

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 STANDING & SPECIAL REEF FISH, MACKEREL, AND SOCIOECONOMIC
4 SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEES

5
6 Webinar

7
8 May 9, 2019

9
10 **STANDING SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 11 Joseph Powers.....
- 12 Lee Anderson.....
- 13 Harry Blanchet.....
- 14 David Chagaris.....
- 15 Benny Gallaway.....
- 16 Bob Gill.....
- 17 Douglas Gregory.....
- 18 Walter Keithly.....
- 19 Robert Leaf.....
- 20 Kai Lorenzen.....
- 21 Campo Matens.....
- 22 Will Patterson.....
- 23 Kenneth Roberts.....
- 24 Steven Scyphers.....
- 25 Jim Tolan.....

26
27 **SPECIAL REEF FISH SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 28 Jason Adriance.....
- 29 Judson Curtis.....
- 30 John Mareska.....

31
32 **SPECIAL MACKEREL SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 33 Jason Adriance.....
- 34 Kari MacLauchlin Buck.....
- 35 John Mareska.....

36
37 **SPECIAL SOCIOECONOMIC SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 38 Jack Isaacs.....
- 39 Kari MacLauchlin-Buck.....
- 40 Andrew Ropicki.....

41
42 **STAFF**

- 43 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 44 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 45 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 46 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 47 Jessica Matos.....Administrative Assistant
- 48 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison

1 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
2 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
3
4 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**
5 Steven Atran.....FL
6 Dale Diaz.....MS
7 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy
8 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS
9 Sarah Gibbs.....NEU
10 Martha Guyas.....FL
11 Sepp Haukebo.....EDF
12 Costa Kouzounis.....
13 Ben Martino.....
14 Julie Neer.....SEDAR
15 Michael Norberg.....FWC, FL
16 Laura Picariello.....TAMU
17 Ashford Rosenberg.....Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance
18 Skyler Sagarese.....NMFS
19 Nathan Vaughan.....NMFS
20 John Walter.....NMFS
21 - - -
22

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 Approval of SSC Minutes.....8
10
11 Selection of SSC Representative at June 2019 Council Meeting.....8
12
13 Review of Carryover Simulations Updated to Include Overages.....9
14
15 Selection of Ecosystem Technical Committee Members.....39
16
17 Other Business.....40
18 Discussion of National SSC Meeting.....40
19 Discussion of Future Meetings.....42
20
21 Adjournment.....45
22
23 - - -
24

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

PAGE 30: Motion that the SSC recommends the simulation analysis done by the SEFSC with respect to quota overages or underages is best available science. All else being equal, results of that analysis indicate if a payback, in the case of a quota overage, or a carryover, in the case of a quota underage, is handled in a one-to-one fashion in the short term, there is little effect on rebuilding trajectories. The motion carried on page 36.

PAGE 36: Motion that the SSC recommends the council consider implementing paybacks for overages for stocks on a rebuilding schedule, in light of the analyses provided by SEFSC regarding overages with no payback provision. The motion carried on page 39.

- - -

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 Thursday, May 9, 2019, and was called to
4 order by Chairman Joe Powers.

5
6 **INTRODUCTIONS AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7

8 **CHAIRMAN JOE POWERS:** Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is
9 Joe Powers, and I welcome all of you as the Chair of the
10 Scientific and Statistical Committee of the Gulf of Mexico
11 Fishery Management Council. We appreciate your attendance at
12 this webinar and input to this meeting.

13
14 Representing the council is Dale Diaz, and council staff in
15 attendance are John Froeschke, Ryan Rindone, Carrie Simmons, and
16 Karen Hoak.

17
18 Notice of this meeting was provided to coastal newspapers
19 throughout the area, Marine Extension and NMFS port agents and
20 the Federal Register. Notice was also sent to subscribers of
21 the council's press release email list and was posted on the
22 council's website.

23
24 Today's meeting will include the following topics: Adoption of
25 the Agenda, Approval of Summaries from the last March meeting,
26 Selection of the SSC Representative for the June Council
27 Meeting, and Discussion and Review of Carryover Simulations, and
28 any other business that might come before this committee.

29
30 This webinar is open to the public, and this meeting is live and
31 is being recorded. Summary minutes of the meeting will also be
32 made available to the public. For purposes of voice
33 identification, and to ensure your mic is operational, please
34 identify yourself by saying your full name into your mic when
35 your name is called by the council staff.

36
37 Once you have been un-muted to identify yourself, you will have
38 control of your own mic from then on. Please remember to
39 identify yourself before making and seconding motions and also
40 to re-mute your mic each time you finish. Thank you. Karen, do
41 you have to go over each one of them to identify themselves
42 again?

43
44 **MS. KAREN HOAK:** Ryan has the attendance list. He can read
45 them.

46
47 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** I will do it, and so we'll do it quick. Lee
48 Anderson.

1
2 **DR. LEE ANDERSON:** Here.
3
4 **MR. RINDONE:** Luiz Barbieri. Harry Blanchet.
5
6 **MR. HARRY BLANCHET:** Harry Blanchet here.
7
8 **MR. RINDONE:** Dave Chagaris.
9
10 **DR. DAVID CHAGARIS:** Here.
11
12 **MR. RINDONE:** Benny Gallaway. Bob Gill. Doug Gregory.
13
14 **MR. DOUG GREGORY:** Doug Gregory is here.
15
16 **MR. RINDONE:** Walter Keithly.
17
18 **DR. WALTER KEITHLY:** Walter Keithly is here.
19
20 **MR. RINDONE:** Robert Leaf.
21
22 **DR. ROBERT LEAF:** Robert Leaf here.
23
24 **MR. RINDONE:** Kai Lorenzen.
25
26 **DR. KAI LORENZEN:** Kai Lorenzen here.
27
28 **MR. RINDONE:** Camp Matens.
29
30 **MR. CAMP MATENS:** Camp Matens here.
31
32 **MR. RINDONE:** Jim Nance. Will Patterson.
33
34 **DR. PATTERSON:** Here.
35
36 **MR. RINDONE:** Joe Powers.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Here.
39
40 **MR. RINDONE:** Sean Powers. Kenneth Roberts.
41
42 **DR. KENNETH ROBERTS:** Kenneth Roberts is aboard.
43
44 **MR. RINDONE:** Steven Scyphers.
45
46 **DR. STEVEN SCYPHERS:** Steven Scyphers is here.
47
48 **MR. RINDONE:** Jim Tolan.

1
2 **DR. JIM TOLAN:** Jim Tolan here.
3
4 **MR. RINDONE:** Jason Adriance.
5
6 **MR. JASON ADRIANCE:** Jason Adriance is here.
7
8 **MR. RINDONE:** Jud Curtis.
9
10 **DR. JUDSON CURTIS:** Jud Curtis is here.
11
12 **MR. RINDONE:** John Mareska.
13
14 **MR. JOHN MARESKA:** John Mareska here.
15
16 **MR. RINDONE:** Kari Buck.
17
18 **DR. KARI MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Kari Buck is here.
19
20 **MR. RINDONE:** Jack Isaacs.
21
22 **DR. JACK ISAACS:** Jack is here.
23
24 **MR. RINDONE:** Andrew Ropicki.
25
26 **DR. ANDREW ROPICKI:** Andrew Ropicki is here.
27
28 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. Good job, everybody.
29
30 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. The first item we have is Adoption
31 of the Agenda, and the agenda is listed here, and it was
32 distributed on the website. We have one addition to that
33 agenda, under Other Business, and Kai Lorenzen, who is our
34 representative to the Steering Committee for the National SSC
35 Meeting that's going to take place next year, he will give a
36 short summary of what's going on and the progress that has been
37 made on that, and so that will be under Other Business.
38
39 **MR. RINDONE:** Dr. Powers, I have one addition as well.
40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay.
42
43 **MR. RINDONE:** The council is populating an Ecosystem Technical
44 Committee, and we would like a couple of volunteers from the SSC
45 to participate in this technical committee, and I think Dave
46 Chagaris has expressed some interest initially, and so we'll
47 need one more, but we can get to that at that time.
48

1 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Let's go ahead and take care of
2 that right after the approval of the minutes.

3
4 **MR. RINDONE:** Okay.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. With those modifications, we need
7 to adopt the agenda. Do we have some sort of motion to that
8 effect?

9
10 **MR. GREGORY:** I will move.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Do we have a second?

13
14 **DR. ANDERSON:** Second.

15
16 **APPROVAL OF SSC MINUTES**

17
18 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you very much. Are there any objections
19 to the adoption of the agenda? Hearing none, the agenda is
20 adopted as amended. Approval of the Minutes, the March 13 and
21 14 meeting of the SSC, and there is a summary that has been
22 delivered to us, and are there any comments or changes or
23 discussion associated with these minutes? If not, do we have a
24 motion to approve the minutes?

25
26 **MR. MARESKA:** John Mareska makes a motion to approve the
27 minutes.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, John. Do we have a second?

30
31 **MR. ADRIANCE:** Second.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you very much. Any
34 objections to approving the minutes? If not, the minutes are
35 approved. As we just discussed a couple of minutes ago, Ryan is
36 looking for volunteers for an Ecosystem Committee, and Dave
37 Chagaris had volunteered for it, and we need another one. Ryan,
38 can you kind of outline again what this committee is?

39
40 **MR. RINDONE:** I will actually ask John to do that, John
41 Froeschke.

42
43 **MS. KAREN HOAK:** John, we can't hear you.

44
45 **MR. RINDONE:** Dr. Powers, let's try and raise John maybe towards
46 the end of the meeting.

47
48 **SELECTION OF SSC REPRESENTATIVE AT JUNE 3-6, 2019 COUNCIL**

1
2 You guys talked about some different mechanisms for how to
3 actually do the carryover, and you saw simulations for red
4 snapper that were based on the SEDAR 31 stock assessment that
5 showed that you could carry over the uncaught quota from the
6 previous year to the following year without having any long-term
7 detrimental effects on meeting the rebuilding plan.

8
9 Fast-forward a little bit more, and staff had developed some
10 options for the council to consider the carryover and presented
11 it to the SSC, who provided some feedback, and fast-forward a
12 little bit more, to the beginning of last year, and we looked at
13 red snapper and king mackerel and how multiple carryovers in the
14 same time period may affect SPR over time, and, generally
15 speaking, as long as the overfishing limit wasn't exceeded, the
16 carryovers could be done pound-for-pound, and it wasn't
17 necessary to adjust for natural mortality, because that had
18 already been accounted for in the projections. Fast-forward
19 some more, and that was generally true for both kingfish and red
20 snapper.

21
22 Earlier this year, staff brought the carryover document back to
23 the SSC with some more options, and it was a more developed
24 document at this point, and it showed the underages and overages
25 by species over time, and so you can see which species were
26 likely to be eligible, based on what the landings were doing,
27 and you guys requested that the Science Center update their
28 projections to look at underages and overages of the ACL and the
29 simulations that they had done previously, and so the council
30 wrote a letter and requested exactly that. The Science Center
31 has been kind enough to do all of that work for us and be
32 available to talk about it today.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. The letter is also distributed,
35 and it's pretty straightforward. It's basically asking what we
36 asked for and a few more specifics and what Ryan essentially
37 just described, and so, unless somebody wants to discuss the
38 letter, we will move ahead from there.

39
40 What we're doing now then is the actual presentation of the
41 results of these simulations, the added simulations, and one of
42 the things that -- Before we get into it, I kind of look at this
43 process that we're going through that these simulations were
44 designed for some specific species, or use the results from
45 specific species, and, of course, they're not really in a stock
46 assessment, per se, but they are some very illuminating results.

47
48 One of the things that I think that we ought to do is, when you

1 listen to the presentations, is think about recommendations that
2 we would be making to the council. In some cases, it might be
3 recommendations for each specific species, but, more
4 importantly, I think it's our role to provide some guidelines
5 over what kinds of things that the council should think about as
6 they progress ahead in developing overage and underage payback
7 systems, and so I am sort of envisioning, at the end of all
8 this, that we would just list some -- I will call them
9 recommendations or things that the council should think about as
10 they go through this process.

11
12 With that sort of introduction, then let's go ahead and go to
13 the presentations themselves. We also have the payback report,
14 plus an addendum to it, but let's go to the presentation. Who
15 is doing this?

16
17 **MR. RINDONE:** John Walter. John, are you there?

18
19 **DR. JOHN WALTER:** I am here, yes.

20
21 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. Are you going to give it, or is Nathan
22 there with you?

23
24 **DR. WALTER:** Nathan is here. I will start, and, if there's
25 other questions that Nathan can answer, he's right next to me.

26
27 **MR. RINDONE:** Okay. We can pass control to you, or I can pull
28 it up and I can tab along for you.

29
30 **DR. WALTER:** It's easy enough for you to pass control to me,
31 just in the sense of I think we can hopefully get through this
32 faster than twenty slides.

33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** Okay. We'll go ahead and make you the presenter.

35
36 **DR. WALTER:** All right. Well, good afternoon, everyone. I am
37 glad to be addressing the SSC. It's been a little while since
38 I've been in this role, and so it's fun to be back. I am going
39 to be presenting work that was primarily by Dr. Nathan Vaughan,
40 who has been doing a lot of this work recently for our center,
41 in particular with a decision support tool that we've developed
42 to help facilitate these and other kinds of decision-making
43 processes.

44
45 I think we all know what the question was, and I'm going to
46 start with the conclusions, because I think it's -- Basically,
47 we projected forward the populations for king mackerel, red
48 snapper, and greater amberjack according to the projection

1 specifications and looking at a single-year underage or overage
2 and then payback scenarios, or takeback scenarios, as I call
3 them.

4
5 The bottom line is that, at one-to-one ratios, none of them have
6 any impact on long-term stock status or rebuilding, and so, if
7 you pay back at one-to-one, either an underage or an overage,
8 you're at the same place as you would be if you fished at the
9 ABC.

10
11 The problem that it runs into though is that you run into either
12 an ABC or an OFL buffer, and I show a figure of that, and I
13 think that's pretty clear. We know that, if we have a big
14 underage, that we can't necessarily take that carryover without
15 running up against either an OFL barrier or an ABC barrier, and
16 the figures show that.

17
18 Then, if it were spread out over a longer period of time for the
19 carryover, there are specific NS 1 Guidelines that don't allow
20 that, and I think we'll have to refer to the NS 1 Guidelines, in
21 terms of where we bump up against that, and so I will go to the
22 figures here.

23
24 Then we were asked to do an additional run, which is whether
25 simply un-paid-back carryovers, or un-paid-back overages, what
26 their effect is, and that's pretty straightforward. If they're
27 not paid back, you're not going to be back on the rebuilding
28 plan, for a stock that needs rebuilding, and so we can show
29 those figures, but that's pretty straightforward that you would
30 then be either delaying rebuilding by any number of years,
31 depending on the amount of overage, or not at the stock status
32 that you would be had you fished at the ABC.

33
34 These are the primary tables that are the most important to look
35 at, and the way that I kind of tried -- I will just go over what
36 they are here, and they're the years from 2017 to 2030, which
37 generally correspond to rebuilding schedules for stocks that are
38 overfished.

39
40 On the left column is the fraction of the OFL to the ABC, and so
41 all of these numbers are the fraction of the catch that you have
42 taken under each scenario relative to the catch that you would
43 have gotten according to the ABC, and so the central line is the
44 ABC if you fished at the ABC, and that ratio is one.

45
46 Now, on either side, if you fish under or over, you're going to
47 be either less than or greater than the ABC, and, in this case,
48 we're saying that 2019 is the year that an underage or overage

1 happens, and I will get to the two random scenarios in a minute,
2 but, basically, what you've got is a series of goalposts, where
3 you say how far in the underage and overage are you away from
4 the ABC and do you get back fairly immediately, and, in this
5 case, you get back immediately on the catch in the ABC after the
6 overage, because it is reverting to that, but you see, that, in
7 2019, if you take a 50 percent overage, you're at 1.5 times the
8 ABC for red snapper.

9
10 If you have a 50 percent underage, you're at 50 percent of the
11 ABC, and then the scenario of either the carryover here, which,
12 because we had an underage here, we carry it over to the next
13 year, and that's how we're parameterizing the carryover of an
14 underage and then a payback of an overage here.

15
16 The comparison about whether you're bumping up against the OFL
17 buffer, which would then be overfishing, if your catch is higher
18 than the OFL, and therefore not allowed, is this comparison
19 between the OFL ratio to the ABC, and, when that's higher here,
20 then you would be at the catch level that would be above the
21 OFL.

22
23 For red snapper, what we can see is we've got a very small
24 buffer between the ABC and the OFL, and it doesn't leave a whole
25 lot of room for carryovers, and that's red snapper, and that's
26 the catch over the ABC, and there's a similar table on the next
27 slide, and I will stick with red snapper for now, just to keep
28 continuity here.

29
30 Here, the table is set up the same, and the ratio is the SSB
31 divided by the SSB that you would get in that year if you had
32 fished under the ABC, and so it's all ones where the ABC -- If
33 you fish at the OFL, you would be fishing at a higher level and
34 reducing the stock, compared to fishing at the ABC.

35
36 What we see from the one-year overage is that, if we pay it back
37 immediately, we're right back on track, and that's pretty
38 straightforward. If there is a random overage, and the random
39 scenarios are if you have that overage at some point during the
40 time period randomly, and if you immediately pay it back, you're
41 back on track.

42
43 This is pretty straightforward. If you pay it back one-to-one,
44 you're going to be back on track. You will see some slight
45 deviations in the numbers not being exactly what one might
46 expect, and that's really because we often are working in having
47 to convert recreational numbers to weight and make some
48 assumptions about the weight of landed fish, and these are sort

1 of the standard assumptions we have to make when we do these
2 projections and why you wouldn't get exactly one-to-one weight-
3 to-weight, necessarily, but, in general, they are pretty
4 intuitive. Are there any questions there, before I go on to the
5 other species?

6
7 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Apparently not, John. Go ahead.

8
9 **DR. WALTER:** Okay. I will go back to greater amberjack, which
10 this bottom-left has a substantially higher buffer between the
11 OFL and the ABC. This allows for a little more scope for a
12 carryover to not result in exceeding the OFL, and, here, if we
13 were to put kind of a goalpost, in terms of where would the line
14 be that you could carry over without hitting, exceeding, the
15 OFL, you could go here for about a 25 percent underage, and you
16 could pay it back, and you would be at 1.2, and so you would
17 right at the OFL.

18
19 Similarly, king mackerel, there is a very low buffer, like there
20 is for red snapper, and so, even a 10 percent underage, you
21 would be going over the OFL.

22
23 Moving on to then the stock status, the results on status are
24 very similar for greater amberjack and king mackerel, in the
25 sense that a single year overage or underage with immediate
26 payback, and I will note that that payback, the way we've
27 parameterized it, is that the fleet that -- It's equally across
28 all fleets according to the original allocation scheme, and so,
29 for red snapper, it's 51/49. For amberjack, I think it's 73/27,
30 commercial and recreational, and so we maintain that, and so the
31 fleet's paybacks or underage wind up being allocated according
32 to that schedule.

33
34 Paybacks that would be differential across different fleets
35 could have different results, because those fleets would have
36 differing selectivities as well as differing discard patterns,
37 and so we have not actually modeled that.

38
39 Then I think we want to see -- The added request was the overage
40 with a payback, and, here, we summarized those results, and we
41 have only used red snapper for this run. If you had a 1 percent
42 overage with no payback, a 10 percent overage, 25, and 50, where
43 you be in stock status, and that's the ten-year average stock
44 status.

45
46 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Yes. I just averaged them ten years following the
47 overage.

48

1 **DR. WALTER:** Okay. Then I think the most important thing for us
2 is how many more years would it take to rebuild, and so a single
3 year of 50 percent overage without paying back would extend
4 rebuilding years by six, and so I think that's generally
5 intuitive, and I think that should answer, at least for red
6 snapper, that request. Do we have further questions and
7 clarifications?
8

9 **MR. GREGORY:** I have a question. It was my understanding that
10 our rebuilding schedules dictate the OFLs that are projected,
11 and the ABC is to establish a buffer to the OFL, and so, if we
12 were to project our ABCs forward, we would actually rebuild the
13 population quicker than what we have on the record, because the
14 record is based on OFL, and so, with this overage without
15 payback, shouldn't that be relative to the rebuilding schedule,
16 as dictated by the OFL, because we really don't have one
17 dictated by the ABC, as far as I understand, and so this, to me,
18 could be misleading, if I'm right.
19

20 If I am right, the thing I would like to see, I guess in the
21 future, and it would be, I guess, extra work for the Center, is,
22 once an ABC is established for an overfished population, it
23 would be nice to see a projection of when that population would
24 rebuild, based on the ABC, in addition to the original
25 projection based on the OFL, and so there's two points there.
26 Thank you.
27

28 **DR. WALTER:** In that case, since the ABC is documented from the
29 OFL, rebuilding, in the case, would rebuild faster, and I think
30 you're correct there, and we could probably say that, in this
31 case, the years to rebuild, Nathan, were based on the --
32

33 **DR. VAUGHAN:** It's based on that rebuilding schedule, and so I
34 think it's --
35

36 **DR. WALTER:** It should be the OFL.
37

38 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Yes. I think I may have been using the OFL.
39

40 **DR. WALTER:** Yes, because that would be the 50 percent
41 probability of rebuilding, and so, if we fish at the ABC, we
42 should have a higher than 50 percent probability of rebuilding.
43 Doug, you're right, and, in this case, if this table were redone
44 with the ABC, I think it would be the same thing, in terms of
45 you are still probably delaying -- In terms of the relative
46 delay, with the ABC, you would probably rebuild a couple of
47 years earlier, and you would probably delay that rebuilding by
48 about the same amount.

1
2 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Yes, because this was just a comparison of,
3 whether it's ABC or OFL, the original rebuilding plan assessment
4 model, and so it was comparing that same model run with no
5 overage to that model run with one year of overage, and so it is
6 an apples-to-apples comparison.
7
8 If you change that to the OFL level or that applied ABC level or
9 ACLs, as long as you run that same projection forward, this is
10 still an apples-to-apples comparison of the same projected catch
11 series with and without an overage in one year.
12
13 **DR. WALTER:** Nathan, can you pull up -- Quickly, do you have on
14 your machine the ability to plot the time series of biomass
15 under the OFL versus the ABC and just project those two forward?
16 I think we can get an answer to that question, Doug, that you
17 posed fairly quickly.
18
19 **DR. VAUGHAN:** It's still that same comparison of biomass at OFL
20 versus ABC in the previous tables.
21
22 **DR. WALTER:** Yes, except that we have it relative, and so if you
23 could just pull up the one -- It would basically be taking the
24 red snapper result here, but, rather than having it relative to
25 the ABC, have it relative to SSB SPR 26 percent, and so when
26 it's rebuilt. You have taken this relative to the ABC and done
27 the --
28
29 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Yes, but that's pulled from their assessment, and
30 so there may be a slightly -- I think that may be the --
31
32 **MR. RINDONE:** Just to remind the SSC, the difference between the
33 OFL and the ABC for red snapper is about 2.58 percent.
34
35 **MR. GREGORY:** The thing that got my attention was that, when we
36 had the overage in 2017 for red snapper, it was considered to
37 not affect the rebuilding period, mostly because of our buffer,
38 our ABC buffer, and so I was surprised to see that even a 1
39 percent overage would have the effect that it's showing, given
40 the evidence, or what we know about 2017 with red snapper.
41
42 **DR. VAUGHAN:** The issue is the percent delay it has compared to
43 that same series without it, and this is -- Maybe I have gotten
44 a little confused in the ABC versus OFL comparison and the
45 rebuilding plan, but this additional request is purely that same
46 theory with or without an overage, and so, if you applied this
47 to any given -- There may be a difference in the series between
48 OFL and ABC, which would give you a little bit of buffer, but

1 this is just how much do you delay, given everything remains the
2 same. Does that make sense?

3
4 Like, if you run the same series with or without an overage that
5 isn't repaid, this is how much it delays you getting back to
6 0.26 SPR, and so, if there is an inherent buffer of 2 percent
7 between an ABC and the OFL, and that OFL is what you set based
8 on your rebuilding plan, then, yes, you do have a 2 percent
9 buffer there, and that wouldn't have -- Because you would be
10 rebuilding faster than that, and so I may have just
11 misinterpreted, but I thought the OFL was without an expectation
12 of a rebuilding plan and the rebuilding was your ABC, to get to
13 your 2032 rebuild.

14
15 **MR. RINDONE:** Doug, the other thing is that the overage in 2017
16 is that, when they finished the SEDAR 52 stock assessment, there
17 was positive recruitment and growth in the stock, and so, once
18 all of that was accounted for, the stock was ahead of its
19 rebuilding timeline, not only from trying to use the ACLs as the
20 management target, but also from a productivity standpoint, and
21 so we were a little bit ahead of where we projected that we
22 needed to be. I think, and Nathan can correct me, but the
23 simulations are assuming that essentially nothing is going to
24 change as far as growth and productivity of the stock and it's
25 all going to be flat.

26
27 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Exactly.

28
29 **MR. RINDONE:** We could still have situations like we had coming
30 out of SEDAR 52, where things are a little bit healthier than we
31 thought they were the next time we check under the hood.

32
33 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Ryan is right, at least to the way I had run these
34 analyses, and it was not -- This is not necessarily going to
35 correlate to a specific scenario and say you're always going to
36 be delaying your rebuilding by a year or two years, but it's
37 saying, in this purely everything remains the same, apples-to-
38 apples, how much does one year of this percent overage slow you
39 down relative to the exact same series of catches, but with no
40 overage, and so this isn't looking at incorporating any inherent
41 buffer, but it's how much do you slow yourself down just by
42 catching more and not paying it back. It will be in the ABC,
43 OFL, ACL realm that there is some inherent buffer that is not
44 being incorporated here.

45
46 **DR. WALTER:** When you add the one year to rebuild, was it like
47 0.6, because you had to call it an integer year to your rebuild,
48 because the biomass is distinguishable at the 1 percent overage.

1
2 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Yes, and essentially that one year does affect
3 that, because you went over that one year, and you've gone
4 forward a year in time as well, and so you still have the same
5 amount of years at that point, and it's just like the year never
6 happened. It doesn't add cumulative extra years, and does that
7 make sense? It's basically just adding one year and a tiny
8 little smidge, because you're a whole year later, and, rather
9 than rebuilding a little bit in that year, you just stayed at --
10 Your spawning biomass didn't go up, and there is that little
11 figure, I think on the next slide.

12
13 Really, we're looking at, in those different scenarios, is your
14 spawning biomass expected to -- If you fish between your ACL and
15 your ABC, and this is the way I sort of walked through it with
16 Shannon, then you expected to increase faster than your original
17 projections, and so your time to rebuild is going to go down
18 faster than it otherwise would have.

19
20 In between ABC and OFL, you might increase a little bit slower,
21 but your spawning biomass is still expected to be going up,
22 whereas, if you fish over your OFL, you are going to be much
23 slower than your base rebuilding plan, and your spawning biomass
24 might actually decrease, which is going to -- Whereas, that 1
25 percent overage, you're basically just sort of treading water at
26 the same distance from rebuilding, because you're always fishing
27 just enough to stay at the same spawning biomass, and you're not
28 getting any better, is the way I interpret those results, and so
29 the next is you're actually getting worse, and the spawning
30 biomass went down. At that 1 percent, you're just treading
31 water with that one year continually.

32
33 **MR. GREGORY:** Thank you very much for that explanation, and,
34 going forward, I think, when we do an ABC and have a rebuilding
35 period, I'm going to see if we can get a projection of that ABC,
36 as to when the stock would rebuild with our buffer, in addition
37 to when it was projected to rebuild with OFL, because, knowing
38 the problem with long-term projections, it will still give us
39 some insight as to the effectiveness of our buffer, whether it's
40 5 percent, 10 percent, or 20 percent of the OFL, the difference,
41 but thank you again very much.

42
43 **DR. WALTER:** I think that's a good recommendation to have on
44 those terms of reference for the -- We usually put together a
45 table, a rebuilding table, and maybe that's an additional line,
46 that could be like time to rebuild with the ABC relative to the
47 OFL.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. The figure that you have there on
2 the screen, this is really, to me, one of the things that
3 council should realize, that we're really talking about relative
4 sort of measures here, like increasing faster or decreasing
5 faster, but, of course, an individual year, whether it's the
6 effect of a payback on an individual year, will it be affected
7 by the recruitment and so forth, and selectivity, and I think
8 the council should be aware of that, but, in terms of these
9 projections, I think they've been useful, in that it gives you
10 an idea of the relative changes.

11
12 If you do this, you're going to be better than if you did that,
13 and you might not know exactly how much better, or whether it
14 compensated for bad recruitment or so on and so forth, but,
15 nevertheless, in a relative measure, I think it's been useful.

16
17 Can somebody remind me what sort of, in terms of what the
18 council is considering now for payback, what sort of caps they
19 have for annual caps? One of the results you have is that, with
20 a low or a small buffer, you can end up with a payback going
21 over the overfishing limit, which, to me, would imply that you
22 have to go through a lot of administrative actions to reduce it
23 again, and am I misconstruing something there?

24
25 **MR. RINDONE:** The way that it's set up right now is -- The way
26 the carryover document is set up is such that the council
27 prefers to limit the amount of carryover such that the
28 difference between the ABC and the OFL cannot be reduced by more
29 than 50 percent, and so, for red snapper, right now, the
30 difference between the ABC and the OFL is 400,000 pounds, and so
31 the total amount that could be carried over in a given year,
32 regardless of how much went unharvested in the previous year,
33 would be 200,000 pounds.

34
35 It doesn't matter which sector it came from or whether it's
36 multiple sectors or what have you, but the absolute maximum for
37 the entire stock that could be carried over would be 200,000
38 pounds.

39
40 Then, as far as the paybacks are concerned, if there's an
41 overage, for the species for which it applies presently, it's
42 pound for pound. Because red snapper is no longer considered to
43 be overfished, the payback provisions don't apply, and so there
44 are no payback provisions right now.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. One of the other things, and this
47 has nothing to do with the simulation, but how is the council
48 addressing -- If you have multiple years of a small sector that

1 has relatively small catch and has multiple years of underages
2 and continuous, three or four years, of underages, versus three
3 or four years of overages, is there some sort of cap system so
4 that you don't accumulate underages or accumulate overages?
5

6 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, and so the way that the document has it set
7 up right now is the ability to have a carryover is based on the
8 original ACL and not the carryover-modified ACL, and so, if you
9 -- Let's say you have the private angling component that has a
10 200,000-pound underharvest in 2020, and so, in 2021, they have
11 that 200,000 pounds added to their component-specific ACL, and
12 then, in 2021, they are under again by 300,000 pounds, and it's
13 still -- Any carryover in the following year would be based on
14 the original ACL, and so, that 200,000-pound add that they had
15 for 2021, you would essentially take that off, and the most that
16 could be carried over for 2022 would be 100,000 pounds, but,
17 again, it's based on the original ACL and not the carryover-
18 modified one, and so that prevents that compounding interest
19 sort of situation. Again, because the ABC cannot exceed the
20 OFL, even without having that 50 percent limiter on there, the
21 ABC can't be set higher than the OFL.
22

23 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Another question I had, and it
24 doesn't so much apply to these particular stocks is what happens
25 if there is lags in monitoring? For example, if you find out
26 too late -- If some sort of overage occurs, or underage occurs,
27 in year T, and you can't implement it until year T-plus-one, but
28 something else happens, or you can't implement it until year T-
29 plus-two, but something happens in the ensuring period, in T-
30 plus-one, and so lags could -- If you can't implement it the
31 next year, it would seem to me that this would be very difficult
32 to deal with.
33

34 **MR. RINDONE:** Right now, the way it's set up is to use
35 provisional landings, which we understand there to be some
36 wiggle room and precision correction that happens along the way,
37 but, for the most part, the provisional landings are usually
38 within a few percentage points of being what the final numbers
39 end up being, and usually it's much closer than that, but that's
40 as quick of a turnaround as we can expect to accomplish right
41 now.
42

43 As far as being able to apply it, except in situations where we
44 have a species that still has a derby-esque approach to how the
45 fleets pursue the fish, most of them have a period during which
46 they are open that is long enough to allow the application of
47 the carryover provision to modify the ABC, and subsequently the
48 ACL, while a season is open, and so NMFS would issue a notice

1 saying that, hey, by the way, you guys are eligible for a
2 carryover, and so, instead of us projecting that your season is
3 going to close on August 21, it's actually going to be September
4 2, or whatever.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay.

7
8 **MR. GREGORY:** Joe, this is Doug.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead, Doug.

11
12 **MR. GREGORY:** In the historical review that Ryan provided for
13 us, I think in our first meeting in January of 2017, that
14 simulation was done with a two-year lag, or a one-year lag, and
15 it says the act of carrying unused quota over to a fishing
16 season two years later was demonstrated to have no negative
17 long-term impact on spawning potential ratio or the rebuilding
18 plan. That didn't address overage at all, and it was just
19 underages.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Again, I am just sort of bringing these
22 things up for discussion. One other issue that I am sure the
23 council would have to deal with is the precision with which we
24 monitor catches, and particularly, if there is a big difference
25 within that precision, then individual sectors will have
26 different perceptions of what is fair and what is not, and so
27 that's something that the councils, I think, should be aware of,
28 and I'm sure they are. Nobody wants to talk about that?

29
30 I mean, basically, if you have something like a recreational
31 catch, where you're operating at a 20 percent CV, versus some
32 smaller commercial sector, where you're at close to a census,
33 there will be perceived slights if one goes over and the other
34 doesn't, and so on and so forth like that.

35
36 **DR. WALTER:** I will make a little comment on that and just refer
37 to something that is in the NS 1 Guidelines, where they do say
38 that overfishing status determinations can be based on three
39 consecutive years of past data, which allows some averaging to
40 go on, but it's not allowed for carryovers in the future.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** In some ways, this is less of a biological
43 stock assessment issue, but rather the dynamics of the council
44 itself, in terms of how they make decisions about -- Again, how
45 people perceive what is fair and what is not fair, which brings
46 up the other comment I would make, and you have alluded to it in
47 your discussions about selectivity, is some of the impacts of
48 this, of overages and underages, will be very, very different

1 depending on the sector involved, and we really haven't dealt
2 with that to this point.

3
4 **DR. VAUGHAN:** All of these simulations are very dependent on the
5 paybacks or carryovers being applied purely to the fleet that
6 incurred them, and so it's not just how many pounds did the
7 entire fishery go over, but it's just did this recreational
8 fleet -- Even if they have different resolutions or
9 uncertainties, if the recreational fleet goes over by a certain
10 number of pounds this year, they need to give it back next year,
11 or, conversely, it can't be washed amongst fleets. Otherwise,
12 none of these results hold.

13
14 **MR. RINDONE:** That's part of the NS 1 Guidelines, as far as
15 applying any sort of carryover provision, regardless of how it's
16 constructed. Anything that is carried over has to go back to
17 the fleet that didn't harvest it in the first place, and, as
18 such, I would imagine, Nathan, that the paybacks are applied in
19 the same fashion.

20
21 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Yes, correct.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** A lot of bookkeeping, in terms of keeping
24 track and the monitoring aspect of it.

25
26 **MR. RINDONE:** Joe, just to touch on what you had mentioned about
27 equity, with respect to the landings data precision and the
28 proportion of standard error for -- Especially for some of the
29 recreational data streams, and it's not nearly as tight as say
30 the commercial IFQ programs, and the ability to forecast the
31 season lengths, based on the ACLs, or whatever we're using as a
32 management target, is kind of playing -- It's kind of
33 considering that proportional standard error by fleet by
34 species.

35
36 When those seasons are set, it's bearing that uncertainty in
37 mind, and the situations that we have where the proportional
38 standard errors might be a little wider, there might be a larger
39 probability that that particular fleet is going to experience
40 situations where they do get a carryover, or they do have a
41 payback, but, in a utopian sort of thought, hopefully our data
42 will get better with time, and so the law will then eventually
43 get better.

44
45 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** I have a question for Ryan, I think.
46 Ryan, with these three species that are here, will you remind us
47 -- So king mackerel, that's not a stock quota, is it?
48

1 **MR. RINDONE:** No, and so kingfish is actually broken up into
2 five pie slices. There is one for the recreational sector and
3 four for the commercial, and the commercial has a handline
4 component in the western Gulf, the northern Gulf, and off of the
5 western coast of Florida, and there's also a gillnet component
6 off the southwestern coast of Florida. Each of those entities
7 has a percentage of the commercial pie.

8
9 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Okay. Then I'm kind of focusing a little
10 more on what Joe was talking about with the perceived -- Some
11 issues maybe with perceptions. With king mackerel, I would say
12 that the recreational -- They don't usually get close to their
13 ACL, do they?

14
15 **MR. RINDONE:** No.

16
17 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** They usually have a lot left, and so I
18 don't think that's going to be -- I don't know. Then, with red
19 snapper though, the recreational landings are being monitored by
20 the states, right?

21
22 **MR. RINDONE:** They will be under Amendment 50, and so Florida
23 has the Gulf Reef Fish Survey, Alabama has Snapper Check,
24 Mississippi has Tails 'n Scales, Louisiana has LA Creel, and
25 Texas has the Texas Sportfish Survey.

26
27 Each of those measures landings and effort, and then there is
28 also MRIP monitoring still and reporting that goes on for
29 Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, but no longer for Louisiana
30 and Texas.

31
32 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Okay. With red snapper, with those
33 programs, do you feel like the recreational community is feeling
34 better about the data that are coming in?

35
36 **MR. RINDONE:** I don't know. I know that, in 2018, all of the
37 original projections for the private angling component season
38 length by the states under the EFPs -- All of them except for
39 Texas, the states projected how long those fishing seasons were
40 actually open, and how long they were actually open was less
41 than what they originally projected.

42
43 In 2019, we are barely started in it, as far as the red snapper
44 fishing season goes, and so we'll see how the states adapt with
45 managing the landings data, and, in many cases, they are looking
46 at, at a minimum, weekly reporting. I think Alabama, and, John,
47 tell me if I'm wrong, but I think Alabama's is mandatory daily
48 reporting, through the app, and so Alabama is pretty confident

1 in their data, as far as being high-resolution and knowing, just
2 about by the end of the day, what was caught.

3
4 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Okay. That's great. Then, the greater
5 amberjack, is that a big recreational species?

6
7 **MR. RINDONE:** Seventy-something percent of it, and I think it's
8 72 percent, 72 or 73 percent, is recreational, and the remainder
9 is commercial, and we have made more changes in the last several
10 years to greater amberjack than I can count for you on the
11 digits that I have on my hands, and, as I'm sure the Science
12 Center folks can tell you, those play an awful lot of havoc on
13 the data and trying to do the assessments.

14
15 We just had our Reef Fish AP meeting this morning, and they were
16 recommending more changes to recreational greater amberjack, and
17 so it's a very contentious species, and it's a very popular
18 species to pursue, and it's a hot-button issue.

19
20 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Okay, and so with that one there may be
21 some social effects with this.

22
23 **MR. RINDONE:** There definitely could be, but, right now, greater
24 amberjack are excluded from carryover, because they're in an
25 overfished status.

26
27 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** That's right. Okay.

28
29 **MR. RINDONE:** We have made them do amberjack as part of this,
30 because it's a contentious species, and because, hopefully, at
31 some point in the future, it's not in such terrible shape, and
32 perhaps it would be eligible for a carryover in an improved
33 condition, and so we went ahead and asked for it now, so to have
34 an idea of how it would look, but, as you guys saw, generally,
35 the effects are similar, regardless of where a stock is
36 presently, and I'm just kind of rehashing what John and Nathan
37 talked about. If you carry it over one-to-one, you're all
38 right, but, if you're not paying back your overages one-to-one,
39 we're not going to be all right.

40
41 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Got it. Okay. Thank you.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. All right. Where do we stand now?
44 One of the things that I looked at, in terms of the conclusions
45 that we might draw, is there was a list of discussion points in
46 the document itself, and not the presentation, and those
47 discussion points, to me, were, in some ways, recommendations
48 and conclusions, and, again, I was looking at the document

1 itself.

2
3 Also, there were two or three others that were in the addendum
4 to this too, but one of the things that I was thinking about
5 doing is -- A couple of these discussion points are more
6 clarification about how the simulations were done, but, by and
7 large, they are conclusions not only about these particular
8 simulations, but also generically about how one might design an
9 overage and underage system.

10
11 One of the things that I was thinking about is that we should
12 perhaps just reiterate these discussion points, or a select set
13 of them, in terms of our reporting to the council. I am looking
14 at where it says "discussion", and I have it on my own screen.
15 There it is. Can you make that bigger?

16
17 Again, to me, this is a good summary of a lot of the issues that
18 one has to deal with with underages and overages, and I was
19 thinking to use this as a template for how we might format our
20 own recommendations to the council. Any enthusiasm?

21
22 **MR. RINDONE:** Not all at once.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** The floor is open. Is there any of these that
25 might cause disagreement?

26
27 **DR. WALTER:** One thing that we didn't add to this paper, but I
28 think is an important comment that the SSC -- It's well within
29 where an SSC would consider these is the reason for an underage
30 or an overage, and these are the things that aren't accounted
31 for in a projection, like an episodic event that either shuts
32 the fishery down or has some impact on the population of fish,
33 and that's the sort of caveat that none of these projections
34 entertain anything of that sort.

35
36 However, in real life, we do see them, and they lead to
37 underages, and potentially to overages, and so it's probably an
38 added caveat that these should be considered on the basis of
39 current events that may have led to those underages or overages,
40 if you deem that some sort of policy on this was drafted, and it
41 would obviously have to consider current events.

42
43 **MR. RINDONE:** To John's point, the council could always do an
44 abbreviated framework or a framework action to suspend carryover
45 for a particular species, and let's say there was a really bad
46 red tide event that we think may have had a detrimental effect
47 on red grouper, and the council could say, for a period of three
48 years, there will be no carryover for red grouper, in order to

1 help it recover from the episodic mortality like we associated
2 with red tide, and so something like that could be done and
3 could be put forward. Not super quickly, but pretty quickly.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I mean, they could develop an opt-out clause
6 within their framework.

7
8 **DR. WALTER:** There is not a lot of room for dealing with an
9 underage, due to like a weather event shutting a fleet down and
10 them not catching the ACL, or the ABC, because they can't then
11 carry that over, to a very large extent, in the next year, and
12 so that's sort of a binding situation.

13
14 **MR. RINDONE:** The way that it's set up right now is that, unless
15 the season was closed because the ACL was projected to be met,
16 and it turns out there were fish left over, there is no
17 carryover, and so the season has to have been closed due to the
18 ACL being projected to be met, and so, if there was a weather
19 event, like a bad hurricane, and 70 percent of the ACL was left
20 on the table, that wouldn't carry over, unless the season had
21 been closed.

22
23 **MR. BLANCHET:** As a real-world example of that, in 2010 in
24 Louisiana, we had a large fraction of the offshore closed due to
25 an oil spill, and it was several years before there was, how
26 would I say, scientific consensus whether that oil spill had any
27 impact on some of the stocks that we're talking about here, and
28 so perhaps that might be something that -- How do you address
29 something like that, where you've got both underages and not
30 necessarily a good understanding of what the impact of those
31 events has been on the stock?

32
33 **MR. RINDONE:** I think, presently, the way that we do that is
34 through stock assessments, but, like you said, Harry, we didn't
35 really understand what happened following the oil spill until
36 several years later, and so there is a delay on that.

37
38 **MR. GREGORY:** Joe, this is Doug.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead, Doug.

41
42 **MR. GREGORY:** It seems to me, from what I remember of the
43 document that was given to us at the last meeting, the amendment
44 that was also prepared for the council, and, from what Ryan has
45 told us today, the council has taken a very conservative
46 approach to carryovers.

47
48 Unless somebody, like you said earlier, has heartburn over a

1 particular discussion item, I think a general motion that the
2 results of these analyses seem reasonable enough science for the
3 council to use it as background information for their amendment
4 in addressing carryover.

5
6 These other things about red tide or oil spills could be a
7 refinement of carryover in the future, once we get an idea of
8 how this works, but it looks like the council has taken a very
9 conservative approach, and that should reassure us all on that.

10
11 The only thing that I would add to this is that maybe should
12 have a discussion about the overages without payback, and my
13 understanding is that -- That's a separate subject, and so I
14 would like to leave that for later to address.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Are you suggesting a motion to the -- Well,
17 are you suggesting a motion, Doug?

18
19 **MR. GREGORY:** I think it's appropriate, to give the council some
20 advice. They were planning to take final action on this
21 amendment at their last meeting, and they postponed that,
22 because of our request for these additional simulations.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** From that standpoint, I agree with you that
25 basically, in terms of simulations, you've gone about as far as
26 you can go, and there is a very good list of the things that one
27 ought to consider when they are going through this process, and,
28 in general, most of those things have been addressed. As you
29 said, they are being fairly conservative about it, and so,
30 again, a motion to that effect would be helpful.

31
32 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Joe, I would just like to say that I think a
33 motion, or some guidance from the SSC, would be helpful. Dr.
34 Barbieri, at the last meeting, brought up the concerns that
35 brought us to this webinar, and I think the consensus I was
36 getting around the table from the council was that the council
37 definitely thinks this is a tool that we should explore, but we
38 want to make sure that we go forward and we do it in a
39 responsible manner and we don't affect the sustainability of any
40 stocks, and so some guidance from the SSC I think would be very
41 helpful. Thank you, Joe.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** What I was envisioning was basically a motion
44 that might say something like the SSC confirms that the various
45 simulations that were done were the best available science, and
46 they resulted in a set of discussion points and recommendations,
47 and we are passing those on to the council, and that list of
48 discussion and recommendations are what is on the screen now.

1
2 **SSC MEMBER:** Second.
3
4 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Well, somebody has to be more specific about a
5 motion, but all right. Technically, I'm not supposed to give
6 motions, but --
7
8 **MR. GREGORY:** Karen, do you have a motion drafted for us?
9
10 **MS. HOAK:** I could make one, but you probably won't like it.
11
12 **DR. ANDERSON:** This is Lee Anderson. Can you hear me?
13
14 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Yes. Go ahead, Lee.
15
16 **DR. ANDERSON:** I like your motion, but I think it's a little too
17 bland in just saying it's good science and there is some advice
18 there and then copy it out. When I read it, I got the intent
19 that, as long as there is payback, these overage and underage
20 policies will not affect the overall management of the stock, in
21 that the rebuilding plans will be met, and do you see what I'm
22 saying?
23
24 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Yes, and the only caveat to that is, and the
25 council has actually addressed this, is that payback has to be
26 kind of short-term, and it has to be sort of random, in the
27 sense that, if you get one bad year and you go over, and the
28 next year you go under, and so on and so forth, and so it
29 randomizes out.
30
31 From this discussion we've just had, much of what the council
32 has done is to try to alleviate the problems of continued
33 accumulation of underages and issues like that, and so I think
34 that's quite good. Did somebody have a comment? Where is Bob
35 Gill when I need him? He's always the motion guy.
36
37 **MS. HOAK:** He's on here, and he can unmute himself.
38
39 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Bob, now you come on.
40
41 **MS. HOAK:** He's on. He's been on for a while, but he's not
42 talking.
43
44 **MR. GREGORY:** Ryan, does the amendment you're working on for the
45 council, does it address overages at all, or is it just
46 carryover?
47
48 **MR. RINDONE:** It is just carryover, presently. If the amendment

1 were approved today, it would approve carryover the way we've
2 described it, but, if there was an overage, unless it's
3 otherwise codified for an individual species, that overage would
4 go unaddressed for that species.

5
6 **DR. PATTERSON:** Ryan, there is no distinction, and, if that
7 overage goes over the ACL versus the OFL, there is no
8 distinction between those two?

9
10 **MR. RINDONE:** Overage is overage. It depends on whether the
11 species is in a rebuilding plan or whether it has some other
12 regulation codified to have that payback, and so one example is
13 the commercial side for gray triggerfish, and so gray
14 triggerfish is in a rebuilding plan, and, if the commercial side
15 goes over, even though gray triggerfish isn't considered to be
16 overfished anymore, there is still a payback.

17
18 **DR. PATTERSON:** So what's the deal with red snapper? Red
19 snapper is not estimated to be overfished, but it's in a
20 rebuilding plan, and does it have any specific language that
21 says, if there's an overage, there must be payback?

22
23 **MR. RINDONE:** Red snapper only has paybacks if it's considered
24 overfished, and so, right now, if there is an overage of the ACL
25 or the ABC, nothing would happen.

26
27 **MR. GREGORY:** But that's a council decision. The council very
28 well could implement a payback, even though it's not overfished,
29 because it has it both ways now. For amberjack, the payback is
30 because it's overfished. For gray triggerfish, there is a
31 payback, even though it's not overfished, and so the council
32 doesn't have a consistent policy on this, and I am more
33 concerned about not having any paybacks on overages than
34 anything else.

35
36 **MR. DIAZ:** If I could, I would like to add something on the red
37 snapper payback discussion. I just want to add that, in
38 general, there are not paybacks for red snapper, with the
39 exception of Amendment 50 that was just passed by the council at
40 the last meeting. If there are any overages, the states are
41 obligated to pay those back through Amendment 50, and, Ryan,
42 correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm pretty sure that is included in
43 that document.

44
45 **MR. RINDONE:** It is, Dale. You're absolutely correct.

46
47 **MR. DIAZ:** For some of the folks that may not be familiar with
48 Amendment 50, that would only apply to private recreational

1 catches of red snapper only, and the charter/for-hire and
2 commercial would be excluded from that, and commercial wouldn't
3 be included in this discussion anyway. IFQ species are exempt
4 from this particular document that we're discussing.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. One of the things that Lee brought
7 up is that the motion that we might have wouldn't be so bland as
8 to say this is the best available science, yada, yada, yada,
9 but, also, I mentioned that it is supporting of the conclusions
10 that carryover of underages, and the carryover that has been
11 discussed thus far of underages, is very unlikely to affect the
12 recovery or affect the status detrimentally, and that's
13 essentially what we're trying to say, correct?

14
15 **DR. ANDERSON:** That's what I got out of the reading of the
16 documents.

17
18 **DR. PATTERSON:** But the documents also -- I mean, the
19 simulations were done for overages and underages, and I know
20 that, in this case, the council is set to vote on an amendment
21 that specifically deals with underages, but I'm not sure why we
22 wouldn't put in this motion that, whether it's an underage or an
23 overage, if it's handled in a one-to-one fashion, and on a short
24 timeframe, that it doesn't affect the rebuilding plan.

25
26 **DR. ANDERSON:** I concur.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Will, can you quote that motion you
29 just made?

30
31 **DR. PATTERSON:** A motion might read that the SSC recommends the
32 simulation analysis done by the Southeast Fisheries Science
33 Center with respect to quota overage or underage as best
34 science. Among results of that analysis is that, if overages or
35 underages is handled in a one-to-one fashion, in the short term,
36 there is little effect on rebuilding trajectories. That needs
37 to be cleaned up a little bit, but that's the gist.

38
39 **DR. ANDERSON:** I second.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Is there discussion?

42
43 **MR. RINDONE:** If I might help you wordsmith a little bit.

44
45 **DR. PATTERSON:** If quota overages or underages are handled.
46 Really, what we're talking about here is payback in the case of
47 the overage, or I forget the term that's being applied to
48 allowing the higher catches in the case of the underage.

1
2 **MR. RINDONE:** Carryover.
3
4 **DR. PATTERSON:** Carryover. Of course. Among results of that
5 analysis are that if payback, in the case of a quota overage, or
6 carryover, in the case of a quota underage, are handled in a
7 one-to-one fashion in the short term, there is little effect on
8 rebuilding trajectories. Anything else that folks want to chime
9 in, and I think Ryan had something to say.
10
11 **MR. RINDONE:** I was just going to say, instead of saying "is
12 considered the", just say "as".
13
14 **DR. PATTERSON:** Yes.
15
16 **MR. RINDONE:** In the first sentence, and so quota overage or
17 underage as best available science.
18
19 **DR. PATTERSON:** That second sentence really is the meat of this,
20 and, if any folks have something to wordsmith or add.
21
22 **MR. ADRIANCE:** Should we add something that that's under normal
23 conditions or as they are right now, short of any of those
24 episodic events or situations that impact effort that we
25 discussed?
26
27 **MR. MARESKA:** I think, along the lines of maybe Harry was
28 talking about, and probably what Jason is talking about, and so
29 it's a question for John Walter. In this simulation, SSB is
30 kept relative to the ABC levels, and so none of these scenarios
31 evaluated what the payback provisions would be if SSB declined
32 at a faster rate than the expected ABC level, and is that right?
33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** Nathan is still on, and it looks like Nathan is
35 muted though. Karen, can you move Nathan over?
36
37 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I think the debate we're having here is the
38 very last clause of the motion, "there is little effect on
39 rebuilding trajectories". Obviously, other sorts of events
40 could have effects on the --
41
42 **DR. VAUGHAN:** That question, I guess you're saying, is if
43 spawning stock biomass were to decline because of some other
44 reason than that single overage, and I guess -- Yes, they push
45 that back that change in spawning stock biomass one-for-one. If
46 there was some external cause as to why the spawning biomass was
47 going down, yes, that's very much going to push forward the
48 rebuilding plans, but that would need to be caught up in another

1 assessment, because that's, obviously, some sort of impact
2 outside of what the projections are affecting.

3
4 But, at any point, the one-to-one payback should account for any
5 influence of a single overage, and so, even if spawning stock
6 biomass was declining for some sort of environmental reason, as
7 long as you were paying back for those overages, you wouldn't be
8 any worse off than you would be if you just continued fishing
9 ABC. Does that make sense?

10
11 **MR. RINDONE:** Just to expand on what Nathan said, you guys can
12 always request an interim analysis if there's a situation where
13 you think something may have happened and you think it might be
14 pertinent to recommend a revision to the ACLs to the council.

15
16 **DR. VAUGHAN:** Exactly. That's what you would need to account
17 for that.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Essentially, what the analysis is saying is
20 that -- In a relative sense, these sorts of carryover systems
21 are not going to have any effect, or a very small effect, on
22 rebuilding trajectories. Obviously, other events could have an
23 effect on it, but the implementation of the carryover aspect
24 probably will not, and so that's the message we're trying to
25 conclude here. Really, it's how one interprets "there is little
26 effect on rebuilding trajectories." Yes, rebuilding
27 trajectories can be very different from this, but it's probably
28 not because of the carryover aspects. I mean, that's the signal
29 I think we're trying to send.

30
31 **DR. PATTERSON:** It's going to be hard to capture all of that in
32 one sentence. I've been thinking about language like given that
33 no external cause of change of stock dynamics, or given typical
34 -- I think what we need to have here is a sentence that says
35 that caution should be applied, however, if there is evidence
36 that stock dynamics have changed due to some natural or
37 anthropogenic factor, which may affect future productivity of
38 the stock.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** That's a good clause.

41
42 **DR. PATTERSON:** How about we add that then? **Caution should be**
43 **applied, however, if some large-scale natural or anthropogenic**
44 **factor is likely to have caused changes to stock dynamics that**
45 **may affect future productivity. If some large-scale**
46 **anthropogenic event has occurred that may cause.**

47
48 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Event has occurred that may cause.

1
2 **DR. POWERS:** Then delete everything until you get to "changes".
3 Instead of "changes to", I would say "changes in".
4
5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Lee, are you still seconding?
6
7 **DR. ANDERSON:** Absolutely.
8
9 **MR. GREGORY:** I have a question. How is the council to
10 interpret this last sentence? Are they to develop a new action
11 in this amendment that they're trying to go final with to not do
12 any carryovers if they think something like this has happened?
13 I think we're mixing things here. This is really not focused on
14 the amendment that the council is considering that we reviewed
15 at the last meeting.
16
17 I like what Nathan said before. Of course, if something like
18 this happens, everybody is going to be aware of it, and the
19 carryovers are not going to be affected by this, unless there
20 was a shortened season, because the season was estimated
21 incorrectly by the Regional Office, and it would have no effect,
22 and, I mean, we're mixing apples and oranges here, and this last
23 sentence just doesn't seem to be applicable to what we're trying
24 to do.
25
26 **DR. PATTERSON:** Well, we're not really commenting on the council
27 and their political process of drafting an amendment. We are
28 reviewing the science that the Southeast Fisheries Science
29 Center performed in their simulations, and we're commenting on
30 those simulations. The council can take our information, our
31 recommendation, here and do with it how they please, and I don't
32 really see how there's a conflict.
33
34 **MR. GREGORY:** This last sentence wasn't incorporated or
35 addressed by the simulations. It's out of the blue.
36
37 **DR. PATTERSON:** No, but, in the simulations, it said, given that
38 nothing has changed, given stock dynamics are the same, then
39 this one-to-one payback doesn't really result in a change, and
40 so we're simply adding, through our discussion here, with the
41 folks that did the analysis and members of the SSC, that this
42 caveat has come to light, and we should present it.
43
44 **MR. MARESKA:** Along those lines, I think Harry's point was that
45 it was actually several years after that event in 2010 that we
46 were actually able to quantify that impact. We all knew it was
47 there, but, going from 2010 to 2011, we couldn't say what it
48 was. I think that's the gist of this statement.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Effectively, what we're trying to say there is
3 -- Prior to the last sentence, there is a clause there that
4 there is little effect on rebuilding trajectories. There is
5 little effect on rebuilding trajectories, but what we're trying
6 to say with the last part is there are other things that can
7 affect the rebuilding trajectories, and how they interact with
8 carryover schemes could be significant, and that's essentially
9 all we're saying.

10
11 **DR. PATTERSON:** In the middle of that second sentence, where it
12 says, "in the case of a quota underage", it should be "is
13 handled".

14
15 **DR. ANDERSON:** If say among the -- We're talking about the
16 results, and we're interpreting them. Among the results of that
17 analysis are -- Then, if we put the all else equal, that is
18 payback, then we're saying the same thing that is said in that
19 last sentence, but we may be not causing the heartburn to Doug,
20 but that's what that all else equal means. The council has to
21 know that these results have no effect on cause and are valid
22 only with all else equal.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Are we going to trot out the Latin?

25
26 **DR. ANDERSON:** If you want. I don't care, and I'm just trying
27 to ease things. If I'm causing trouble, I will shut up.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** No, I think that's a good point, because
30 that's essentially what we're saying, is all else being equal.

31
32 **DR. PATTERSON:** I think the most direct, briefest way to state
33 it is appropriate, and, if Lee figures out the right place in
34 that second sentence to insert "all else being equal", then I'm
35 all for it, and we can delete the last sentence.

36
37 **DR. ANDERSON:** It looks to me like placing it after "are", "are,
38 else equal, that if payback".

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** You could put a parenthesis, perhaps.

41
42 **MR. GREGORY:** None of this affects the way I'm going to vote,
43 but I would ask Ryan. I mean, his -- How would he incorporate
44 this in the amendment, or even try to incorporate this last
45 sentence in the amendment for the council consideration?

46
47 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I think what Lee's suggestion was is to just
48 put in "all else being equal" and take away that last sentence.

1
2 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay.

3
4 **MR. RINDONE:** When we take this to them, and we're talking about
5 this, obviously, I'm going to remember our discussions, and Kai
6 is going to be there, and Kai will remember the discussions, and
7 it will be in the summary, and the council has a few things in
8 its toolbox to deal with these things, be they underharvest or
9 declining SSB that has nothing to do with overharvest, or
10 whatever situation you want to apply.

11
12 If the health of the stock is in jeopardy, due to something like
13 an episodic mortality event, regardless of what it is, the
14 council can request an emergency action by NMFS to do something
15 immediately while more work is done to develop a more permanent
16 fix, and that emergency may be to suspend carryover, or the
17 council may say we're going to suspend -- We're going to do a
18 framework action to suspend carryover for this stock for this
19 amount of time, or we want the Center to do an interim analysis
20 on this stock, to figure out what happened last year with
21 whatever the thing was.

22
23 There is ways to get on top of something, and, granted, it's
24 still bureaucratic and it will take a minute to deal with, but
25 it's not the snail's pace that we may be accustomed to for some
26 of the things that we have to do.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Is there any further discussion on
29 this motion?

30
31 **SSC MEMBER:** Speaking of bureaucracy, could we take the commas
32 out from each side of the parentheses?

33
34 **DR. PATTERSON:** I actually have one last edit that will make
35 this second sentence here less wordy. If we start at "All else
36 being equal," and so before the "among", "all else being equal,"
37 and then delete "among", "the results of that analysis
38 indicate", and then delete the word "that". Thanks.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Any other discussion about the
41 motion? If not, then are there any objections to the motion? I
42 am going to allow people -- Because this is all by webinar, I'm
43 going to give you a little bit of time, if you do want to
44 object.

45
46 **MS. HOAK:** We're getting some text messages from Ken Roberts
47 that he's having trouble speaking into the webinar, and I'm not
48 sure if he has anything to say or not, and so let me see if he

1 can text if he's got any comments.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Yes, please.

4

5 **MS. HOAK:** Ken says yes for passage.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. **No objections, and the motion passes.**

8 Thank you.

9

10 I think, implicitly, we agreed, in terms of the discussion of
11 this meeting, the summary of this meeting, that will be included
12 to go to the council that we list some of those discussion and
13 conclusion points that were in the document prepared by the
14 Center, unless somebody objects to that, and I will work with
15 Ryan to do that.

16

17 Are there other motions that we might want to talk about? Doug
18 brought up that one of the things that he would like to see is,
19 and, at some point, the council is going to have to deal with
20 overages and how to deal with overages, in terms of whether
21 there is payback or not. Do we want to make some sort of
22 recommendation relative to that?

23

24 In terms of the discussion resulting from this set of
25 simulations, it was basically the very intuitive result that, if
26 you have some overages, you are basically delaying reaching
27 whatever objective you have. Now, you could consider that
28 pretty intuitive and there's no real need for a motion, but I
29 just bring it to the table to see what your thoughts are.

30

31 **MR. GREGORY:** I will take a stab at it.

32

33 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead.

34

35 **MR. GREGORY:** In light of the analyses provided by SEFSC, with
36 regard to overages with no payback provision, for those stocks
37 on a rebuilding schedule, the SSC recommends the council
38 consider implementing paybacks for overages.

39

40 That's not a concise statement, and I welcome any edits that
41 anybody would like to make, but that's the gist of it. Do we
42 want to make such a recommendation to the council, that they
43 address this issue at all?

44

45 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Is there a second?

46

47 **MS. HOAK:** Doug, can we move this part to after, "for those
48 stocks on a rebuilding schedule"?

1
2 **MR. GREGORY:** You can try it and see how it reads. **We can even**
3 **delete that, if you want.**
4

5 **DR. PATTERSON:** I don't disagree with the sentiment, but I think
6 we can capture this in the text of the report. It also already
7 says, in the previous motion -- You know, we talk about overages
8 and underages, and it seems to me that the council is
9 considering these issues already.

10
11 The one that was, I think, most topical, in the context of this
12 discussion, was the fact that red snapper are no longer being
13 declared overfished, and the accountability measures wouldn't
14 kick in when an overage occurred and cause a payback. However,
15 we just heard that Amendment 50 has that provision, in the case
16 of the private recreational sub-quota, and so it seems the
17 council is aware of this, and they're attempting to deal with it
18 in different fisheries in different ways, but, again, I think we
19 can just capture this in the text following the previous motion.

20
21 **MR. GREGORY:** Well, the state programs only apply to private
22 anglers, and it doesn't apply to the charter boat industry, and
23 we heard that -- And it's likely to have overages in the IFQ
24 fishery, but this is more of a general statement, and I don't
25 know what other species it might affect down the line, but, in
26 this analysis, it seems like a dangerous to have, and I'm fine,
27 and it's implied with the previous motion, very lightly, but it
28 is.

29
30 **MR. BLANCHET:** My perspective on this is that, yes, I agree that
31 the council is addressing this. I don't know that this is
32 precisely the correct way to approach it, but I think --

33
34 **MR. GREGORY:** Not politically anyway.

35
36 **MR. BLANCHET:** But it's certainly something that they're going
37 to need to address. I mean, when we get amberjack up above a
38 certain level, they're going to end up at that same point as we
39 are with red snapper, and so, whatever that is, but my concern
40 is that you end up in a situation where you never actually
41 achieve your rebuilding schedule if folks see some benefit in
42 maintaining some small overage on a regular basis.

43
44 **DR. ANDERSON:** It's a small point, but I think, if you're going
45 to include it in the text as something that needs to be done, I
46 would say put the motion in. You're not doing any harm by
47 putting it in, and you may be doing some harm by leaving it out.

1 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** With that, I'm still waiting for a second,
2 Lee.
3
4 **MR. GREGORY:** I would suggest putting a period after "overages"
5 and deleting the last two lines. We would elaborate on it and
6 say whether the stock is considered overfished or not, but that
7 may not be necessary.
8
9 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Again, I am waiting for a second.
10
11 **DR. ANDERSON:** Doug, I think, on the other one, we were talking
12 about the results of the study, and this motion follows from the
13 results of the study, and so I would prefer to have that phrase
14 left in.
15
16 **MR. GREGORY:** You mean the last two lines?
17
18 **DR. ANDERSON:** Yes, the what was there before.
19
20 **MR. GREGORY:** Okay. We can put it back.
21
22 **DR. ANDERSON:** We are making a motion in light of the things
23 that we were asked to study.
24
25 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Lee, are you seconding?
26
27 **DR. ANDERSON:** Yes.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you. Again, we can
30 elaborate on this discussion in the summary of the meeting,
31 clearly. All right. Is there any further discussion of this
32 motion?
33
34 **DR. PATTERSON:** I wouldn't oppose this motion, but I just don't
35 think that it says anything. The SSC recommends the council
36 consider implementing paybacks. The council has had discussion
37 about paybacks in all of the manners of these different
38 fisheries and sectors, and it has considered that, and it
39 doesn't state should or shall.
40
41 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** The difference is in light of the analysis,
42 and I agree with Lee that, basically, we're saying, here, we got
43 this analysis, and, yes, it isn't anything new, but it's
44 reinforcing that inclusion.
45
46 **DR. TOLAN:** I think the addendum that came out on May 6, this
47 really supports it, because it shows that, without the payback,
48 there could be some very substantial changes to the stock

1 assessment, and I think the data that backs this up is the
2 addendum that came out on the 6th, and so I think this motion
3 should stay.

4
5 **DR. ANDERSON:** I think you can take the comma out after
6 "Southeast Fisheries Science Center".

7
8 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Is there any other discussion on
9 this motion? **If not, are there any objections to the motion?**
10 **Seeing none, the motion passes.**

11
12 **MR. DIAZ:** I just want to mention that I'm fine with the motion
13 being passed, and so I'm the Chair of the Sustainable Fisheries
14 Committee, where we're going to be addressing this, and I will
15 do my best to try to encourage some discussion on this item, and
16 certainly I would be glad to invite Dr. Lorenzen up to the mic
17 during that part of the discussion, maybe, to relay some of the
18 SSC's concerns. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Again, in terms of developing the
21 summary of this meeting, we will put some verbiage in there kind
22 of explaining this a little bit better, so that Kai can use this
23 when he is asked to go up to the microphone to explain this.

24
25 **DR. LORENZEN:** I will prepare that. Thanks.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. I believe we're finished with this
28 agenda item. Are there any other items on the payback and
29 carryover sorts of issues, other motions? If not, then that
30 completes this agenda item, and we now return to the discussion
31 of what was the Ecosystem Committee that we're looking for, and
32 John Froeschke was going to explain this.

33
34 **MR. RINDONE:** John is no longer on, but Carrie is.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Carrie.

37
38 **DISCUSSION OF ECOSYSTEM TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

39
40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** This is a fairly new
41 technical committee that the council just formed, and we have
42 four stakeholders on it, and we have the Special Ecosystem SSC,
43 and then we're asking for two members from the Standing SSC.

44
45 This group is going to be tasked with developing that ecosystem
46 FMP, and how much detail the council wants to get into I'm not
47 sure, but it's going to stem from the National Ecosystem-Based
48 Roadmap Plan, and I don't have it in front of me, and then we

1 have a regional roadmap, and this is going to be specific to the
2 Gulf Council. That's where we are right now, in the early
3 stages.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. There's a little bit more guidance
6 for volunteers, and, as Ryan mentioned, Dave Chagaris, you had
7 agreed to be one of the volunteers, and so we're entertaining
8 another volunteer. Any interest?

9
10 **DR. LEAF:** Joe, I would like to serve on that.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you, Robert. That fulfills
13 our quota of two, but, if somebody else is interested, let me or
14 Ryan know, and then maybe we can work something out as well as
15 we're going to through this. Okay.

16
17 With that, I think we're moving on to Other Business. As I
18 mentioned, in Other Business, Kai Lorenzen is our representative
19 on the Steering Committee for the National SSC Meeting, which
20 will take place next year, and they've had several conference
21 calls about subject matter and so on and so forth, and so I
22 would like him to provide a little update on where we stand with
23 this.

24
25 **OTHER BUSINESS**
26 **DISCUSSION OF NATIONAL SSC MEETING**

27
28 **DR. LORENZEN:** Thanks, Joe. There were multiple calls, most of
29 which I attended, and the outcome of all of that is a proposal
30 now, a draft proposal, to hold the 7th National SSC Meeting in
31 Alaska, probably in Sitka, in sort of late July or early August
32 of 2020, and that will be hosted by the North Pacific Fishery
33 Management Council.

34
35 The themes are broadly in the ecosystem-based fishery management
36 realm, and there are really three proposed theme topics. Number
37 1 is how to incorporate ecosystem indicators into stock
38 assessments, or the stock assessment process, and Number 2 is
39 management of interacting species in the context of ecosystem-
40 based fisheries management. Number 3 is how to assess and
41 manage species exhibiting distributional change, mostly in the
42 context of climate change.

43
44 I don't think that I have to elaborate much on those topics,
45 and, in fact, there's not a lot more that has been done, but
46 that's on the table. In fact, while we were in the meeting,
47 there was a last email going around of are there any suggested
48 changes, and, if not, I think this will go to the Council

1 Coordinating Committee next week as a finalized draft proposal.
2 If there is any feedback from the SSC, the next hour or so is
3 your chance.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** The three items you mentioned there, it isn't
6 -- The proposal is all three items, correct?

7
8 **DR. LORENZEN:** Correct, yes.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Good. Any other comments on this?
11 This is, again, over a year away, but I think it's an important
12 subject matter.

13
14 **DR. PATTERSON:** Kai, the three main topics were incorporating
15 ecosystem indicators, climate changing the distribution of
16 species and how that affects assessment, and what was the other?

17
18 **DR. LORENZEN:** Managing interacting species, and so predator-
19 prey complexes, mostly.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. I think that's good. We will get
22 updates periodically as this progresses along. With that, I
23 believe we have finished the agenda items for today.

24
25 **DR. PATTERSON:** I just -- In Kai's discussions with the folks at
26 the national level, in the Gulf, I am trying to think about
27 climate and how climate has been addressed at all within stock
28 assessments, or even ecosystem models, and I can't think of an
29 example of that happening in our region.

30
31 However, there have been large-scale anthropogenic stressors
32 other than climate that have been incorporated, and I'm just
33 thinking about how these national SSC meetings run, and the Gulf
34 will be expected to give examples of how it's dealing with a
35 given topic and things that it has done, and, if that could be
36 thought of a little more broadly, as just anthropogenic
37 stressors versus just climate effects, I think that would make
38 the Gulf's input there a little more meaningful.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Yes, and, actually, as I remember reading the
41 thing, it doesn't actually mention climate, but it's more
42 distributional effects, and so things like the dead zone, and
43 that might fit into that same sort of category.

44
45 **DR. PATTERSON:** Okay. Great.

46
47 **DR. LORENZEN:** To elaborate on that a little bit, yes, the focus
48 is on distributional changes, but it does mention climate, and,

1 as you know, in some of the other regions, that's really a very
2 major issue, the distribution shifts, particularly with species
3 sort of moving into and out of management areas, but that's
4 really the focus, and I guess it could -- This could be one that
5 is not as relevant to our council as it is to some of the
6 others.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you. Any other comments?

9
10 **DR. LORENZEN:** I should also maybe add that one of the other
11 topics that we had in very early discussions, of course, was
12 management of recreational fisheries, which the others
13 considered to be mostly a southeastern issue, and so this may be
14 the 8th National SSC, and so we should think about whether we
15 want to encourage our council to take the lead in the next
16 iteration of this and maybe invite the next session here.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** The interim is two years between these things?

19
20 **DR. LORENZEN:** Roughly, I believe, yes.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. All right. Any other comments?

23
24 **MR. DIAZ:** My comments aren't necessarily to the SSC meeting
25 that you all discussed, but, before you close, I just want to
26 take a minute to thank the SSC members for sharing your time and
27 your expertise to make our Gulf fisheries as good as they can
28 be.

29
30 I always like to participate in these meetings, because I get a
31 lot out of it, listening to the discussion, and you all come up
32 with things that I don't think I would ever think of, and so I
33 really appreciate it. I want to especially thank you, Joe, for
34 chairing the meeting, but also for leading the discussion today
35 and trying out this new method, and so, anyway, I appreciate
36 everything, and thank you, all.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** It's a little bit of the blind leading the
39 blind, but we'll make headway that way, I think. Thank you very
40 much. With that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

41
42 **DR. LORENZEN:** Joe, were we going to try and revisit the draft
43 schedule of future meetings for this year?

44
45 **DISCUSSION OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

46
47 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** That's right. You wanted to talk about that.
48 Ryan, particularly Kai had interest in the October meeting,

1 correct?

2
3 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, and it would be good to nail you guys down,
4 or at least be thinking about what we need to be looking at for
5 that October meeting. Right now, the tentative dates that we
6 have are October 1 through 3, which happens to coincide with the
7 AFS meeting, and we don't want to overlap that.

8
9 The week prior, the week of September 23, the council is looking
10 to host a barotrauma workshop at the council office, which I
11 imagine that some of you will be either attending or interested
12 in attending or otherwise not be able to do that week, and so
13 that leaves us with the week of September 16, and the only thing
14 we have on the calendar for that is a South Atlantic Council
15 meeting, which none of you are on the South Atlantic Council,
16 and so that leaves that week available. We can look at the week
17 of September 16, unless there are resounding mutinous comments.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I have no objection.

20
21 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I just wanted to chime in with
22 Ryan. We don't know if we're going to have the barotrauma
23 workshop in our office or not, and so that's the other thing we
24 have up in the air, but, yes, there's a lot of things going on,
25 and we also don't know when the SEDAR Steering Committee is for
26 the fall, and so that's the other thing that we have up in the
27 air as well, and we're hoping to find that out next week.

28
29 **MR. RINDONE:** The SEDAR Steering Committee, usually the fall
30 meeting is done via webinar or conference call or something like
31 that, and it typically is less than a full day, and so, if we
32 can get something on the books for the SSC meeting before SEDAR,
33 and kind of beat them in the race, then they will have to work
34 around us a little bit.

35
36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Agreed. Thanks.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. We will proceed then with that
39 notion in mind. Is everybody okay? Any other business? If
40 not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

41
42 **DR. PATTERSON:** We haven't rescheduled the SSC meeting for
43 September, and what is happening with that. I mean, what's the
44 process?

45
46 **MR. RINDONE:** I am going to send out a doodle poll, and you guys
47 are going to pick some dates, and we're going to figure it out,
48 and that will be done quickly, by the end of the week. I will

1 send a doodle poll by the end of the week, and I will give you
2 guys a few days to look at it.

3

4 **MR. GREGORY:** Joe, can I say something briefly?

5

6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Yes, you may, Doug.

7

8 **MR. GREGORY:** The historical summary of our discussion of the
9 previous meetings was compiled by Ryan at my request. We have
10 the minutes from the very previous meeting that we have, and we
11 have the minutes in front of us, but we don't necessarily have
12 the minutes of the ongoing discussion, and sometimes it seems
13 like we repeat ourselves, or go around in circles, and the
14 document that has been most confusing to everybody has been the
15 status determination criteria document.

16

17 Now, I don't really want a vote or a whole lot of discussion
18 about whether you like the historical summary or not, because I
19 don't really want this to be an imposition on staff to do this
20 on a regular basis, but this was just an experiment that I
21 wanted to try, and, to me, it was very helpful, and so I think I
22 will ask for these, as long as staff has the time to do it,
23 because I realize that staff is a bit shorthanded too, and
24 they've got more important things to do than hold our hands, but
25 thank you, Ryan, and I appreciate you doing that.

26

27 **MR. RINDONE:** No worries. I will send you a bill.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you.

30

31 **MR. RINDONE:** I have no problem doing one for the status
32 determination criteria stuff too in July, and I will try and get
33 that up. I will work with Joe a little bit on it, and we'll try
34 to get that up before anything else, if we can, because I know
35 that discussion has been long and involved.

36

37 **MR. GREGORY:** Four years or five years.

38

39 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, and that will give you guys some time to
40 review the history of where you've been, so you know where to
41 go.

42

43 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Let me try again. Do we have a
44 motion to adjourn?

45

46 **MR. GREGORY:** I so move.

47

48 **MS. HOAK:** Ken Roberts votes for it.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. It's moved by Doug and seconded by
3 Will. I just assigned you, and I think it's accepted without
4 objection. Thanks very much.

5
6 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on May 9, 2019.)

7
8 - - -