Gulf Council
Standing and Shrimp Scientific and Statistical Committees
Meeting Summary
May 8, 2025
Council Office
Tampa, Florida

The meeting of the Gulf Council Standing and Shrimp Scientific and Statistical Committees (SSC) was convened at 8:30 AM EDT on May 8, 2025. The agenda for this meeting was adopted as modified, and the minutes from the February 2025 meetings were approved as written.

Discussion: Status Determination Criteria and OFL and ABC Projections Settings for Gulf Stock Assessments

Dr. Katie Siegfried (Southeast Fisheries Science Center [SEFSC]) and Council staff reviewed previous decisions about projections settings for Gulf stock assessments and explained differences in some of those decisions. These core decisions by the SSC include specifying relative fishing mortality (F), selectivity, retention, recruitment, interim landings, sector allocations (stating what they are, not determining them), and the duration of projections. Relative F, selectivity, and retention are consistent across many stock assessments, whereas estimated future recruitment values can vary. Dr. Siegfried and Council staff summarized differences in specifications across assessments, highlighting the rationale for and potential effects of decisions for each factor.

An SSC member asked whether sector allocation was limited to being specified between commercial and recreational, or whether allocations were also specified within a sector. Dr. Siegfried replied that historically, only the commercial and recreational sector allocation is considered. Council staff added that the main effect is based on selectivity and retention differences by fleet, especially when one fleet (e.g., commercial bottom longline) may select for and retain a different age composition of fish compared to another fleet (e.g., recreational private vessels). Another SSC member asked whether the modifications to the sector allocation specification are estimated internally within Stock Synthesis (SS), or after SS is complete. Dr. Siegfried replied that the sector allocations in the projections are addressed with an external package due to issues with doing so within SS.

An SSC member asked about the scaling of recruitment when other sources of mortality are modified, and whether spawning stock biomass (SSB) also scales to fit. Dr. Siegfried replied that recruitment deviations can be constrained to estimates within a reasonable range, as allowing those deviations to be estimated unconstrained often results in issues with model convergence. She added that SSB would also scale as historical mortality estimates change. Another SSC member asked whether multiple gear types with multiple selectivities within a sector could confound sector-specific estimates of selectivity. For example, if the commercial vertical line component of the commercial sector harvests substantially more than the commercial bottom longline component, then the commercial sector estimates of selectivity and retention would be driven primarily by the commercial vertical line component and its estimate of relative F. Dr. Siegfried

noted that the relative Fs are estimated by fleet, but sectors are combined for the purposes of projecting under a sector allocation.

An SSC member asked about the difference between using arithmetic and geometric means to estimate F. An arithmetic mean will be more sensitive to outliers than a geometric mean. The SSC member thought that consistency, or at least justification, in the use of arithmetic versus geometric mean should be standardized. Another SSC member thought specifications may need to remain flexible to accommodate the circumstances of each stock assessment, and that standardization may be inappropriate. An SSC member thought that averaging years of finalized landings was acceptable for informing a couple of interim years, but inappropriate when there are multiple years of interim landings beyond the model terminal year. The SSC member asked whether research was being done to examine trends in those landings, or whether short-term forecasting could be applied to better specify interim years. Dr. Siegfried replied that work on this concern is ongoing, and further work could be considered to better estimate uncertainty, which is presently primarily derived from the model results and not from the projections.

Dr. Mike Allen (SSC Chair) will work with Dr. Siegfried and Council staff to create a "cheat sheet" for the SSC regarding projections specifications. More immediately, Dr. Siegfried asked that the SSC consider whether it would prefer to use a short-term or long-term trend in recruitment when discussing the scamp and yellowmouth grouper projections later in the meeting. Using a short-term trend in recruitment could be in indicator of a regime shift (i.e., a fundamental change in the total biomass the stock will support irrespective of fishing), and the SSC would be assuming that a change in stock productivity has occurred. Using the short-term trend could represent a more plausible representation of expected recruitments than the long-term trend, or the estimated stock-recruit function. Dr. Siegfried recalled two peer-reviewed publications which provide advice for determining whether a regime shift has occurred which were considered last by the SSC when reviewing greater amberjack (SEDAR 70). In the last greater amberjack stock assessment (SEDAR 70), the data did not conclusively disprove that a regime shift had occurred.

Revised OFL and ABC Projections for Gulf Red Grouper (SEDAR 88)

Dr. Francesca Forrestal (SEFSC) provided updated catch projections for Gulf red grouper based on the SEDAR 88 stock assessment, using a proxy for fishing mortality at maximin sustainable yield (F_{MSY}) of the fishing mortality at a 40% spawning potential ratio ($F_{40\%SPR}$). Dr. Forrestal demonstrated the effect of going from the Marine Recreational Information Program's Fishing Effort Survey (MRIP-FES) calibrated recreational data units with those from the State of Florida's State Reef Fish Survey (SRFS) for the recreational private vessel fleet. She caveated that all of the changes made for the red grouper SEDAR 88 stock assessment were not possible to replicate for the previous red grouper assessment (SEDAR 61) for a full comparison. The revised projections were completed under the same specifications as those presented to the SSC in February 2025, beginning yield stream projections in 2025. An SSC member clarified that the projected catch levels are lower than the previous projections because the harvest estimated for the interim years (2025 and 2026) is higher. The Council has requested an emergency rule for red grouper in 2025, which is expected to change the catch limits later in 2025 based on updated catch advice. Following the emergency rule, a subsequent amendment to modify the catch limits and sector allocations over a longer term is expected to be completed by 2026.

Some SSC members expressed concern about the potential negative effects on the share price and ex-vessel price for red grouper within the Grouper-Tilefish individual fishing quota (IFQ) program. These SSC members suggested that a large influx of pounds into the commercial sector in 2025 as a result of the emergency rule, could lead to substantial reductions in ex-vessel values of landed fish and allocation lease prices. This could contribute to negative economic consequences for fishermen who have already planned for the year based on current market conditions. Council staff added that the Council's request for the emergency rule included setting the stock annual catch limit (ACL) at 90% of the acceptable biological catch (ABC) for 2025. An SSC member clarified that support for a revised catch limit should not be interpreted as support for a mid-year modification to the catch limits. Another SSC member thought additional social and economic analyses should have been considered prior to the Council requesting the emergency rule. An SSC member did not think the age structure of the stock supported long-term sustainability at the projected harvest levels. NOAA General Counsel clarified that once the Council requested the emergency rule, there would not be another opportunity for Council input prior to the rule being submitted, and that there would not be another opportunity for analytical review if the emergency rule proceeds as anticipated. Council staff added that if the typical amendment development process, which includes in-depth biological, social, economic, and administrative analyses, was fast enough to implement management changes mid-year, the Council would have taken that approach. The emergency rule was requested due to the expediency with which it could be implemented. Council staff noted that the Council requests emergency rules sparingly, and that not all emergency rule requests meet the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act or are approved by NMFS.

Council staff said that the prospective emergency rule would only be in place for 180 days and could only be renewed for up to an additional 186 days. Further, the ability to apply the emergency rule was predicated on receiving revised catch advice beginning in 2025. Council staff added that the SSC would see revised projections during the development of the amendment to follow the emergency rule, where reconsideration of sector allocations is expected due to the updated recreational data unit used in the stock assessment. An SSC member asked what the consequences were for not modifying the OFL and ABC for red grouper for 2025 and beyond at this meeting. Council staff replied that the previous catch limit recommendations began in 2027, and as such, the advice for 2025 and 2026 would not be able to be modified until 2027. NOAA General Counsel concurred that the current catch limit recommendations would not be effective until 2027.

An SSC member noted the concerns from economists on the SSC about a mid-year change in the catch limits and asked whether beginning the projections in 2026 would satisfy those concerns. Council staff recalled that there have been several mid-year modifications to catch limits for other species, such as red snapper, with both increases and decreases enacted. When mid-year decreases have been applied previously, NMFS has withheld quota at the beginning of the fishing year in anticipation of the decrease. Council staff added that the idea of "fishing down the stock," another concern raised by SSC members, was fishing to MSY which is estimated to be sustainable long-term. An SSC member asked if mid-year increases had demonstrated negative economic effects in the past. Council staff replied that no published research was available, but that the annual IFQ reports do characterize subsequent decreases in share prices as a result of a mid-year quota

increase. Council staff also recalled the support of the commercial fishermen for this increase during public testimony at the Council's April 2025 meeting. An SSC member did not think it was good practice to respond immediately to fleet requests without comprehensive analyses to support the decision.

> **Motion: The SSC recommends using the 3-year projection from 2025 – 2027 to calculate an average OFL and ABC giving a constant catch for the OFL at 10.64 mp gw, and the ABC at 8.28 mp gw. The SSC recommends prioritizing interim analyses and other pertinent evaluations of the stock on an annual basis.**
>
> *Motion carried 12 – 5, with two absent.*

Review: SEDAR 68 Updated Projections for Scamp and Yellowmouth Grouper

Council staff provided a brief overview on Council actions and requests since the SEDAR 68 scamp and yellowmouth grouper projections were last reviewed and recommended by the SSC. A number of issues have resulted in delays in implementing the prior SEDAR 68 catch advice, including complications with the availability of commercial permit data as well as modifying the IFQ program to accommodate the separation of the Other Shallow-water Grouper complex (SWG) into two subcomplexes of scamp and yellowmouth grouper and black grouper and yellowfin grouper respectively).

Dr. Skyler Sagarese (SEFSC) provided updated catch projections for Gulf scamp and yellowmouth grouper based on the SEDAR 68 operational stock assessment. These projections have been updated at the Council's request to include finalized landings data for 2021 – 2023, using F_{MSY} proxy values of $F_{30\%SPR}$ and $F_{40\%SPR}$. The interim landings for 2024 and 2025 are based on the average landings from 2021 – 2023 for each fleet and reduced by 54% for 2026. Dr. Sagarese commented that there are currently 6 interim years in these projections, which is exceptionally uncommon. Long-term management changes are anticipated to take effect in 2027. After updating the landings and re-running the projections scamp and yellowmouth grouper are estimated to be overfished and undergoing overfishing at F_{MSY} proxy of $F_{40\%SPR.}$ Thus, the OFL and ABC under $F_{40\%SPR}$ are projected at $F_{Rebuild}$ for the time period of 2026 – 2035, to rebuild the stock back above the minimum stock size threshold. Dr. Sagarese explained that this change was likely due to continued harvest estimated above that which is sustainable for the stock, based on assumptions about recruitment and other parameters fixed in the projections.

The SSC discussed the need to evaluate its recommendation for a proxy for F_{MSY}, and what to recommend for a corresponding catch limit. Staff clarified that the purpose of the interim measure is to reduce harvest in 2026 by 54%, commensurate with the anticipated reduction in the ABC based on the SSC's last recommendation. An SSC member thought using $F_{40\%SPR}$ remained appropriate for scamp and yellowmouth grouper, based on life history characteristics, stock productivity, and compensatory recruitment capacity. The SSC member did not think that scamp and yellowmouth grouper demonstrated an observed reproductive capacity on par with some of the managed snapper species. Another SSC member agreed and thought that recent recruitment should be used to inform the ABC. Dr. Siegfried clarified that the SEFSC provided projections at $F_{30\%SPR}$ for comparison purposes in response to a Council request, not because there was current

information to suggest that $F_{30\%SPR}$ was a more appropriate proxy for F_{MSY}. She added that the reference period for recruitment was consequential and using the short-term period results in an estimate of the stock being overfished, whereas the long-term period does not.

An SSC member asked about the influence of the use of average landings for 2024 and 2025 on the estimate of stock status and the resulting projections. Dr. Sagarese reiterated that there are 6 total years of interim landings being used, and uncertainty in projected yields increases with distance from the terminal year. She said that it is possible that effort is shifting from other grouper species for which catch limits have been reduced (i.e., gag grouper), but that is not quantified in this analysis. She added that assumptions from the terminal year of the stock assessment in 2020 apply to these projections, including selectivity, retention, and recruitment. SSC members did not think that effort shifting was likely to change much, since those fishing trips are often multi-species in nature. Dr. Sagarese said that discards are not included in the yield projections. However, the assumptions about discard mortality and discard fraction by fleet from the model are carried forward in the projections. At present, reducing landings in the projections does not automatically increase discards. Current discard mortality rates are estimated at 28% for the commercial vertical line, 47% for the longline fleet, and 26% for the recreational fleets. The latter estimate is based on observer data from the Southeast Region Headboat Survey. The SSC thought that based on scamp harvest depth, a discard mortality rate of 26% for the recreational fleet seemed low. The SSC thought modified assumptions about discard mortality would be necessary for future years given the proposed management changes, and suggested the Council should be cautioned about the potential for increased discards due to projected seasonal closures.

SSC members suggested that the Council should be cautious about catch limits for scamp and yellowmouth grouper. Dr. Sagarese added that it is customary practice for the OFL to be projected based on a longer time series of recruitment data because using a more recent time period suggests a productivity regime shift. Dr. Sagarese asked whether the SSC thought a regime shift had occurred, and whether they still supported using the short-term recruitment period (2008 – 2017) for scamp and yellowmouth grouper. The SSC did not think a regime shift was likely, but there was an extended 8–10-year period of lower recruitment at the end of the recruitment time series from the assessment.

> **Motion: The SSC accepts the updated projections produced for SEDAR 68 for Gulf of America Scamp and Yellowmouth Grouper, setting an OFL (0.233 mp gw) equal to the yield at $F_{40\%SPR}$, and the ABC (0.183 mp gw) as the yield at 75% of $F_{40\%SPR}$, for 2027 – 2031.**
>
> *Motion carried without opposition*.

Revisit of SEDAR 68 Projections for Scamp and Yellowmouth Grouper

At a later point during the meeting, the SSC revised the SEDAR 68 Projections for scamp and yellowmouth grouper. The SSC discussed the Council's request for OFL and ABC projections for scamp and yellowmouth grouper, which included a request for projections at $F_{30\%SPR}$.

Motion: The SSC recognizes that Scamp OFL at F30% SPR would be 0.311 mp gw, and the ABC would be 0.250 mp gw at 0.75*$F_{30\%SPR}$, for the years 2027 – 2031, but we do not recommend the $F_{30\%SPR}$ values for scamp based on life history/biological attributes of this species.

Motion carried without opposition.

Review: Center for Independent Experts (CIE) Independent Peer Review of the Shrimp Bycatch Estimation Methodology for Finfish Species

Dr. Steve Smith (University of Miami) presented on the estimation of red snapper bycatch from Gulf of America shrimp trawls, with a project team goal of improving the methodology for estimating bycatch. The team arrived at seven key findings/improvements for bycatch estimation along with two conclusions: unbiased observer trip-level catch and effort data exist, and remaining bias is likely a result of issues with total fleet effort and landings. A Center for Independent Experts (CIE) review produced the same conclusion regarding remaining sources of bias. Dr. Smith also reviewed the next steps including an overhaul of the shrimp observer program.

An SSC member inquired if bycatch reduction devices (BRDs) were in place in 1998. Dr. Smith responded that BRDs became mandatory in 1998. The SSC member then inquired if that was reflected in red snapper bycatch levels from 1984 to 2024. Dr. Smith responded that effort is the primary driver for changes in red snapper bycatch, rather than implementation of BRDs. Another SSC member inquired if the Council is working on a document to replace the cellular electronic logbooks (cELBs), with the expiration of the 3G network preventing automatic data transmission. Council staff responded that the Council took final action on a document at its April 2025 meeting to replace the current cELBs and noted that LGL Ecological Associates is leading an Early Adopter Program to place approximately 300 devices on volunteer vessels with a federal Gulf shrimp permit. Another SSC member inquired about the number of active federal Gulf shrimp permits. Council staff responded that they could provide that information during the next break.[1]

Council staff inquired about the 2-3% observer coverage with the Gulf shrimp fleet. Dr. Smith noted that the 2-3% observer coverage is for trips, and each trip can include numerous tows. An SSC member noted that effort and landings for the Gulf shrimp industry have been decreasing due to market conditions which should translate to decreasing bycatch. The SSC member recommended weighing the benefits of 100% coverage against the burdens that would be placed upon the industry. An SSC member inquired about the percentage of the Gulf federal fleet that uses 4-net versus 2-net gear types. Dr. Smith responded that the federal fleet is primarily 4-net. The SSC member suggested examining whether there were correlations between ice boats (boats that store catch on ice as opposed to on-board freezers) or vessels with 2-nets and specific bycatch species. Dr. Smith responded that bycatch and effort stratification by gear type are included in the

[1] https://gulf-council-media.s3.amazonaws.com/uploads/2025/04/05.-GulfshrimppermitsOY_17B_March_2025-v3.pdf In 2023, 49% of offshore vessels with a federal Gulf shrimp permit were active.

analyses. An SSC member stated that fishers may operate differently when observers are onboard. He inquired if current data can be used to examine differences between observed trips and unobserved trips. Dr. Smith responded that some trips are 1-month in length, and it would be difficult for captains to change their fishing behavior due to the presence of an observer for that duration.

Dr. Cheston Peterson (University of Miami) then presented on a stop-gap approach for estimating gray triggerfish bycatch in shrimp trawls. Because gray triggerfish are not quantified in the observer program, the bycatch estimation method for red snapper is not a suitable approach for gray triggerfish. Dr. Peterson also stated that SEAMAP is a poor substitute for bycatch estimation for gray triggerfish due to differences in gear, tow times, and habitats sampled. Dr. Peterson recommended using proxy species in the observer program for estimating bycatch of gray triggerfish, with lane snapper and vermillion snapper both under consideration based on analyses identifying co-occurrence with gray triggerfish.

An SSC member inquired if gray triggerfish were not quantified in the observer program because of low prevalence. Dr. Peterson responded that he was uncertain of the cause, but he did not believe it was due to low prevalence. Another SSC member inquired whether the use of lane snapper and vermillion snapper as proxies would bias the north-central Gulf such as off the Florida panhandle. Dr. Peterson stated that data on proxy species would be evaluated to avoid spatial and temporal bias. Council staff inquired whether it was necessary for efforts on this project to continue, given the minimal mortality of gray triggerfish as shrimp trawl bycatch. Dr. Siegfried responded that they know the current methodology does not work, and the new approach will be evaluated to accurately assess gray triggerfish bycatch in shrimp trawls.

Review: New Bycatch Estimates and Other Analyses for Smalltooth Sawfish and Giant Manta Ray

Dr. Peterson provided a presentation estimating bycatch of smalltooth sawfish (ESA listed in 2003) and giant manta ray (ESA listed in 2018) in the shrimp trawl fishery. The objective of the study was to estimate total annual bycatch of these two species with uncertainty in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic. A design-based approach compared un-pooled and pooled stratified ratio estimators while a Bayesian model-based method considered year, shrimp statistical zone, water depth, and season as explanatory variables. Broadly, both approaches provided point estimates of bycatch for each species but with marked uncertainty.

An SSC member asked about the mortality of sawfish captured in shrimp trawls. SEFSC staff replied that observed bycatch mortality is considered to be about 50%. There have been efforts for observers to deploy satellite tags on sawfish released alive after entanglement with shrimp trawls to assess post-release mortality; however, observers equipped with these tags have yet to observe a sawfish encounter. An SSC member asked if the research team had considered establishing an acceptable uncertainty threshold, and SEFSC replied they had expected high uncertainty and contended the results of this work were an improvement from previous results for estimating sawfish bycatch.

For the observer data, the SSC asked if the observer reports included the condition of encountered protected species, if observers were able to identify the difference between giant manta and devil rays and inquired whether the aggregation behavior of giant manta rays could explain some of the encounters of multiple manta rays in a single tow. The SEFSC answered that condition is often recorded for protected resource releases. They continued that misidentification between giant manta and devil rays is possible, so photographs and tissue samples are collected to be analyzed later to confirm species identification. The SEFSC added that, in the model, season was not as strong as a predictive factor for giant manta ray observations as stat grid; therefore, it is possible that giant manta rays are aggregating in particular areas throughout the year.

Review: Population Viability Analysis for Endangered and Threatened Resources that Interact with the Shrimp Fishery

Dr. John Carlson (SEFSC) presented an updated population viability analysis (PVA) for endangered and threatened species that may interact with the Gulf shrimp fishery. The purpose of this analysis is to consider the effects of the continued operation of the shrimp fishery on the maintenance or rebuilding of key vulnerable stocks. Three updated PVA inputs were identified: shrimp bycatch estimates, population size, and the 2024 smalltooth sawfish mortality event.

An SSC member noted that range expansion has been occurring and inquired if that would improve the long-term viability of smalltooth sawfish. Another SSC member commented that the presentation states that 2024 had the lowest bycatch mortality of smalltooth sawfish, but that elsewhere in the presentation, it showed an estimated range of 60 or 72 shrimp trawl removals. Dr. Carlson responded that the analyses were conducted before the actual 2024 estimate was calculated. An SSC member stated that many uncertainties exist in the PVA, which would have impacts on fishermen. Another SSC member commented that the PVA could be considered best scientific information available (BSIA) but needs additional refinement. Dr. Carlson commented that a next step is to develop a more robust stock assessment. An SSC member stated that "consistency with BSIA" has a significant connotation and expressed hesitation in deeming this PVA as such in a motion. Another SSC member commented that more precise research should be conducted in the identified geographic areas for bycatch of smalltooth sawfish. An SSC member added that the time period of the PVA began after a significant decline in landings from the pink shrimp fishery and suggested that impacts of a historically larger shrimp fishery should be included for establishing reasonable bounds for the estimated effects.

> **Motion: The SSC reviewed the population viability analysis for smalltooth sawfish and concluded that it represents a useful analysis for understanding impacts of bycatch and other mortality sources on population viability. The SSC encourages cooperative research for targeted data collection and increased observer coverage in areas of high bycatch, evaluation of uncertainty around bycatch source estimates, potential impacts of range expansion, and continued refinement of effective population size estimates. Ultimately, continued development of this approach could be used to inform bycatch mitigation measures for fisheries in the Gulf.**
>
> *Motion carried without opposition.*

SEDAR Process Update

Dr. Siegfried and Council staff discussed proposed changes to the SEDAR process. Briefly, these changes will primarily affect the assessment process portion of the stock assessment process. As opposed to SEDAR coordinating this portion, the SEFSC will instead take the lead, with public webinars still used when necessary to make key decisions in view of the public. Also, the SEFSC will present interim progress to the SSC when appropriate, to collect feedback about key decisions. This modification is expected to increase the efficiency of the stock assessment process without sacrificing transparency or quality. Generally, the SSC thought the proposed approach was both pragmatic and appropriate given recent and anticipated reductions in funding and staff. The SSC also supported exploring more efficient methods for assessing stocks, such as limiting analyses to key indices.

An SSC member asked about improving efficiencies for the Data Workshop. Dr. Siegfried said that multi-species data workshops have been considered and held in the past; however, some species do benefit from a more individualized approach. She agreed that the data provisioning could certainly benefit from increased efficiency. Dr. Julie Neer (SEDAR Program Manager) added that data provisioning has become much more complex with more data streams and species-specific research being offered for consideration.

SEDAR 100: Gulf Gray Triggerfish Participants for Review Phase

Dr. Siegfried and Council staff reviewed proposed terms of reference for the assessment process and review workshop and requested volunteers from the SSC for of the latter for the upcoming SEDAR 100 stock assessment for Gulf gray triggerfish. The assessment began with data scoping in April 2025, and will conclude with an in-person Review Workshop in February 2027. Dr. Siegfried discussed the assessment process terms of reference first, with specific references to the data to be considered for gray triggerfish during the Data Workshop. The review workshop terms of reference are boilerplate and used across assessments to standardize the review process. Council staff asked whether any video data from the Great Red Snapper Count might help inform the SEDAR 100 assessment. An SSC member replied that visual data are likely available for the eastern Gulf. However, data from the western Gulf would require calibration to swim bladder composition to identify gray triggerfish from those acoustic data. The SSC member did not think processing those data would be possible in time for the data workshop. An SSC member noted to ensure that fecundity is determined relative to age or length depending on model type.

Council staff recommended waiting on volunteers for the assessment and review components for SEDAR 100 at this time.

SSC SEDAR Workshops Update

This item was not reviewed and will be considered at the SSC's July 2025 meeting.

Review of Takeaways from Science Coordination Subcommittee

This item was not reviewed and will be considered at the SSC's July 2025 meeting.

Public Comment

None received.

Other Business

July 2025 SSC Meeting

Council staff asked the SSC to tentatively expect a July 2025 meeting the week of July 21, contingent on the Council receiving its funding. An SSC member asked for consideration of an item at that or a future meeting to review the economics of mid-year quota changes for IFQ species.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm eastern time on May 8, 2025.

Meeting Participants

Standing SSC
Jason Adriance
Mike Allen (*Chair*)
Luiz Barbieri
Harry Blanchet
Dave Chagaris
David Griffith
Tiffany Hopper
Jack Isaacs
John Mareska
Paul Mickle
Trevor Moncrief
James Nance (*Vice Chair*)
William Patterson
Dan Petrolia
Andrew Ropicki
Ralph Townsend
Steve Saul

Special Shrimp SSC
Don Behringer
Jason Saucier

Council Representative
Kevin Anson