1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	GULF SEDAR COMMITTEE
4 5	The Lodge at Gulf State Park Gulf Shores, Alabama
6 7	April 8, 2024
8 9	MONTHS MEMBERS
10	VOTING MEMBERS Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alabama
11	Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut)Louisiana
12	Tom FrazerFlorida
13	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
14	C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley)Florida
15	
16	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
17	Kesley BanksTexas
18 19	Susan Boggs
20	Dale DiazMississippi
21	Dave Donaldson
22	Jonathan DugasLouisiana
23	Bob Gill
24	Michael McDermottMississippi
25	Anthony OvertonAlabama
26	Joe SpragginsMississippi
27	Andy StrelcheckNMFS
28	Ed WalkerFlorida
29 30	Troy WilliamsonTexas
31	STAFF
32	Max BirdsongSocial Scientist
33	Assane Diagne
34	Matt FreemanEconomist
35	John FroeschkeDeputy Director
36	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biologist
37	Mara LevyNOAA General Counsel
38 39	Jessica MatosAdministrative & Accounting Technician Emily MuehlsteinPublic Information Officer
40	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
41	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
42	Carrie SimmonsExecutive Director
43	
44	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
45	Jessica McCawleySAFMC
46	Jim NanceSSC
47 48	John WalterSEFSC
48 49	
4 ブ	

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	
3	Table of Contents2
4	
5	Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and
6	Next Steps3
7	
8	SSC Initial Discussions About the Current SEDAR Process3
9	
10	March 2024 SEDAR Steering Committee Meeting Report5
11	
12	Review and Discussion of Gulf of Mexico SEDAR Schedule13
13	
14	Other Business
15	
16	Adjournment
17	
18	
19	
20	

The Gulf SEDAR Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at The Lodge at Gulf State Park in Gulf Shores, Alabama on Monday morning, April 8, 2024, and was called to order by Chairman Kevin Anson.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA APPROVAL OF MINUTES ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON: We'll get started with the Adoption of the Agenda. As far as numbers, it's myself, Mr. Geeslin, Dr. Frazer, Dr. Sweetman, and Mr. Schieble, and so are there any changes to the agenda needed? All right. Is there any objection to adopting the agenda as written? Not seeing any, and so the agenda is adopted as written.

Approval of the June 2022 Minutes, are there any edits or changes needed, or clarifications? Not seeing any, is there any objection to accepting the minutes as written? Not seeing any objections, and the minutes are approved. That will take us to Item Number III, Action Guide and Next Steps, Tab I, Number 3, and Mr. Rindone.

MR. RYAN RINDONE: Thank you, sir. First up to bat will be Dr. Nance's presentation, which is Item V, and Dr. Nance is going to come to the podium, and he's going to summarize discussions about recommended revisions to the SEDAR process in response to the SSC's February 2024 review of the SEDAR 74 research track assessment for red snapper and include a brief overview of the revisions that the Science Center was considering as a result of that review.

The SSC provided feedback for council consideration about many facets of the stock assessment process, and some of these recommendations have also been discussed recently by the SEDAR Steering Committee, at its March 2024 meeting. The committee should review these recommendations, ask question, and make recommendations to the council, as appropriate.

SSC DISCUSSIONS ABOUT THE CURRENT SEDAR PROCESS

 DR. JIM NANCE: Thank you. It's nice to be here. This part of the presentation is going to talk about the process. Tomorrow, we have some slides on the SEDAR 74 track assessment, but, to begin with, we had a nice discussion with the Southeast Fisheries Science and the SSC at our SSC meeting.

The process recommendations that came out of that is we all felt

like we needed some additional flexibility in the SEDAR process, as it goes forth. Our preference is for addressing key stocks on a regular schedule and then assessing others as needed. Prescribing specific types of assessment in advance, and, in other words, operational and benchmark, we can do that through the processes.

4 5

The research track assessment, the center, in their discussion with us, noted that limited efficiency gains were observed in the research track, in light of increased workload on data providing for those types of assessments, and there was discussion on the independent reviewer process and how necessary that is, and, ultimately, I think we came to the conclusion that, ultimately, we did not recommend continuing the use of research track assessments in the future.

The peer review and working groups, probably a case-by-case determination of the peer review, and how necessary those are, and we can include those, the peer review process, in our terms of reference, and I think it will become a little bit clearer, and then consideration -- We need probably, for topical working groups, to have those in the terms of reference, also.

Future plans are we're going to have a continued discussion on this at our May SSC meeting on potential modifications to improve efficiencies and effectiveness, and input from SEDAR Steering Committee meetings are anticipated, and so I know Carrie, and the staff, went to the SEDAR Steering Committee, and, once we hear the outcome of those, we'll probably have further discussions, at our SSC meeting, on the SEDAR process, and we'll try to move that along, so that it's efficient for all of us, and I think we can have a lot better input on throughput through that process, and, Chair, that ends my presentation on this topic.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you, Dr. Nance. Any questions for Dr. Nance? I am not seeing any. Thank you.

39 DR. NANCE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: That will take us then to Item Number VI, the 42 March 2024 SEDAR Steering Committee Meeting Report. Dr. 43 Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Would you like Mr. Rindone to do the action guide?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Sure.

MARCH 2024 SEDAR STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. RINDONE: All right. It says Item Number IV, and it should say Item Number VI, but we're going to summarize the proceedings from the steering committee meeting that was held on March 25 and 26 in Charleston. Just a reminder to the committee that the council chair and executive director represent the interests of the council with respect to SEDAR on the SEDAR Steering Committee, which meets twice a year, typically, to discuss the stock assessment schedule process, and other topics, as necessary, and the committee also discussed new approaches for conducting stock assessments in the southeastern U.S. The schedule, and other topics, this committee should review the presentation and ask questions and make recommendations to the council, the SSC, and staff, as appropriate.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I'm going to summarize Tab I, Number 6, and so there's not yet a summary from the SEDAR Steering Committee. We just met, in Charleston, on March 25 and 26, and so this is a presentation that we put together, and it was reviewed by the chair and vice chair and staff.

To give you an overview, we're going to talk about the SEDAR projects report, and we talked about the SEDAR process review discussion, and we started hearing some information from the Science Center regarding process suggestions. They had a presentation that they walked us through. We had three Other Business items that we discussed, that I will provide some information to you all, and then next steps, as far as when we're going to meet again, and then we're going to circle back and talk about the assessment schedule, where we are with that, and then we're going to start a discussion of key stocks that the center asked us to start reviewing and thinking about for the council.

I focused on the Gulf stocks, or the joint stocks, and I don't have anything in here regarding the South Atlantic Council stocks, and so, if you would like to look at that information, you'll have to go to the SEDAR committee website to take a look at that, but, to give you an update, SEDAR 96 was Southeast U.S. yellowtail snapper.

 The councils, both councils, the Gulf and South Atlantic, requested an operational assessment to use the State Reef Fish Survey for private vessel landings, and so we have reviewed and approved, both the SSCs and the councils, the terms of reference

for that assessment. There is assessment webinars that are scheduled throughout the months of May and September this year, and they're expecting completion in late 2024. If there are no questions on that, next slide, please.

For SEDAR 94, the Florida hogfish, a benchmark was slated to begin in 2024, and it was postponed until 2025, in order to allow the yellowtail snapper to be accommodated back into the assessment schedule. The terms of reference were reviewed, and approved, by the SSCs and the councils, to-date, and then SEDAR is going to finalize that project schedule with the participants as well, for both the Gulf and South Atlantic, and so, again, this is for your information, and we'll have to take some of this back to the SSC.

During the steering committee, we received a presentation from the center, and they started discussing some changes they wanted to make to the process, and so one of those things they started talking about was identifying the cooperators, being the Gulf Council, the South Atlantic Council, the Caribbean Council, and Highly Migratory Species, identifying key stocks and assigning a permanent rotating calendar to those key stocks, to try to improve efficiencies and thinking about the frequency that was needed for those stocks in the SEDAR schedule itself and approaches to update management advice between full assessments, versus like an interim assessment, that maybe accommodated, in between, those bigger, larger, more complex assessments.

Then the potential for extra SEDAR assessments to address emergent issues, and so we wanted some flexibility in this process, as we forward, and recommendations to improve the timeliness of stock assessment advice, and they want to start really applying these changes, I believe, in 2026 and beyond, to the stock assessment calendar, and so we kind of need to keep that in the back of our minds as we're going through the stock assessment schedule.

When we get to that point, we'll need some committee and council feedback regarding the key stocks, and then, as Dr. Nance mentioned, we're going to start bringing that information to the SSC, as the center kind of moves forward with developing this renewed process and trying to streamline the assessments through that process to the SSC and then the council.

 The Science Center recommended these changes, eliminating the research track, as it was completed in the Gulf for red snapper, eliminate the assessment nomenclature and slot concept. These key stocks, again, with the council really trying to identify

what the key stocks are, and prioritizing them, and trying to really think about how some of the remaining stocks could be assessed, potentially using less time-consuming approaches. Like, you know, do they all need to go through the more complex models, and the most complex assessments, and so the SEDAR Steering Committee was supportive of these recommendations that were presented from the center.

4 5

Another item was discussed regarding virtual public comment for in-person meetings, and so it began in 2023, and so SEDAR began broadcasting plenary sessions of in-person SEDAR meetings, and so the individuals that were not able to attend in-person could absorb that process now via webinar, and you can use the public comment form on the SEDAR website, but you have to attend in-person to provide public comment.

Comments on management can be directed to the appropriate management body, and so I think we discussed this, and there were a lot of concerns about public comments being directed at management, versus at, you know, the SEDAR process, and that stock assessment, and so I think that was one of the other impetuses, as well as logistics for not allowing virtual public comment during those in-person meetings.

There was three Other Business items, and we discussed an update on the status of Science Center efforts to automate data provisions, and we spent a long time talking about this, and so the outcome was that the work was going to continue with the Fishery-Independent Indices Working Group. I think there's been a lot of effort, and they're trying to wrap up some of that, particularly with the state partners, and the center is considering ways to automate data processing and to ensure the best practices for these various indices of abundance, and so I think there's quite a bit of work to do there, but it seems like the ball is rolling.

We spent some time talking about the Center for Independent Experts, which is the CIE, performance work statements, and this came up, for us, during the review of the red snapper assessment, and the reviewers that were selected and involved in that process didn't seem to be very familiar with the fisheries, along with some of the data limitations that we have in the Southeast, and so we talked about this at the steering committee, and the center plans to be more involved in reviewing the statements for the various assessments prior to the selection of those CIE reviewers.

Other suggestions were made regarding the review workshops, with

the SSC members and their engagement in those workshops, and so I think we'll hear more from the center as we work through the next iteration of the red snapper stock assessment, as well as some other benchmark assessments, and so that's in the works.

For assessment webinars, this is kind of just, as we go back towards benchmarks, and benchmark terminology, I think there are some questions about if cooperators, such as the Gulf Council, can appoint panelists to participate in those webinars, where they can talk, and that was confirmed, and so I think this was enough of an issue that I just wanted to say that that was cleared up during the steering committee, and that was the result.

The next steering committee will meet in August of 2024, I think is what the plan is, and, right now, we're trying to have a midmeeting, and it will probably be virtual, and I think the August meeting as well I think will be virtual, to receive updates and exchange any recommendations from the council and its SSC towards this reimagining and envisioning the stock assessment process. Now, I think, if there's not any questions, Mr. Chair, on that, we'll talk about the schedule.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any questions for Dr. Simmons? I'm not seeing any, if you want to go ahead. Mr. Strelcheck.

MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: I just wanted to build upon the comments from Carrie, and so, you know, we certainly recognize, as an agency, the need to improve the SEDAR process and the lessons learned. The Science Center gave a comprehensive presentation on the research track, and what we thought it would accomplish, versus what it actually accomplished, and you were there, Kevin, right, and they were two very different things.

One of the things that I think we really need to be willing to do is adapt to some pretty significant change going forward, and our willingness to simplify the process, right, and so that's not just NMFS. That's the council as a whole, in terms of, if we're going to increase throughput, and ultimately have more assessment advice, we're going to have to simplify things considerably.

The other approach that I like is, when we get into the schedule, you've all seen kind of the blocks of time that are essentially put on a calendar, and sometimes we stay within those blocks of time, and a lot of times we extend beyond those blocks of time, but the proposal, from center staff, right, is kind of a build, you know, the timeline, based on the components

of the stock assessment, and, as you add complexity, that adds time to the stock assessment, and so, if there's technical working groups, or there's other activities that are added, that's all plugged into the process, and, obviously, things will change, but you kind of get an idea, and is it going to be a six-month timeframe, or is it going to be a nine-month timeframe, or is it going to be a nine-month timeframe, or is it going to be a fifteen-month timeframe, and so that also will, I think, bring some predictability, in terms of the process, and so I just wanted to note that.

4 5

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Sweetman.

 DR. C.J. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just general questions, and I know we'll get into the schedule in a little bit here, but, I mean, overall, I agree with Andy, and I'm supportive of getting rid of the research track assessment component. It doesn't provide management advice, and we've had challenges with that in the past, and they take up a lot of time.

A general question though, and so how does -- Obviously, some folks in the Science Center are concerned about staff capacity, and everything along those lines, and the current structure that we have right now for the stock assessment process, and so looking at -- I'm probably skipping ahead here, but, looking at some of the key species that we've kind of looked at here, how would that rotating schedule actually reduce capacity, and then I'm thinking, from the perspective of -- I know, at least on the South Atlantic, you know, they've done a lot of management strategy evaluations, and we haven't really incorporated that too much into the Gulf side here, and so I'm wondering how separate things along those lines, that would require the Science Center to get involved, could interact with what is tentatively being proposed right now.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Obviously, I would want John to weigh-in here, but, you know, with the management strategy evaluations in the South Atlantic, we're still, I think, finding our way on that, in terms of how that ultimately integrates into management advice, but there has been time dedicated on the SEDAR schedule to allow that to happen.

Your point, right, in terms of staffing, resources, capacity, I guess the way I'm looking at it is we're not, you know, going to be able to greatly expand, or maybe increase, our workforce of stock assessment scientists, and so it's really about then how

do we simplify the process and be able to kind of schedule these assessments in a way that is being informed by the complexity of the assessments, and so, by identifying key stocks upfront, that provides some uncertainty, but then also providing some simpler approaches to how we assess these species could ultimately allow those scientists that we have to produce more assessments, or more interim analyses, or more, you know, products that the council could receive.

4 5

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Walter, to that point?

DR. JOHN WALTER: Yes. Thanks, and thanks, C.J. I think the goal is to try and meet the complexity and resources invested in an assessment with the need, and, in some cases, we've got a need for integrating a whole lot of information, you know, the full red snapper assessment, and, in other cases, probably the need doesn't rise to the full SEDAR approach, and how can we take some stocks and do it maybe a little more efficiently, and then there's also the idea that we probably --

We're always going to have this time delay between the conventional assessment and when management advice hits, and are there things, and indeed there are, and we've talked about like empirical, or index-based, management procedures that might be able to be a little more responsive and adjust the catch levels in response to something that might happen without spinning-up the whole SEDAR process.

I think the key is going to be we've got a couple of management procedures, MSEs, on the books here, and the schedule, and how we do them all need to fit the need, and I think we've heard, and been a little bit concerned, that MSE is going to be this really intensive, long process that we fear, when it doesn't need to be, and it can be a desk MSE, and it can take a couple of weeks by an analyst, or it can be a full stakeholder participatory MSE, but, if the management objectives are pretty clear, and it's simply to be able to provide catch advice that objectives, those management then there doesn't meets necessarily need to be a really intensive process of developing new objectives.

I think how we build those MSEs, or management procedures, to just meet the needs that we have, I think is going to be the key there, and one of the things that I think the SEDAR Steering Committee talked about, in terms of taking some of the assessments outside of SEDAR, is could we do them a little simpler, and then maybe there's a process, like that old reef fish assessment panel, that might be useful to stand up that

says, okay, this is a group of the experts appointed by the council, maybe from SSC members, and they're going to have this group of species, that are not the priority ones, which we'll get to, and they're going to be tasked with coming up with a plan, maybe, with the Science Center, with the states, on how we're going to address these stocks in the most efficient manner, and then actually doing it. That might be a way forward, while we still do the key stocks in the normal fully-transparent, inclusive manner. Thanks.

4 5

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Frazer.

DR. TOM FRAZER: I think Dr. Walter answered the question, and so, based on the SEDAR Committee's kind of deliberations, the MSE type of work would be held outside of the SEDAR process, and is that what you're suggesting, or would the Science Center handle that?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Go ahead, Dr. Walter.

 DR. WALTER: In think, in some cases, yes, but I think, as we're learning in the South Atlantic, it's -- Depending on the need, you're going to need other players involved, and so, right now, what we initially said it let's keep it out of the SEDAR process, because SEDAR has a particularly rigid process for doing the stock assessments, the data, assessment, and review workshop, that could be adapted to developing MSEs, but, because we've never done it in the Gulf yet, we might have to define that process, and so that was really -- It's not that the SEDAR process couldn't achieve that, because it's very good at creating transparency and inclusivity and getting people there, which, in some MSEs, is exactly what needs to be done, but, for others, it's probably overkill, when we just need to see which index works well for an interim approach. That's just kind of a desk MSE assessment kind of thing. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, but, I guess, to your point, Dr. Frazer, yes, historically, the steering committee has requested that the MSEs not be put in the previous process scheduled slots that they had, and we had asked that they be done outside of the SEDAR process, but, again, moving forward, and thinking about this reimagined process, I think we're opening up and thinking about things a little bit differently, but, yes, historically, that has been our approach.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Diaz.

1 2

4 5

MR. DALE DIAZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your committee, but I really am optimistic about what's being discussed around the table right now, and I like where I hope we're headed. I've been around the council process since around 2008, and my thinking has shifted on this since 2008.

I like not having and assigned name for a stock assessment. The reason for that is, in the past, I think, especially around red snapper, even if we had buy-in in the SEDAR process, and trying to get things done, people would always want the Cadillac version, instead of the version that we need, and so, anyway, I like where we're going, and I like what Dr. Walter said about standing up panel, and that panel should, every time we look at a new stock assessment, say how can we simplify it, and what do we need, and how can we get more timely data. Those need to be the things that they focus on every single time, and any progress we could make would be huge.

I just absolutely hate, whenever we're trying to manage, and then you've got a terminal year that's two or three years out, and people out on the water are seeing something entirely different than it was four years ago, or three years ago, and so I like where we're going, and please keep the momentum going, and I really was enthused with Dr. Walter's statement a minute ago, and so hopefully we can keep moving in that direction. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Geeslin.

MR. DAKUS GEESLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will echo some of Dale's sentiments and then move on to a more pointed observation, and I am also encouraged by the efforts to create a more efficient and timely SEDAR process.

Now my pointed comment is to -- I recognize the need to maybe refine our CIE process review, having sat in on that SEDAR workshop, and that was absolutely painful, to listen to some of that, and I can only imagine what it was like sitting in the room.

Some of those criticism, and feedback, weren't necessarily relevant, or germane, to our fishery, and I'm talking specifically to SEDAR 74, the red snapper stock assessment, and so, the more we can, you know, strike that balance, and I think that's what it is, is having that independent review, that has some unbiased perspectives, and striking that balance with, you know, those comments, and criticisms, that are both relevant,

and, more importantly, probably reasonable to come back to, and so some of that I felt was kind of pie-in-the-sky comments that I didn't even know how our SEDAR folks would deal with that, and so I do sympathize with some of the folks that had to deal with that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I appreciate the comments, and, Dale, your comments about, you know, an eye toward, you know, throughput, efficiency, so that we can kind of keep up with the fishery, and so -- Andy talked about it a little bit a minute ago, and one thing that I was encouraged to hear, by the staff that were there, the NOAA staff that were there, was, you know, an understanding, a desire, to, you know, put energies into some of those less-technical assessment processes, with an eye toward trying to get more throughput forward, you know, with management advice.

I was encouraged to hear what was talked, and discussed, about it around the table. You know, certainly there is, you know, the nuts-and-bolts of how this newly-envisioned process is going to work, and, although they're trying to get away from slots, at the end of the day, it still comes down to, you know, available bodies, and resources, to be able to do whatever it is that's selected for whatever species, you know, but the first jumping-off point, if you will, for that process, as I understand it, is for the respective councils to come back with this kind of list of species.

Then, as they develop what is the -- You know, internally how they're going to set this up, and that would be helpful, as they kind of envision 2026 and beyond, how that first year is going to look, and those types of things, and so that's something that we have yet to discuss, but certainly I look forward to the SEDAR Steering Committee members, and then we can have discussion at Full Council, of course, of trying to identify those priority species.

If there's no other discussion about kind of the process, and certainly we'll hear more about it in upcoming council meetings, when those details get fleshed out, but, right now, I think we'll go to the current SEDAR schedule. Ryan, did you want to handle that?

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE GULF OF MEXICO SEDAR SCHEDULE

MR. RINDONE: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. We updated the schedule, as you see on the screen here, current as of the last SEDAR Steering Committee meeting. There are still some old system

assessment nomenclature used in here, because we're not expected to really phase out of that until we get into -- Or beyond 2026, but we'll be working on that as we move forward with that.

For 2024, we have the expectation of starting -- Or of continuing and finishing the red grouper operational assessment. The SSC would be expected to review that, I believe, in November, and the red snapper benchmark assessment will be expected to start later this year. The data workshop, or initial data discussions, the phone calls and whatnot, begin in the third quarter of this, and a data workshop in December, and I think we're looking at The Renaissance in Mobile for that, Mr. Chair, and so we expect to see your shining face there.

We will also be continuing to work on the shrimp benchmark assessment, and so FWC will be wrapping up the mutton snapper assessment and starting the yellowtail snapper assessment that was requested by both councils, and both of those assessments will also consider the State of Florida's State Reef Fish Survey, as will the red grouper assessment.

Then FWC has contracted with a consulting group to work on the development of an MSE for black grouper, and, at this time, we expect that process to carry into 2025, and so, when there's more to report on the development of that, we'll let you know.

 For 2025, we hope to finish up that benchmark for red snapper, and do an operational for gag grouper, or start one for gag grouper, and we also want to start the benchmark for gray triggerfish, which has been out of the assessment loop for a while, and so it's time to bring that one back in, and an operational assessment for kingfish. We've been hearing a lot, obviously, from our fishing public about matters related to kingfish harvest being down considerably from previous years, and so it's time to take a look under the hood there.

Then we'll finish up shrimp, and FWC will have finished up the other two Florida species, and they'll pick up Florida hogfish, which will be all the way down the coast, and we hope to see that black grouper MSE wrap up. We finalized 2026 also, with finishing up the gray triggerfish benchmark assessment, and the gag operational, and starting a benchmark for greater amberjack.

We also have a cobia assessment listed on here as well, and cobia tends to be churned out pretty quickly, and so then FWC should wrap-up its work on hogfish that year as well. I'm just going to keep going, unless somebody, you know, puts a flare up.

DR. SWEETMAN: Just a real quick question, Ryan. Relative to king mackerel, the operational assessment, obviously, we've heard a lot about that. Is there the potential to incorporate the findings from the port meetings and whatnot that are being conducted across the various councils into that assessment?

MR. RINDONE: It's certainly plausible. It just depends on the timeliness of those reports becoming available and being able to see what kind of information is generated there and how it might help inform what's going on. The kingfish assessment is kind of a curious one, right, and like it's -- Based on the catch limits anyway, it's not overharvest, and so where have the fish gone, and nobody seems to be getting, you know, a return phone call about that, and so it will be a curious effort, for sure, with the next examination of kingfish, to try to figure out if there's something environmental at-play, or, you know, if there's something else, and so lots of questions there right now. Mr. Gill.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Gill.

MR. BOB GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on your committee, but I know there was discussion, at the steering committee, about the planning grid, or the appropriateness of that kind of grid, but I note that the current planning grid, on the SEDAR site, is not consistent with the current schedule. Is that because the grid hasn't been updated, or it is not intended to be updated, but, in terms of the schedule, the first thing I vote for is take a look at that grid, and find out where things are, but, at the moment, there seems to be a disconnect, and does anybody know why?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so recall the report hasn't come out yet from the SEDAR Steering Committee, and so we were just trying to update it for ourselves in the Gulf, and we are waiting to get that information from Julie, and so what you saw was what we reviewed during that meeting and not the results of that.

 I also wanted to point out that, Ryan, in 2026, my understanding is -- It says "final" on our schedule here, but my understanding, from the center, was they wanted to start this re-envisioning process in 2026, and that's when we get back to the key stocks slide. It was something they wanted us to start thinking about beginning in 2026, and is that correct?

MR. RINDONE: It's something that we'll start trying to implement in 2026. In the meantime though, these were all still species that the Gulf had agreed that were important to have on the board at that time, and so, you know, things like gray triggerfish will have started in 2025, and be getting wrappedup, and gag will have started in 2025, and be getting wrappedup, and then, you know, cobia was undergoing overfishing the last time that we assessed it, and that one is a pretty easy turnaround for the center to be able to do.

4 5

The council will have an interest in knowing what's going on with cobia at that point, and then greater amberjack will have been out of an assessment for a while at that point, and we had talked about -- We've been talking, for a couple of years, about having another assessment of greater amberjack, and so that was the next available point in time to slip in it, was in 2026, and, based on our initial discussions at the SEDAR Steering Committee, we had every expectation that greater amberjack would be identified as one of the Gulf's key stocks, and so that's kind of where we were on that.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: But the message is, from 2026, the species after it could be subject to change, depending upon the priorities and the schedule that we select here at this meeting, or maybe the next, but --

MR. RINDONE: There could still be some tweaking for 2026, and, if you guys recall, and this might pre-date some of the newer council members, but we try to put final on these things as much as, you know, a deterring label, you know, kind of like a caution label of don't screw with this, because, as we move species around on the agenda, or on the schedule, it certainly has a ripple effect for resource allocations for FWC, and for the Science Center, for being able to properly allocate human and other resources to the assessment process, and so final is kind of like a don't touch unless absolutely necessary sort of label.

 When we get out beyond, into like the proposed, there's a lot more fluidity that we tend to look at that part of the schedule with, for being able to change, and we have made changes, in the past, to things that were labeled final, and we had emergent issues, but making space for those emergent issues is one of the goals that the steering committee noted in its meeting in March.

 CHAIRMAN ANSON: All right. Any other questions, or discussion, on the schedule? All right, and so our homework, or charge, was to -- Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, Bernie, could we put the presentation back up? There's a slide to get the committee's, and council's, minds thinking about how we would identify, and prioritize, key stocks.

Staff has put together a draft list, and we're certainly not saying that the center could take on eight species in 2026, and so don't have a panic attack, but we're just trying to start putting some stuff down on paper, and so some things that we talked about, at the Steering Committee, were key stocks of importance to management, but they don't have to be necessarily the most data-rich stocks, and so that was discussed.

Then some considerations that we thought of, internally after the meeting, that we thought were important to put on this slide, were, you know, does the council consider prioritization to be, you know, just high-profile stocks, stocks that might suffer from episodic mortality, stocks that have either a larger commercial or recreational component, or both, and/or all of the above, and so, just to get the conversation going, we have provided a draft list of stocks for the committee, and the council, to provide feedback, because I know we're getting close on time, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: So, staff has put together this list for discussion, and is there any discussion? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know I'm going to discuss something, and I'm not on this committee, and so I appreciate the recognition. One stock that's not on that list is shrimp, and was that intentional, and, if so, why?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair, and so and I'm hoping, from the benchmark an annual crop, assessment process that is currently underway, and I think we're going to get the data workshop here wrapped-up in the next month or so, that we will hopefully not have to embark on a more complex assessment process again, but, if you're suggesting like a more interim, or update, approach, we can certainly consider weaving that into this process, but I think staff was thinking, you know, we will just have completed, in 2026, that larger assessment process for the three penaeid shrimp, is МУ understanding.

MR. GILL: To that point, Mr. Chairman, but we're identifying two stocks not for 2026, but for the future, on how we're going to operate the assessment schedule, and 2026 is what it is, but

I guess I'm trying to figure out the rationale for how one can say that shrimp is not a key stock, because, in the long term -- Well, given what the industry state is at, and we all understand that, but certainly it ought to be under consideration. What we have here is finfish, and, granted, shrimp are different, but, however the current assessment of shrimp comes out, in my mind, it is immaterial to whether shrimp is considered a key stock or not.

4 5

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Point taken with me, Mr. Gill, yes, and I think this slide was intended just to, again, provide some basis for starting a discussion to kind of flesh out, again, what those priority key stocks would be, and then, if there can be a priority identified with those key stocks, kind of prioritize them, and so, if you feel like there is certainly a species, or a suite of species, that are closely related, that need to be input on the list, then we can do that.

Now, I would just say that, at the end of the day, resources are still going to be limited, you know, and so we have like sixty-some-odd species under our FMP, and one could argue that we put them all in there, but, you know, we have to kind of make some decisions as to what we feel like deserve merit, you know, and, as you -- What I think we're alluding to is the importance of shrimp relative to the economic importance of it, as well as potentially if there are things going on there environmentally that we're not capturing, that maybe the assessment might be able to find that, and so do we have anybody that wants to add to the species? Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: Just, again, these are probably, I mean, the eight most commonly-targeted ones, and I'm not sure that king mackerel is in the top eight, but, you know, yellowtail snapper is one I would think about, right, and the reason that I would think about that is because it's jointly managed by both councils, right, and we know that those fish are likely undergoing some distributional shifts, right, and the dynamics in the fishery are likely going to change, and so I would like to consider, you know, a little forward-thinking stuff going here.

 You know, king mackerel is tough, right, and we don't really know what's happening, but I would say that cobia is in the same boat, right, and so these coastal kind of pelagics -- I mean, again, I think that's maybe not so much an assessment exercise as it is what are the plans for data collection that would allow us to actually assess those stocks, moving forward, and so those are the two big things that I think about.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Sweetman.

4 5

DR. SWEETMAN: I agree with what Tom is saying, but, to the yellowtail point, how does FWC fit into this updated kind of process here, with how our FWRI staff are conducting assessments through the SEDAR process right now?

CHAIRMAN ANSON: I'm not sure. Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: I think this is the council's prioritization, and so we're agnostic on that particular aspect of it. We share the workload with our partners, and particularly with FWRI, who carries the lion's share of the workload on a number of stocks, like hogfish, yellowtail, black grouper, et cetera, but, in terms of the council's priorities, that's what we're seeking guidance on. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Mr. Rindone.

MR. RINDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Sweetman, I think it's all a negotiation between the cooperator, which in this case is the Gulf Council, and the analytical agency, which, in the case of yellowtail and the other species Dr. Walter mentioned, would be FWRI, and so, if any, or all, or some combination thereof, of those south Florida species, or Florida-centric species, that fall under FWRI's assessment purview are listed as key stocks, then the routine nature with which they would be assessed, and the capacity, and resources allocated to that, would just be something that the cooperators, because we share a lot of these with the South Atlantic, would have to be negotiated with FWRI, through that steering committee process. There is no definitive answer about it now, but, you know, we all know each other, and we'll be able to hash it out if those species get added to the list.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Any other discussion on priority or key species, key stocks? All right. I guess that concludes that item, and, under Other Business, there was no -- Mr. Schieble.

OTHER BUSINESS

 MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: I asked Bernie to pull up the motions report from the last meeting in January, and I think it's page 8 that has the motion that the council passed with regard to the SEDAR process, and I just sort of wanted to pull it back up, real quick, and I don't want to take a bunch of time with this, but I wanted to see if the council feels that this motion was adequately addressed in the steering committee meeting, with

particular consideration to the last three parts of it.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so we've been discussing this motion, and I think I sent it to the center right after the January council meeting, and we were hoping that, after the SEDAR meeting, they might be ready, the SEDAR Steering Committee ready, to provide the council, and the SSC, with more information, but they're not going to be ready for this meeting. They've requested to move that to June, to provide more information on this reimagining process, and so I think we can just remind them of these other items in there as well, and so I think that is their intent, but I will look at Dr. Walter, to be sure.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Dr. Walter.

DR. WALTER: Thanks, Chair. On a couple of these things, and remember there is a lot wrapped up in here, and a lot of work on really -- That's been outlined here, and I think what we saw, at the SEDAR Steering Committee, was really a collaborative approach towards really trying to get at a proposed action plan, and I think there was a lot of progress there, and there's still more to be made on that, like identifying the key stocks and what they're going to get.

In terms of the consideration of state surveys being fully-integrated replacements for FES, it's not something that the Science Center can do exclusively on our own, and a lot of things have to be in motion, in terms of how those get addressed within each individual assessment.

One thing that we are doing, with regard to that, is the evaluating whether -- We had talked about this percent change approach, about whether we can manage using a percent change, even if we have different units going into the assessment, and we're managing different units, and I don't want to scare anybody with this word, of how we're addressing that, but we're using a simulation testing framework that evaluates that, and it's called a desk MSE, but to be able to explore how well that option works.

I think that's going to be a useful thing to present to the SSC, as the Executive Director said that we're going to do, and then see whether that's something that we can show whether it works before proposing it to the council, and that would be going to that percent change, and managing for a percent change, in the

1 catch.

The conducting assessments outside of SEDAR, I think that's conversations that the steering committee is really having, and I think we're getting to that point. As I mentioned, that --Maybe that reef fish assessment committee, and there used to be something like that, that would vet these non-SEDAR assessments, and so, for the ones we think we can do that way, that might be a way to go, and then, obviously, they would also potentially be tasked with other methods, that might be those simpler ones, and I think we're making progress on those, and I think it's just we're going to have to have further conversation before this proposed action plan is fleshed out even more, but, given the timeframe, I thought we made pretty good progress, and the steering committee was quite effective in moving this forward. Thanks.

MR. SCHIEBLE: Thank you, Dr. Walter. I appreciate that, and it was really just to bring this back up to the attention of the council, and make sure this doesn't get lost in the works, and that we're moving forward with it, and potentially, the next SEDAR Committee, whenever we have that scheduled, we can bring it back up again, to see where the progress is.

CHAIRMAN ANSON: Thank you. Any other discussion? There's no other business, and, seeing none, we'll go ahead and adjourn the SEDAR Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on April 8, 2024.)