

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 GULF SEDAR COMMITTEE

4
5
6 Battle House Renaissance Mobile Mobile, Alabama

7
8 October 20, 2014

9
10 **VOTING MEMBERS**

11 Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship)Alabama
12 Pamela Dana Florida
13 Harlon Pearce Louisiana
14 Robin Riechers Texas

15
16 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

17 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley)Florida
18 Leann BosargeMississippi
19 Doug Boyd Texas
20 Jason Brand USCG
21 Dale Diaz (designee for Jamie Miller)Mississippi
22 Dave Donaldson GSMFC
23 Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina) Louisiana
24 John GreeneAlabama
25 Campo Matens Louisiana
26 Corky PerretMississippi
27 John Sanchez Florida
28 Phil Steele (designee for Roy Crabtree) NMFS
29 Greg Stunz Texas
30 David WalkerAlabama
31 Roy Williams Florida

32
33 **STAFF**

34 Stephen Atran Population Dynamics Statistician
35 John Froeschke Fishery Biologist
36 Doug Gregory Executive Director
37 Beth Hager Financial Assistant/IT Coordinator
38 Mara Levy NOAA General Counsel
39 Charlene Ponce Public Information Officer
40 Ryan Rindone Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
41 Charlotte Schiaffo Research & Human Resource Librarian
42 Carrie Simmons Deputy Executive Director

43
44 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

45 Luiz Barbieri GMFMC SSC
46 Jeff Barger Ocean Conservancy, Austin, TX
47 Randy Boggs Orange Beach, AL
48 Steve Branstetter NMFS

1 Gregg Bray GSMFC
 2 Gib Brogan Oceana
 3 JP Brooker Ocean Conservancy
 4 Michael Drexler Ocean Conservancy
 5 Cynthia Fenyk NOAA
 6 Benny Gallaway LGL Ecological, TX
 7 Sue Gerhart NMFS
 8 Chad Hanson PEW
 9 Ben Hartig SAFMC
 10 Margaret Henderson Gulf Seafood Institute
 11 Mike Jennings Freeport, TX
 12 Robert Jones EDF
 13 Kristen McConnell EDF
 14 Herb Murphy
 15 Laurie Picariello Audubon Nature Institute
 16 Bonnie Ponwith SEFSC
 17 Katie Semon LDWF
 18 Steve VanderKooy GSMFC

19
 20 - - -
 21

22 The Gulf SEDAR Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
 23 Management Council convened at the Battle House Renaissance
 24 Mobile, Mobile, Alabama, Monday afternoon, October 20, 2014, and
 25 was called to order at 4:07 p.m. by Chairman Kevin Anson.

26
 27 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
 28 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 29 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
 30

31 **CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON:** That takes us to the next committee and
 32 that's the Gulf SEDAR Committee and that's my committee.
 33 Members on the committee include Dr. Dana, Mr. Pearce, and Mr.
 34 Riechers. First, you have the agenda, Tab I, Number 1, in front
 35 of you or you should. Are there any changes to the agenda? Do
 36 I have a motion to adopt the agenda?

37
 38 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** Move to adopt.
 39

40 **DR. PAMELA DANA:** Second.
 41

42 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** It's been moved and seconded and anybody that
 43 doesn't want to approve the agenda? All right. Thank you. The
 44 next item is Approval of Minutes. Does anybody have any edits
 45 or changes to the minutes?
 46

47 **MR. RIECHERS:** Move to adopt.
 48

1 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion to move to accept the minutes
2 as written and it's been seconded. Anybody that has a problem
3 with that? All right. Seeing none, we will move on to Item
4 Number III, Action Guide and Next Steps, Tab I, Number 3. You
5 see the steps that we would like to accomplish or the items that
6 we're going to review here today. That will take us to Item
7 Number IV, SEDAR 38: Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic King
8 Mackerel, and Mr. Rindone.

9
10 **SEDAR-38: GULF OF MEXICO AND SOUTH ATLANTIC KING MACKEREL**

11
12 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is largely
13 just an update with where we stand with this for the council and
14 so the SSC was not able to review the king mackerel assessment
15 at its last meeting, due to some logistical issues with getting
16 the analysts there to be able to present and also being able to
17 have all of the yield streams ready on time and so those are
18 actually going to be done sometime at the end of this month.

19
20 The SSC will have an opportunity to review those assessments at
21 their next meeting and so we're a little bit behind on that, but
22 that's where the status of king mackerel is.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Does anybody have any questions for
25 Ryan? All right and that will take us to Item Number V, SEDAR
26 Steering Committee Update, and Mr. Gregory.

27
28 **SEDAR STEERING COMMITTEE UPDATE**

29
30 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
31 Steering Committee met the first week in October in Charleston,
32 as it does every year. We also have a webinar in February of
33 each year and there will be some things that this council needs
34 to make a decision on in January that we can take to the
35 February meeting.

36
37 The Steering Committee is made up of the Executive Directors and
38 the Council Chairs of the three Southeast councils, the
39 directors of the Gulf and South Atlantic Marine Fish Commissions
40 and a representative from the Highly Migratory Species group and
41 is chaired by Dr. Bonnie Ponwith.

42
43 I think she and Chairman Anson will have some comments as I
44 finish this. This is a very brief overview of what happened at
45 the Steering Committee. We discussed a data procedures
46 workshop that's being planned to establish standard methods of
47 handling data, in an effort to streamline the data workshop.

1 We've been having problems recently with datasets and data
2 summaries coming out of the data workshop late and causing the
3 assessment itself to be late in our benchmark timelines.

4
5 There is also going to be a data-poor procedures workshop that
6 will focus on Caribbean species and some of us from the other
7 councils may want to participate in that, because the results of
8 that workshop could be applicable to some of our species, even
9 if they're not the same species.

10
11 At this meeting, I will point out that Dr. Luiz Barbieri also
12 was there representing FWC and not as a committee member, but as
13 an observer, because FWC does a number of stock assessments,
14 like the mutton snapper, black grouper, yellowtail snapper, and
15 hogfish.

16
17 The other thing we discussed was headboat data evaluation. You
18 may have seen some emails and stuff related to some concerns
19 about headboat data and there was a data workshop for South
20 Atlantic red grouper and some concerns were raised about the
21 validity of the headboat data prior to 1992 in the South
22 Atlantic area and so the data workshop halted until the
23 Southeast Fisheries Center could have a chance to evaluate those
24 concerns, but it does not look like -- We are confident that
25 it's not going to affect any of the Gulf species.

26
27 For one thing, our headboat survey in the Gulf didn't start
28 until 1986 and by then, most of those problems were probably
29 worked out and it was not a -- From 1986 to 1992 is only six
30 years and so the red grouper benchmark assessment for the Gulf
31 is moving forward as planned and that's not being halted or
32 jeopardized in any way.

33
34 The other thing we discussed was the Southeast Fisheries Science
35 Center assessment program review. Both Ryan and I went down to
36 listen to that and we had a couple of our SSC members, Will
37 Patterson and Sean Powers, to observe that as well.

38
39 That was an in-depth, two-day review of all the assessment
40 procedures of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. It was
41 very enlightening and it was a peer review by people from other
42 regions, other areas.

43
44 The review focused on the science and technical approach to
45 assessments, the assessment and peer review process and, of
46 course, SEDAR was a major component of that, interagency
47 communications, research efforts, and integration of ecosystem
48 information and the Center's organization, priorities, and

1 accomplishments and this is just a part of NMFS's overall
2 ongoing review system. Other Centers are being reviewed and
3 last year, the data aspect of the Southeast Fisheries Center was
4 reviewed and Ryan went to that in 2013.

5
6 Then we reviewed the overall SOPPs for SEDAR. At the request of
7 the Gulf Council representatives, the SEDAR SOPPs will be
8 modified to make the data workshop draft working papers
9 available to the public at the meeting. Up to now, because they
10 are draft, they had not been made available to the public and
11 only after the workshop and so it's made it difficult for
12 observers to kind of keep up with the discussion if they can't
13 read the working papers.

14
15 Future working papers will be made to the public and it will be
16 emphasized that these are draft and not for distribution and I
17 think Bonnie might speak to that later, but the concern was that
18 people would take something in the draft format that may be
19 incorrect and later corrected during the data workshop and
20 report it later and confuse the issue, but I think the people
21 involved in that can always point out that that data had been
22 corrected if it's misused later.

23
24 Then we looked at the assessment project schedule, which Ryan is
25 going to go over in detail, but we discussed the council's
26 request to do a red snapper assessment in 2015, right after we
27 receive an update assessment, and Dr. Ponwith indicated that
28 there's just not enough resources at the Science Center to do
29 two stock assessments two years in a row and there's not going
30 to be that much difference in the data and what can be
31 accomplished in that regard. We didn't really get into a
32 discussion of whether it should be a standard or a benchmark
33 assessment at that point.

34
35 We also -- I will just save this part for Ryan, but we talked
36 about what we're going to do in 2015 and what we're going to do
37 in 2016 and 2017 and what the council needs to decide on in
38 January is the semi-final 2016 assessment schedule and a
39 preliminary 2017 assessment schedule and with that, that
40 concludes my report of the Steering Committee and I welcome any
41 comments by yourself or Dr. Ponwith.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any committee members have any questions of Mr.
44 Gregory? Ryan, do you have something to add?

45
46 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. So you guys might remember
47 a while back, I think it was actually in August in San Antonio,
48 we had talked about the idea of having a more IPT-style approach

1 to the assessment workshops and that's something that the
2 Steering Committee approved and so that's going to make going to
3 the assessment workshops a whole lot more smooth and a better
4 cooperative process for the analysts and for the SSC members and
5 for the AP members involved and basically what it means is that
6 if one of the analysts has a question for a specific SSC member
7 that they just email them and ask them, instead of everything
8 having to occur in a 100 percent public environment like a
9 webinar. This eliminates the need for having fifteen or twenty
10 webinars like we had with gag and greater amberjack.

11
12 It doesn't mean that there won't be public involvement. There
13 will still be steps along the way where you'll have a public
14 webinar where all the things, all the communications that have
15 taken place prior to that, and the decisions that have been made
16 will be made open to the public to comment on before the process
17 moves forward any more, but it just allows significant progress
18 to be made along the way without having to wait for another
19 webinar to make a decision and so if anybody has any questions
20 about that -- I hope I explained that well.

21
22 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** I think you did a really good job of
23 covering that and I think of all the changes that we made,
24 that's the one that's going to have some of the most sweeping
25 repercussions, that and the data methods workshop.

26
27 We talked about getting the data methods workshop scheduled for
28 the spring and what that will do is decide in framework some of
29 these analytical approaches to the data and do it once and
30 document it, so it's perfectly clear how those decisions were
31 made and how those analyses are being done.

32
33 Then in the future, when an assessment is done, all you have to
34 do is cite that documentation, as opposed to over and over and
35 over again revisiting that same decision and writing a long,
36 elaborate discussion of that decision.

37
38 That has two bonuses. You do it once and you document it once
39 and you're going to end up with a lot shorter stock assessment
40 report, which makes them more approachable. They are easier to
41 read and the IPT approach to these meetings I think will
42 encourage a smooth flow of the deliberations of the analysts and
43 then pause at three key decision points to be able to hold the
44 public meetings and make sure that we're being attentive to the
45 transparency of the process in that way.

46
47 Another thing that was discussed was the SEDAR Committee of the
48 Gulf Council is fairly new and one thing that we haven't done is

1 kind of a SEDAR-101 of how the SEDAR Steering Committee
2 functions and how those decisions are made and how the Gulf
3 Council can position itself to be the most effective possible in
4 that decision making process.

5
6 Mr. Anson had recommended that at the January meeting we
7 actually have a special agenda item and that's kind of a SEDAR-
8 101, so that council members, whether they be seasoned veterans
9 or whether they be brand new, can actually see sort of the
10 beginning to the end process, so they can see the best way to
11 plug into that and reap the most benefits from that.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any comments or questions from committee
14 members? That will take us to -- I do appreciate it, Bonnie, if
15 you can put that together and have that available. I think it
16 would be helpful. We did have some discussion about that and
17 going to the SEDAR Steering Committee certainly helped myself to
18 get in the frame of mind as to the planning and the timing and
19 the outcomes and you know if you start here, you get this over
20 here and then how that could relate to the council.

21
22 I am hoping that would be something of benefit to the other
23 council members and help, again, try to -- When we have these
24 discussions and we start thinking about update assessments and
25 standards and what you get from them, how much it takes and the
26 resources and the time and then when we get the information
27 available back to us, that it hopefully will be set up in such a
28 way that we can use it immediately for setting future
29 management.

30
31 We have no other questions on that and that will take us to Item
32 Number VI, SEDAR Schedule Review, Tab I, Number 4, and Mr.
33 Rindone.

34 35 **SEDAR SCHEDULE REVIEW**

36
37 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. 2014 assessments are
38 obviously going to stay as they are and in 2015, we're looking
39 at finishing the assessment review workshops for red grouper and
40 that should be delivered to the council either by August or
41 October of next year and the same goes for a standard assessment
42 of gray triggerfish, which there's a typo on this. That should
43 be a terminal year of 2013 and that's because the standard
44 assessment is starting this winter or early spring and so the
45 most recent data that we can apply is 2013 there.

46
47 A standard assessment of vermilion snapper is also scheduled to
48 start later in 2015 and using 2014 data and that should be

1 available to the council early the following year and the FWC
2 assessments of mutton snapper and black grouper are also
3 scheduled to start.

4
5 2016 and 2017 are proposed and this is where some council
6 feedback would be really helpful. We have update assessments
7 for gag and greater amberjack proposed for 2016 and these would
8 begin in the last half of the year, to be able to use 2015 data
9 and hopefully it would be able to be delivered by the end of the
10 year, so that the council can see them and take action on them
11 at their first meeting in 2017.

12
13 Then the last meeting you guys had made a decision to shift one
14 of the slots in 2016 from a benchmark for red drum to a data-
15 poor assessment which would include red drum. If you wanted to
16 make recommendations about what other species you might
17 consider, that would be very helpful to help inform the schedule
18 and then we have an FWC update assessment of yellowtail snapper
19 listed.

20
21 2017, we have it on the list to try to assess two species that
22 have never been assessed before by SEDAR, which are gray snapper
23 and scamp, and also a standard assessment for yellowedge grouper
24 and then also, and this is also at the recommendation of the
25 Joint South Florida Group, to look at goliath grouper again.

26
27 There have been a lot of data that have been collected in recent
28 history and a lot of things that are on the docket to be
29 collected over the next couple of years, including close kin
30 analyses, which use genetic markers to track parentage and use
31 that as an estimate for population abundance. It's some
32 actually really interesting work and so we're looking at doing a
33 standard assessment of goliath grouper with FWC in 2017. Any
34 input?

35
36 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** You had mentioned in 2016 the addition of
37 some priorities there and the thought being that because we're
38 doing a data poor that there might be an option for another
39 assessment or another data-poor species? Expand on your
40 thinking a little bit there so that we can possibly think about
41 that before full council.

42
43 **MR. RINDONE:** What I meant was that it would be a data-poor
44 assessment, which would include an examination of red drum and
45 other species. It still takes up one spot, but other species
46 that you might consider might be warsaw or speckled hind or
47 other things that they're not preeminent, high-landing species,
48 but they're ones that we have and ones that we manage and we

1 don't have an assessment on the books for.

2
3 **DR. PONWITH:** The contribution that the Science Center could
4 make to that is we've got kind of a list of the species and
5 there are the regular ones where we've accumulated good data and
6 we have good, solid fishery-dependent data and we have at least
7 one index, if not more indices, of fishery-independent data.

8
9 Then there are some species that are in that sort of midrange,
10 where we've got some data, but not necessarily enough that would
11 enable us to conduct a traditional stock assessment and those
12 would be the ones that we would put in sort of a basket to
13 choose from for these data-poor species analyses and the benefit
14 of this is that instead of going deep on any one species, you go
15 wide on several species and so the council could weigh on a
16 collection of those and we would do an evaluation of how many
17 could be included and take that broader approach and get a
18 result that may be more informative than just some of the triage
19 approaches that we took when we were coming into compliance with
20 the reauthorization of the Magnuson Act, which was to have ACLs
21 by certain deadlines for all stocks.

22
23 We used evaluations of historic landings and this would take
24 into consideration much more information than just that and give
25 us a more robust mechanism for setting those ACLs.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I apologize, Bonnie, and I may have missed it,
28 but that analysis that you mentioned regarding some of these
29 species and doing the inventory of available data and such,
30 would that be available at our January meeting?

31
32 **DR. PONWITH:** We could come up with a short list of species we
33 think that are in that kind of the sweet spot for application of
34 data-poor techniques, yes.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Does anybody have any comments on
37 the SEDAR schedule that goes through 2017, proposed for 2016 and
38 2017?

39
40 **MR. ROY WILLIAMS:** Ryan referenced warsaw grouper and speckled
41 hind, perhaps, as species that could be added for data-poor
42 species and any consideration of that? I would at least like to
43 know if it's possible.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Being at the SEDAR Steering Committee, Bonnie
46 had made mention that we could go as late as January's meeting
47 with the data-poor species and provide that to the Science
48 Center and that would still fit into the 2016 slots, if you

1 will, and be able to be done, some of those species, if not all.

2
3 Is that still the case, Bonnie, that we could come back in
4 January with your information that you're going to provide as
5 far as those species and the priority or the rankings of those,
6 relative to data and such, have those available in January and
7 we can make a decision on the data-poor stocks then?

8
9 **DR. PONWITH:** That's correct, as long as the winter of SEDAR
10 meeting is scheduled after the Gulf Council meeting. We would
11 be able to provide sort of a shopping list of the species,
12 purely from a data availability standpoint, and then we can
13 merge that with the council's best thinking of which stocks they
14 would prioritize from within that basket and provide that as the
15 list.

16
17 Even if the SEDAR Steering Committee were scheduled in a way
18 that precluded that, because we're holding the slot for data-
19 poor species, I think that that's satisfactory for ensuring
20 that's what we're going to do and it gives us kind of some
21 latitude on identifying which stocks we're going to do within
22 their.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** In my mind, Roy, that was what I had thought
25 of, was to go ahead and use that information. Again, being at
26 the SEDAR Steering Committee, Bonnie had mentioned that she
27 could go ahead and develop that list and so we would have that
28 available and make that decision in January, since there was
29 still time to do that. Nobody else has any comments on that and
30 so that would take us to Item Number VII, Updated List of
31 Fishery Research and Socioeconomic Priorities for 2015 to 2019.
32 That would be Tab I, Number 5 and, Dr. Simmons, are you ready?

33
34 **UPDATED LIST OF FISHERY RESEARCH AND SOCIOECONOMIC PRIORITIES**
35 **FOR 2015-2019**
36

37 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** Yes and thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be
38 walking through Tab I, Number 5. I have to apologize. This is
39 one of the last items that made it into the briefing book,
40 because the Standing SSC and Reef Fish SSC wanted to make some
41 additional changes to the document and we wanted to make sure
42 that they could do that via email before we got to the council,
43 because they did review a previous, an earlier, draft that we
44 made some changes to that are reflected in what you have before
45 you.

46
47 Every five years, each council has to update their list of
48 monitoring and research priorities and those are submitted to

1 the Science Center and I believe the Science Center uses those
2 for a multitude of reasons, for various research grant
3 priorities as well as other internal research, I believe, that
4 occurs at NOAA. Maybe Dr. Ponwith can elaborate on that a
5 little bit later.

6
7 The way we've done it in the past, and this is similar to the
8 structure that we used the last five-year period, we've made
9 some additional modifications by including or better integrating
10 the socioeconomic priorities and the ecosystem-based management
11 priorities, we feel, from the last five-year research and
12 monitoring priorities.

13
14 We've divided it up into four sections, four main sections,
15 Broad, Multipurpose, Research/Monitoring, and Survey Programs,
16 and we've given those the following priority codes. The highest
17 priority, A, would be surveys to meet critical needs for stock
18 assessments and management.

19
20 B, our second priority, surveys to improve indices of abundance,
21 life history, or human dimension data that complements or adds
22 to those priorities that were listed in A and then C, third
23 priority, is surveys to characterize stocks or parameters for
24 assessments and so those are those broad priorities that you see
25 on page 1 through the top of page 4.

26
27 Just to tell you a little bit more about what the SSC was
28 concerned about, if you see on the bottom of page 2, we did
29 incorporate the ecosystem-based management data collection
30 priorities. That was previously in the ecosystem section and
31 it's now been moved up to these broad priorities and we've
32 incorporated or integrated more of the socioeconomic indicators
33 information under B, ecological relationships, linkages, and
34 networks, under that main header, to try to get at some of their
35 concerns.

36
37 For the next section, the priorities associated with individual
38 species or specific research topics, many of these species, if
39 not all, have had an assessment and so the priority codes for
40 this particular section were A, highest priority, stocks
41 designated as overfished and undergoing overfishing or in
42 critical need of an assessment; B, second priority, stock
43 designated as overfished or undergoing overfishing or just in
44 need of an assessment; third, C priority, is stocks with SEDAR
45 assessments, but not classified as A or B; then we added D, not
46 yet prioritized, criteria needed to prioritize non-SEDAR
47 recommendations.

48

1 I think the one we gave the D was some of the royal red shrimp.
2 That's the only current species we have a D priority there
3 listed currently.

4
5 Then for the last two sections, the economic and sociocultural
6 recommendations, they begin on page 7 and the ecosystem-based
7 management recommendations, which were greatly pared down from
8 what the SSC reviewed. We kept to a priority C and that was
9 primarily the ecosystem modeling development.

10
11 Both those last two sections are based on the following priority
12 codes: A is the highest priority, critical research and data
13 needs for socioeconomic analyses; B, second priority,
14 supplementary data collection and research needs; and then C,
15 third priority, is longer term data needs and research efforts.

16
17 One of the other concerns the SSC had is when they first
18 reviewed this, there was no priority codes for the economic and
19 sociocultural section. Those have been added and I just
20 mentioned what those priorities were and then for the ecosystem-
21 based section, the only standalone part currently that's not
22 integrated in our broad research priorities is the ecosystem
23 model development. With that, I will stop there and see if
24 there's any questions or additions.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any questions from the committee? I guess,
27 Carrie, I've got one question. If you look at -- I have read
28 the priority codes and I just might be overthinking this, but on
29 page 6, you listed vermilion snapper as priority code C and so
30 using that as an example, could you kind of explain why it was
31 vermilion snapper and was it related to those specific items and
32 their need or how they fit into the need of the species or was
33 it something else?

34
35 **DR. SIMMONS:** I kind of missed the question. The question is
36 why is vermilion snapper coded as a C?

37
38 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Yes and is it the -- Is it more so the items
39 that have been selected and that's what's driving the C or is it
40 just a C because the vermilion snapper is -- Based on the latest
41 assessment and such as you described it and so I just wanted to
42 make sure I'm clear on the priorities and how you set those.

43
44 **DR. SIMMONS:** Right and so what we were using is the fact that
45 the results of management were not overfished or undergoing
46 overfishing and I think, in recent times, we have heard some
47 testimony that there is more concern about vermilion snapper and
48 potential problems with the stock, but there has been no other

1 real information that has been brought forth, whereas compared
2 to gag, we've talked in length about the episodic mortality
3 events, the red tide event, et cetera, and so we currently have
4 a C, but we can certainly modify it.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. I just wanted more clarification
7 and thank you.

8
9 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Is there a plan and a timeline to accomplish the
10 A items?

11
12 **DR. PONWITH:** How I wish I could say yes. The carrying out this
13 work is all totally dependent on the availability of funds, but
14 the beauty of having a prioritized list is that when funds are
15 available or if we are engaged in an activity that we view as
16 lower priority than some of these research priorities,
17 activities can be redirected to focus on these and Dr. Simmons
18 made a remark that we use this list and that is absolutely true
19 and, in fact, the most recent very influential use of the
20 priorities that all of the councils are putting forward is those
21 were taking into direct consideration when the very recently
22 released call for Saltonstall-Kennedy Grants was put together.

23
24 The focus areas of the SK Grant call for proposals that hit the
25 streets last Thursday used each of the councils' list of
26 research priorities as the basis for generating that call for
27 proposals and so this is very, very valuable information and
28 having the priority list ensures that if resources are available
29 or if we are looking for cooperative research to be able to
30 collaborate with the fishing industry on, we will go to this as
31 our shopping list of ideas to tackle first.

32
33 **DR. SIMMONS:** I think I read a draft of that, but just to be
34 sure, it will use the most recent priorities we submit or is it
35 the older 2010-2014 research priorities?

36
37 **DR. PONWITH:** Since the call just came out last week, it was
38 more than likely the preceding list of priorities. It depends
39 on the timing.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other comments from committee members? All
42 right. Bonnie, just if you can refresh my memory, at least, on
43 -- So you get a suite of proposals in and you have X number of
44 dollars available that you know relative to the councils'
45 priority list here and what is that process then? They go
46 through a scientific review as far as matching or merging the
47 priorities and then the scientific merits of the project and you
48 try to match I guess an A with -- A submitted priority project

1 with a ranking of A with a project and that type of thing? Are
2 there agencies or other policy drivers in that decision making
3 process?

4
5 **DR. PONWITH:** The answer to that is convoluted because there are
6 many, many different call for proposals and each of them have
7 their own mechanism. The way I approach it is this information
8 is available. It's posted in a publicly-available spot.

9
10 If I were an academic researcher and I wanted to give my
11 proposal a competitive edge, I would cite that and I would say
12 this proposal, by the way, is not only phenomenal in its
13 scientific merit and being conducted by a world-class
14 researcher, but it actually handles Priority Number 7B that was
15 stated by the fishery management council and it gets at
16 relevance.

17
18 I will tell you every call for proposals has its own criteria of
19 what good is, but I have never met a call for proposals that did
20 not have as one of their key criteria the relevance to
21 contemporary issues.

22
23 By having this available, researchers who are competing for
24 MARFIN money, Saltonstall-Kennedy money, Cooperative Research
25 Program money, all of these calls for proposals, if they can
26 cite one of these and say this tackles one of the councils very
27 dearly-held priorities, that should have bearing on how fundable
28 that proposal is.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Any other questions?

31
32 **DR. SIMMONS:** That being said, I'm just curious. Does the South
33 Atlantic Council keep this on their website or do other councils
34 keep these priorities on their website or do they just submit it
35 to the Science Center and that's available? How would one go
36 about finding these if you're submitting a proposal if these
37 aren't available within the call for proposals?

38
39 **MR. BEN HARTIG:** That's a good -- I am not sure if we have them
40 on our website. I know we continually resend them every year.
41 We haven't had a lot of activity answering many of the questions
42 over time, but to Bonnie's point, I have worked on several
43 cooperative research projects and there, researchers who
44 actually get in contact with you are trying to answer an
45 assessment-grade question and that's great, but how do we
46 broaden that to fishermen who have these -- They want to answer
47 these questions, but yet, you don't have a researcher who is
48 ready and available to do this.

1
2 I ran into this problem when I tried to do my last king mackerel
3 project that I initiated. I could never get anybody to bite,
4 because, for one thing, it was the year of the Gulf oil spill
5 and so all hands on deck for that. Obviously there were
6 extenuating circumstances, but still, how can the council
7 actually start moving ahead?
8

9 **DR. PONWITH:** That's a very good question and one of the vexing
10 things about cooperative research is it takes a long time and a
11 lot of work to get a really, really successful proposal and then
12 ultimately a really successful project and the reason is because
13 there is nobody who knows more about the fishery than the people
14 who participate in it.
15

16 They are on the water on a day-to-day basis and they see things.
17 They are on the leading edge of environmental change in that
18 system. They are the first eyes to see those changes and then,
19 on the flip side, you have scientists who are experts at writing
20 proposals, but they're not at sea every day.
21

22 The whole idea of cooperative research is you get those two
23 things together and magic happens. The problem is one fisherman
24 and one scientist getting together and you run out of fishermen
25 and you run out of scientists really, really fast.
26

27 One idea that I've been thinking about that gets at Ben's very
28 question is what would stop the council from working with a
29 collection of fishermen and a collection of scientists and
30 instead of putting in these one-off little ideas of, hey, if you
31 give me \$10,000, I will run my boat out and I will catch twelve
32 fish and I will learn something about those twelve fish versus
33 taking something that's bigger and perhaps longitudinal, a two-
34 year or a three-year study, that's big and comprehensive and
35 very carefully thought out that addresses some of those issues
36 that are near and dear to the council and to the scientists and
37 tackles it in a really comprehensive way. I don't think there
38 is anything that would prevent that sort of a business model
39 from being approached.
40

41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Dr. Simmons, any more comments or
42 questions?
43

44 **DR. SIMMONS:** I guess would you like us to consider putting a
45 place for this on our website or a link to the SEDAR website, so
46 that they can get access to these priorities or we can talk
47 about it at a later time, but it's just a suggestion.
48

1 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I talked with Doug just a minute ago and I
2 think that's something that he is going to bring up with staff.
3 That's something I think that we can do, but certainly what's
4 the best way that we can do that, whether it is linking to their
5 website or what have you. I think that's what we'll attempt to
6 do and do that as soon as possible. That takes us to the last
7 item, Other Business, and we didn't have any other business that
8 was presented at the adoption of the agenda and is there any
9 other business? In that case, we will conclude the SEDAR
10 Committee.

11
12 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m., October 20,
13 2014.)

14
15 - - -
16