.Ott@safmc.net)  
937-479-6171

# SAFMC March 2025 Council Meeting

## Attendee Report: (03/3/25 - 03/7/25)

Report Generated:

03/10/2025 09:04 AM EDT

**Webinar ID**

564-916-027

**Actual Start Date/Time**

03/06/2025 07:54 AM EST

## Staff Details

**Attended**

Yes

**Interest Rating**

Not applicable for staff

## Attendee Details

**Last Name**

**First Name**

Alnes	Alex
Adam	Bailey
Alger	Brett
Amick	Scott
Barile	Peter
Barrows	Katline
Batsavage	Chris
Beal	Bob
Beckwith	Anna
Blough	Heather
Bogdan	Jennifer
Borland	Gary
Brogan (Oceana)	Gib
Brouwer	Myra
Bublely	Walter
Buntin	Jesse
Bunting	Matthew
Byrd	Julia
Cass-Calay	Shannon
Cathey	Andrew
Cermak	Bridget
Charydczak	Jenna
Cheshire	Rob
Conklin	Christopher
Curtis	Judd
DD	D
Dancy	Kiley
Darrow	Jamie
Davis	Christopher
DeVictor	Rick

Downes	Athena
Dyar	Ben
Evans	Joseph
Finch	Margaret
Flowers	Jared
Fluech	Bryan
Foor	Brandon
Foss	Kristin
Franco	Crystal
Franke	Emilie
Gahm	Meghan
Gamboa-Salazar	Keilin
Gatchell	Courtney
Gentner	BRAD
Gore	Karla
Gray	Alisha
Green	Matt
Griffin	Aimee
Griner	Tim
Grist	Joseph
Hadley	John
Hale	Robert
Hart	Hannah
Helies	Frank
Helmey	Judy
Hendon	Read
Hiers	Homer
Hildreth	Delaine
Hill	Kaleigh
Horn	Calusa
Horton	Chris
Hull	Jimmy
Iberle	Allie
Iverson	Kim
Karnauskas	Mandy
Keppler	Blaik
Klasnick	01Kelly
Klibansky	Lara
Knowlton	Kathy
Larkin	Michael
Lazarre	Dominique
Lee	Jennifer
Levy	Mara
MCCLAIR	GENINE

Marhefka	00Kerry
Marinko	Jeff
Markwith	Anne
Masi	Michelle
McGill	Maria
Mehta	Nikhil
Merck	Nicole
Meyer-Gutbrod	Erin
Murphey	Trish
Murphy	Allison
Neer	Julie
Newman	Thomas
Oliver	Ashley
Ott	Emily
Owens	Marina
Package-Ward	Christina
Pehl	Nicole
Pierce	Brett
Poholek	Ariel
Poland	Stephen
Potter	Caroline
Ramsay	Chloe
Ramsey	J
Records	David
Reding	Brandon
Reese	Dylan
Reichert	Marcel
Roller	Tom
Runde	Brendan
Seward	McLean
Shaffer	Charles
Shultz	Chris
Silvas	Rachael
Sinkus	Wiley
Smart	Tracey
Smillie	Nick
Smit-Brunello	Monica
Snyder	Dave
Solinger	Laura
Spanik	Kevin
Spottswood	00Robert
Spurgin	Kali
Sramek	Mark
Stam	Geoff

Stephen	Jessica
Stephens	Haley
Stephenson	Sarah
Sweetman	CJ
Turley	Brendan
Vara	Mary
Waldo	Jennifer
Walia	Matt
Walsh	Jason
Walter	John
Wamer	David
Webb	Greyson
Wiegand	Christina
Wilhelm	Catherine
Williams	Erik
Withers	Meg
Woodstock	Matt
Zapf	Daniel
colby	barrett
collier	chip
curtis	Joe
everett	Nathan
gwin	earlgwin
hallett	fletcher
I	I
leonard	edward
moss	david
sandorf	Scott
shervanick	kara
thomas	suz
vecchio	Julie
vincent	matthew
zales	bob
Aukeman	Trip
Baker	Scott
Balderson	John
Barbieri	Luiz
Beaty	Julia
Bell	Mel
Bianchi	Alan
Binion-Rock	Samantha
Bristle	William
Carrigan	Abby
Carvalho	Avelino

Cody	Richard
Coffill-Rivera	Manuel
Coleman	Heather
Corey	Morgan
Cox	Jack
Davis	Conor
DeFilippi Simpson	Julie
DeJohn	Frank
Delrosario	Leeanne
Denson	LaTreese
Dieveney	Beth
Dobbs	Jeffrey
Forrestal	Francesca
Franco	Dawn
Garber	Chip
Gentry	Lauren
Gloeckner	David
Gomez	Josalyn
Guyas	Martha
Haddad	Nick
Harrison	Alana
Hemilright	Dewey
Hollensead	Lisa
Howard	Lawton
Howell	Mary
Huber	Jeanette
Kalinowsky	Chris
Ketn	Russell
Kimrey	Captain Chris
Klibansky	Nikolai
Kolmos	Kevin
Lam	Sarah
Lewis	Savannah
Lloyd	Victor
Loeffler	Michael
Lorenzen	Kai
Malinowski	Richard
Markwith	Anne
Mason	Gina
Matter	Vivian
McGovern	Jack
McWaters	Mark
McWhorter	Will
Mendez-Ferrer	Natasha

Merrifield	Mike
Mitchell	Kathy
Moore	Jeff
Muffley	Brandon
Nietert	Dessie Anne
Norelli	Alex
Nuttall	Matthew
Ostroff	Jenny
Paul	Eric
Petersen	Andrew
Peterson	Cassidy
Porch	Clay
Ralston	Kellie
Reichert	Marcel
Rios	Adyan
Robbins	Megan
Rutherford	John
Sagarese	Skyler
Salmon	Brandi
Shertzer	Kyle
Shirley	Jody
Siegfried	Kate
Smith	Matthew
Somereve	Jake
Stein	Sarah
Stemle	Adam
Stevens	Molly
Stewart	Jimmy
Takade-Heumacher	Helen
Thompson	Laurilee
Vaughan	Nathan
Wheatley	Thomas
White	Geoff
Williams	John
Williams	Travis
Wilms	Olivia
burgess	Erika
lavine	craig
oden	jeff
scott	sean
zales	robert