

Rankings of SG Stocks

Based on median landings 1999-2008

All Sectors Combined

Primarily state stocks deleted

(based on Comp ACL Preferred Alt)

90% of SG, median 99-08

Count	STOCK	MED LBS	PCT SG	cumulat
1	vermillion snapper	1,687,129	0.12	0.12
2	greater amberjack	1,532,659	0.11	0.22
3	yellowtail snapper	1,269,588	0.09	0.31
4	gag	1,238,667	0.09	0.40
5	black sea bass	1,228,675	0.09	0.48
6	blue runner	953,554	0.07	0.55
7	gray snapper	758,445	0.05	0.60
8	red grouper	695,332	0.05	0.65
9	white grunt	627,306	0.04	0.69
10	gray triggerfish	531,635	0.04	0.73
11	red snapper	526,424	0.04	0.77
12	scamp	475,803	0.03	0.80
13	mutton snapper	461,982	0.03	0.83
14	golden tilefish	369,284	0.03	0.86
15	snowy grouper	324,947	0.02	0.88
16	atlantic spadefish	231,056	0.02	0.90

Top 90% Factoids

- 16 Stocks
- 10 currently assessed through SEDAR
- Smallest median landings in the group over 200,000 pounds, 2% of the total
- Top 5 are all assessed and represent 50% of the total landings

Down to 20,000 pounds/Year

Count	STOCK	MED LBS	PCT SG	Cumlat
17	almaco jack	219,911	0.02	0.91
18	black grouper	194,986	0.01	0.93
19	red porgy	160,259	0.01	0.94
20	blueline tilefish	154,209	0.01	0.95
21	hogfish	127,746	0.01	0.96
22	lane snapper	114,395	0.01	0.96
23	banded rudderfish	113,080	0.01	0.97
24	tomtate	64,454	0.00	0.98
25	knobbed porgy	45,428	0.00	0.98
26	jolthead porgy	33,424	0.00	0.98
27	rock hind	31,782	0.00	0.98
28	yellowedge grouper	29,034	0.00	0.99
29	silk snapper	25,177	0.00	0.99
30	red hind	22,924	0.00	0.99
31	whitebone porgy	21,738	0.00	0.99
32	cubera snapper	20,574	0.00	0.99

Down to 20,000

- 20,000 is the current preferred (note the years are different here. This uses the same years as used for ABC of unassessed stocks.)
- 16 additional stocks
- Only 3 assessed stocks
- Assessed stocks all have landings > 150,000
- 24 stocks with landings over 100,000 pounds, representing 97% of the total

The remainders

- warsaw grouper, speckled hind, nassau grouper, goliath grouper, wreckfish
- All special circumstances
- Adds another 5 stocks to the FMU
- Considerable assessment challenges due to restrictive regulations.
- Catch based assessment methods unlikely to succeed