

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 **MEETING IN DESTIN, FLORIDA**  
2

3 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. We'll put that in abeyance, but  
4 remembering that Dave had already volunteered for this. Agenda  
5 Item III is Selection of an SSC Representative for the June 3  
6 through 6 Council Meeting in Destin. Kai Lorenzen expressed his  
7 availability for it. Does anybody else want to -- I will give  
8 others an opportunity, but, without such, Kai has agreed to do  
9 it. Anybody else?

10  
11 **MR. RINDONE:** I was just going to clarify that the SSC member  
12 would only need to be there from Sunday to Tuesday, and so the  
13 council will cover your travel from Sunday to Tuesday.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Thank you. If there is no  
16 enthusiasm other than Kai, then, Kai, you have our blessing to  
17 present our results to the council.

18  
19 **DR. LORENZEN:** Thank you.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Agenda Item IV, which is the crux of this  
22 short meeting, and this is the discussion and review of the  
23 carryover simulations, including underages and overages that are  
24 done by the staff, but it also goes back to some original  
25 discussions about this that were made at the beginning of the  
26 year and earlier.

27  
28 The first item that we have there is the review of the SSC  
29 discussions that have been going on thus far, and this was in  
30 the documents that were distributed to you. Ryan, are you going  
31 to go over this with us?

32  
33 **MR. RINDONE:** I sure can.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Great. Thank you.

36  
37 **REVIEW OF CARRYOVER SIMULATIONS UPDATED TO INCLUDE OVERAGES**

38  
39 **MR. RINDONE:** I put together a summary here, and it's generally  
40 just clips from past SSC summary meetings, and it's kind of  
41 detailing the progress that you guys have been making about  
42 discussing the idea of carryovers, and it all started with an  
43 update to the National Standard Guidelines, which suggested that  
44 it could be possible and acceptable to carry over some portion  
45 of the uncaught quota from one year to the next year, and so you  
46 can see a little illustration of that. I am going to breeze  
47 through this, by the way, because it's about five pages in  
48 total, but just as a very general overview.

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 6<sup>th</sup>, 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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 - - -