

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2  
3 GULF SEDAR COMMITTEE

4  
5 Hilton Clearwater Beach Resort Clearwater Beach, Florida

6  
7 June 20, 2016

8  
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
- 11 Pamela Dana.....Florida
- 12 John Greene.....Alabama
- 13 Campo Matens.....Louisiana

14  
15 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 16 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 17 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 18 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- 19 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 20 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 21 Myron Fischer (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
- 22 Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- 23 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- 24 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 25 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 26 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 27 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 28 David Walker.....Alabama
- 29 Roy Williams.....Florida

30  
31 **STAFF**

- 32 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- 33 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist - Statistician
- 34 Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
- 35 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
- 36 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 37 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 38 Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
- 39 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner/Travel Coordinator
- 40 Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
- 41 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 42 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 43 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research and Human Resource Librarian
- 44 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

45  
46 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 47 Patrick Banks.....LA
- 48 Luiz Barbieri.....GMFMC SSC

1 Jeff Barger.....Ocean Conservancy, Austin, TX  
2 Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC  
3 Randall Bibler.....FWC DLE  
4 Chris Blankenship.....AL  
5 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS  
6 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL  
7 Jim Clements.....Carrabelle, FL  
8 Lee Crockett.....Pew Charitable Trusts  
9 Jocelyn D'Ambrosio.....NOAA GC  
10 Martin Fisher.....St. Petersburg, FL  
11 Matthew Freeman.....FWC DLE  
12 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS  
13 Chad Hanson.....Pew Charitable Trusts  
14 Frank Helies.....Tampa, FL  
15 Representative David Jolly.....FL  
16 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA  
17 Michael Kelly.....CLS America  
18 Benny Gallaway.....LGL, TX  
19 Mike Larkin.....NMFS  
20 Rich Malinowski.....NMFS  
21 Sharon McBreen.....Pew Charitable Trusts, Orlando, FL  
22 Jack McGovern.....NMFS  
23 C. Melancon.....Baton Rouge, LA  
24 Cynthia Meyer.....NOAA  
25 Daniel Padron.....Key West, FL  
26 Todd Phillips.....Ocean Conservancy, Austin, TX  
27 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC  
28 Lance Robinson.....TX  
29 Sunny Snider.....NMFS  
30 Jessica Stephen.....NMFS  
31 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS  
32 Michael Travis.....NMFS  
33 Tom Wheatley.....Pew Charitable Trusts, Tampa, FL  
34 Marlon White.....NOAA/NMFS, St. Petersburg, FL  
35 Roger Young.....FWC DLE  
36  
37 - - -  
38

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....3  
4  
5 Table of Motions.....4  
6  
7 Adoption of Agenda.....5  
8  
9 Approval of Minutes.....5  
10  
11 Action Guide and Next Steps.....5  
12  
13 SEDAR Steering Committee Review.....5  
14  
15 SSC Review of SEDAR Research Track Assessment Proposal.....11  
16  
17 Comments by Representative Jolly.....13  
18  
19 SEDAR Schedule Review.....16  
20  
21 Adjournment.....26  
22  
23 - - -  
24

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

PAGE 21: Motion to move the gray triggerfish assessment to 2017 and move the gray snapper assessment back to starting in 2018. The motion carried on page 25.

PAGE 26: Motion to draft a letter to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center requesting that the fall plankton larval survey samples from the U.S. Gulf of Mexico for Calendar Year 2008 forward be processed in time for the next gray triggerfish assessment, to be scheduled in 2017. The motion carried on page 26.

- - -

1 The Gulf SEDAR Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at the Hilton Clearwater Beach  
3 Resort, Clearwater Beach, Florida, Monday morning, June 20,  
4 2016, and was called to order at 10:50 a.m. by Chairman Kevin  
5 Anson.

6  
7 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
8 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
9 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON:** Let's go ahead and we're going to start  
12 the SEDAR Committee. Members on the SEDAR Committee include  
13 myself, Dr. Pam Dana, Mr. Camp Matens, and Mr. Johnny Greene.  
14 Everyone is present, except for I don't see Camp.

15  
16 The first order of business on the agenda is the Adoption of the  
17 Agenda. Before we do that, I just want to point out that  
18 Representative Jolly from Florida is expected here before we  
19 break, and, when he comes, we're going to go ahead and allow him  
20 to address the council, and so that will occur during the  
21 agenda, and so I just wanted to let everyone know that. Besides  
22 that though, is there any -- Does anyone want to move to approve  
23 the agenda or is there any changes to the agenda?

24  
25 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** So moved.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Move to approve and it's been seconded. Any  
28 objections to approving the agenda? With no objections, we will  
29 go to Approval of the Minutes. Is there a motion to approve the  
30 minutes or are there any changes that need to be made to the  
31 previous meeting's minutes? Do you want to make a motion, Mr.  
32 Greene?

33  
34 **MR. GREENE:** Motion to approve.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion to approve and it's seconded  
37 by Dr. Dana. Any objection to approving the minutes? Seeing  
38 none, the minutes are approved. Action Guide and Next Steps,  
39 it's Tab Number I-3, and so we have our two agenda items here  
40 that are highlighted, and there is a short description of what  
41 our goals are here with those agenda items, for your review.  
42 Next is Item Number IV, SEDAR Steering Committee Review, and Mr.  
43 Gregory.

44  
45 **SEDAR STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW**

46  
47 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am  
48 just going to give a brief overview of the review and some other

1 comments of things we learned at our Council Coordination  
2 Committee Meeting last month. The full summary report is in the  
3 briefing book. This is the conclusions of the May 2016 SEDAR  
4 webinar. Item 1 is the SEDAR Committee supported the Best  
5 Practices Panel recommendation for a multispecies stock ID  
6 workshop in 2017. Stocks to be included or considered to be  
7 included are cobia, lane snapper, and scamp. We're going to do  
8 something similar with gray snapper as part of their benchmark  
9 assessment. There is evidence that there is multiple stocks of  
10 gray snapper in the Gulf of Mexico.

11  
12 The panel also recommended holding a broader procedural workshop  
13 on reference points, which would include the topic of  
14 reproductive inputs. The panel also recommended two additional  
15 procedural workshop topics to be considered in the future, the  
16 Gulf of Mexico shrimp bycatch estimation and data-limited method  
17 improvements for best practices.

18  
19 Each council is asked -- This is something that we might need  
20 some action on. Each council is asked to report to the Steering  
21 Committee in October on its progress in reviewing and applying  
22 the prioritization tool. At this point, the Gulf Council's  
23 position has been, and it's been what I've been pushing, is to  
24 request that the Southeast Fisheries Center draft the initial  
25 factors and weighting factors for consideration by our SSC,  
26 rather than having our SSC develop them from scratch. My main  
27 concern has been the amount of time that it would take to do  
28 that.

29  
30 The South Atlantic SSC is planning, however, to develop the  
31 factors and weightings on their own, and so we can see how well  
32 that goes. At the CCC meeting, the Pacific Fishery Management  
33 Council announced that they did their prioritization with the  
34 SSC, but it was very time consuming. Therein, it reinforces my  
35 concern.

36  
37 Although the councils have been told -- Now here is another  
38 point that is important, and I don't know how it's going to  
39 operate here in the Southeast. The councils have been told that  
40 we are not required to use the prioritization tool exclusively  
41 when determining which stocks to assess, but rather it's one of  
42 the tools that we use in setting our recommendations to the  
43 SEDAR Committee.

44  
45 However, it was noted at the Council Coordinating Committee  
46 Meeting that one of the centers in the country was indicating to  
47 the councils that they would only follow the prioritization  
48 results in doing assessment scheduling. If that were to occur

1 here in the Southeast, then the councils and the Steering  
2 Committee would have less input into the stock assessment  
3 scheduling, and so that's just a red flag for us to be aware of,  
4 that, even though we were told we still have flexibility, in  
5 some regions it's being interpreted otherwise.

6  
7 The Gulf SSC recently received a presentation on the research  
8 track proposal at their June meeting, and Luiz is going to give  
9 a brief summary of that. Overall, the process was viewed  
10 favorably by the SSC, as long as it did not result in fewer  
11 assessments.

12  
13 The first test application of the research track approach is  
14 planned for the Gulf of Mexico/South Atlantic scamp assessment  
15 beginning in 2018. The council may wish to request adding  
16 yellowmouth grouper to that assessment, due to the problem of  
17 species identification between the two species.

18  
19 Also, the potential priority stocks for MRIP revision  
20 assessments in the Gulf of Mexico were identified as gray  
21 triggerfish, greater amberjack, gag, red snapper, red grouper,  
22 king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, and vermilion snapper.

23  
24 The Steering Committee, lastly, discussed having a Gulf and  
25 South Atlantic king mackerel assessment in 2018, including data  
26 and input from Mexico, as part of, I think, the large ecosystem  
27 assessment that was discussed with this council previously by  
28 Dr. Ponwith. The assessment will be conducted by the ICCAT  
29 Highly Migratory Team at the Southeast Fisheries Center Miami  
30 Lab. That concludes my summary of our SEDAR webinar.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Doug. Do any committee members have  
33 any questions for Doug? Doug, I have a couple for you. First  
34 is this comment in your report regarding adding yellowmouth  
35 grouper to the assessment. I know we've kind of set the  
36 schedule or will be setting the schedule here, and so my sense  
37 is that it wouldn't be difficult to add yellowmouth, because it  
38 has relatively low landings throughout the Gulf, and so it could  
39 be quite easy to accommodate that. Is that what you get the  
40 sense for, and maybe Ryan can answer that.

41  
42 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** One question would be for the  
43 Center, I guess, and Dr. Ponwith. Given the species ID problem,  
44 would it be worthwhile to add those to the stock ID and  
45 meristics workshop before trying to do a benchmark or research  
46 cycle on them? I do think the landings of yellowmouth are  
47 relatively small, and I have heard fishermen talk about species  
48 ID being a difficult issue.

1  
2 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Certainly if there are any concerns about  
3 the quality of the data and that the data evolve over the time  
4 series, understanding that evolution is crucial to getting a  
5 sound assessment out of that. One approach to doing that is to  
6 include it in the stock ID.

7  
8 I am unsure whether it's best to treat this as a stock  
9 identification, which is typically you have this population and  
10 is it one stock or two stocks is the real question, or whether  
11 that is a data workshop question, but, regardless of what  
12 approach you took, getting clarity on that before you begin an  
13 assessment would be pretty crucial.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Do we need to make a formal request that they  
16 be added then, if that's a perceived issue? Do you agree with  
17 that, for the stock ID?

18  
19 **DR. PONWITH:** I think that that's smart. The stock ID may not  
20 be the best venue. It may be. I think what it's going to do is  
21 take some probing of the data to answer that question, and so,  
22 as a placeholder, including it in that discussion I think would  
23 be useful.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ryan.

26  
27 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actual delineation  
28 of where certain yellowmouth populations occur isn't something  
29 that has been the primary concern for the SEDAR 49 data-poor  
30 effort, which is looking at yellowmouth. It's been that there's  
31 a lot of -- There are many issues with identification,  
32 recreationally and commercially, with properly identifying  
33 yellowmouth, and they tend to occur in a lot of the same places  
34 that scamp do.

35  
36 Of course, yellowmouth are a shallow-water grouper, and scamp  
37 can be shallow-water or deepwater, but addressing it as more of  
38 a complex was one of the things that was discussed during one of  
39 the SEDAR 49 webinars, and so it might be worth investigating  
40 adding yellowmouth to scamp, because, in a research-track-style  
41 approach, everything like that could be looked at, and it would  
42 be a good venue for it, and that's why we brought it up to you  
43 guys.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. I would concur with that. The next  
46 thing I had regarding your report, Doug, was on the request from  
47 the Steering Committee to provide some progress in reviewing and  
48 applying the prioritization tool that you briefly summarized,



1 but we had, at the last meeting, a more thorough description.

2  
3 You have kind of given a summary of what other councils are  
4 doing, and I kind of would go in with what the general feeling  
5 is of the other councils in regards to a strict adherence to  
6 this tool or to just kind of use it to help guide our decision  
7 making process as one more piece of information.

8  
9 That's kind of the way I would look at it, but certainly other  
10 committee members, if they have any other discussion -- If  
11 you're looking for we've got to get an answer by October, and so  
12 we might have one more meeting to discuss it, and so I don't  
13 know if you need more discussion now, as a primer for the next  
14 meeting, to make a final decision.

15  
16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** If I may, I think this might be the  
17 first that Dr. Ponwith has heard of this, and so I think it's  
18 something for us to discuss at the Steering Committee meeting.  
19 If indeed this is going to become a general NMFS policy and not  
20 just the interpretation of somebody at one center, then it is  
21 something that we need to discuss in more detail and have a  
22 letter of statement or comment, but, right now, I don't know how  
23 prevalent that approach is.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Ponwith.

26  
27 **DR. PONWITH:** The tool is really valuable, because what it does  
28 is it essentially codifies a lot of the same process this  
29 council and your SSC goes through in deliberating on what stocks  
30 should bubble up next. Instead of having it be kind of an ad  
31 hoc or gestalt approach to what is the suite of stocks we want  
32 to put on the schedule, it actually creates a mechanism to  
33 document what are the considerations you want to evaluate in  
34 making those decisions and how do you weight those  
35 considerations against one another, and so it makes that process  
36 more transparent.

37  
38 I hear loud and clear that the goal is to have the Science  
39 Center create the first version of the factors and the  
40 weightings of those factors for the SSC to respond to, but then,  
41 once that tool is parameterized, the expectation is that the  
42 output of that tool really does guide the decision making  
43 process.

44  
45 Now, in my mind, it doesn't handcuff the council. In other  
46 words, if the output says you do this, you are obligated by  
47 policy to do this, but there would be an expectation that if the  
48 council chose to depart from the output of the tool that they

1 worked on to parameterize that there would be a logic behind it,  
2 and so you never want to cede your authority to essentially a  
3 machine that you created, but you also want to respect the fact  
4 that you created that tool, you created that machine, to help  
5 guide your process.

6  
7 My view on this is that, if you depart from the results that the  
8 tool creates, once it's up and running and running in a way that  
9 you're comfortable with, a rationale for why gives you that  
10 continued sense of transparency, documents why you chose to  
11 depart from those results, and creates a record for that  
12 decision. In my mind, yes, there is going to be an expectation  
13 that we abide by it, but we are not dominated by it.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I can understand that perspective or thought  
16 process regarding that tool, and just I guess my -- Well, you  
17 gave us an out, if you will, if we felt like the tool wasn't  
18 providing us the output for the direction of assessments that we  
19 would be doing, particularly as it relates to let's say, for  
20 instance, gray triggerfish.

21  
22 We had this hiccup with gray triggerfish, and, depending upon  
23 the weights and everything of the different determining factors  
24 that would be in there, you might change a couple or two or  
25 three numbers for gray triggerfish, based on its situation that  
26 we're in of the rebuilding time period and we need to act more  
27 quickly, in regards to setting up a new rebuilding plan and  
28 such, and whether or not just using the tool would bump up that  
29 triggerfish up to a level that would basically meet the next  
30 assessment schedule is my fear, I guess.

31  
32 Having the ability then to say, okay, we have triggerfish, and  
33 we know all the problems with triggerfish now and we have these  
34 timelines and everything, and that would be enough rationale to  
35 go ahead and alter the schedule then of the output for the other  
36 species is my biggest concern.

37  
38 As long as we did have that ability to change, with some  
39 rationale, some legitimate rationale, that would be just my main  
40 concern. Anyone else have any comments or questions regarding  
41 that topic or anything else? Anything else on Doug's report  
42 that you had any questions about?

43  
44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Luiz will do the SSC.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Next, we have Item Number V, which  
47 will be the SSC Review of SEDAR Research Track Assessment  
48 Proposal. Dr. Barbieri, you're up for that?

1  
2           **SSC REVIEW OF SEDAR RESEARCH TRACK ASSESSMENT PROPOSAL**  
3

4 **DR. LUIZ BARBIERI:** I sure am, Mr. Chairman. I don't have an  
5 actual formal presentation. This is going to be pretty quick,  
6 and Mr. Gregory already went over the main points. The SSC,  
7 overall, liked the approach and was supportive of the research  
8 versus operational assessment track process for SEDAR, but they  
9 had some concerns and made some recommendations that I am going  
10 to summarize here.

11  
12 One was a concern. It was whether a transition to the new  
13 process would disrupt the timeliness of current assessments.  
14 Dr. Clay Porch, who came to the SSC meeting and gave us a  
15 presentation, summary presentation, on this, clarified that, no,  
16 because the schedule is going to be set up in a way that those  
17 research and operational assessments would be lined up and  
18 scheduled in a way that there wouldn't be any interruption of  
19 the current schedule.

20  
21 Actually, we are going to have an improvement in throughput that  
22 should increase the number of assessments that are going to come  
23 before the SSC and address council management needs, but the  
24 committee still had a bit of a concern about the role, or a lack  
25 of clarification at this point about the role, that the SSC is  
26 playing in both conducting the assessments and reviewing the  
27 assessments.

28  
29 The presentation that Dr. Porch presented was very thorough, but  
30 we felt that not having an actual summary document, a report, a  
31 SOPPs, so to speak, that would outline all of those parameters  
32 explicitly would be difficult for us to really evaluate properly  
33 how SSC participation might be integrated into this new process.  
34 The SSC is very interested, continues to be very interested, in  
35 participating very closely in the SEDAR process, and we would  
36 like to have the opportunity to be more involved in this  
37 research track, as currently presented.

38  
39 Another concern was the stakeholder input or feedback on the  
40 process. The committee had questions, and they wanted to make  
41 sure that there was clear understanding by industry and other  
42 stakeholders, to make sure that they were satisfied with the  
43 level of transparency in the actual operational conduct of these  
44 assessments.

45  
46 Finally, the committee suggested, and I don't know if this is a  
47 realistic suggestion or not, but the committee felt that perhaps  
48 we could have an implementation, pilot implementation, to test

1 the next few assessments coming under those two tracks and to  
2 see whether there will be adjustments, course corrections, that  
3 needed to be made at that point. That way, we could review  
4 those and provide some recommendations for improvements.

5  
6 Overall, the committee was very supportive and saw the  
7 advantages of these two tracks, and, actually, we approved,  
8 overwhelmingly, a motion in support of the concept of SEDAR  
9 stock assessments having this research and the operational  
10 components. That completes my report, Mr. Chairman. If there  
11 are any questions from the committee, I would be glad to address  
12 them.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Does anyone have any questions? Dr. Ponwith.

15  
16 **DR. PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a follow-on. I  
17 appreciate the careful consideration. Any time we make a change  
18 to the procedures we use for stock assessments, these are high-  
19 stakes decisions, and so I really appreciate the care that's  
20 being taken by the SSC in deliberating on this change.

21  
22 The reason that the Center didn't arrive with a set of SOPPs in  
23 hand was essentially that it was intended to be presented as a  
24 concept to the councils and to the SSCs as a proposed approach  
25 that we think is an improvement, and the notion is that, if the  
26 councils and the SSCs embrace the concept, we would actually  
27 work collectively, via the SEDAR Steering Committee, with heavy  
28 input from the SSC, to develop those SOPPs. Essentially, once  
29 the concept is embraced, you would be helping to be architects  
30 of the SOPPs, to make sure that they address all of your biggest  
31 concerns.

32  
33 In terms of the notion of conducting a research track as a  
34 pilot, to see how it goes, I have no difficulty with that at  
35 all, and the sense is those research track assessments or  
36 research track evaluations would be highly collaborative. We  
37 would still have a terms of reference. We would have a  
38 beginning date and an end date, but the beauty of it is it  
39 breaks off that end deliverable, unlike a benchmark stock  
40 assessment, where the last step in the process is the  
41 deliverable. Here is your stock assessment.

42  
43 It is getting you to the point where the decisions that are  
44 required to get a stock assessment done are made, and, at that  
45 point, all those decisions are made in an open forum, so the  
46 public can watch that happening, and so the SSC panelists who  
47 are selected to be participants are fully engaged. All those  
48 decisions are made, and then all that's left is to execute those

1 decisions, which sounds exactly like an update stock assessment.

2  
3 Essentially, at that point, by dissociating those two things,  
4 get those decisions made and hand that report through a peer  
5 review process and make sure the decisions are sound. Then, at  
6 that point, it's just a matter of executing those decisions.  
7 Again, I like the concept myself. I am not troubled by moving  
8 slowly on this, to make sure that we're considering this and  
9 getting it right, by treating this first one as a pilot.

10  
11 I believe that the first one we've selected is one that's  
12 germane to both the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and so it would  
13 be joint. This is very attractive to me, again, because then it  
14 tackles some of the challenges we've had with why do you do it  
15 this way here and that way there, and I think it's a valuable  
16 experiment for us to engage in.

17  
18 **DR. BARBIERI:** Yes, and thank you for that, Dr. Ponwith. I mean  
19 I think it was very reassuring to hear your points on this, and,  
20 of course, during the meeting, the SSC discussed this and tried  
21 to get some of these clarifications and got some good  
22 information from Dr. Porch. Given your comments, I can say,  
23 unequivocally, that the committee is very supportive of this  
24 concept and we would be glad to work with the Center in  
25 developing those SOPPs and beefing up the structure of this  
26 process going forward.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Dr. Barbieri, and thank you, Dr.  
29 Ponwith, for kind of clarifying that path forward, if you will,  
30 and realizing that there is kind of a growing-up period, I  
31 guess, for the first couple, at least, to maybe work out the  
32 kinks and come up with a more fine-tuned way or process for  
33 subsequent assessments through the research track, and so thank  
34 you very much.

35  
36 I mentioned earlier that we would have Representative Jolly from  
37 Florida come and talk to us a little bit, and he is here, and so  
38 we're going ahead and we're going to postpone or suspend the  
39 SEDAR Committee meeting. Representative Jolly, welcome.

40  
41 **COMMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVE JOLLY**

42  
43 **REPRESENTATIVE DAVID JOLLY:** Thank you very much. First,  
44 welcome. Thank you for having me attend the meeting. Thank you  
45 for the opportunity to be here, but thank you for having the  
46 council meeting in Clearwater Beach. A lot of folks didn't have  
47 to travel as far for this one, and you understand the  
48 significance of the industry, both for-hire and commercial and

1 recreational, to the quality of life and the economy here and  
2 the balance between those two.

3

4 I just appreciate the opportunity to be home. Some of you may  
5 have seen that I'm not making friends in D.C. these days, and so  
6 it's nice to be home this week. My wife and I are here, and she  
7 joined me for today, but, when it comes to counting fish, she  
8 decided she would leave that to you all and a little bit to me.

9

10 I always tell the story about Laura. We have only been in  
11 office about two-and-a-half or three years, and I kind of take  
12 the position of members of Congress need to sometimes recognize  
13 that they don't have all the answers, but, as a community, we  
14 do. Who knows best the impact of regulations and of decision  
15 making of Congress when it comes to Magnuson-Stevens or  
16 regulations or you name it on industry and on quality of life,  
17 on commercial, on recreational, on for-hire? You all do. The  
18 folks throughout this community do.

19

20 Obviously you all bring the expertise, the background, the  
21 academic expertise, but then also we see the impact on the  
22 waters, from the folks who go out every day, either making a  
23 living or just enjoying what Florida offers out on the water,  
24 and so I appreciate the opportunity to work with you all. What  
25 I have tried to do, and I want to thank publicly -- Some of you  
26 are well aware of this. You have attended some of the  
27 congressional council meetings we have, different form the  
28 formal council.

29

30 When I first got elected, I asked the three different sectors,  
31 if you will, to join me in a congressional council to advise me  
32 on policies that we could build consensus around, and you all  
33 have some hard decisions to make, when it comes to stock  
34 assessment, to management, to species management. Trust me, I  
35 understand the complexity of the decision making you all have to  
36 do, and I appreciate the responsibility that you bring to it,  
37 and I thank you for that.

38

39 What I have tried to do with my congressional council is kind  
40 of, first, learn, be made smarter on the issues. As a member of  
41 Congress, it doesn't come from industry or the academia  
42 background that you do, but also to try to build and coalesce  
43 around a consensus position, which has led us down the road to  
44 additional data collection and resources through the Congress  
45 and working together with the agency, with industry, with  
46 recreational, to figure out how can we continue to evolve and  
47 improve and put additional resources towards new data collection  
48 opportunities.

1  
2 I realize we are never going to have complete consensus, but, to  
3 the extent that we can continue to build consensus around some  
4 new data collection, I think we're making progress among the  
5 sectors, and hopefully, at the end of the day, allowing for more  
6 days on the recreational and more fish to catch for commercial,  
7 in a responsible way that looks towards species and stock  
8 management. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you today.  
9 I thank you for working with me and making me smarter.

10  
11 If I were to provide any legislative update, very briefly, it  
12 would be this. I don't believe we will see reauthorization of  
13 Magnuson by the end of the calendar year. I just think, between  
14 the congressional calendar and some of the substantive issues  
15 that are still outstanding between the House and the Senate, I  
16 don't see Magnuson being reauthorized this year. Frankly, I  
17 will be happy if we can keep the government open this year.

18  
19 That's not to mean that it's not being worked on, but you all  
20 know kind of some of the finer points of where the differences  
21 are. Some folks have made the case not to even reauthorize it  
22 or make any changes and just keep it in place exactly as it is.  
23 As it has been opened up, on the House side, it has created a  
24 few divisions, and I just don't think we're going to see much of  
25 a movement on that.

26  
27 The only window where you might see it would be sometime in the  
28 fourth quarter of the calendar year. You might see an effort to  
29 revive consideration of it, but I just -- I would put it  
30 somewhere at 70/30 unlikely that we're going to see it move.  
31 Congress is only in session for about another three or four  
32 weeks before we break for July for the national conventions of  
33 each party and then the August district work period. We are  
34 back in about three weeks in September and then out all of  
35 October, leading into the November Election Day, and then you  
36 will be in a lame duck session, where very little substantive  
37 work is done, other than hopefully a wrap-up of some of the  
38 budget.

39  
40 For those of you affiliated with federal agencies, I do think we  
41 will be able to satisfy some of the budget requirements,  
42 particularly in the science and oceans areas, NOAA and other  
43 agencies, likely before the end of the calendar year. We might  
44 even see it a little bit sooner, and so I don't think we will  
45 face a real cliffhanger, and the one question would be following  
46 the Presidential election, if things get pushed to January or  
47 February. I am of the position, and will continue to advocate,  
48 to get a budget done by October 1, so that agencies can

1 effectively manage their resources.

2  
3 That is about it, in terms of a legislative update, simply  
4 because it's a political election year for a Presidential  
5 candidate. Most of the focus will be on there, and you will see  
6 Congress just attending to kind of the routine order of  
7 business, but, again, on Magnuson, I don't see it moving this  
8 year.

9  
10 With that, if there are any questions of me or if there is any  
11 comments, interest, concerns, criticisms, certainly I would be  
12 open to any of those today. Thank you for the opportunity for  
13 me to be here and any questions or thoughts, I would love to  
14 have them.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any questions for Representative Jolly? There  
17 doesn't appear to be any.

18  
19 **REPRESENTATIVE JOLLY:** With that, I apologize that you're  
20 indoors. It's a beautiful day outside on the beach. In fact,  
21 that's why my wife didn't make it all the way in here. She  
22 stopped out on the sand there.

23  
24 Thank you, all, and I truly mean it. I understand the headwinds  
25 you often face and the politics of stock management, and I know  
26 we don't always agree and sometimes we agree, but I appreciate  
27 the collaborative spirit. I know you put your heart, soul, and  
28 careers into this, and so thank you for what you're doing to  
29 make sure the economy and quality of life for the entire Gulf  
30 region, but particularly right in Florida and Pinellas County,  
31 continues to make it one of the greatest places any of us call  
32 home. Thank you all very much.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Representative Jolly. We will get  
35 back into the SEDAR Committee. That will take us -- We  
36 completed Item Number V, and we will go Item Number VI, the  
37 SEDAR Schedule Review, and Mr. Rindone.

38  
39 **SEDAR SCHEDULE REVIEW**

40  
41 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will start at the top  
42 and just give you guys an update of where some things stand.  
43 The vermilion snapper standard assessment is going to be  
44 delivered to the SSC, and they will be reviewing that. The gag  
45 and amberjack updates, they are scheduled to be completed by the  
46 year's end, maybe early 2017, and those are both underway.

47  
48 The data-poor assessment is SEDAR 49. I spoke of it just a



1 little bit before, and we had the data workshop and the post-  
2 data workshop webinar, discussing kind of where things stood,  
3 and the panel is optimistic about being able to produce quality  
4 assessments that will yield management advice for red drum, lane  
5 snapper, speckled hind, and snowy grouper.

6  
7 Yellowmouth grouper, we discussed that a little bit, that it  
8 might be best to roll that into the research track with scamp,  
9 to try to address some of the other outstanding issues with  
10 actual identification between scamp and yellowmouth and maybe  
11 looking at them as a complex.

12  
13 However, almaco jack, lesser amberjack, and wenchman are truly  
14 data poor, and the panel is not optimistic about those  
15 particular species, the efforts for those particular species,  
16 resulting in assessments that will be able to tell us anything.  
17 The landings are low and there is very little life history data,  
18 especially for wenchman. There was only one study and only a  
19 handful of fish collected. The panel didn't vote to stop work  
20 on those yet, but it is certainly being considered.

21  
22 The black grouper assessment by the FWC will begin this winter,  
23 and the goliath grouper assessment wrapped up with a review  
24 workshop in St. Petersburg in May, and that assessment report is  
25 actually completed, and it's available on the SEDAR website.  
26 The SSC will receive a review on it, but the short story is that  
27 the assessment was not recommended for management. Stop me at  
28 any point if you have a question or comment or something to that  
29 effect.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We do have a question from Mr. Diaz.

32  
33 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not on your  
34 committee, but, Ryan, I just heard you say that there's I think  
35 you said about three species that it doesn't look like there's  
36 going to be enough data to do anything on those data-poor  
37 assessments, and I do remember, when we talked about that, we  
38 were trying to -- Because data-poor was less labor intensive, we  
39 were trying to get enough species in there where we could get  
40 some species with stock assessments that we don't have. Is it  
41 too late to replace those with some other species that might  
42 have enough data at this point?

43  
44 **MR. RINDONE:** I think, for this particular round, yes, but I  
45 would encourage you guys to consider perhaps repeating this kind  
46 of effort with a new set of species, maybe in a few years.  
47 Then, that way, we can try and work through the species that we  
48 manage, perhaps, and then make at least an attempt on all of

1 them to have something on the books, but, for some of them, we  
2 just don't catch that many of them and the independent sampling  
3 that we have is extremely sparse, in some cases, and in others  
4 it's completely absent. Some of them just won't be tenable.

5  
6 **MR. DIAZ:** I understand that, and if we do decide to make a new  
7 effort like this, it would probably be good if there was a  
8 little bit of work done and let us know what were good  
9 candidates to put into it, where we don't do another round of  
10 this where we actually get stuff in the hopper that is not going  
11 to produce any results. If we happen to do that, probably ahead  
12 of time, we need to get that information, so we don't lose some  
13 opportunities. Thank you.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Ponwith, to that point?

16  
17 **DR. PONWITH:** Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chair. It's exactly to  
18 that point, and I appreciate that point. The whole notion of  
19 data poor is almost ironic. This is too data poor to use for  
20 data poor, but the notion about data poor is this. Right now,  
21 for stocks that are unassessed, to meet the provisions of the  
22 Act, of having ACLs in place for all managed stocks, we have  
23 used landings history.

24  
25 The notion of data poor is there may be some cases where we  
26 actually have enough data to do better than just some landings  
27 history with a buffer for uncertainty, and so that was the  
28 criteria for selecting these stocks, and the actual process of  
29 scoping the data for these stocks would yield the answer of do  
30 we or do we not have enough data to do something that's better  
31 than simply the landings history.

32  
33 I think you're really smart, and that is we should be gauging  
34 the remaining unassessed stocks for whether there are some  
35 additional candidates that are appropriate for the next round of  
36 data-limited assessments, and I think that would be a reasonable  
37 assignment for the Center to start that work, even as we are  
38 working on this round of data-limited assessments, because I  
39 think that that certainly brings a lot more scientific weight to  
40 the process for those stocks where we have enough data to do  
41 something more than landings history. Thank you.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Lucas.

44  
45 **DR. KELLY LUCAS:** This is not exactly to the point, but I did  
46 want to -- Before Ryan went down the list a little more, I  
47 wanted to I think say this now, before he gets there. I  
48 appreciate all the work on the research track. I think it's

1 great that we're working to find a solution that meets the needs  
2 of the Southeast Science Center and aims at getting the council  
3 more stock assessments.

4  
5 Earlier today, we talked a lot about intent and showing the  
6 council's intent and talking about intent and getting notice of  
7 Congress, and it was great to have Representative Jolly speak,  
8 because they are listening to us.

9  
10 I am wondering, as we look at this list, and we have talked a  
11 lot about getting more stock assessments done, if maybe we  
12 shouldn't try to put more stock assessments in the queue, like  
13 under these years. You know, we might not be able to achieve  
14 it, because of money or because of staff or whatever, but it  
15 shows our intent. It shows what we're trying to achieve,  
16 instead of continuously just talking about we know we need more  
17 stock assessments.

18  
19 Let's show our intent. Let's show that we want more stock  
20 assessments, and when Bonnie and them have to push back and be  
21 like, we don't have the money and we don't have the staff, we're  
22 showing it to them. We are telling Congress right there what we  
23 need. We need more money for these stock assessments, because  
24 we need more and better stock assessments.

25  
26 I appreciate that the research track is going to try to get us  
27 there, but I am just wondering, from the council as a whole, if  
28 we don't want to start putting it in there, putting those on the  
29 list, just to show our intent.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** That's a good point, Dr. Lucas, and another way  
32 of looking at it and trying to highlight some of the  
33 frustrations we have with lack of resources, not necessarily due  
34 to the Science Center's fault, but, as you said, it may be the  
35 message would be received a little bit differently if it were  
36 put in that context, and so that's an interesting point. Dr.  
37 Ponwith.

38  
39 **DR. PONWITH:** I'm a big fan. Let me say that I always find it  
40 more valuable to have a list of assessments ranked one to X from  
41 the council than a here are the three assessments we would like  
42 this year if we can get three.

43  
44 The reason is because having that one to X list creates that  
45 intent. This is how much work needs to be done, and this is how  
46 much we're able to chip away at this year, but it also has a  
47 second value, and that is, if we end up, through some means,  
48 acquiring additional help, like a post-doc or contract resources

1 that are available in one year that would enable us to bring an  
2 extra set of hands on for one year, we have that one to X list  
3 and we know what's next in line. I think that that's a very  
4 worthwhile approach, and I would encourage the council to take  
5 that approach.

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Just to be clear, you mentioned having the one  
8 to X and then a year associated, and so we would have four to  
9 five species, I think, put on that list for next year, let's  
10 say, and there would be additional species beyond that, to X,  
11 but at least we would have five identified, and you may only  
12 have staff and resources available and budget available for  
13 three, but we have five for 2017, let's say.

14  
15 **DR. PONWITH:** Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the notion. The  
16 challenge that that creates is a requirement for an iterative  
17 process for scheduling, because if you put in a list of one to X  
18 candidates and you put in seven species, and it turns out the  
19 resources are available to be able to do four of those, then you  
20 also are scheduling the out years, and you need to figure out  
21 what the repercussions of those three that didn't make the list  
22 are in the out years, but we're smart people. I'm confident we  
23 can figure out a way that those don't then fall through the  
24 cracks, but that is one of the challenges of that.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. That might be coming up then in  
27 some future discussions, but I guess let's go ahead and continue  
28 on with -- Mr. Rindone, do you want to continue with your  
29 summary?

30  
31 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure can. For 2017, we have scheduled MRIP  
32 calibration updates in this order of priority: gray triggerfish,  
33 gag, amberjack, red snapper, red grouper, kingfish, Spanish, and  
34 vermilion. These will be updates to the recreational MRIP  
35 indices for those particular species and that's it. They're not  
36 full-scale updates like we usually talk about.

37  
38 A note on this is that we don't have to do all of these species  
39 if you guys don't want to. If you wanted to free up some time  
40 to maybe do another update or standard assessment, instead of  
41 doing all these calibration updates, that's an option that's  
42 available to you, or, if it's more important to update the  
43 recreational effort indices for all these species, then leave it  
44 as is.

45  
46 We're also starting a gray snapper benchmark in 2017 and a red  
47 snapper standard assessment, and the FWC will be looking at  
48 yellowtail snapper, and that's going to be a benchmark, because

1 they're going to be putting it into Stock Synthesis from ASAP.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a question from Dr. Ponwith.

4

5 **DR. PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. The MRIP calibration  
6 updates, and, again, the notion is this is not a traditional  
7 update stock assessment. It is merely taking the last  
8 assessment and dropping into it the calibrated recreational data  
9 and rerunning the same model exactly the way it was run before,  
10 to get the output with those data.

11

12 Now, the MRIP calibration team have been meeting to define the  
13 methodology that's going to be used in that process when the  
14 data become available. Those deliberations have been ongoing,  
15 and they are very close to having a report and some  
16 recommendations out. In the process of doing that, they have  
17 run some test analyses.

18

19 Those analyses are going to be enlightening in terms of how  
20 short or long the calibration list is, which is my opportunity  
21 to say we want to be resilient to that current level of  
22 uncertainty by understanding, if we ended up discovering that  
23 there are fewer species on that list that needed the MRIP  
24 calibration, where it just isn't appropriate or not needed,  
25 because the delta between the two methodologies is so small, it  
26 could create an opportunity to slip another update in there.  
27 Having a discussion of what species you would put in there if  
28 you could would be valuable, in the event that something like  
29 that were to occur.

30

31 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. We will take that into  
32 consideration. Mr. Greene.

33

34 **MR. GREENE:** With that being said and the unique situation we're  
35 in with triggerfish, where we have a ten-year rebuilding goal  
36 and we have some situations with it, I guess I will make a  
37 motion to move gray triggerfish to 2017.

38

39 **DR. DANA:** Second.

40

41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion to move gray triggerfish from  
42 2019 to 2017. It's been seconded by Dr. Dana. Is there any  
43 discussion on the motion? Dr. Ponwith.

44

45 **DR. PONWITH:** The question is as a benchmark in 2017? As a  
46 benchmark, that may be more than could be absorbed in lieu of  
47 one or two of those MRIP calibrations. If it's posed as an  
48 update, and, again, that's something you would want your SSC to

1 weigh in. If you change the timing, does it change the level of  
2 the assessment? If it were posed as an update assessment, then  
3 that is something that would be easier to accommodate.  
4

5 **MR. GREENE:** While I understand your comment, I would think it  
6 would be for a benchmark, and, if there's no way it can be done  
7 in 2017, then it would move to 2018 automatically. I mean we  
8 have a very tough situation with triggerfish. I mean, in my  
9 opinion, and I will come back to it later, but I'm going to just  
10 stick to the motion, but it is my intent to do a benchmark for  
11 gray triggerfish in 2017.  
12

13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other discussion on the motion? Mr.  
14 Swindell.  
15

16 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What does this then  
17 do to the vast amount of work that I see starting up or involved  
18 in 2017? How does it fit into the picture?  
19

20 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mr. Greene.  
21

22 **MR. GREENE:** Well, the way I would envision it is that you have  
23 the list that has been provided to you for the assessments to be  
24 done in 2017, and I would assume that it would be the last  
25 assessment in the list. If they get the MRIP calibration done  
26 and the gray snapper and red snapper stuff done and there is any  
27 remote possibility they can get started on it at that point,  
28 then at that point they should.  
29

30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Ms. Bosarge.  
31

32 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thank you. I am not on your committee, but,  
33 Bonnie, the way I understand this new research versus  
34 operational track system, if you couldn't handle a full  
35 benchmark on gray triggerfish in 2017, would it be possible that  
36 that research track, that it could slip into that, which  
37 essentially my understanding is that what it will do is all the  
38 legwork of a benchmark, going and looking at how you're going to  
39 configure all your different datasets and what's going to go  
40 into the model, so that, when it's time to actually put the data  
41 in, it just falls in and comes out fairly quickly, and is it  
42 possible to put gray triggerfish in that type of slot in 2017,  
43 if you end up with some extra staff time?  
44

45 **DR. PONWITH:** In response to that, the notion right now is to,  
46 per your SSC's advice, is to pilot the research track in using  
47 scamp as sort of the pilot stock, and that would be scamp in  
48 both the Gulf of Mexico and in the South Atlantic. To actually

1 demonstrate the research track with gray triggerfish in 2017  
2 would be essentially, in my view, as onerous as conducting a  
3 benchmark in 2017, because it is doing all that frontend  
4 loading, the public meetings, the data scoping, the decisions  
5 about how to parameterize the model. All of that work is the  
6 equivalent of doing a benchmark, with the exception of the fact  
7 that the assessment itself follows as an update later in time  
8 and is dissociated from that earlier process.

9  
10 In my mind, if fewer calibrations had to happen, and it created  
11 a small amount of scope for some additional work, that scope may  
12 be great enough to be able to accommodate another update. If  
13 Mr. Greene is interested in adding a benchmark stock assessment  
14 for gray trigger in 2017, it may have to come at the expense of  
15 the gray snapper benchmark or of the red snapper standard, to be  
16 able to accommodate that.

17  
18 I can consult with staff, and I would consult with staff to  
19 confirm that, but that is the scope of adding a benchmark into  
20 the assessment. It's not just the assessment staff, but it's  
21 the people that do all the data prep as well.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Martha.

24  
25 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** I am going to support the motion, but also  
26 ask that people talk closer to the microphones. I don't know if  
27 it's the vent over here, but we cannot hear anyone, particularly  
28 in this corner of the room, when you talk.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right, and so we have a motion on the board  
31 to move the gray triggerfish benchmark assessment to 2017. The  
32 question was to you, Mr. Greene, if you want to kind of make a  
33 suggestion as to what to do with the other species or how they  
34 should be identified for shuffling, relative to future years.  
35 Do you have any comments to that?

36  
37 **MR. GREENE:** Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I was going to, after this  
38 motion passes, I was going to move gray snapper back to 2018 and  
39 let it start at that particular point and fill the hole in  
40 accordingly, if that makes sense.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** It makes sense. You know, as we wrap our minds  
43 around what Dr. Lucas was talking about earlier, I don't know  
44 when we want to jump in and kind of make that prioritized list  
45 of ten to twelve species and then putting years associated with  
46 them, but that might be something as well that we might want to  
47 do kind of at the same time. Mr. Rindone.

48

1 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to contribute  
2 a little bit to your timeline discussion here. If it did end up  
3 getting pushed to 2018, I would say there is -- Based on what I  
4 know about the schedule, I would say there is a better chance of  
5 it happening in 2018 as a full-on benchmark or research track,  
6 if the research track method is adopted.

7  
8 Then, in 2017, because you will have gray snapper concluding in  
9 the 2018, very early spring, and then the MRIP calibrations --  
10 You know if you cut some of those off the backend, like let's  
11 say if you were to drop -- I am arbitrarily picking the last  
12 two, Spanish mackerel and vermilion, but that might free up some  
13 time on the backend of that MRIP calibration effort.

14  
15 You have scamp as the big project, perhaps also with yellowmouth  
16 grouper, and then king mackerel is done by the Highly Migratory  
17 Species Group, and so, from an analytical standpoint, it's a  
18 different set of folks that are tasked with that. A lot of the  
19 same data folks are still involved, but it's a different set of  
20 staff that work on some of the pelagics. Your odds are better  
21 in 2018, I would say, than 2017, speaking frankly.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Mr. Greene.

24  
25 **MR. GREENE:** Mr. Rindone, even with pushing gray snapper back to  
26 starting in 2018?

27  
28 **MR. RINDONE:** If you swap them, then that changes everything.  
29 If you leave it as it is, then I still think it could happen in  
30 2018. It's dealer's choice.

31  
32 **MR. GREENE:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to modify my motion to  
33 add the assessment in 2017 and move gray snapper back to  
34 starting in 2018.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Is that your motion as it reads on the board?

37  
38 **MR. GREENE:** Yes, sir. That is correct.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Dana, do you second still? Okay. Any  
41 further discussion or any discussion on this motion? We have  
42 had some discussion already, pretty much. **All those committee**  
43 **members who are in support of the motion, please raise your**  
44 **hand. There is no opposition, and so the motion passes.**

45  
46 Mr. Rindone, is there anything else? Do you want to finish up  
47 the remainder of the schedule? I don't think you went through  
48 2019.



1  
2 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure. I can finish it up. I talked briefly about  
3 what's going on in 2018. Are there any questions on that? All  
4 right. For 2019, you guys had made a prioritized list for gray  
5 trigger, which I will send you guys an amended schedule to  
6 review for full council that reflects this motion, but then you  
7 also requested updates for cobia, Spanish mackerel, yellowedge,  
8 and tilefish.

9  
10 Cobia and Spanish mackerel were last done in 2013, with I think  
11 a terminal year of data that was 2011. Then yellowedge grouper  
12 were done quite some time ago, and the terminal year for that  
13 assessment I think was either 2009 or 2010, and so it's good to  
14 see that those are going to get updated. Then FWC has verbally  
15 committed to a spiny lobster assessment in 2019. Any other  
16 schedule questions?

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Are there any other questions for Mr. Rindone?  
19 I guess we're out of time, or out of the scheduled time that we  
20 had for this committee, and this is the last item, and so we can  
21 wrap it up fairly quickly, but I was wondering maybe, Ryan, if  
22 you and staff could put a list together relative to what Dr.  
23 Lucas was talking about and kind of putting all the species that  
24 we've got for the foreseeable future, the ten or twelve species.

25  
26 If you can bring that list with you to full council and then we  
27 can talk about the years to associate with them, as far as the  
28 intent that Dr. Lucas brought up. Could you do that, please?

29  
30 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, sir.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Mr. Greene.

33  
34 **MR. GREENE:** Mr. Chairman, I've got one more thing I would like  
35 to tackle under this, if we can, in about two minutes, if you  
36 will bear with me.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead.

39  
40 **MR. GREENE:** Okay. I had forwarded a motion over to staff  
41 earlier. While they're putting that up on the board, I'm just  
42 going to read to you what I've got here. In the most recent  
43 Gulf of Mexico gray triggerfish assessment, SEDAR 43,  
44 recruitment was estimated to be low, with the only uptick in  
45 recruitment evident in the terminal year of 2013 of the  
46 assessment. However, the larval index was incomplete, as it  
47 stopped in 2007. It is anticipated that this index will help to  
48 inform recruitment indices as well as tuning the indices of

1 spawning stock biomass estimates in the next assessment.

2  
3 **With that, with a lot of help, I have crafted a motion here to**  
4 **bring before you to draft a letter to the Southeast Fisheries**  
5 **Science Center requesting that the fall plankton larval survey**  
6 **samples from the U.S. Gulf of Mexico for Calendar Year 2008**  
7 **forward be processed in time for the next gray triggerfish**  
8 **assessment, to be scheduled in 2017, if you can make that**  
9 **change, please.**

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** You have to leave it, I think, there, because  
12 it hasn't gone through full council yet, your motion, and so I  
13 think if you leave it here that we'll be good, and we can clean  
14 it up as it goes through full council, your other motion.

15  
16 There is a motion on the board. Is there a second to the  
17 motion? It's seconded by Dr. Dana. Any discussion on the  
18 motion? Any discussion on the motion? Dr. Simmons.

19  
20 **DR. SIMMONS:** Just real quick. I just wanted to tell the  
21 committee that we did bring this up at the SSC meeting, very  
22 briefly, and they thought this was a good idea. I did spend  
23 some time talking to Dr. Jeff Isley, who did the last standard  
24 assessment, and he did think this would help inform those  
25 indices and help them move forward with trying to get some  
26 better ideas about recruitment, because the species is data  
27 poor, essentially, and has an unusual life history compared to  
28 other species that we manage in the Gulf, and so he did think  
29 this would be helpful. Thank you.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. **Any opposition to the motion?**  
32 **Seeing none, the motion carries.** I think that will conclude --  
33 Is there any other business? Seeing none, the SEDAR Committee  
34 is adjourned.

35  
36 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m., June 20, 2016.)

37  
38 - - -