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## Introduction:

The Fishery Dependent Monitoring subsection (FDM) of the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWRI) monitors commercial and recreational fishing in marine environments along the Florida coast in association with several fishery-dependent research and monitoring projects. FDM administers two federal surveys, the Marine Recreational Information Program (MRIP) for the recreational sector and the Trip Interview Program (TIP) for the commercial sector. Additionally, FDM conducts several unique surveys of recreational anglers that allow for the collection of supplemental biological data. Each fishery dependent research or monitoring project that contributed to the age and length data provided to the Life History Group is described below. Because fish must be returned to anglers quickly during fishery-dependent surveys, priority was given to collecting the left otolith if both otoliths could not be removed.

## Commercial Fishery Data

## Trip Interview Program (TIP)

The commercial fishery is sampled via the NOAA Trip Interview Program (TIP) in which Florida participates. Biological samples collected from the commercial fishery included in this dataset encompass the years 2002-2019. The primary focus of the TIP program is collecting random size frequency data and biological samples from commercial marine species. Samplers take information from harvested fish being offloaded from commercial fishing vessels. Length measurements include fork length and natural total length (mm). Weight measurements are whole weight or gutted weight ( kg ), dependent upon on the status of the fish upon landing. Typically a single otolith is extracted below the operculum to retain filet integrity. Length and weight data are provided as part of a single federal dataset. Otoliths are aged with samples collected from recreational fisheries by FWRI Age and Growth Laboratory, and are provided with the current dataset.

## Recreational Fishery Data

## At-Sea Observer Sampling of For-Hire Fisheries

In 2005, at-sea observer survey coverage started on headboats operating from the Gulf coast of Florida from the panhandle through the Florida Keys. The at-sea headboat survey was funded by the Gulf Fisheries Information Network (GulfFIN) continuously through 2007 and was discontinued in 2009. In June of 2009, the state of Florida secured alternative funds to continue at-sea observer coverage in the northwest panhandle and central peninsula and expanded coverage to include charter boats in these regions. In 2010, sampling coverage in the Florida Keys was re-initiated for both headboat and charter vessels through the present, with exception of a sampling hiatus in 2014. In 2014, representative at-sea observer data was only collected from charter vessels in the Florida Keys. Data from headboats and charter vessels in northwest and southwest Florida were a small subset of the for-hire fleet, and may not be representative of the fleet as a whole in that year. For the survey, both headboats and charter boats were randomly selected weekly throughout the year. Biological data was collected from harvested Red Snapper dockside after observed trips, including midline length ( mm ), whole weight ( kg ), and whenever possible a left otolith was extracted from sampled fish. Measurements and otoliths collected from observer coverage represent supplemental sampling separate of the dockside sampling conducted for the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey (SRHS).

## State Reef Fish Survey of recreational fishers

The State Reef Fish Survey has run continuously on the Florida Gulf coast since May 2015. This survey is a directed effort to collect data from offshore private recreational anglers who target reef fish species. Anglers wishing to harvest certain reef fish species, including Red Snapper, on the Gulf or Atlantic coasts of Florida are required to have a State Reef Fish Angler designation on their fishing license. The State Reef Fish Survey is composed of two survey components: a mail survey of State Reef Fish anglers, which collects data on angler effort, and a dockside intercept survey, which collects data on angler catches and fishing practices. Interview assignments are drawn from a subset of sampling sites known to have offshore fishing activity to intercept fishers that target reef fish. The dockside interview includes biological sampling of reef
fish species, including measurement of midline length (in mm ) and whole weight (in kg ). Otoliths are also taken during dockside sampling for retained fish.

## Opportunistic Biological Sampling

Between 2000 and 2018 opportunistic biological sampling was conducted at angler intercept sites along the Gulf coast of Florida, supported by a limited amount of funding from GulfFIN. Sampling assignments were conducted opportunistically to maximize the number of biological samples collected, primarily from busy charter landing sites. While the sampling sites were not selected using a randomized methodology, the fish sampled were not sampled in a biased manner. Biological sampling of intercepted fish included collection of length measurements (midline length in mm ), whole weight (in kg ) and collection of aging structures (otoliths or spines).

## Representative Biological Sampling Program

The Representative Biological (RepBio) sampling program conducts supplemental biological sampling along the Gulf coast of the Florida peninsula (Escambia to Collier County) and the Florida Keys (Monroe). The survey began a pilot phase in 2018 and was fully implemented by 2019 along the entire Gulf coast of Florida. A randomized draw process is used to ensure representative collection of biological samples, along with a species list that prioritizes collection of biological samples from data-poor, state-managed, and federally managed species when encountered. Interviews of recreational anglers are conducted at fishing access points identified via the MRIP Site Register and assigned via a weekly draw by sub-region. Biological sampling of harvested species includes collection of length measurements (midline length in mm ), whole weight (in kg ) and collection of aging structures (otoliths or spines).

## Ageing Protocols:

Sagittal otoliths were removed from the head, cleaned, dried, and stored in vials. The left otolith was processed for age determination unless it was broken through the core, in which case the right otolith was processed. The core of the otolith was marked with pencil and the whole otolith was mounted on card stock using hot glue. Otoliths were processed on a Buehler Isomet low
speed saw that was equipped with four equally spaced diamond wafering blades. With this multi-blade technique, one transverse cut yields three $\sim 400 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ thick sections that encompass both the core and the entire region surrounding the core (VanderKooy et al. 2020). After processing, sections were mounted on glass slides with Flo-texx, a chemical mounting medium.

Sectioned otoliths were examined on a stereo microscope using either reflected or transmitted light, which was at the reader's discretion. Each otolith was examined with at least two blind reads. These reads were conducted either by two readers working independently, or by a single reader examining the otolith two separate times. When age estimates did not agree between reads, a third read was conducted to resolve the discrepancy. Ageing was conducted on the dorsal lobe of the otolith along an axis near the sulcal groove from the core to the edge.

Annual ages were calculated using annulus count (number of opaque zones), degree of marginal completion, average date of otolith increment deposition, and date of capture. This traditional method is based on a calendar year instead of time since spawning (Jerald 1983; VanderKooy, et al. 2020). Previous studies have found that Red Snapper off the Southeastern US complete annulus formation by late spring to early summer (Wilson and Nieland 2001; White and Palmer 2004, Allman, et al. 2005). Using these criteria, age was advanced by one year if a large translucent zone was visible on the margin and the capture date was between January 1 and June 30. For all fish collected after June 30, age was assigned to be annulus count, since opaque zone formation is typically complete (Allman, et al. 2005). Calendar ages were converted to fractional, or monthly biological, ages by adding or subtracting the fraction of a year calculated between the assumed July 1 birth date and month of capture.

The total number of otoliths aged from FWRI sampling along the Gulf Coast of Florida was 61,211. Given the timespan of otolith collections and turnover in the FWRI ageing lab, 14 individual readers contributed to ageing these otoliths. Prior to ageing these samples, each ager read through an in-house reference set of Red Snapper otoliths representing a range of age classes, seasons, sexes and collection locations (Campana 2001) to calibrate ageing technique, particularly identification and interpretation of the first annulus and margin type. Quality control subsets were read each sampling year by all active readers to estimate precision. Readers were assigned different portions of the collections for individual reading. The average percent error on all first and second reads was $0.83 \%$, which is considered highly precise (Campana 2001);
moreover, there was an 93\%age agreement between all first and second reads, and a $99 \%$ agreement +/- 1 year All age data provided for SEDAR74 included increment count, calendar age and fractional age; however, the summaries including ages in this report were based on adjusted calendar age.

## Delivered ages and lengths:

## Fishery-Dependent Results: Age and length composition

All fishery-dependent age data have been provided to the life history workgroup; what follows is a summary of the calendar ages and lengths of aged Red Snapper. The following summaries were performed using all fish that were caught in either the central (Zone 7-12) or eastern (Zone 1-6) sub-area of the Gulf of Mexico and landed in Florida. Depending on data source, fish were geographically grouped based on capture zone or landing county. Fish for which capture zone was 7-12 (Central sub-area) were coded as northwest Florida (NWFL). Fish for which capture zone was 1-6 (Eastern sub-area) were coded as southwest FL (SWFL). Fish collected by recreational surveys (SRFS, At-Sea, Representative Biological Sampling, or Targeted Biological Sampling) were grouped by landing county if no capture zone was given. All fish landed in Escambia to Levy counties (Central sub-area) were coded as NWFL. All fish landed in Citrus to Monroe counties (Eastern sub-area) were included in SWFL if no fishing area code was given. Data are presented in three ways, as a single time unit, separated into two time periods (20002008 and 2009-2019), and presented by individual collection year. The data were split into an early and a late time period at 2008/2009 for two reasons. First, commercial length limit was reduced from 16" to $13 "$ TL in 2008. Second, TAC was cut dramatically in 2007 and 2008 before being increased again in 2009.

Age data are summarized for a total of 61,211 individuals. A total of 27,502 samples were collected from the commercial sector ( $44.9 \%$ of samples). The majority of age samples were obtained from surveys of the recreational sector, including 3,338 samples from private recreational boat trips, 23,453 from charter trips, and 6,622 from headboats. In addition, 296 aged fish were from an unknown source (primarily fishing tournaments; Table 1). Over $95 \%$ of fish aged from the private boat fishery were collected between 2009 and 2019 with total otolith
collections being above 100 per year every year since 2014 (Tables $2 \& 3$ ). Over $58 \%$ of otoliths collected from charter vessels were collected from before 2009 with fish collected in NWFL representing the bulk of collections each year (Table $2 \& 3$ ). Commercial samplers collected over 1,000 otoliths each year from 2011 until 2019, primarily in NWFL (Table 3). Headboat samples were heavily concentrated in the later period as well, with large collections in 2014 and 2015 in NWFL (Table 2 \& 3).

Approximately $26.3 \%$ ( 16,095 fish) were female, $25.7 \%$ ( 15,788 fish) were male, and $47.9 \%$ ( 29,328 fish) were unsexed. The ages of fish from each sector were consistent across the aggregated dataset, with mean age ( $\mathrm{y} \pm \mathrm{SD}$ ) differing by no more than 0.8 years among all sectors (Table 1). Over the full time series, the mean ages varied little by fleet. The lowest mean age was $4.07 \pm 1.83 \mathrm{y}$ in the NWFL charter fishery. The highest mean age was $4.93 \pm 2.18 \mathrm{y}$ in the SWFL commercial fishery. The oldest fish aged was from the charter fishery that was aged to 40 years. The next oldest fish was a 38 -year-old that was sampled from the commercial fishery. A total of 18 fish in the full dataset were over 20 years of age (Figure 1). The three sub-sectors of the recreational fishery showed similar distributions with $\sim 30 \%$ of fish aged to 3 years and another $\sim 25 \%$ age to 4 years. The commercial fishery had a broader age range with aged 2-6 heavily represented (Figure 2).

When data were divided into early (2001-2008) and later (2009-2019) time periods, age distributions were markedly different, especially in the recreational sector. Older fish were more common in each of the sectors with fish over 10 years of age being more frequent than in the later period. In the charter, headboat, and commercial fisheries, the most frequently sampled age increased by 1 year (from 3 to 4 years; Figure 3). Age distributions by region and year are presented in Figures 4-7. In years with larger sample sizes, age distributes become representative. In years with relatively low sample sizes, age distributions are skewed. The commercial fishery included the largest range of both ages and sizes of any sector, but the agelength relationships remained consistent across regions and sectors (Figure 8).

Table 1. Numbers of fish aged, mean ( $\pm$ SD) age, and length landed by fishing fleet (2000-2019). Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.

| NWFL |  |  |  | SWFL |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fishing Fleet | \# Fish | Mean age <br> (y) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Mean FL } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Fish } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Mean age (y) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Mean FL } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Charter | 22,458 | $4.07 \pm 1.83$ | $461 \pm 87$ | 995 | $4.45 \pm 1.91$ | $515 \pm 81$ |
| Commercial | 19,191 | $4.37 \pm 1.86$ | $468 \pm 102$ | 8,003 | $4.93 \pm 2.17$ | $521 \pm 105$ |
| Headboat | 4,471 | $4.91 \pm 1.96$ | $476 \pm 88$ | 2,151 | $4.52 \pm 1.51$ | $503 \pm 86$ |
| Private | 2,961 | $4.67 \pm 2.21$ | $495 \pm 92$ | 377 | $3.67 \pm 1.26$ | $473 \pm 82$ |
| Unknown | 206 | $4.68 \pm 1.65$ | $524 \pm 93$ | 90 | $5.30 \pm 2.20$ | $578 \pm 101$ |

Table 2. Numbers of fish aged, mean ( $\pm$ SD) age, and length landed by fishing fleet divided into early (2000-2008) and late (2009-2019) time periods. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.

|  | NWFL |  |  | SWFL |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean age <br> $(\mathrm{y})$ |  |  | Mean FL <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ | \# <br> Fish | Mean age <br> $(\mathrm{y})$ |
| \# Fish | Mean FL <br> $(\mathrm{mm})$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Charter |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001-2008 | 13,653 | $3.30 \pm 1.22$ | $428 \pm 66$ | 43 | $3.63 \pm 0.72$ | $465 \pm 42$ |
| 2009-2019 | 8,805 | $5.27 \pm 2.00$ | $510 \pm 93$ | 952 | $4.48 \pm 1.96$ | $518 \pm 82$ |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001-2008 | 544 | $3.43 \pm 1.09$ | $402 \pm 73$ | 131 | $4.07 \pm 1.88$ | $493 \pm 76$ |
| $2009-2019$ | 18,647 | $4.40 \pm 1.87$ | $470 \pm 102$ | 7,872 | $4.95 \pm 2.17$ | $521 \pm 105$ |
| Headboat |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2001-2008$ | 202 | $3.47 \pm 0.85$ | $417 \pm 42$ | 184 | $3.74 \pm 1.13$ | $473 \pm 62$ |
| $2009-2019$ | 4,269 | $4.97 \pm 1.98$ | $479 \pm 88$ | 1,967 | $4.59 \pm 1.52$ | $505 \pm 87$ |
| Private |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2001-2008$ | 127 | $3.46 \pm 0.92$ | $438 \pm 60$ | 16 | $3.00 \pm 0.37$ | $446 \pm 64$ |
| $2009-2019$ | 2,834 | $4.72 \pm 2.24$ | $497 \pm 92$ | 361 | $3.70 \pm 1.28$ | $475 \pm 83$ |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2009-2019$ | 206 | $4.68 \pm 1.65$ | $524 \pm 93$ | 90 | $5.30 \pm 2.20$ | $578 \pm 101$ |

Table 3. Numbers of fish aged mean \& SD age and length landed by fishing fleet by year 20012019. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.

|  | NWFL |  |  |  |  | SWFL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | mean age | SD age | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { mean } \\ \mathrm{FL} \\ (\mathrm{~mm}) \end{gathered}$ | SD FL | N | mean age | SD age | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { mean } \\ \text { FL } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | SD FL |
| Charter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 1 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 432 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 3855 | 3.24 | 1.19 | 432 | 67 | 11 | 3.09 | 0.30 | 469 | 20 |
| 2004 | 2897 | 3.55 | 1.43 | 439 | 73 | 3 | 4.33 | 0.58 | 507 | 31 |
| 2005 | 4239 | 3.18 | 1.07 | 422 | 63 | 5 | 2.80 | 0.84 | 424 | 50 |
| 2006 | 2423 | 3.27 | 1.25 | 419 | 58 | 5 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 451 | 12 |
| 2007 | 98 | 3.21 | 0.76 | 425 | 48 | 14 | 4.00 | 0.39 | 459 | 26 |
| 2008 | 140 | 3.52 | 0.63 | 451 | 59 | 5 | 3.80 | 1.10 | 499 | 86 |
| 2009 | 204 | 4.34 | 1.06 | 492 | 82 | 16 | 3.56 | 0.51 | 478 | 35 |
| 2010 | 1115 | 4.35 | 1.09 | 496 | 77 | 119 | 4.51 | 1.15 | 524 | 83 |
| 2011 | 645 | 5.12 | 1.10 | 501 | 84 | 73 | 4.88 | 1.22 | 528 | 88 |
| 2012 | 1168 | 5.55 | 1.27 | 537 | 95 | 14 | 5.57 | 1.79 | 557 | 123 |
| 2013 | 1606 | 5.65 | 1.77 | 527 | 98 | 20 | 5.80 | 1.01 | 552 | 69 |
| 2014 | 708 | 5.50 | 2.05 | 514 | 99 | 81 | 5.23 | 1.65 | 545 | 110 |
| 2015 | 1432 | 5.75 | 2.22 | 501 | 95 | 130 | 4.78 | 0.95 | 567 | 61 |
| 2016 | 691 | 5.55 | 2.60 | 508 | 100 | 24 | 2.92 | 1.21 | 439 | 87 |
| 2017 | 260 | 4.96 | 2.77 | 494 | 92 | 61 | 3.39 | 0.78 | 466 | 56 |
| 2018 | 591 | 4.68 | 2.44 | 491 | 87 | 207 | 4.04 | 0.61 | 486 | 60 |
| 2019 | 385 | 4.70 | 2.28 | 502 | 81 | 207 | 4.66 | 1.07 | 523 | 78 |
| Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 2 | 6.00 | 1.41 | 647 | 44 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 237 | 3.60 | 1.08 | 410 | 80 | 1 | 4.00 | 0.00 | 488 | 0 |
| 2006 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 22 | 4.36 | 1.33 | 527 | 77 |
| 2007 | 180 | 2.69 | 0.96 | 365 | 57 | 30 | 3.20 | 1.00 | 429 | 59 |
| 2008 | 125 | 3.94 | 0.93 | 457 | 58 | 78 | 4.33 | 2.17 | 508 | 67 |
| 2009 | 120 | 3.11 | 1.11 | 405 | 75 | 71 | 3.30 | 1.15 | 437 | 68 |
| 2010 | 299 | 3.55 | 1.15 | 431 | 80 | 673 | 4.58 | 1.02 | 522 | 83 |
| 2011 | 1776 | 4.58 | 1.39 | 478 | 86 | 423 | 4.89 | 1.15 | 517 | 81 |
| 2012 | 1547 | 4.86 | 1.39 | 479 | 82 | 257 | 5.25 | 1.32 | 528 | 82 |
| 2013 | 1230 | 5.12 | 1.87 | 510 | 113 | 375 | 5.75 | 1.28 | 547 | 83 |
| 2014 | 1103 | 5.59 | 2.01 | 520 | 110 | 321 | 5.93 | 2.01 | 542 | 108 |
| 2015 | 1557 | 5.20 | 2.28 | 514 | 112 | 283 | 5.68 | 2.45 | 531 | 112 |
| 2016 | 1934 | 4.25 | 2.59 | 468 | 122 | 1287 | 4.92 | 2.44 | 526 | 120 |
| 2017 | 2281 | 3.66 | 1.78 | 447 | 96 | 1479 | 4.50 | 2.50 | 496 | 117 |
| 2018 | 3231 | 3.90 | 1.45 | 453 | 89 | 1199 | 4.70 | 2.20 | 517 | 101 |
| 2019 | 3569 | 4.28 | 1.54 | 453 | 96 | 1504 | 5.26 | 2.26 | 539 | 101 |

Table 3 (cont.). Numbers of fish aged mean \& SD age and length landed by fishing fleet by year 2001-2019. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.

|  | NWFL |  |  |  |  | SWFL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { mean } \\ \text { age } \end{gathered}$ | SD age | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { mean } \\ \text { FL } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | SD FL | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { mean } \\ \text { age } \end{gathered}$ | SD age | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { mean } \\ \mathrm{FL} \\ (\mathrm{~mm}) \end{gathered}$ | SD FL |
| Headboat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 9 | 3.44 | 0.53 | 451 | 44 | 2 | 3.50 | 0.71 | 441 | 37 |
| 2004 | 28 | 4.11 | 1.26 | 412 | 31 | 1 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 421 | 0 |
| 2005 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 52 | 3.50 | 0.80 | 444 | 52 |
| 2006 | 20 | 3.50 | 0.83 | 410 | 30 | 78 | 4.36 | 1.12 | 498 | 59 |
| 2007 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 3.29 | 0.49 | 436 | 30 |
| 2008 | 145 | 3.34 | 0.72 | 417 | 45 | 44 | 3.05 | 1.06 | 471 | 64 |
| 2009 | 165 | 3.52 | 0.86 | 421 | 50 | 284 | 3.93 | 0.94 | 496 | 76 |
| 2010 | 108 | 4.03 | 1.06 | 486 | 80 | 240 | 4.53 | 1.10 | 516 | 83 |
| 2011 | 84 | 4.99 | 0.88 | 497 | 79 | 260 | 4.28 | 0.87 | 485 | 67 |
| 2012 | 78 | 4.68 | 1.30 | 495 | 93 | 126 | 5.30 | 1.57 | 527 | 82 |
| 2013 | 188 | 5.55 | 1.83 | 458 | 66 | 150 | 4.91 | 1.39 | 523 | 91 |
| 2014 | 2073 | 5.24 | 1.98 | 485 | 93 | 100 | 5.38 | 1.88 | 507 | 95 |
| 2015 | 1289 | 5.02 | 2.09 | 484 | 88 | 203 | 5.73 | 2.09 | 560 | 107 |
| 2016 | 39 | 4.23 | 1.78 | 470 | 84 | 39 | 4.82 | 2.21 | 508 | 109 |
| 2017 | 92 | 3.82 | 2.29 | 436 | 73 | 158 | 3.20 | 0.79 | 434 | 60 |
| 2018 | 123 | 3.50 | 0.81 | 437 | 43 | 236 | 4.47 | 1.57 | 487 | 78 |
| 2019 | 30 | 3.70 | 1.34 | 440 | 73 | 171 | 5.03 | 1.14 | 534 | 77 |

Table 3 (cont.). Numbers of fish aged mean \& SD age and length landed by fishing fleet by year 2001-2019. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.

|  | NWFL |  |  |  |  | SWFL |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | mean age | SD age | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { mean } \\ \text { FL } \\ (\mathrm{mm}) \end{gathered}$ | SD FL | N | mean age | SD age | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { mean } \\ \mathrm{FL} \\ (\mathrm{~mm}) \end{gathered}$ | SD FL |
| Private |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 11 | 3.09 | 0.70 | 436 | 47 | 3 | 3.33 | 0.58 | 497 | 18 |
| 2004 | 52 | 3.79 | 0.61 | 456 | 47 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 21 | 3.10 | 0.83 | 433 | 56 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 43 | 3.33 | 1.17 | 417 | 76 | 2 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 395 | 12 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 415 | 0 |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  | 10 | 2.90 | 0.32 | 444 | 71 |
| 2009 | 3 | 4.67 | 2.08 | 456 | 34 | 2 | 4.50 | 0.71 | 467 | 10 |
| 2010 | 14 | 4.00 | 0.78 | 503 | 90 | 13 | 5.15 | 0.80 | 589 | 57 |
| 2011 | 54 | 5.33 | 1.21 | 546 | 89 | 13 | 5.15 | 0.69 | 580 | 54 |
| 2012 | 52 | 5.35 | 1.60 | 546 | 85 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 | 46 | 6.04 | 1.73 | 578 | 93 | 7 | 4.29 | 0.76 | 490 | 68 |
| 2014 | 258 | 5.62 | 2.09 | 517 | 94 | 10 | 4.20 | 1.32 | 483 | 99 |
| 2015 | 404 | 4.92 | 2.28 | 481 | 87 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 725 | 5.00 | 2.50 | 502 | 102 | 10 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 383 | 24 |
| 2017 | 447 | 4.30 | 2.49 | 489 | 93 | 252 | 3.47 | 1.29 | 462 | 79 |
| 2018 | 468 | 4.25 | 1.91 | 481 | 79 | 40 | 4.13 | 0.52 | 499 | 59 |
| 2019 | 363 | 4.15 | 1.60 | 497 | 82 | 14 | 4.21 | 0.97 | 484 | 79 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 3.67 | 0.52 | 513 | 42 |
| 2010 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 33 | 5.00 | 1.12 | 581 | 95 |
| 2011 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 5.41 | 0.87 | 587 | 80 |
| 2012 | 206 | 4.68 | 1.65 | 524 | 93 | 16 | 5.81 | 1.33 | 606 | 113 |
| 2017 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 18 | 5.83 | 4.36 | 559 | 127 |



Figure 1. Age distribution by fishing fleet, area, and time period. $\mathrm{N}=$ total numbers of samples included in each box. Y-axis is truncated at 20 years. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 2. Age distribution of fish across entire time series in each fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 3. Age distribution by fishing sector separated into early (2001-2008) and later (20092019) time periods. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 4. Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the CHARTER fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 4 (cont) Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the CHARTER fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 5. Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the COMMERCIAL fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 5 (CONT). Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the COMMERCIAL fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 6. Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the HEADBOAT fishery.
Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 6 (CONT). Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the HEADBOAT fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 7. Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the PRIVATE fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure7 (CONT). Proportion of total fish aged by year and region from the PRIVATE fishery. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.


Figure 8. Fork length as a function of age in each fishery sector. The dashed line represents 16 " TL, the minimum size for all recreational fisheries since 2000. The commercial sector decreased the minimum legal size to 13 " TL in 2008. Regions are NWFL (central Gulf of Mexico) and SWFL (eastern Gulf of Mexico) as defined by the analysis team.

## Literature Cited:

Allman, R. J., G. R. Fitzhugh, K. J, Starzinger and R. A. Farsky. 2005. Precision of age estimation in Red Snapper (Lutjanus campechanus). Fisheries Research 73:123-133.

Campana, S. E. 2001. Accuracy, precision and quality control in age determination, including a review of the use and abuse of age validation methods. Journal of Fish Biology 59:197-242.

Jerald, A. Jr. 1983. Age determination. Pp 301-324 In: L. A. Nielsen and D. L. Johnson (eds.), Fisheries Techniques. American Fisheries Society Bethesda, Maryland. USA.

VanderKooy, S., Carroll, J., Elzey, S., Gilmore, J., \& Kipp, J. 2020. A Practical Handbook for Determining the Ages of Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Coast Fishes. (GSMFC No. 300). Ocean Springs, MS: Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. https://www.gsmfc.org/publications/GSMFC\ Number\ 300.pdf.

White, D. B. and S. M. Palmer. 2004. Age, growth, and reproduction of the Red Snapper, Lutjanus campechanus, from the Atlantic waters of the southeastern U.S. Bulletin of Marine Science 75(3): 335-360.

Wilson, C. A. and D. L. Nieland. 2001. Age and growth of Red Snapper, Lutjanus campechanus, from the northern Gulf of Mexico off Louisiana. Fisheries Bulletin 99:653-664.

