

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2
3 STANDING, REEF FISH, & MACKEREL SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL
4 COMMITTEES

5
6 Webinar

7
8 January 9, 2019
9

10 **STANDING SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

11 Joseph Powers.....
12 Lee Anderson.....
13 Luiz Barbieri.....
14 Harry Blanchet.....
15 David Chagaris.....
16 Bob Gill.....
17 Douglas Gregory.....
18 Walter Keithly.....
19 Robert Leaf.....
20 Kai Lorenzen.....
21 Camp Matens.....
22 James Nance.....
23 Will Patterson.....
24 Sean Powers.....
25 Kenneth Roberts.....
26 Steven Scyphers.....
27 Jim Tolan.....
28

29 **SPECIAL REEF FISH SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

30 Jason Adriance.....
31 Judson Curtis.....
32 John Mareska.....
33

34 **SPECIAL MACKEREL SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

35 Jason Adriance.....
36 Kari MacLauchlin Buck.....
37 John Mareska.....
38

39 **STAFF**

40 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
41 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
42 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Administrative & Human Resources Assistant
43 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
44

45 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

46 Julie Neer.....SEDAR
47 Bob Shipp.....Alabama
48 - - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....2
4
5 Table of Motions.....3
6
7 Introductions and Adoption of Agenda.....4
8
9 Scope of Work.....8
10
11 Approval of SSC Summaries.....8
12
13 Approval of SEDAR Terms of Reference.....12
14 King Mackerel Update.....12
15 Cobia Update.....20
16 Vermilion Snapper Assessment.....22
17
18 Approval of Project Schedules and Workday Appointments.....28
19 Vermilion Snapper Schedule and Workshop Appointments.....28
20 Scamp Stock ID and Data Workshop Appointments.....30
21
22 Gulf SEDAR Stock Assessment Schedule 2021.....33
23
24 Other Business.....40
25
26 Adjournment.....44
27
28 - - -
29

TABLE OF MOTIONS

- 1
2
3 [PAGE 9](#): Motion to add clarification to the October 2018 SSC
4 summary report. [The motion carried on page 11.](#)
5
6 [PAGE 20](#): Motion that the SSC recommends that the TORs for the
7 king mackerel update assessment be adopted as amended. [The](#)
8 [motion carried on page 20.](#)
9
10 [PAGE 21](#): Motion that the SSC recommends that the TORs for the
11 Gulf of Mexico migratory group cobia update assessment be
12 adopted as amended. [The motion carried on page 22.](#)
13
14 [PAGE 28](#): Motion that the SSC recommends that the SEDAR 67 TOR
15 for the Gulf of Mexico vermilion snapper standard assessment be
16 adopted as amended. [The motion carried on page 28.](#)
17
18 [PAGE 29](#): Motion that the SSC adopts the SEDAR 67 vermilion
19 schedule of events. [The motion carried on page 29.](#)
20
21 [PAGE 40](#): Motion that the SSC adopts the Gulf of Mexico SEDAR
22 schedule for 2021. [The motion carried on page 40.](#)

23
24 - - -
25
26

1 The Standing, Reef Fish, and Mackerel Scientific and Statistical
2 Committees of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
3 convened via webinar on Wednesday, January 9, 2019, and was
4 called to order by Chairman Joe Powers.

5
6 **INTRODUCTIONS AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

7
8 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** We will get started. Happy New Year,
9 everyone. Hopefully this meeting won't take all four hours, and
10 so we have the scope of work and three terms of reference.

11
12 One thing is, after the meeting, I may send around something in
13 the near future. We have had some internal discussions about
14 moving the SSC meetings up a week relative to the council
15 meetings in the future, to give us a little more time to review
16 the meeting summaries and provide them to the SSC for comment
17 and things like that, and so, if you have comments about that at
18 some point, or later, please let us know. Otherwise, if there
19 are no questions, I will turn it over to Dr. Powers.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN JOE POWERS:** Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is
22 Joe Powers, and I welcome all of you as the Chair of the
23 Scientific and Statistical Committee of the Gulf of Mexico
24 Fishery Management Council. We appreciate your attendance at
25 this webinar and input to this meeting.

26
27 Representing the council is Bob Shipp, and council staff in
28 attendance are John Froeschke, Ryan Rindone, Carrie Simmons, and
29 Charlotte Schiaffo.

30
31 Notice of this meeting was provided to coastal newspapers
32 throughout the area, Marine Extension and NMFS port agents and
33 the Federal Register. Notice was also sent via email to
34 subscribers of the council's press release email list and was
35 posted on the website.

36
37 Today's meeting will include the following topics: Adoption of
38 the Agenda; Approval of Summaries from the August and October
39 2018 SSC Minutes; Review of SEDAR Terms of Reference for King
40 Mackerel, Cobia, and Vermilion Snapper; Appointments to the
41 Scamp Stock ID and Data Workshops; Review of the 2021 Gulf SEDAR
42 Stock Assessment Schedule; and any other business that might
43 come before this committee.

44
45 This webinar is open to the public, and this meeting is live and
46 is being recorded. Summary minutes of the meeting will also be
47 made available to the public. For purposes of voice
48 identification, to ensure your mic is operational, please

1 identify yourself by saying your full name into your mic when
2 your name is called by the council staff. Once you have been
3 un-muted to identify yourself, you will have control of your own
4 mic from then on. Please remember to identify yourself before
5 making and seconding motions and also to re-mute your mic each
6 time you finish speaking. Again, I think we need to do the
7 voice identification, and so don't do it until you are called
8 on. Charlotte, are you going to call people's names?
9
10 **MS. CHARLOTTE SCHIAFFO:** John, do you want to call names, or do
11 you want me to?
12
13 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Go ahead, Charlotte.
14
15 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** All right. Joe Powers, we know you're here. Kai
16 Lorenzen.
17
18 **DR. KAI LORENZEN:** Kai Lorenzen.
19
20 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Lee Anderson.
21
22 **DR. LEE ANDERSON:** Here.
23
24 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Luiz Barbieri.
25
26 **DR. BARBIERI:** Here.
27
28 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Harry Blanchet.
29
30 **MR. HARRY BLANCHET:** Harry Blanchet, here.
31
32 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** David Chagaris.
33
34 **DR. DAVID CHAGARIS:** Here.
35
36 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Bob Gill.
37
38 **MR. BOB GILL:** Bob Gill, here.
39
40 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Doug Gregory.
41
42 **MR. DOUG GREGORY:** Doug Gregory is here.
43
44 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Jeff Isley.
45
46 **DR. FROESCHKE:** He is not going to be here, I'm sure, because he
47 is --
48

1 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** That's right. Walter Keithly.
2
3 **DR. WALTER KEITHLY:** Walter Keithly is here.
4
5 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** All right. Robert Leaf. Camp Matens.
6
7 **MR. CAMP MATENS:** Camp Matens is here.
8
9 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Jim Nance.
10
11 **DR. JIM NANCE:** Jim Nance is here.
12
13 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Will Patterson.
14
15 **DR. PATTERSON:** Here.
16
17 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Sean Powers.
18
19 **DR. SEAN POWERS:** Sean Powers is here.
20
21 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Ken Roberts.
22
23 **DR. KEN ROBERTS:** Ken Roberts is here.
24
25 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Steven Scyphers.
26
27 **DR. STEVEN SCYPHERS:** Steven Scyphers is here.
28
29 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** James Tolan.
30
31 **DR. JIM TOLAN:** Jim Tolan is here.
32
33 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Jason Adriance.
34
35 **MR. JASON ADRIANCE:** Jason is here.
36
37 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Judson Curtis.
38
39 **DR. JUDSON CURTIS:** Jud Curtis is here.
40
41 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** John Mareska.
42
43 **MR. JOHN MARESKA:** John Mareska is here.
44
45 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Kari Buck.
46
47 **DR. KARI BUCK:** Kari Buck is here.
48

1 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** All right. Then we've got Bob Shipp. We heard
2 you earlier, Bob. I hope you're still here.
3
4 **DR. SHIPP:** I'm still here.
5
6 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Carrie Simmons, are you with us?
7
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** I'm here.
9
10 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** Ryan.
11
12 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Ryan Rindone is here.
13
14 **MS. SCHIAFFO:** All right. I guess we've got everybody.
15
16 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. The first agenda item is
17 introductions and the adoption of the agenda. We have gone
18 through the introductions. The agenda itself, there is two
19 other items that just very, very briefly I would like to mention
20 under Other Business, and one of them is the fact that we really
21 haven't proceeded on with our progressing about how the SSC does
22 business, and this is tailing on to Lee Anderson's presentation.
23
24 Some of that was I was to give a white paper, and I will do that
25 shortly after this meeting, but it seemed to me that it was
26 unlikely to be able to be talked about with any length in a
27 webinar sort of atmosphere, and so I would like to just briefly
28 mention under Other Business what we should be doing relative to
29 that.
30
31 The second thing that I would like under Other Business was
32 there is planning that is going on for the national SSC meeting,
33 and there was a conference call in December, and I wasn't able
34 to be on it, because it would have been a rather hefty toll call
35 for me, and I was wondering if either Kai or John Froeschke were
36 in the meeting and you could maybe mention that. Were either of
37 you on the call?
38
39 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I was not on the call.
40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Then never mind about that in
42 terms of other business. They are planning another conference
43 call in early February, but we'll go from there.
44
45 **DR. NANCE:** Joe, what is the purpose of a national SSC?
46
47 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** They have those about every two years, and
48 it's to focus on how you would approach certain sorts of

1 problems. Last January, there was one in San Diego, and it was
2 basically about management strategy evaluation and how to
3 proceed with that. We have been having them, or I remember
4 having them, many years ago as well, and, like I said, it's
5 every couple of years or so, but, anyway, if we don't have any
6 information to update that, we can skip that, and we can
7 investigate it more over the interim.

8
9 That is the agenda. Is there any other changes or corrections
10 to the agenda? If not, do we need a motion? Bob Gill, you're
11 the motion person. Can you have a motion to adopt the agenda?

12
13 **DR. NANCE:** I will make a motion to adopt the agenda.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Is there a second?

16
17 **DR. BLANCHET:** I second.

18
19 **SCOPE OF WORK**
20 **APPROVAL OF SSC SUMMARIES**

21
22 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Harry. Is there any objection to
23 adopting the agenda? Hearing none, the agenda is adopted. The
24 scope of work for this particular meeting is outlined by the
25 agenda itself, but, also, there is a document, and I believe
26 it's Tab 1(b), that has been prepared by the council staff, and
27 Ryan in particular, which outlines where we're going to go for
28 this particular meeting, if you will use that as kind of a
29 template as we go through the meeting, in terms of what is
30 expected.

31
32 The first agenda item after that is the Review of the SSC
33 Minutes, and there is two SSC minutes that we're talking about,
34 the October 2nd through 3rd minutes and then the August minutes.
35 Now, the October 2nd through 3rd, one of the issues that we dealt
36 with there was the presentation about best available science and
37 how the practice that we as the SSC had about motions that, for
38 example, a particular assessment wasn't useful for management or
39 wasn't useful for that particular management action, and they
40 made some recommendations relative to that.

41
42 Now, Doug Gregory has brought up that that wasn't fully captured
43 in the minutes about how we should proceed based upon that
44 presentation, and so, Doug, if you could kind of outline what
45 your comments are, and then you had actually drafted a section,
46 drafted in terms of a motion, and so, with that, let me pass the
47 baton over to Doug to kind of explain what it is that you're
48 talking about.

1
2 **MR. GREGORY:** Thank you, Joe. First off, I think the report is
3 very well done, and I do not envy John, and in the past Steven,
4 for the challenge of having to summarize our sometimes
5 complicated discussions, but, in the ABC discussion part, the
6 SSC spent about thirty minutes of the hour of that discussion
7 talking about the draft framework and how to try to make
8 recommendations that were more generally comfortable to NOAA
9 General Counsel, and I brought up those four criteria that are
10 in the draft framework as a suggested approach in the future,
11 instead of making what has been considered the general motion of
12 not suitable for management.

13
14 I thought, if we followed these four items, it would be more
15 specific. Now, they're not complete, but I think they do form a
16 basis for a discussion and recommendations to the council when
17 we review a stock assessment.

18
19 Now, normally, with a benchmark or research track assessment,
20 the review workshop performs the peer review, but, on updates
21 and standards, like we're talking about at this meeting with the
22 terms of reference, the SSC is the peer review, and so I would
23 like to suggest that we add this paragraph at the third
24 paragraph in that ABC discussion, as it appears on the screen
25 here. I know this is more than just a grammatical correction or
26 anything like that.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Largely, those four items were essentially
29 what the presentation and the discussion was about, and so, to
30 me, what you're really asking to do here is to make sure that
31 everybody understands and we have a record that we agree with
32 that, and is that correct, basically?

33
34 **MR. GREGORY:** Yes.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Doug has presented this in terms of a
37 motion to add to the minutes. Is there a second to that motion?

38
39 **DR. NANCE:** I will second that, Joe.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Jim. I guess Jim is going to be
42 our designated seconder for the meeting, to speed things up. Is
43 there any objection to adding this to the minutes?

44
45 **SSC MEMBER:** I am just confused about what we're doing here. Is
46 this being added to the minutes or to the report?

47
48 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** The suggestion was to add it to the minutes.

1 The intent is to make sure there is a record of specifically
2 what we, the SSC, would -- How we're going to approach these
3 sorts of issues, to avoid this determination that the assessment
4 isn't the best available science, or is not the best available
5 science.

6
7 In essence, the presentation that was given to us was -- Their
8 suggestion was to break up your motions when you go through that
9 process into these four particular kinds of items, and so you
10 can be much more specific about what our advice is relative to
11 an assessment. Now, the suggestion that Doug had was to add
12 this to the minutes. My view is how it gets added is less
13 important than there being a record that we agreed to this, and
14 so, to me, adding it to the minutes is fine, but, if there's
15 some objection, then we could append it to the report as well.

16
17 **MR. GREGORY:** Joe, in my mind, the report and the minutes are
18 the same thing.

19
20 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I was just going to add that we don't do
21 verbatim minutes for these, and so the summary report is the
22 record, although we do keep a digital recording forever, if
23 anyone is interested, but the SSC summary report that we
24 provided here is the report, and so that's what we would be
25 modifying.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. That was my mistake then. Again, the
28 motion was to add these comments to the summary report. Any
29 other discussion on this before we vote?

30
31 **DR. BARBIERI:** Joe, I have a quick question. Doug, can you
32 clarify, under Item (a), the review is of the scientific
33 information and not of the subsequent determination?

34
35 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay. This is verbatim out of the framework
36 action. Given the presentation by Ms. Levy, I think that refers
37 to the subsequent determination by the council and National
38 Marine Fisheries Service as to SDCs and harvest control rules,
39 but, I mean, that's my interpretation of it.

40
41 **DR. BARBIERI:** Right. That makes sense, because I know that
42 legal counsel, and the agency in general, has tried to bring
43 this issue up, saying that the SSC makes a recommendation on the
44 best scientific information available, but the final
45 determination is actually up to the agency, as determined by the
46 Secretary. Okay. That sounds good. Thank you, Doug.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Luiz. Is there any other comments?

1
2 **SSC MEMBER:** I just have a question of how this will affect the
3 way we go about our business, like we're doing a given
4 assessment, and I don't remember the context of the conversation
5 or presentation from the last time this came up, and so I'm just
6 trying to put it all in perspective about how this would
7 actually affect how we do business.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** My interpretation of the presentation and the
10 conclusions that we drew from that was that the bind that we had
11 gotten ourselves into, or not so much we go ourselves into, is
12 the interpretation by the General Counsel's office of what our
13 recommendations were were being confused because of making
14 motions where an assessment was not useful for management.

15
16 The presentation and the information that was provided by Ms.
17 Levy was basically suggesting that these four items are the main
18 items to be addressed, in terms of the advice provided by the
19 SSC relative to any particular assessment, and so I have
20 interpreted that, and I believe Doug has as well, as that we
21 should use those as guidelines and that, when we make motions
22 relative to a particular assessment, we make motions, perhaps,
23 to address each one of these four items, and, in some cases,
24 we'll probably actually do it where we have four separate
25 motions, and so that, I think, is how I was viewing approaching
26 this.

27
28 **SSC MEMBER:** Thank you.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. **Are there any objections to this**
31 **motion? If not, the motion carries unanimously.**

32
33 Are there any other comments about the October meeting? All
34 right. John, do we need a motion to accept the minutes, because
35 the minutes really are rather limited.

36
37 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I think we just need a separate motion to accept
38 the August minutes.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay, and so we don't have to deal with the
41 October. All right. That was my plan. All right. With no
42 further discussion on the October minutes, going back to the
43 August minutes.

44
45 **MR. GILL:** Move to accept the August minutes.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Motion by Bob Gill.

48

1 **DR. BARBIERI:** Second.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** We have a second by Luiz, and the beginning of
4 the minutes is put up on the screen by Charlotte. Is there any
5 discussion about these minutes or changes or misinterpretations?
6 If not, is there a motion to accept the minutes?

7
8 **DR. BARBIERI:** So moved.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** We have a motion, and I believe that was Luiz.
11 Is there a second?

12
13 **DR. TOLAN:** I will second that.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Jim seconds. Any objection to
16 accepting these minutes? If not, then the minutes are accepted.
17 The next agenda item is a series of terms of reference that Ryan
18 Rindone will be presenting, and these are the king mackerel
19 update, the cobia update, and the vermilion snapper, in terms of
20 terms of reference for how we're going to approach the SEDARs,
21 and so, Ryan, if you will go ahead.

22
23 **APPROVAL OF SEDAR TERMS OF REFERENCE**
24 **KING MACKEREL UPDATE**

25
26 **MR. RINDONE:** As many of you are aware, but just in case, the
27 update assessments, the way that they're designed is to be kind
28 of a turn of the crank, and so updating all of the new years of
29 data for the previously-used data streams for the subject
30 species.

31
32 We are doing update assessments for Gulf migratory groups of
33 king mackerel and cobia, because we do not know of any new data
34 that could be incorporated into the stock assessment at this
35 time. We were supposed to have a data scoping call for the king
36 mackerel update yesterday, and clearly that didn't happen, and
37 so we're kind of in a holding pattern on that update assessment
38 right now, but it's going to be done eventually by the Highly
39 Migratory Species Group at the Southeast Fisheries Science
40 Center.

41
42 The terms of reference that you have in front of you reflect all
43 of those circumstances. The fishing year for king mackerel
44 begins on July 1 and ends on June 30, and so that's why it says
45 update the base model with data through the 2017-2018 fishing
46 year, and the recreational data through the MRIP waves is parsed
47 out to reflect the commercial July to June fishing season in the
48 model.

1
2 The only real changes are in Term of Reference Number 2, where
3 we clarify that commercial and recreational landings and
4 discards are to be provided in pounds and numbers, when
5 possible, and king mackerel are currently tabulated in landed
6 weight, which means basically however the fisherman manages to
7 get that fish to the dock. The gillnet fishery sometimes
8 doesn't return whole fish, and sometimes fish get bitten by
9 sharks or what have you, and some fishermen gut fish and some
10 don't, and so it's just landed weight. Are there any questions
11 about the king mackerel update assessment terms of reference?
12

13 **MR. GILL:** Ryan, I have one. My question relates to the
14 schedule data through the fishing year. The SEDAR schedule
15 notes that it has 2017, which I guess is consistent with the
16 2017 fishing year, but, in terms of looking at it from the
17 vantage point of someone looking at whether 2018 data is
18 included, it is in fact included, and so my suggestion is that
19 the schedule ought to reflect the 2018 terminal year.
20

21 **MR. RINDONE:** That's an easy edit that I can make right now.
22

23 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, sir.
24

25 **MR. RINDONE:** The schedule has been so edited. Thanks for that
26 clarification, Bob. Are there any other questions about the
27 terms of reference before you?
28

29 **MR. MATENS:** I do. Do we have any idea, when we do the
30 recreational landings, what average weight of fish we're going
31 to have to convert to pounds?
32

33 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, Camp. We have a table that goes into just
34 about all of the stock assessments that looks at the meristic
35 conversions, and these are the conversions from whole weight to
36 gutted weight and gutted weight back to whole weight and maximum
37 length to total length to fork length, et cetera, and it helps
38 to convert -- It helps show all the equations used to convert
39 between all of the different measurement units, and so that
40 would be included as part of the assessment, as part of the best
41 practices for the SEDAR stock assessments.
42

43 **MR. MATENS:** Thank you, Ryan. Just off the top of your head, do
44 you know what weight we're using for the recreational individual
45 fish?
46

47 **MR. RINDONE:** For the average weight for a recreational fish?
48 No, I don't know it off the top of my head, but it's something I

1 can look up and talk to you about later.

2

3 **MR. MATENS:** That would be great. Thank you.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** But that's going to -- When you do the
6 assessment, that actually changes, depending on what sizes of
7 fish are actually caught, and so that's one of the aspects of
8 the assessment, is to look at the available data, size frequency
9 data, from the recreational sector and then base the average
10 weight on that, to my knowledge anyway.

11

12 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, that's correct. The average weight will
13 change from assessment to assessment, and so knowing what it is,
14 based on the previous assessment, basically tells you what it
15 was using data through 2012, which, at this point, is not very
16 informative.

17

18 Also, it's important to consider that king mackerel are a
19 migratory species, migrating, contemporarily anyway, from west
20 to east in the Gulf, and those fish are targeted that entire
21 time during that migration, and so there could be subtle changes
22 in the average weight through time, even within the same fishing
23 year.

24

25 **MR. MATENS:** All right. Thank you.

26

27 **MR. RINDONE:** Just as a point of clarification for you guys,
28 these update assessments are the last that we're going to
29 actually do as what we're calling update assessments or standard
30 assessments. From 2020 and beyond, they will just be called
31 operational assessments, and their general scope of work will be
32 determined in advance, but they will all have the same name.
33 Are there any other questions regarding the king mackerel update
34 terms of reference?

35

36 **MR. GREGORY:** I have a question about update assessments. This
37 assessment will be conducted by National Marine Fisheries
38 Service and presented to the SSC, and there will be no interim
39 meetings or workshops between SSC members and National Marine
40 Fisheries Service analysts?

41

42 **MR. RINDONE:** There will be no formal workshops or anything like
43 that. Members of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center will be
44 able to contact people, as they generally need to, to acquire
45 data or to ask questions about data streams, et cetera, but the
46 way that the update assessments were designed was to be done
47 largely in-house and without a lot of additional public input or
48 involvement during the assessment process, with the reviews

1 conducted in public by the SSC.

2
3 **MR. GREGORY:** Thank you.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Ryan. Are there any other
6 questions about the terms of reference for the king mackerel
7 update assessment?

8
9 **DR. BLANCHET:** This may be a bit out of place here, but it's
10 just that it's the first of several that we're going to talk
11 about, and so I'm just taking it up here. One of the concerns
12 that I have with this update assessment is that we have some
13 consideration during the assessment by the analysts, as well as
14 after the assessment by the reviewers, of is the next assessment
15 going to need something different than another update, and I
16 recognize that some of that evaluation does get done as part of
17 the SEDAR process in globo, but not necessarily at the level
18 that the people that are actually doing the analysis at the time
19 may be aware of oncoming data streams that other people are not
20 cognizant of or not ready to build into the next assessment, and
21 I don't know how that might work, but I am just -- Is there
22 something that we should put into here, in terms of making some
23 comment in terms of future needs for the next assessment, or is
24 that too far in advance?

25
26 **MR. RINDONE:** As part of all of the stock assessment reports
27 that we get, we get research recommendations and things that
28 should be considered or included in the future, and it's often
29 as research recommendations, which trigger a change in the
30 amount of analysis that is conducted the next assessment.

31
32 The reason why we're doing kingfish as we are this time is
33 because we didn't have any new data streams which were prepared
34 to be included in the stock assessment, but, if those
35 circumstances are different in the future -- The scoping process
36 for what data can be included actually starts a couple of years
37 in advance, with some phone calls and emails and just touches
38 out to the general scientific community and literature searches,
39 to see what's been done. A lot of this is done in-house at the
40 Science Center.

41
42 There is a fairly good general awareness of what is out there,
43 but just this time, for kingfish, there really wasn't much, and,
44 for cobia, we just finished doing the stock ID workshop for the
45 South Atlantic migratory group cobia, which included looking at
46 the Gulf migratory group, and we had a big goose-egg for the
47 Gulf, and so it's just the circumstances of where we are at the
48 moment, but, in the future, if a more in-depth analysis is

1 required, that could be done under the guise of the operational
2 assessment.

3
4 If there is a very considerable sort of approach that needs to
5 be done with respect to kingfish, then perhaps a research track
6 would be more appropriate. It just depends on what kind of data
7 are made available.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Ryan. I think what Harry may be
10 getting to is perhaps -- This is an option, and I'm not sure if
11 I'm in favor of it or not, but an option that each one of these
12 terms of reference should have something in it that says that
13 the assessment will -- The report of the assessment will make
14 some sort of recommendation about what level of assessment
15 should be done, and so not necessarily suggesting that any
16 particular avenue should be taken, but rather the questions that
17 should be addressed.

18
19 Now, I don't know -- I mean, something Ryan just said indicated
20 to me that that is in fact done at some level, but I wasn't sure
21 if Harry was suggesting that each one of these have some sort of
22 addendum asking for that particular kind of recommendation.
23 Harry, can you help me out here?

24
25 **DR. BLANCHET:** Yes, Joe. That is very much where I was trying
26 to go, and, again, I am not real sure -- Like I said, I'm not
27 real sure that this is the time or the place to do it, but I
28 just hate to have this situation where we have had challenges
29 with a couple of these species before, and I don't want it to be
30 a basic turn-of-the-crank assessment that does not necessarily
31 help refine what is needed next time, and, to Ryan's point, some
32 drive toward getting better information to better manage that
33 species, whether we're talking about something like ageing or
34 the challenges of ageing in some of these species or the
35 understanding of migration patterns or whatever the situation is
36 for that particular group.

37
38 To me, an assessment is -- In many ways, it's a characterization
39 of what we have, and we should also do our best to see if there
40 is some outstanding thing that needs to be done, and that might
41 entail a different form of assessment at the next level, at the
42 next assessment, rather. It just seems like -- I just wanted to
43 be sure that it was addressed as part of the report-out. That's
44 all.

45
46 **DR. PATTERSON:** Harry, I think those are really important
47 points, and I think, historically, we have, in our review of a
48 given assessment at the SSC, had discussion and made

1 recommendations about whether we believed a future assessment
2 needed to be, I guess, moving forward to be a research track,
3 versus just a standard, and so I'm not sure that we actually
4 have to put that, or ask for it to be put in the terms of
5 reference, but just for us to have that as part of our
6 discussion and put it on the record that we think, the next time
7 around -- For king mackerel, perhaps, we could say that an
8 update or a standard, whatever it's going to be called in the
9 future, and I forget, should be that.

10
11 I actually thought this time around, for Gulf king mackerel, it
12 was going to be a benchmark assessment, trying to incorporate as
13 much of the Mexican landings as possible, and I thought that's
14 why the HMS folks were doing it, and so I was kind of surprised
15 when I saw this come up as an update, given the western Gulf and
16 the landings issue with Mexico and how that had been treated in
17 the past, and I thought we were actually going to try to get
18 past that this time, but I guess not, but we can, obviously, in
19 our reporting, indicate that we feel strongly that that should
20 be the case in the future.

21
22 **MR. RINDONE:** To Will's point about the Mexican data, that was a
23 very good point. We had initially intended to try and include
24 those data in this stock assessment, and it was going to be a
25 benchmark-type assessment. The issues were pretty extensive
26 with those data, and what it would have taken to try to get
27 those data to a point where they could have been included in
28 this assessment at this point in time was just not realistic,
29 but it is something that the Science Center is aware of, and
30 they are working with their Mexican counterparts to try to
31 resolve issues with those Mexican data, so that they can be
32 included in a future assessment, but, at this time, those data
33 are not available to be included.

34
35 I have added a new Term of Reference Number 4 there to try to
36 address what I think Mr. Blanchet is getting at, and so, if this
37 is something that you guys want to include, by all means,
38 indicate so. If you want to make changes, the same, and, if you
39 don't think it's necessary, just let us know.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. First off, let's kind of decide --
42 Let me get a feel of the interest of the committee in terms of
43 having something like the Item 4 there, where basically you're
44 asking for the assessment process to provide a recommendation
45 about what to do next in terms of the level of assessment. I
46 think I'm in support of that.

47
48 It can, obviously, be overruled based on human resource factors

1 and budgets and so on and so forth like that, but I think it's a
2 good starting point for a statement about what the priorities
3 are, for an individual stock anyway, but what direction we ought
4 to go in. Is there differing viewpoints relative to that?

5
6 **DR. BARBIERI:** I just want to make a quick suggestion, I think
7 similar suggestions probably to Harry, and then Will made a
8 point about us more explicitly discussing the data available and
9 all the information that would be needed for the next assessment
10 and the SSC making a more explicit recommendation for the next
11 type of assessment.

12
13 I would suggest that perhaps we can have that added to our scope
14 of work whenever we have a stock assessment review by the SSC.
15 I mean, that way, we can remember to specifically make those
16 recommendations.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Is there another comment?

19
20 **DR. PATTERSON:** I like what Luiz just said, but what is added
21 here in the text that Ryan put up actually captures a couple of
22 things. One is the research recommendations, but then also just
23 generally additional analyses, and so I think the text that Ryan
24 added here in the terms of reference is solid, and I would be
25 supportive of it, while, at the same time, we can have any
26 discussions we want to when we actually review the assessments,
27 whether it's in the scope of work for that meeting or not about
28 what we think the subsequent assessment -- What level it should
29 be and whether it needs to be a research track or a standard.

30
31 **MS. JULIE NEER:** This is Julie from SEDAR.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead.

34
35 **MS. NEER:** I agree with everything you guys have said. My only
36 concern -- I am sort of trying to speak as if I was an analyst,
37 since they're not here to speak for themselves. Any additional
38 analyses which should be conducted during a subsequent stock
39 assessment, "should be" is a pretty strong word, and maybe
40 "should be considered during subsequent assessments", something
41 along that line, and say, yes, we should look at that, but, if
42 you say we have to do it, and then data changes or modeling
43 changes before we do king mackerel again eight years from now,
44 "should be" may be difficult for them to accomplish, but I like
45 the intent of what you're saying, for sure.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you, Julie. One other thing I
48 was seeing out of Harry's original recommendation was a basic

1 recommendation about what level of assessment, update or
2 benchmark or research track or whatever, whatever the names are,
3 and to keep the recommendation kind of simple like that, with
4 some justification, of course, about why you suggest that.

5
6 To get real detailed about all the methods or analyses and
7 stuff, I kind of agree with Julie that "should be considered" is
8 a bit strong, and what you're really -- What I was viewing this
9 as is some sort of advice about what level of assessment that we
10 ought to be considering in the future. Is there any other
11 comments about that?

12
13 **MR. RINDONE:** This is directly to Dr. Powers' comment. When the
14 Center is looking at the different analyses that it's
15 considering for the subsequent stock assessment, that will
16 largely determine whether something is going to fall under a
17 research track approach or an operational assessment approach,
18 and a lot of it has to do with how much work is actually
19 involved and the kind of time commitment that is going to need
20 to be allocated to those analyses.

21
22 Julie can vouch for this as well, but there is about a two to
23 two-and-a-half-year lead time to planning all of the stock
24 assessments, to try to figure out what the best approach is and
25 what level of analysis is going to be necessary to assess a
26 certain species, and so all of that is presently happening as
27 part of the SEDAR best practices, and so I don't know that you
28 need to be explicit in that.

29
30 Also, with respect to how the analysts read the terms of
31 reference, using passive language like "should" and "may" and
32 "to the extent practical" allows them the leeway to make a
33 judgment call, along with the assessment panel, as to whether
34 that term of reference can be completed explicitly, or, if it
35 can't, it allows them to provide language as to why it can't
36 without violating the term of reference.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you, Ryan. Does anybody
39 want to wordsmith the Item 4? If not, what Ryan is saying is --
40 The way I interpreted what he was saying is the word "should" is
41 flexible enough that you can react practically, an analyst could
42 react practically to it, pragmatically to it.

43
44 **DR. NANCE:** Joe, I think "should" is the proper term that should
45 be in there. If we change it to "shall", that's the one that is
46 apt to do it, but "should" gives us, I think, the flexibility
47 that we're looking for.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you. Given this discussion,
2 can we go ahead and adopt these terms of reference, as amended,
3 that's on the board there, on the screen? Can I have a motion?
4

5 **MR. GILL:** I will give you a motion.
6

7 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Motion by Bob Gill. **The motion is to adopt**
8 **the terms of reference, as amended, for the Gulf king mackerel**
9 **assessment.**

10
11 **MR. GILL:** King mackerel update assessment. Yes, sir.
12

13 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Do we have a second?
14

15 **DR. NANCE:** I will second it, Joe.
16

17 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Again, Harry, is this what you
18 were looking for?
19

20 **MR. BLANCHET:** Yes. To the broader comments, I really -- I just
21 wanted to be sure that we had it captured, whether it's here as
22 part of the terms of reference or whether it's as part of the
23 scope of work for the SSC. I just wanted somehow to get that in
24 there, because I just want to keep it on that front burner, that
25 we're doing something here beyond a turn of the -- I've just
26 been in too many workshops where we were constrained by the form
27 of the assessment, and I want to try to limit that, as much as
28 possible.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. The motion is on the board,
31 to adopt it as amended. **Are there any objections to the motion?**
32 **If not, then the motion carries.**
33

34 One of the things I think what Harry was getting at is that, if
35 we go through some of the subsequent ones, we might be
36 considering a similar sort of amendment for other sorts of
37 assessments and the terms of reference to that too, but I will
38 let that fall out as it may for the individual terms of
39 reference. Ryan, the next one?
40

41 **COBIA UPDATE**

42

43 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure thing. Cobia, the same thing.
44

45 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Except that Item 4 shouldn't say "king
46 mackerel", but other than that --
47

48 **MR. RINDONE:** That is true. It should not.

1
2 **MS. NEER:** You should also take out "migratory group" before the
3 word "cobia" in Term of Reference 4.
4
5 **MR. RINDONE:** It is the Gulf migratory group.
6
7 **MS. NEER:** Okay.
8
9 **MR. RINDONE:** We removed the Atlantic migratory group from the
10 FMP in CMP Amendment 31, but there's still an Atlantic and a
11 Gulf migratory group of cobia.
12
13 **MS. NEER:** I didn't know they were referred to in that format.
14
15 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes.
16
17 **DR. PATTERSON:** I move to accept these.
18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I've got a motion by Will to accept these
20 terms of reference.
21
22 **MR. BLANCHET:** I will second.
23
24 **MR. GREGORY:** This is Doug. I have a question.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead, Doug.
27
28 **MR. GREGORY:** Ryan, with Item Number 2, in the king mackerel,
29 you had the parenthetical phrase "when possible" at the end of
30 the sentence, the second sentence. Do you want to put that
31 here, or is there a reason not to put that here?
32
33 **MR. RINDONE:** Thanks for the question, Doug. If I am speaking
34 as me, I am saying I don't want to put it there, because we have
35 these data for cobia, and it's a little more hairy with
36 kingfish, because of things like the gillnet fishery. We don't
37 have that with cobia. Cobia is almost primarily hook-and-line,
38 with some spearfishing, but, by and large, these fish are landed
39 whole, and their ABC and ACL and ACT is all in pounds whole
40 weight, and so I think how it is currently listed is
41 appropriate, given the way in which the data are collected and
42 provided.
43
44 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay. I am just confused, because you still have
45 the problem that commercial is going to be in pounds, and
46 recreational will be in numbers. I don't think it's -- It's not
47 important to me, but it just looked like it was left out.
48

1 **MR. RINDONE:** We still have recreational landings that -- I
2 mean, the landings are recorded in numbers, but they're
3 converted to pounds based on the dockside intercepts, and so we
4 have the data to convert those numbers to pounds.

5
6 **MR. GREGORY:** We can convert commercial pounds to numbers of
7 fish?

8
9 **MR. RINDONE:** Based on average landings, yes. If we really
10 wanted to get into it, we could do it on average poundage per
11 trip, and so it could even more fine-scale for the commercial
12 data, if it were necessary to analyze it in such a way.

13
14 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** We had a motion and a second to accept these,
17 as amended through the Item 4. **Is there any objection to these?**
18 **If not, then the motion carries, and the terms of reference are**
19 **accepted.** All right, Ryan, the next one.

20
21 **VERMILION SNAPPER ASSESSMENT**

22
23 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. We're just cruising right along.
24 Council staff took a crack at the vermilion terms of reference,
25 and I'm just going to go ahead and show you what we fiddled
26 around with, and I'm going to show it in the simple form, or
27 simple mark-up form, so as to not lose everybody.

28
29 What you see in front of you is the vermilion snapper standard
30 assessment terms of reference, and this is because we're
31 exploring some different things with the data that we have and
32 hoping that we'll be able to incorporate some new information,
33 especially with respect to the shrimp fleet and shrimp discards
34 on vermilion.

35
36 The bulk of the modifications that have been proposed by council
37 staff are shown in Term of Reference Number 2. Specifically,
38 we'll start here, at Point Number 4, where staff are saying to
39 clearly indicate the data sources considered for determining
40 recreational landings and effort, be these state, federal, or
41 other surveys, whether those data sources were used for
42 determining the recreational landings or effort, and, if not,
43 explain why they were not used. Does anyone have a question
44 about that or disagree with it?

45
46 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Apparently not.

47
48 **MR. RINDONE:** We are putting this in here largely because there

1 are a number of new surveys in the Gulf that are being hosted by
2 the respective Gulf states which are explicitly examining reef
3 fish landings and effort, and so there is a fair probability
4 that some of these surveys may be able to provide data towards
5 abundance.

6
7 **MR. ADRIANCE:** This kind of goes along with that, and it's that
8 next one to investigate the impact of FES-adjusted MRIP data,
9 and this may be a question for Luiz, but does that also consider
10 the Florida GRFS and how those all interplay?

11
12 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Luiz.

13
14 **DR. BARBIERI:** Well, I don't know at this point. I think,
15 Jason, that's a good question, and this is one of the things
16 that I think is still being resolved.

17
18 **MR. ADRIANCE:** Yes, and that's kind of why I asked it.

19
20 **DR. BARBIERI:** Yes, and so no final resolution on that just yet.

21
22 **MS. NEER:** My understanding of that particular one, the
23 investigate the impact of FES-adjusted MRIP data, is simply
24 looking at the changes in the new MRIP estimation and the
25 adjustment process. That is just looking at MRIP. I believe
26 the one above, that council staff is suggesting, talking about
27 all the different data sources that may be available for
28 recreational landings and effort, I believe that was where we
29 would come up with all the state surveys and if they're included
30 or not and why.

31
32 **MR. RINDONE:** Julie is mostly correct on that. The only
33 difference is that it's kind of expected that the federal
34 surveys will be used as kind of the foundation. Since they were
35 used in the previous assessment, they are automatically going to
36 be considered in this one, because they're an existing data
37 stream, but, given the new reality of having all of these
38 additional state surveys, this is as fair of a time as any to
39 try to start some sort of formal process by which we consider
40 whether these surveys should be included. If they are, great.
41 If not, explain why they weren't, and that, in itself, provides
42 feedback to the respective states as to what sort of adjustments
43 may need to be made to those data or to those survey methods to
44 make them more useful to the stock assessment process.

45
46 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Just to follow-up, one of the things that seems
47 necessary to me is, if the FES data are used in the assessment,
48 but a state survey, for example the Florida survey, were used

1 for quota monitoring, that seems to be problematic, and so, if
2 we're not going to use the Florida survey for Florida
3 monitoring, but it's in the survey, that also seems like
4 something that we should be clear about to whoever is conducting
5 the survey, so they know.

6

7 **DR. BARBIERI:** By the way, if I might jump in, Joe.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead, Luiz.

10

11 **DR. BARBIERI:** Well, I agree completely with what John just
12 said. The expectation -- We're in the process right now of
13 having MRIP staff put together a white paper that is addressing
14 a lot of these issues for different reef fisheries, primarily in
15 red snapper, but for some of these other species as well, and
16 that paper should be circulated to the different states, state
17 folks and mostly the folks from the states that are on this
18 call, or this webinar, and so, by the time that this assessment,
19 I think, gets going, that issue will be resolved, but it's just
20 still in that sort of -- It's cooking still, and it's not
21 completely finalized yet.

22

23 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. Is there any other comments
24 or suggestions for re-wording?

25

26 **MR. GILL:** My question is, in contrast to the two previous TORs,
27 this one does data through 2017, and why is it not data through
28 2018, like cobia and mackerel?

29

30 **MR. RINDONE:** What it comes down to is just the assessment
31 workload for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and being
32 able to get the data together for cobia is going to require less
33 effort than it is -- Through 2018 is going to require less
34 effort than it is to try to get vermilion spooled up all the way
35 through 2018, cutting otoliths and doing age and length
36 composition, and so it's just -- In discussions with the Science
37 Center, very generally speaking, data through 2017 is possible
38 for vermilion, and we have asked for 2018, and they just told us
39 that they can't do that. They can't drop cobia back to 2017 and
40 then do 2018 for vermilion. It's not apples to apples, and so
41 this was as good as we could get it.

42

43 **MR. GILL:** Thank you.

44

45 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you.

46

47 **DR. CHAGARIS:** Just going back to what Luiz said about these
48 FES-adjusted MRIP data, and it could be a little bit

1 presumptuous, but the intention of the FES is to improve the
2 survey, and, if we're supposed to include the best available
3 data and the best available science, then it seems like doing
4 both the adjusted and non-adjusted data and evaluating those in
5 the model -- It seems like that might be going backwards. It
6 could be a little burdensome on the analysts.

7
8 I am just wondering if this is the best idea to include in an
9 individual species terms of reference, versus waiting for some
10 larger consensus to emerge, via some white paper and review
11 efforts.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you.

14
15 **MS. NEER:** I do know the Science Center put that term of
16 reference in there because it has been a high topic for every
17 assessment and update that's been coming through since these new
18 numbers came out. Everyone has all -- All the SSCs and councils
19 have been wanting to say, well, how much did the change actually
20 impact the assessment, and so, I mean, that is one of the terms
21 of reference that the Science Center put in there on their own,
22 and it was not a staff recommendation. It was a center
23 recommendation.

24
25 I think you could take it out if you want, but I think someone
26 is going to want to know how the adjustments affected the model
27 inputs. I know the SSC sent back four assessments, the South
28 Atlantic SSC sent back four assessments, for more detailed
29 analysis on this particular topic for their updates they just
30 got at their last meeting. That's just food for thought.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, and the reality of the situation
33 and the issue was brought up earlier about doing an assessment
34 with a certain set of data and the monitoring it with another
35 set of data, and I think the assessment people would be real
36 cognizant of that, and there has to be some sort of analysis
37 that is addressing the transfer from one to the other, and so I
38 kind of interpreted that, this item, in the terms of reference
39 as kind of addressing that as well. Is there other comments?

40
41 **MR. BLANCHET:** We have been kind of going down this road since
42 2014, and we did side-by-side benchmarking in 2015 between LA
43 Creel and MRIP, and, since 2016, we have been trying to come up
44 with a set of factors for translations between the various
45 surveys, exactly what we're talking about in both of these
46 terms, and have yet to do so, and so I don't --

47
48 At the same time, I was involved with a meeting down in New

1 Orleans last October that several other folks that are on this
2 webinar were also at, and there was clearly a lot of work that
3 needed to be done to relate state survey information to both
4 existing and newly-developed estimates of MRIP data, and I
5 understand where all of this is going at, and I'm agreeing both
6 that it needs to be part of this evaluation, but I'm not sure
7 that it is fully captured in this term of reference what those
8 complexities are, because this --

9
10 Until we have good, comprehensive methods of translating LA
11 Creel data into FES data and back, we're always going to be
12 challenged of are we doing the best job we can, in terms of
13 monitoring the harvest, and that's all I've got.

14
15 **DR. BARBIERI:** Joe, may I provide some input there?

16
17 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead, Luiz.

18
19 **DR. BARBIERI:** Harry, I agree. The way that I'm reading this
20 bullet, it clearly indicates the data sources considered for
21 determining recreational landings and effort, whether those data
22 sources were used, and, if not, explain why, and so it's not
23 telling anybody that they should be used, the way I am reading -
24 - Unless I am reading the wrong bullet there.

25
26 If we're on that bullet, basically, this is a way to, during the
27 assessment process, to document what data was used and justify
28 why, and so this could be just coming at that white paper and
29 any other subsequent reports or papers or analysis that our
30 programs, run by the states, are going to be producing, in terms
31 of calibrations, and say, well, for this species, we used FES,
32 because we really didn't have anything else, or, for this
33 species, we used LA Creel, and for this one we used GRS. I am
34 not seeing that as saying, well, let's use the state surveys or
35 let's not. It's basically just asking that that issue be
36 addressed explicitly and some explanation provided.

37
38 **MR. RINDONE:** Luiz is correct. That's the intent of the
39 highlighted term of reference.

40
41 **MR. BLANCHET:** I just think that's going to be a very
42 challenging term to address.

43
44 **MR. NEER:** Harry, I guess the other option -- It is going to be
45 challenging, and, eventually, we're going to have to get a
46 handle on it, and this assessment is slated to get underway, and
47 so I guess the attempt is to put in here -- The other option
48 could be to say we're not going to look at any of the state

1 data, and we're just going to use what was used last time, which
2 is pretty much normal in standards, but I don't think you guys
3 would be happy with that either.

4
5 I would think you would want to at least have it considered, the
6 new state data programs, and see if they can be incorporated,
7 but we don't know how long it's going to take for an ultimate
8 resolution of being able to shift back and forth between those
9 state programs. I anticipate it's going to be longer than this
10 assessment is going to be underway, honestly, but I guess that's
11 the other option, is to not include that term of reference.
12 Then you don't have to worry about dealing with it, but I think
13 you're also not getting that first step in the door to start
14 looking at those state data in the scope of an assessment
15 process.

16
17 **MR. BLANCHET:** Actually, Julie, my concern was kind of in the
18 other direction. It was that I am hoping that there is adequate
19 time included in the assessment schedule that this can be
20 adequately done, and that's all.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I think what we're trying to do is to make
23 sure that the issue is addressed, to some extent, and, through
24 that process, through that addressing, there should become some
25 understanding of what's missing and what isn't.

26
27 I mean, clearly, if you can't do all the conversions, if you
28 don't have the right set of data, you just can't do it, but at
29 least, because of the importance of this particular issue,
30 somebody is going to ask for it anyway, and so we need to
31 address it, and that's kind of where I'm coming down, is make a
32 good-faith attempt, make some progress, and then see where we go
33 from there. Any other comments on this? Is there any
34 suggestions for rewording any of these?

35
36 **MR. ADRIANCE:** I don't know if it requires rewording, but I
37 noticed it says, if those surveys aren't used, to explain why,
38 but, kind of along the lines of some of this discussion, if it
39 is used, there is going to have to be a clear outline of how it
40 was used, going back to the discussions of calibrating those
41 state surveys against FES or against a quota that may be in
42 another number, but I don't know if that's just implied in this
43 or not.

44
45 **MR. RINDONE:** Jason is correct that, whatever data are included,
46 how they're included and how those indices are put together is
47 detailed pretty well in the assessment, and the point of that is
48 for reproducibility down the road, if someone were to try to

1 duplicate the work that was done, and so that's part of the
2 SEDAR best practices already, and so that will be done.

3
4 **MS. NEER:** We're not always as good at documenting why we don't
5 include something as why we do, and I think that was why Ryan
6 specifically to explain why if not used, to make sure we don't
7 miss that piece of the puzzle.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Are we ready to adopt these terms
10 of reference? If so, does somebody wish to make this motion or
11 some modification of this motion?

12
13 **DR. BARBIERI:** Motion to adopt.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Luiz has made the motion.

16
17 **MR. GILL:** Second.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Bob Gill seconds. **Are there any objections to**
20 **this motion? If not, the motion carries.**

21
22 That concludes Agenda Item 4, and we're now on to Project
23 Schedules and Workshop Appointments, and there's two items
24 there, the Vermilion Snapper Schedule and Workshop Appointments
25 and then the second is the Scamp Stock ID and Data Workshop
26 Appointments. Ryan.

27
28 **APPROVAL OF PROJECT SCHEDULES AND WORKSHOP APPOINTMENTS**
29 **VERMILION SNAPPER SCHEDULE AND WORKSHOP APPOINTMENTS**

30
31 **MR. RINDONE:** All right, and so, as we discussed, SEDAR 67 is
32 going to be a standard assessment of vermilion, and there's
33 going to be an in-person workshop that's going to be held on
34 November 13 through 15, and so we have a schedule and
35 participants to look at for this, and so here is your schedule
36 of events for the vermilion assessment. We're in the process of
37 approving the terms of reference and the schedule now, and then
38 we'll work on all of our workshop appointments.

39
40 Yours truly has to get the management history done by April 1,
41 and that will have a data scoping call April 22, and an
42 unprocessed data deadline, which includes raw age and
43 reproductive data and raw effort data for the indices is due the
44 middle of June, and the deadline for all final analytical
45 products is going to be the middle of September. We will have
46 an assessment scoping webinar in the middle of October, with all
47 working papers due the first of November, two weeks ahead of
48 that in-person workshop in Miami on November 13 through 15.

1 Then, in December and January, we'll have a couple of follow-up
2 webinars to tie up all the loose ends, and the report will be
3 edited and provided to the council and you guys in the middle of
4 March of 2020. Does everyone like this schedule?
5
6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** This is assuming, of course, that our federal
7 colleagues are still employed.
8
9 **MR. RINDONE:** Glass half full, Joe, glass half full.
10
11 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I don't have any comments on the schedule. It
12 looks -- Do you need a motion to adopt this schedule?
13
14 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes.
15
16 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay.
17
18 **DR. PATTERSON:** So moved.
19
20 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Will Patterson has moved to adopt the
21 schedule, and this is for vermilion.
22
23 **DR. NANCE:** I will second it, Joe.
24
25 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Jim Nance seconds. Is there any
26 objection to the schedule? That is the motion that was
27 presented and has been seconded. **Is there any objection to this**
28 **motion? Then the motion carries.** Okay, Ryan.
29
30 **MR. RINDONE:** Okay. So, we're talking about the folks that are
31 going to be on the workshop panel for vermilion. We are allowed
32 ten participants, plus two industry observers, and, typically,
33 we appoint about four SSC members to these sorts of things, and
34 sometimes less, depending on how many of you guys are willing to
35 subject yourselves to the servitude, and we can always backfill
36 with more AP members, or usually we can anyway. Mr. Chairman, I
37 would like to ask for volunteers from the SSC to participate in
38 the vermilion snapper standard assessment, and this includes all
39 the webinars, as you are able, and the in-person workshop in
40 Miami.
41
42 **DR. NANCE:** I would like to participate in this one.
43
44 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Jim.
45
46 **DR. PATTERSON:** I volunteer.
47
48 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** So we have Jim Nance and Will Patterson.

1
2 **DR. POWERS:** I will volunteer.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Sean.

5
6 **MR. RINDONE:** Is anyone else really excited to take a deeper
7 look at vermilion?

8
9 **DR. LORENZEN:** I am super excited.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Are you looking for more than four, just in
12 case somebody drops out or drops dead or something?

13
14 **MR. RINDONE:** Not particularly, and hopefully not, but, if
15 anyone else wants to volunteer, they certainly can, and,
16 ultimately, the Council Chair and the Executive Director will
17 make the final call.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. For all these things, if somebody sort
20 of reconsiders and wants to be considered, just let me know, and
21 then we can kind of fold it into the decision-making, but, for
22 those set of people that were chomping at the bit, you probably
23 have first dibs on it. All right. So go ahead then, Ryan. We
24 don't have to have a motion to decide whether Sean is acceptable
25 or not, do we?

26
27 **MR. RINDONE:** Only if you want to.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** No thank you.

30
31 **SCAMP STOCK ID AND DATA WORKSHOP APPOINTMENTS**

32
33 **MR. RINDONE:** Sean has many storied SEDARs under his belt. All
34 right, and so the next thing is the SEDAR 68 Gulf of Mexico
35 scamp research track assessment, and this is actually being done
36 concurrently with the South Atlantic. SEDAR 68 is going to
37 begin with a stock ID workshop, which is going to help determine
38 whether there are two stocks of scamp, seven stocks of scamp,
39 one stock of scamp, or whatever the circumstances may be, based
40 on the data we have available.

41
42 If you have a little experience with the stock ID process, some
43 issues that we're anticipating are species ID issues between
44 scamp and yellowmouth, and those are already being included in
45 the terms of reference for the stock ID workshop and other parts
46 of the assessment, and these are actually really interesting
47 workshops.

1 They are going to be held via webinar, the stock ID portion is
2 anyway, and it's going to be held in the spring and early summer
3 of 2019, and so we're just looking for a few volunteers to
4 participate in these stock ID webinars. All the data that are
5 available will be made available for your consideration and
6 digestion ahead of the webinars, and there will be presentations
7 and whatnot, like you might expect, and the ultimate goal is to
8 examine the null hypothesis of the way we're doing it now is the
9 right way, in terms of assuming that there are two stocks of
10 scamp, an Atlantic stock and a Gulf stock, with those stocks
11 being separated at the council jurisdictional boundary west of
12 the Dry Tortugas.

13
14 That will be the hypothesis that will be tested, and, if the
15 data presented suggest that that hypothesis is refutable, then
16 an alternative hypothesis will be proposed. Is there any
17 volunteers? Again, we don't have definitive dates yet for this,
18 but I can give you a ballpark though.

19
20 **DR. GREGORY:** I volunteer for the ID webinars.

21
22 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. Thank you, Doug. We're going to have
23 a data scoping webinar in March, and it's going to talk about
24 discussing a modeling approach and whatnot for the actual
25 assessment leading into the research track. The actual stock ID
26 workshops are going to be in May and June. There may be a call
27 here or there, before and after, to talk about some wrap-up
28 things, but expect those webinars to be in May and June.

29
30 **DR. TOLAN:** Ryan, I was part of the group that did a very
31 similar thing with cobia, and it was really quite interesting,
32 like you were saying, and so I would like to be a part of this.

33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Jim. There's no limit on this. As
35 many of you who are interested can certainly listen in. It's
36 being held via webinar, and so there's no travel involved or
37 anything like that, but the council will appoint a certain
38 number of SSC members, but everybody can actually listen in and
39 digest the information. It is very interesting.

40
41 **MR. MARESKA:** I will volunteer to be part of the stock ID
42 workshop.

43
44 **MR. GREGORY:** Ryan, if you can reach out to any working
45 geneticists in the Gulf that you might be able to get on the
46 SEDAR Technical Committee that are interested in this sort of
47 thing, and it seems to me that we've been lacking in that in the
48 past.

1
2 **MR. RINDONE:** Let me see if I can find the spreadsheet that I
3 have, and so these are the people that we have reached out to so
4 far to be involved as well on behalf of the Gulf that are not
5 actual SSC or AP members. Andrea Bernard had some unprocessed
6 genetic samples, and genetics is what she does at Nova
7 Southeastern, and she is being approached about trying to get
8 her some help with her samples, and most of you who are familiar
9 with Ted Switzer and Bev Sauls, who have a lot of knowledge
10 about Florida's data.

11
12 Dustin Addis has some acoustic tagging data, and so he can help
13 with the spatial distribution aspect of the stock ID process.
14 Steve Cadrin is a member of the CIE group that independently
15 reviews our more in-depth assessments, and Steve has a
16 background in genetics as well and has a lot of experience in
17 delineating between different stocks of the same species. Dave
18 Portnoy from Texas A&M is also a genetics expert, and he has
19 some unprocessed samples from the Gulf, and he's going to give
20 us the spatial distribution of those samples, which will provide
21 a little bit more information from the western Gulf, where we
22 know we are already going to be a little bit light, in terms of
23 what we have on hand.

24
25 **MS. NEER:** Additionally to those, the South Atlantic has a list
26 of people that they were also suggesting for stock ID, with
27 similar background material and background expertise, since we
28 did this for both blueline tilefish and cobia along the
29 Atlantic, for both the Atlantic stocks just recently, and so,
30 yes, we have been fortunate enough that we've done this -- This
31 is now the third or fourth time we're going into this, and we
32 have what we feel is a good pool of geneticists to tap into and
33 get them involved.

34
35 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, very much so. Any other volunteers? Thank
36 you to those who did volunteer. You're going to find it very
37 interesting, as Dr. Tolan can attest.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, and, as I said before, if you
40 reconsider, and particularly for these kinds of things, because,
41 even without becoming a bonified member, you can certainly
42 listen in, and I'm sure that some level of participation as
43 well, even if you're not a bonified member. Are we finished
44 with Item V, Ryan? We're moving on to Item VI, the SEDAR Stock
45 Assessment Schedule for 2021?

46
47 **MR. RINDONE:** All right, and so --
48

1 **MR. GREGORY:** Wait a minute. Don't you also need volunteers for
2 the data workshop?

3

4 **MR. RINDONE:** We're not soliciting those quite yet.

5

6 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay.

7

8 **MR. RINDONE:** We have some time before we have to do that, and
9 we can make sure that we've gotten through the stock ID process
10 in an adequate fashion before we go about scheduling the data
11 workshop. We have a loose date on there.

12

13 **MR. GREGORY:** Well, it's in the scope of work. That's the only
14 reason I asked.

15

16 **MR. RINDONE:** So we can do that one as well. Thanks for
17 catching that, Doug. It's just listed as October for right now
18 of 2020, and we don't have a formal memo from SEDAR telling us
19 how many participants we're going to be able to have, but, for
20 those of you that can forecast two years out, by all means,
21 please offer to be involved. I'm sorry. I'm looking at the
22 wrong -- It's November of 2019 is what we're looking at for the
23 data workshop. Excuse me. It's October 29 through November 1,
24 and this for the data workshop for scamp, and, again, we don't
25 have a formal memo telling us how many people can participate,
26 and so if you guys want to just volunteer, and then, once we
27 know, we can touch base with the Chair again and verify all of
28 that, verify your availability.

29

30 **MS. NEER:** Like Ryan said, we don't really need these yet, if
31 you want to start pondering it and deciding whether you might be
32 interested as the process progresses. We were going to revisit
33 that and come back to this at your March meeting.

34

35 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. Nobody wants to put their
36 name down yet? It's a long way away, and so we'll be more
37 solicitous about this later on. All right. The next agenda
38 item is Item VI, the Assessment Schedule for 2021. Ryan.

39

40 **GULF SEDAR STOCK ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE 2021**

41

42 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. The 2021 SEDAR stock assessment
43 schedule, as proposed, is listed right here, and, Mr. Gill, I
44 just want to note the change that I made, at your request, for
45 the terminal year of king mackerel. It's been clarified as
46 2017-2018, to reflect the fishing year. 2020 is already
47 finalized, and 2021 is the one that's proposed, and so we have
48 finishing up our research track assessment of red snapper, and

1 immediately following that will be the operational assessment,
2 which yields management advice. That is anticipated to be
3 delivered in the fourth quarter of 2021 to the SSC for review.
4

5 A gag operational assessment, with a terminal year of 2019, will
6 be delivered to the SSC in the first quarter of 2021 for review,
7 and the scamp operational assessment, which is following the
8 scamp research track assessment, will use data through 2020, and
9 it will be delivered in the fourth quarter of 2021, and we have
10 on here a red grouper research track with an undefined terminal
11 year and an undefined project schedule, because this is -- Given
12 the issues that have been presented with red grouper, this was
13 thought that maybe this might be a good time to start a research
14 track on red grouper, given the results of the interim analysis
15 and what we're seeing in the fishery with the disparity between
16 landings and the previous catch advice, and so that's why that's
17 there.
18

19 Then, for FWC, we have a bench assessment of mutton snapper,
20 with a terminal year of 2019, to be delivered in the fourth
21 quarter of 2021, and a Gulf hogfish benchmark assessment, also
22 with a terminal year of 2019 and an undefined project schedule.
23 The reason that the FWC assessments are still listed as
24 benchmarks is more in reference to the manner in which those
25 assessments are anticipated to be conducted. The FWC isn't
26 necessarily constrained to doing a research track or an
27 operational track assessment, and so the benchmark connotation
28 infers the level of analytical clout that's going to be thrown
29 at that particular species for that assessment.
30

31 **MS. NEER:** I just want to point out to everyone that, when Ryan
32 is listing these quarters, for any projects past 2019, they are
33 -- All these project timelines are all extremely tentative. The
34 new way we're doing planning for all the projects within the
35 Southeast is an overall approach, and so, as you already saw,
36 where we have to make sometimes decisions of when things happen,
37 or a 2017 terminal year, versus a 2018 terminal year, and so,
38 until you guys approve a project schedule, everything listed in
39 these quarters is highly subject to change, and I just don't
40 want people to get hung up on when you're going to get it, in
41 March versus May or which quarter or whatever.
42

43 We do our best to accommodate everyone's requests, but just kind
44 of keep that -- Basically, from 2020 forward, they're all sort
45 of tentative, and, as Joe sort of pointed out earlier, with the
46 government shutdown, every time we cancel something, every day
47 along, it may affect our 2019 schedules as well, FYI.
48

1 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, all very true. Thank you, Julie.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Again, a motion to adopt this
4 schedule, with the proviso, of course, that it can change, and
5 so, with that, is there any further discussion about the
6 schedule, about things that you wish were different?

7
8 **DR. ROBERTS:** I just have a question about the -- The research
9 track, what is the purpose of that if it can't offer management
10 advice? Number two, we have consecutive RTs in 2019 and 2020,
11 for both red snapper and scamp, and so that's a question that I
12 have too, is why consecutive years?

13
14 **MR. RINDONE:** A research track allows the analytical team to
15 delve into as many questions that they had piling up in research
16 recommendations for previous assessments as they can make time
17 for. Now, reasonably, we can't have them spending three or four
18 or five years just doing a research project -- Not just doing a
19 research project, but doing a research project on a particular
20 species when we need management advice in a timely fashion to be
21 able to manage these stocks the way that we're mandated to.

22
23 The research track process is about a year-and-a-half to two
24 years, depending on what's being proposed to be examined, and
25 the analytical team may not use the most recent terminal year of
26 data to answer the questions that they are asking. That is the
27 reason why the research track for red grouper has an undefined
28 terminal year, because they may decide that they are only going
29 to use data through 2012 to answer the questions, because it
30 allows them to answer it best, and then they can use that
31 solution to address the subsequent years.

32
33 We have an operational assessment -- The research track
34 assessment doesn't yield management advice, because that's not
35 the point of it. It purely focuses on answering the scientific
36 questions. The operational assessment that follows is what is
37 intended to provide the management advice, and so we have two
38 research tracks.

39
40 We have the scamp research track that starts this year, late
41 this year, and then a red snapper research track that is
42 starting early next year, tentatively, because we have
43 identified needs in both of those situations that both of those
44 species require that level of analysis.

45
46 Scamp, we have never assessed before, and so doing it as a
47 research track is appropriate, to get a full grasp of what's
48 actually going on with that species for the very first time.

1
2 Red snapper, we have a veritable laundry list of things that we
3 have been putting off, due to time and data constraints, for a
4 long time, we're now prepared to be able to address, and so
5 those will be addressed in the red snapper research track,
6 culminating in management advice at the end of 2021 with the
7 operational assessment.

8
9 **DR. ROBERTS:** Let me ask further. Does the committee ever seen
10 the RT outcome, a document?

11
12 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, absolutely, and so you guys will be involved
13 in these research track assessments as panelists, if you
14 volunteer to do so, and, along the way, there will be public
15 meetings and public webinars, et cetera, that will be noticed,
16 but there will also be meetings and webinars and calls, et
17 cetera, that allow the analysts the flexibility to ask questions
18 and get answers and then make some decisions immediately, so as
19 to not impede progress of the assessment.

20
21 One of the things that we have found with the benchmark
22 assessments was that the analysts could be waiting a few weeks
23 to get a decision from the assessment panel on what to do on a
24 particular problem, and, during that time, no progress is made
25 on that project, but, under the research track approach, the
26 appointed panel can be contacted, and a decision can be made on
27 that, and then that decision is then reviewed at one of the
28 intermediary webinars that is held along the way, so people have
29 some idea of what's going on as it's going on.

30
31 **DR. ROBERTS:** That's a very thorough and clear explanation, and
32 I appreciate it very much.

33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** You're welcome.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I would also -- Scamp is kind of the first
37 research track. Is that true, Ryan?

38
39 **MR. RINDONE:** That is true.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** It's also joint between the Atlantic and Gulf,
42 which what that implies, to me, is the implication of the stock
43 ID workshop is really pretty important, because do you really
44 need to have individual for the Gulf or not, or do you have to
45 divide within the Gulf or within the Atlantic, and so on and so
46 forth, and so, again, with research tracks, it's less
47 constrained about where you're going to end up, in terms of how
48 you end up doing the assessment modeling, and so I view it from

1 that sort of standpoint, is you're opening the door for a
2 different interpretation and different ways of modeling it and
3 so on.

4
5 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, that's true. The research track cares less
6 about the present management environment and more about just the
7 science behind the species, and so the operational assessment is
8 designed to deal with what comes out of the research track and
9 the present management environment.

10
11 **MR. GREGORY:** I have a question for Ryan.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead, Doug.

14
15 **MR. GREGORY:** Has the SSC and council determined what type of
16 operational assessment is desired for greater amberjack and gag?
17 Has that already been done?

18
19 **MR. RINDONE:** You guys provided feedback on the scope of work
20 for the gag and greater amberjack operational assessments at the
21 October meeting, and that information was then passed along to
22 the Science Center for finalizing their terms of reference for
23 those assessments, which you haven't seen yet, but I guess, when
24 they open up shop again and they get the ball rolling again,
25 when it's time for you guys to approve those finalized terms of
26 reference, you will see those.

27
28 From what we have gathered from the Center, the standard
29 operating procedure for the operational assessments is going to
30 be an initial proposed scope of work, which is going to look a
31 lot like terms of reference, like you guys saw at the last
32 meeting, and you guys will provide feedback. That will go back
33 to the Center, and they'll talk more about timelines and what
34 can actually be done, and then they will send back a proposed
35 terms of reference that you guys will edit and/or approve, and
36 then the ball will get rolling.

37
38 **MR. GREGORY:** So there has not been a request or a suggestion
39 that the operational assessments be either an update or a
40 standard?

41
42 **MR. RINDONE:** There is no update or a standard with those
43 assessments. They are just operational assessments, and the
44 only thing that is really differentiating them is whether
45 additional analyses are being considered, and, for both of them,
46 you guys did propose various additional analyses beyond what was
47 just simply done the last time around.

48

1 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay, because I guess the notation is changing
2 with these, but, at one point, a year ago, the Center was saying
3 that, within the operational assessments, it could be standard-
4 like or update-like, and I do realize that they're trying to get
5 away from that terminology, but that's a wide range of potential
6 assessment workloads, and so I think what you're saying is that
7 has not been determined, and the Science Center is going to
8 recommend that to us at some point, and we get to respond to
9 that.

10

11 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, that's correct.

12

13 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay. Thank you.

14

15 **MR. RINDONE:** That will be recommended and brought back to you
16 guys, I would imagine sometime late this year, if I were to
17 guess when they would make that available, and so mid to late
18 this year. Julie might know more, or Julie might not know
19 anything, since they're closed right now.

20

21 **MS. NEER:** What happens is you guys did that scope of work, as
22 Ryan suggested, and you started that, and they submitted that to
23 the Science Center, and the Science Center is going to review
24 that as part of the overall workload that was proposed for the
25 following year, and then, when the Steering Committee meets,
26 that's part of their discussions on how much they can do, how
27 many species we can do, and at what level of assessment those
28 can be conducted at and what terminal year and level of
29 assessment, in terms of data requirements.

30

31 That will go to the Steering Committee for discussion, you guys'
32 input on what you think needs to happen for gag and amberjack,
33 and that will be figured into the determination of whether those
34 get done, and the degree of data pull that's going to need to be
35 done will help determine where on that sliding scale within the
36 operational venue of how much will be done, and then we'll do
37 the terms of reference, and they will come to you for review. I
38 hope that makes sense. Ryan, you're right in your timing. The
39 Steering Committee, I believe, is going to look at these at the
40 May meeting, and hopefully they'll be finalized then, but,
41 again, everything is a little up in the air right now.

42

43 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes and true.

44

45 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. I think we're at the point
46 of having a motion to adopt the schedule with all of the caveats
47 associated with things that may change, but, in terms of a
48 template for operating over the foreseeable future, we're

1 looking for a motion to adopt.

2

3 **MR. GILL:** Joe, could I ask a question?

4

5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** You certainly may.

6

7 **MR. GILL:** Ryan, my question relates to the gag assessment. It
8 shows up, and I recognize that, as Julie mentioned, the
9 schedules far out are pretty fluid, but it shows up in two
10 years, in contrast to the vermilion and cobia, which is the same
11 situation, which does not, and so, looking at the 2021 schedule,
12 it looks like it's taking up an entire slot for the entire year,
13 and the reality, from a planning point of view, is it's taking
14 up a small portion of the year, but it looks like we lose a
15 slot, the way it's done differently from the vermilion and the
16 cobia, and could you talk about that a little bit?

17

18 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure, Bob. Thanks for your question. The thing
19 to consider is that, in 2020, we're doing two research tracks,
20 one starting at the beginning of 2020 and one that will have
21 started at the end of 2019, and so, during 2020, we will have
22 two research tracks going on, which are going to -- It's going
23 to suck up a lot of people's time, and so that is part of the
24 reason why we're otherwise light outside of that, is because
25 there's a lot of analytical brainpower that's being thrown at
26 Items 1 and 4 in 2020.

27

28 After that, like leading into 2021, red snapper, obviously, is
29 still going to be the big bear in 2021, all the way through Q4
30 right now, and the same with scamp, and then you will have the
31 gag assessment wrapping up, and we now have a proposed red
32 grouper research track that could be starting at some point
33 during 2021, and so that will suck up some more time as well.

34

35 Now, the idea is that, as we work through doing these
36 operational assessments, we get a better grasp of how they're
37 going to work, and especially the research track assessments and
38 how the Science Center is going to manage their time on those,
39 and we should be able to get maybe another operational
40 assessment or two incorporated.

41

42 Also, as you guys continue to review future interim analyses,
43 like you did for red grouper, more of those can be requested
44 along the way, to get snapshots of what's going on with
45 particular species, in relatively short order, and make
46 recommendations based on those interim analyses to the council,
47 on the basis of providing catch advice, and so the interim
48 analyses are another tool that's not listed on the SEDAR

1 schedule, because it's not a SEDAR product, and it's something
2 that is requested through the Science Center by the council.

3

4 **MR. GILL:** Thank you.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you. Any more discussion on
7 the schedule? Is there a motion to adopt?

8

9 **MR. GILL:** So moved.

10

11 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Bob. Is there a second?

12

13 **DR. BARBIERI:** Second.

14

15 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Bob, this is the motion that you just made.
16 All right.

17

18 **MR. RINDONE:** Mr. Chair, just a point of clarification, before
19 you guys vote on it, with respect to the motion that's on the
20 board. We don't actually have anything listed for 2022, and the
21 schedule for 2018 to 2021 is already finalized, and so -- 2018
22 to 2020 is already finalized, and so you guys are just talking
23 about 2021 right now.

24

25 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Our mistake.

26

27 **MR. RINDONE:** It should just say "2021". There we go.

28

29

OTHER BUSINESS

30

31 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. **Any objection? If not, then the**
32 **motion carries.**

33

34 In terms of Other Business, there were a couple of items that I
35 mentioned previously. One of them was the National SSC
36 schedule, and Luiz -- We have participated in these before, and,
37 for example, the contact point before was Luiz, as the Chairman
38 of the SSC, and then you bequeathed it to me, because I was
39 going to end up going, and then, also, Steven Atran was the
40 council staff. Has any of the council staff been contacted
41 about this?

42

43 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I have not been contacted about it.

44

45 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Then that was my mistake. Like I said,
46 when -- I had assumed that the same sort of procedure, that the
47 council staff and the Council Vice Chair would be contacted
48 about this. Like I said, I mean, this was just a -- I think

1 they're just beginning to start talking about subject matter and
2 things like that.

3
4 Kai emailed me in the interim, during this meeting, and said
5 that he wanted to make sure that he's going to be involved with
6 that, and I will make sure too, because, like I said, calling
7 from where I'm calling -- For some reason, they can't set up a
8 webinar like this, but you have to actually call in, in which
9 case, for me, it would be like a couple-hundred-dollar phone
10 call, and so I tried to avoid that.

11
12 **DR. LORENZEN:** Joe, I didn't know, and I think I was out of the
13 loop, and so that's why -- Otherwise, I would have volunteered
14 to do that call.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Exactly, and I guess that's why -- I will make
17 sure that you're on the distribution list, and then also John
18 Froeschke as well, as we proceed.

19
20 Also, I would -- We had brought up before about rethinking some
21 of the operating procedures for the SSC, and this led to a
22 presentation by Lee at the last SSC meeting, and we really
23 haven't -- To me, one, I agreed to do a white paper, which I
24 haven't completed yet, and so some of this is on me, but,
25 secondly, I am really reluctant to get into a discussion on this
26 via a webinar, and there are certain limitations, in my mind,
27 about what we can and can't do on a webinar, and so I would like
28 to make sure that we proceed and make some progress and put this
29 on the agenda for the next meeting, which brings to mind -- When
30 is the March meeting, because you said, at the beginning of this
31 meeting, you are considering moving it up a week, and so when is
32 the schedule now?

33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** Let me call up my calendar here. I think John
35 stepped away from his desk for just a second. We have tentative
36 dates for March 12th through 14th for March's SSC meeting. If
37 we're moving it up a week, that would be March 5th through 7th.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** We need to get that set fairly quickly, I
40 think.

41
42 **MR. RINDONE:** Indeed.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** But we can begin to get the -- Just another
45 aside is this was a pretty limited agenda that we had for this
46 particular meeting, and there is lots of things that we could
47 consider and begin to start addressing issues, and one of the
48 things that I was thinking about was how we're proceeding with

1 management strategy evaluations and general issues about
2 ecosystem-based fisheries management and things like that.

3
4 Clearly it's hard to do things like that via webinar, and then,
5 of course, even more so without having our federal colleagues
6 here, and so the fact that we aren't addressing broader items at
7 this particular meeting doesn't bother me so much, but I think
8 we need to think a little bit more about the agenda and the
9 long-term sorts of -- I realize that there are also some
10 budgetary issues, because, obviously, if you do a webinar, it's
11 not nearly the cost, but, at the same respect, I think we as an
12 SSC have to be cognizant of the sorts of progress that we might
13 make. Those are really more comments on my part than any
14 particular agenda item. Is there any other comments?

15
16 **MS. NEER:** Just one quick question. If you guys are going to
17 make that shift to four weeks in advance from three weeks in
18 advance, be aware that we have SEDAR schedules that were already
19 built around that three weeks in advance, and so please don't
20 overlap things that are already on the schedules if you shift
21 those meeting weeks, and I will, for the future, now plan that
22 you're going to do them four weeks in advance of the council
23 meetings, as opposed to three.

24
25 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Julie, that's not set in stone. That's just
26 something we've sort of had some discussions, and that's why I
27 brought it up, just in case there are some other issues and
28 things, and so I will get in touch with you, when we start
29 planning the March meeting here soon, and just see, one, if the
30 government has reopened, and I assume it will be, and just to
31 kind of go through these issues and see what problems we might
32 be creating and if it's something that we need to phase-in or
33 something like that.

34
35 **MS. NEER:** I will accommodate whatever you guys decide.

36
37 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay.

38
39 **MR. RINDONE:** Julie, presently, the SEDAR 64 yellowtail workshop
40 is scheduled for February 25th through 27th, prior to the week
41 being proposed, and so that may require two weeks in a row
42 travel for a couple of people.

43
44 **MS. NEER:** When it was the week of the 12th, the week after that
45 was the SEDAR 62 workshop, and so that might have also required
46 back-to-back travel, and so we're kind of stacking it there in
47 March.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. In terms of this meeting, is there any
2 other items to be brought up in Other Business? If not, then
3 thank you, and let's hope that for the March meeting that we
4 have our federal colleagues.

5
6 **DR. CHAGARIS:** I was muted there, but I was trying to respond.
7 I just wanted to bring something to the group's attention, and
8 you sort of alluded to this in your previous comment about
9 thinking in advance of the agendas, and I emailed you and John
10 and Kai about this, but I would just bring to the attention some
11 of the ongoing ecosystem work underway here at UF and the
12 Science Center in Miami, and it's a project funded by the NOAA
13 RESTORE Science Program, and it's myself and Rob Ahrens here at
14 UF, and Skyler and Matt Lauretta in Miami, as well as Kim de
15 Mutsert, and we're working on a suite of ecosystem models
16 designed to inform the assessment and management of fisheries
17 here in the Gulf.

18
19 We had a scoping workshop towards the end of 2017 that
20 identified some of the broad management questions, and we're
21 planning to do some things specifically for gag, and also for
22 Gulf menhaden, but, at some point, I would like to give a
23 presentation to the SSC to bring the group up to speed on the
24 project and get some more feedback about the types of outputs
25 that would be useful for this committee and so forth.

26
27 For me, it would be useful to get that feedback early on, before
28 we start generating these outputs, so that we're putting
29 something out there that is most useful, and we can also pivot,
30 if needed, to more pressing questions, and so I just wanted to
31 bring it up here, to let everyone know about our efforts and see
32 if the committee might like a presentation on the project and
33 have an opportunity to provide input at an earlier stage, and I
34 thought maybe the March meeting might be good timing for this,
35 or if the group would prefer to wait until something more
36 actionable were on the table to see a presentation, and so
37 that's really all I wanted to say at this point, and I welcome
38 any thoughts about how best to bring this before the committee.
39 If nobody has anything to add right now, I can always reach out
40 later, if something comes to mind, and so that's all. Thank
41 you.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Of course, the process is that
44 John Froeschke and Kai and I and other council staff will
45 develop the agenda, and we'll keep this in mind, and this is
46 kind of the thing that I was alluding to, as you indicated, that
47 we should have these sorts of issues and always try to make some
48 progress, in terms of these sorts of issues.

1
2 **DR. CHAGARIS:** Thank you, Joe.
3
4 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** If you have any comments, if any of you, other
5 than David, have comments you want to make about these kinds of
6 things, send them to Kai or me or John Froeschke, and we can
7 integrate those into our thinking, in terms of the agenda. All
8 right. Any other business or comments? If not, can I have a
9 motion to adjourn?

10
11 **MR. GILL:** So moved.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Bob Gill moves, and do we have a second? We
14 have a second. If everybody hangs up, then we know that you all
15 agree. Any objection? There are none, and so thank you very
16 much for your attention, and we'll look forward to the March
17 meeting.

18
19 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 9, 2019.)

20
21 - - -
22