

GULF COUNCIL

SHRIMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Hilton Tampa Airport Westshore Tampa, Florida & Virtual

June 1, 2026

VOTING MEMBERS

Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut).....Louisiana
 Michael Allen.....Florida
 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
 Kesley Banks.....Texas
 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
 Troy Frady.....Alabama
 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
 Jason Osborne.....Mississippi
 John Sanchez.....Florida
 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Brenda Ballard.....Texas
 Gregg Bray.....GSMFC
 J.D. Dugas.....Louisiana
 Johnny Marquez.....Mississippi
 Lt. Jackson Morton.....USCG
 Anthony Overton.....Alabama
 C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
 Ed Walker.....Florida

STAFF

Alyssa Clift.....Administrative Assistant
 Assane Diagne.....Economist
 Leonardo "Leo" Egula.....Fishery Outreach Specialist
 Matt Freeman.....Economic Analyst
 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
 Sarah Gardiner.....Fishery Biologist
 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
 Jessica Matos.....Administrative Document Editor & IT Coordinator
 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner & Travel Coordinator
 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
 Anabelle Suitor.....Social Scientist

1	<u>OTHER PARTICIPANTS</u>	
2	Jessica McCawley.....	SAFMC
3	John Walter.....	SEFSC
4		
5		
6		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Adoption of Agenda and Approval of April 2026 Minutes.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Action Guide and Next Steps.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Presentation: Update on Working Group for Shrimp Bycatch Methodology for Finfish Species.....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Discuss Workplan and Membership: Working Group to Address Interactions and Bycatch of Protected Resources in Shrimp Trawls</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>Draft Amendment 20: Status Determination Criteria for the Penaeid Shrimp.....</u>	<u>20</u>
<u>Adjournment</u>	<u>28</u>

- - -

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf Council convened at
2 The Hilton Tampa Airport Westshore in Tampa, Florida on Monday
3 morning, June 1, 2026, and was called to order by Chairman Chris
4 Schieble.

5
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF APRIL 2026 MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** At this time, I would like to call the
11 Shrimp Management Committee to order. Members of the committee
12 and myself as the chair, Dr. Overton as the vice chair, Dr. Allen,
13 Mr. Anson, Dr. Banks, Mr. Broussard, who is attending virtually,
14 Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Frady, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Geeslin, Mr. Sanchez,
15 and General Spraggins. All committee members are present.

16
17 The first item on the agenda is Adoption of the Agenda, Tab D,
18 Number 1. Does anyone have any other business they would like to
19 see added to the bottom of the agenda? Seeing none, can I get a
20 motion to adopt the agenda? General Spraggins. A second? Mr.
21 Osborne.

22
23 The next item on the agenda is Approval of the April 2026 Meeting
24 Minutes, Tab D, Number 2. Are there any additions, deletions, or
25 edits to those minutes? I went through all sixty-seven pages of
26 those, and I couldn't find anything wrong either, and so can I get
27 a motion to adopt the minutes as written? Mr. Osborne. A second?
28 General Spraggins. The minutes are adopted as presented in the
29 briefing book.

30
31 Next on the agenda is Tab D, number 3, and we're going to let Dr.
32 Freeman introduce that and go through the action guide for it,
33 please.

34
35 **PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON WORKING GROUP FOR SHRIMP BYCATCH**
36 **METHODOLOGY FOR FINFISH SPECIES**
37

38 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Thank you, sir. The first agenda item we have
39 is a presentation from Dr. Simmons, or sorry, from Dr. Froeschke,
40 giving an update on the Working Group for Shrimp Bycatch
41 Methodology for Finfish Species. Staff will provide an update on
42 that working group, and the committee should consider the
43 information provided and ask questions.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** All right. Seeing no questions, we will move
46 on to the first agenda item, Tab D, Number 4, which is an Update
47 on the Working Group for Shrimp Bycatch Methodology for Finfish
48 Species. Dr. Froeschke, I believe.

1
2 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Good morning. I don't know how I got
3 volunteered to lead off here, but -- Okay, and so I'm going to
4 give you a little overview presentation of the meeting, with some
5 tidbits in the process, and what the goals and things are.

6
7 Just kind of give you this first slide here is the workgroup
8 membership. We met again, and there's council staff, and many of
9 the Science Center -- They were the bulk of the analysts producing
10 work in the presentation, and so we really appreciate their work
11 and contributions to this group. Then we had some SSC members and
12 industry members as well that provided -- Contributed to the
13 discussion and feedback from the meeting. I also want to thank
14 Gregg Bray from the Gulf States, that I talked him into chairing
15 this group, and he's been really helpful, and so much appreciated.

16
17 We met May 11th and 12th. This was -- We had two three-hour
18 webinars. We previously -- Prior to the April council meeting, we
19 had an initial meeting, and it was a three-hour webinar meeting.
20 We went over some presentations and things, and identified some
21 areas that the group wanted to learn more about, and so we use
22 these two days to do that.

23
24 It was a series of webinar-based meetings. It was open to the
25 public, just like an AP kind of a style, and so they were productive
26 meetings. We looked at species-specific shrimp effort, and so
27 these are the species of shrimp, the brown, white, and pink, and
28 kind of how those are estimated.

29
30 We've had some discussion about that in prior AP meetings and
31 things, and how that relates, or doesn't, to the bycatch of
32 finfish, and so we talked about that. We went into detail about
33 how the methods from the observer program, and the data collected
34 in that are used to actually estimate bycatch for finfish, and so
35 many of the stuff -- The workgroup, in a bigger sense, it wasn't
36 to say you should do this or that differently, per se.

37
38 It was more to understand how this process works, from soup-to-
39 nuts, from beginning to end, because it was very -- There is many
40 steps in there, and, in order to contribute to the stock
41 assessments, and understand how these data may be used, or could
42 be interpreted, and those kinds of things, we really needed to do
43 that, and it just -- It takes some time, and it takes some
44 explanation from the Science Center, to explain their work and
45 things and give them that opportunity, which we're really
46 appreciative they did that. I mean, it just -- There's a lot that
47 goes into this.

1 We also talked about some gear selectivity and the efficiency of
2 the gears. Primarily, the things that we talked about are whether
3 the vessels are two nets or four nets, or whether they are trawling
4 in the day or the night, and then, more specifically, on red
5 snapper and gray triggerfish, we talked some about the methods
6 which vary between those two stocks on how those data are used in
7 a stock assessment.

8
9 I'm just going to kind of go through some of the major bullets,
10 and the highlights, and what the working group discussed, and
11 recommended, if applicable, and, if you have questions, we can
12 follow it up, but there's a lot to it. I don't want to take too
13 much time, but there is -- It is interesting to see how much effort
14 goes into this process.

15
16 This first slide here is based on a presentation. The graphic on
17 the right is from the Science Center, and, essentially, what this
18 shows is that, if you take a step back, the effort for the fleet
19 is estimated from the cellular electronic logbook program, which
20 we've talked about many times, and it's went through in many forms.

21
22 It used to be automatically transmitted over the cellular network,
23 that's now mailed in, that we're now transitioning to a different
24 program informed by the Early Adopter, and so there's many
25 different changes in that, but the concept is the same.

26
27 What those data transmit are actually just timestamp location and
28 speed data, primarily, and so it doesn't tell you what species,
29 specific species, they are targeting in their effort, and so that's
30 done on the back end, and the Science Center has a process based
31 on the location, the depth, the area fished, and there are several
32 different factors that they use to parse it out into the species
33 that you see here. Pink off Florida, and inshore is white, brown,
34 and pink, primarily white and brown, and then the farthest offshore
35 is brown shrimp.

36
37 That being said, for the purposes of finfish estimation, it's not
38 critical to know what species is being targeted, so long as you
39 know the other things, the depth and the location, time, and all
40 that, which we do have, and so, for the purposes of finfish stock
41 assessments and estimating bycatch, the information are also
42 presented by what we call the shrimp statistical grids, and you
43 can see those numbers 1 through 21, and they're parsed out further
44 into depth and other things.

45
46 We can use them that way, and so we have the information, and
47 that's primarily how they're used, more so than just by the
48 species, although we had discussed, either at the AP meetings or

1 the council meetings, how these species-specific estimates are
2 produced, and so we did provide that. The workgroup didn't have
3 any specific feedback on how this was done, and they really
4 appreciated the explanation.

5
6 The next part of this was a follow-up. The first meeting, the
7 working group had asked about the observer program, and to get a
8 foundational understanding from -- Observers go on a small
9 percentage of trips. On the trips, there are multiple tows, of
10 which each tow has multiple nets, of which some nets are sampled,
11 because there are too many nets, too much bycatch, perhaps, for an
12 observer to work through all of those and not slow down the other
13 operations.

14
15 If you break all that down in order to produce an estimate for the
16 tow, and then the trip, and then expand it to what we'll call the
17 strata, which you can cover in just a minute, all the way up to
18 the stock, there's a lot of steps, and so we were trying to
19 understand how that works, and so we had a presentation, and we
20 just worked it through it step-by-step for some example species.

21
22 On the diagram on the right, there's kind two pathways, and I'll
23 start on the top, but you start with a net, and so that's the
24 finite unit, and there may be four nets on a vessel, but one net
25 may be sampled.

26
27 The sample was broken down into what we would call buckets, or
28 baskets, and then the species that are enumerated are calculated
29 on there, and they're weighed, and then they're extrapolated up to
30 the net, and then how many nets, and then the tow, and then,
31 likewise, all the way up to the trip, et cetera.

32
33 That process, that's how it works for species that are
34 characterized other than red snapper. Red snapper is a bit
35 different, in that, for each net, all of the red snapper are
36 counted, and enumerated in weight, and so that's specifically
37 because we have management targets directly related to the bycatch
38 of red snapper.

39
40 It is more work to do that, and so I'm not sure if that could be
41 done for all species based on the workload, but it is a more
42 precise method, but, again, the workgroup didn't really have any
43 criticism, necessarily, or feedback specifically that you should
44 do that differently on this part. It seemed very reasonable, but
45 it takes some explanations to understand.

46
47 The part that is -- We also talked about, and it's not illustrated
48 necessarily on here, but there are many what we're calling strata,

1 which strata are -- If you have the Gulf of America as your
2 population, your sample area, and that is subdivided into smaller
3 areas, either by geography or time, and so there can be
4 combinations of time and area strata, and there are many of those.

5
6 To produce a population-wide estimate, you generally would want to
7 produce an estimate for each individual strata, and then you would
8 combine them. Well, each estimate comes with its own variance and
9 is affected by the number of samples, and the nature of the data
10 in each of the strata, et cetera.

11
12 That being said, there are, for example, different zones, and so
13 the statistical grids, 1 through 21, are broken into four zones,
14 roughly east to west, and then there are three depth zones,
15 inshore, nearshore, and offshore. There are regions, and there
16 are seasons, summer and fall, and there are time periods, among
17 others.

18
19 There's essentially -- I think we calculated 112 strata, and, in
20 a historical sense, there's also different time eras of 1980s,
21 1990s, that kind of thing, which adds up more, and so, when you
22 combine that with the relatively sparse number of trips that have
23 observer coverage, there are many of those that have very low or
24 no sampling.

25
26 Then we did talk about, which was helpful, is some of those have
27 no sampling, because they don't make sense, and like a strata --
28 If you just factorialize it, for example, pink shrimp in the day,
29 or that West Florida Shelf in the day might be a strata, but, in
30 reality, they don't really do that.

31
32 There was just a couple of edge cases where it was close to the
33 day, and so there are some strata that will almost always be zero,
34 which aren't really problematic, but it is helpful to know that
35 those kinds of things exist, and so these are just some of the
36 things that the Science Center addresses when compiling these
37 estimates, and so, if it makes your head spin, it made our heads
38 spin as well.

39
40 This is one of the other things we looked at, was this gear
41 selectivity and efficiency. This was sort of a new wrinkle that
42 the Science Center has been working on, and the reason that you
43 want to incorporate these strata is that, as you add additional
44 strata in them, you do have to provide more parameters to estimate.

45
46 That makes it more complicated, but you do potentially reduce the
47 variance in your analysis by putting things like bins in like bins,
48 and so what they did here is they looked at the composition of the

1 vessels, whether they be two-net vessels or four-net vessels, and
2 most of the federal ones are four-net vessels.

3
4 The chart there kind of shows the composition of those over time,
5 and then we looked at the -- Well, just, on that, in terms of the
6 catch rates, it's not just a simple calculation that on a four
7 net, you catch twice as many shrimp per unit time, or twice as
8 many finfish per unit time, as the two nets. It's actually --
9 It's more -- The four nets are more than the two nets, but it's
10 like a 1.23, and not a double.

11
12 All of those things, they looked into that, and tried to produce
13 estimates of those, and, given the way that the estimates are
14 expanded, it's important that you get those as correct as you can,
15 and so those are useful efforts to make that, so we don't
16 overestimate in that way.

17
18 Again, one of the things that we did talk about is that the observer
19 coverage -- It is low, and so we're talking 2 or 3 percent, and
20 that is not all of the strata are sampled evenly, because it's not
21 necessarily -- Some are extraordinarily low. Some are never
22 sampled, and some of it is because there's not enough -- There's
23 not vessels operating that strata, or there's only one, and they
24 don't want to just keep going on the same vessel again, and not
25 burden the vessel.

26
27 In totality, the workgroup didn't have any specific
28 recommendations on this. We did talk about it a lot, and it was
29 very useful to understand this.

30
31 Okay, so we're going to go back just to red snapper and just kind
32 of wrap up that thought a little bit. With red snapper, and the
33 additional sampling, the way that was done, this was -- This
34 presentation described the methods that was previously used in the
35 SEDAR 98.

36
37 The workgroup didn't have any specific recommendations about that.
38 It seems to be a fairly robust procedure, although it does take
39 more work, and some additional discussion perhaps, on how this
40 could be used, or not, for other species that are characterized.
41 It's probably worth thinking about, and so let me just explain
42 that really quick.

43
44 What's characterized -- So, in a shrimp trawl, you get many
45 species, hundreds of species. Not every species is characterized,
46 or that they would be there all day, or all night, and so there's
47 a list of species, which does change, and it has been updated
48 recently, and we'll talk about that in a minute, to include gray

1 triggerfish starting in 2025, and so they're intended to focus on
2 the important-to-management species, but it's not every species,
3 and so, of those, that's kind of what we're talking about here.

4
5 Gray triggerfish is a little bit different, in terms of estimating
6 finfish bycatch for the purposes of a stock assessment. Red
7 snapper was enumerated in its entirety. Gray triggerfish, until
8 2025, was not on what we're calling the characterized list. They
9 were captured historically, but they were not characterized until
10 2025, and so, for the purposes of the stock assessment, a different
11 method needed to be used to estimate the bycatch.

12
13 What the Science Center had done, given the lack of really options,
14 given the data, is they considered using a proxy species, and so
15 I'm going to say lane snapper, and there's a little detail we can
16 talk about, but -- Essentially, what they did is they used SEAMAP
17 data, which is a fishery-independent trawl. It's not -- In theory,
18 it's close to what the industry does, and it's, you know,
19 essentially similar selectivities and things, and not exact, but
20 all the species are enumerated, and counted, and it's a scientific
21 survey.

22
23 What they did -- If you look at the maps on your right, you'll
24 see, on that upper-left, there's a map, and the orange dots for
25 lane snapper are the tows where the lane snapper were encountered.

26
27 The panel to the right, in the purple, or -- Excuse me. Down below
28 that, in the blue, are triggerfish, which roughly is similar in
29 geographic range. You can kind of infer, from the blue, that there
30 are not as many blue dots as there are orange dots, meaning that
31 they're less common than lane snapper. Their geographic range is
32 similar, although lane snapper are more common than triggerfish in
33 the Keys, particularly that strata.

34
35 The purple dots, on the upper-right panel, are the samples in which
36 both of them occur. You can see that was over 15,000 tows, and so
37 what was done, essentially, was to use the proportion of lane
38 snapper as a proxy to estimate gray triggerfish, also accounting
39 for the differences in how common each of the species were, and so
40 it was sort of use lane snapper to estimate triggerfish, but also
41 account for that lane snapper are more common than triggerfish,
42 and so it's not a direct -- Not every lane snapper means that we
43 estimated a triggerfish was counted, and so there's an adjustment
44 factor based on the data.

45
46 We went through that for a long time, and that was actually useful.
47 In the northern Gulf, off of Alabama, lane snapper were not used
48 there. They're not very common, and so red snapper was substituted

1 just in two strata, using the same procedure, but, in a nutshell,
2 that was what was done.

3
4 The workgroup thought that it was a reasonable approach. There
5 were some questions about the use of the proxy species. I mean,
6 the way that we discussed it is that it's certainly not the ideal
7 way, and, going forward, gray triggerfish is now being
8 characterized.

9
10 The data in one year were not adequate to expand to the entirety
11 of the time series, either because the spatial coverage in that
12 was not adequate, just based on the time, and then, you know, there
13 are just many of these strata that are just too sparsely estimated,
14 and the Science Center didn't feel comfortable doing that, and so
15 that was kind of where we left that. We didn't provide any specific
16 recommendations on something to do different here.

17
18 Okay, and so a couple of just take-homes, and so we did talk a lot
19 about the proxy species for gray triggerfish, and we discussed
20 that this particular application was probably reasonable. It's
21 not something that neither the Science Center nor the working group
22 would advocate for doing routinely for other species, and so one
23 of the -- We all agreed that this is something that's probably a
24 one-off concept. It probably worked this time, but it's not
25 something we would endorse for other things as it comes up, and so
26 I think that that's a good place to be.

27
28 For triggerfish specifically, I would anticipate that, by the next
29 stock assessment, that there would be enough data, now that it's
30 being characterized, that wouldn't be a concern.

31
32 For red snapper, and we kind of touched on this, that the
33 methodology used for red snapper specifically is pretty robust.
34 For some of these other characterized species, we may need to think
35 about that a little bit more, because they don't go through the
36 red snapper track exactly. For example, king mackerel come up as
37 sort of the other pathway, although it doesn't require a proxy
38 species.

39
40 One of the things that the workgroup discussed is whether they
41 should meet again to look over king mackerel, the methodology used
42 for that, or shall we just defer and accept it as it is, and so
43 that's something that this committee can kind of talk about and
44 see if there's merit in convening that group again in the future.

45
46 Our plan going forward, we're going to present our findings and
47 recommendations to the SSC at their July meeting. We're not
48 exactly sure what the SSC will do with those, and they may have

1 some additional feedback, or they may not, and so we'll see.

2
3 Just a reminder, I appreciate the effort of the Science Center and
4 Gregg Bray for all of their work on this, and then we would solicit
5 some input from you all, if you think that the workgroup should
6 meet again about king mackerel specifically, and so I'll stop there
7 for questions.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Froeschke. Do we have
10 any questions, or comments, regarding the presentation? Mr.
11 Sanchez.

12
13 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** A comment. Yes, I would support them looking
14 deeper into working with king mackerel, and including that, taking
15 a deeper dive, given everything going on in king mackerel, and I
16 wanted to ask you. Was there any discussion of sawfish at this,
17 and what we're going to do about that with, you know, possibly
18 addressing ways to mitigate interaction?

19
20 **DR. FROESCHKE:** So, for sawfish specifically, we're going to be
21 discussing today, or shortly, the composition of an additional
22 workgroup to focus specifically on protected resources, and so the
23 rationale is we wanted to look at it for finfish, and understand
24 a lot of foundational information, which is similar for protected
25 species, but it's -- It will be challenging, and so we were trying
26 to build through that.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Captain Walker.

29
30 **MR. ED WALKER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't think I'm on your
31 committee, but just a general question. Are king mackerel a
32 relatively common catch? It said -- It sounded like not really,
33 but are they somewhat of a shrimp bycatch?

34
35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Well, Dr. Walter can correct me if I'm wrong.
36 They're not terribly abundant, but they're not zero. We do get
37 them. I was -- I've always been surprised that they're more common
38 than I would have intuitively thought, but, yes, and, I mean,
39 they're not -- They're not -- It's a non-zero for sure. In terms
40 of how it plays out in the whole assessment, I'm not sure.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Walter, to that point, and then we have
43 Dr. Allen,

44
45 **DR. JOHN WALTER:** They're common enough that we do have to account
46 for them in bycatch. You're not going to see them stand out,
47 because they're kind of like little needles in a pile of other
48 bycatch, but it's enough that, when we've done the calculations in

1 the past, it has definitely been something that has to be accounted
2 for in the assessment.

3
4 Now, the methodology, I think one of the things we do need to --
5 We want to ensure that we note that the methodology is greatly
6 improved recently, and so one of the things that the working group
7 saw was how it's better using the effort data, better using and
8 characterizing how that effort differs between two and four nets,
9 night and day, and the primary thing that's different than how
10 we've done bycatch in the past is that we're not using the SEAMAP
11 catch rate data to inform that, and that was the concern, that we
12 were using surveys to inform fishery bycatch.

13
14 In this case, I think that's the fundamental change in why a lot
15 of these processes are greatly improved, why they passed the CIE
16 review, and I think they're generally passing through each of the
17 SEDAR stock assessments, and so one thing that this committee is
18 going to have to consider is where staff and everyone's efforts
19 are going to be.

20
21 I think, in terms of king mackerel, I would say that's less
22 important than focusing on the protected species, smalltooth
23 sawfish and giant manta, and so I would say I would really want to
24 focus the effort there, and that may be that working group does
25 not need to meet on king mackerel, because it's already going
26 through the SEDAR process, and has been actually accepted, and so
27 that would be what I would put out there. Thanks.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Walter. Dr. Allen.

30
31 **DR. MIKE ALLEN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the work that
32 the working group did on this. There was a good bit of discussion
33 about the use of lane snapper as a proxy species for gray
34 triggerfish, and gray triggerfish will be quantified from 2025 on,
35 and so, in the future, we'll have some direct data from them, but
36 I wonder -- Was there discussion about whether the use of lane
37 snapper as a surrogate species is suitable for this current gray
38 triggerfish? Is that a -- Was the group okay with doing that, or
39 is that going to go to the SSC for more comments?

40
41 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I'll start, and Dr. Walter can jump in if he has
42 additional thoughts. Yes, and we talked about it. I mean, what
43 we looked at -- So there's sort of two questions. One, there
44 really isn't a perfect option, because the approach where you have
45 a lot of years of data is using a proxy, and there definitely are
46 regional disparities.

47
48 You know, they're -- Probably the correlation, positive

1 correlation, is stronger in the western Gulf than the eastern Gulf,
2 and it's problematic. In the eastern Gulf, there's not as many,
3 and so the magnitude of that may not be as problematic, but, you
4 know, as more data are available, that would probably be a better
5 pathway, is to use the direct approach in the future. I think
6 everyone agrees on that.

7
8 We did have some back and forth, I guess, about, you know, whether
9 it was worth trying to think about making use of those 2025
10 observer data, and how they could be expanded, and I think the
11 working group ultimately decided that there were just too many
12 holes to fill at this time to be perhaps more confident in that
13 than what we already have, but it's kind of a tough nut.

14
15 **DR. ALLEN:** Yes, and I understand that, John. It's a data gap
16 that you're trying to fill.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Walter.

19
20 **DR. WALTER:** Yes, and I think, given that, and given that it's
21 gone through a lot of scrutiny, and there's not a better option
22 identified, then that basically says, okay, what does the stock
23 assessment -- What is it going to do with that, and that's, I
24 think, where going to the SSC will be helpful, and I think the
25 assessment working group certainly knows that there's a lot of
26 uncertainty there, and there's a couple of approaches they're using
27 to adequately characterize that uncertainty in the stock
28 assessment, and I think some context, and sort of scale, is
29 important.

30
31 These estimates are much lower than they were previously, and so
32 it's not going to be as influential in the stock assessment. It's
33 also being super year-ed, so that the interannual variability is
34 not being seen by the model as actually recruitments, and that's
35 a key way of addressing this, because we know that there's
36 substantial uncertainty in what we're doing here.

37
38 We're using a proxy, and we don't want lane snapper recruitment to
39 be seen as gray trigger recruitment, and the way that the model is
40 accounting for that is it's going to basically diminish the impact
41 of that, and I think the other way of dealing with it is, if the
42 scale is of concern here, which I think it is, is sensitivity runs
43 that increase or decrease the scale of those estimates, which would
44 then increase or decrease its impact on the stock assessment, and
45 I think those are probably the best course of action we've got
46 right now. Thanks.

47
48 **DR. ALLEN:** Thank you, Dr. Walter. That makes sense to me.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Do we have any other comments, or
3 questions, on the working group summary? I guess I have one
4 additional question, Dr. Froeschke, and so what is the next step
5 for this finfish bycatch working group? Do they put together a
6 final report, or do we get something like that that is the end
7 product?

8
9 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Well, my thoughts are that they would report out
10 to the SSC this July, and then, if we need to meet again for king
11 mackerel, we would do that. I don't know -- We'll produce a
12 meeting summary for each of the meetings, but there wasn't a larger
13 report or something that it was going to be compiled into.
14 Primarily, it was input to the SSC.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and so advice to the SSC for the next
17 meeting? All right. Roger that. Any other questions? Then we'll
18 move on to the next agenda item, which is the Discussion on the
19 Workplan and Membership for the Working Group to Address
20 Interactions and Bycatch of Protected Resources in Shrimp Trawls.
21 Dr. Freeman, can you lead us through the action guide for that
22 one, please?

23
24 **DISCUSS WORKPLAN AND MEMBERSHIP: WORKING GROUP TO ADDRESS**
25 **INTERACTIONS AND BYCATCH OF PROTECTED SPECIES IN SHRIMP TRAWLS**
26

27 **DR. FREEMAN:** Certainly, and so, for this agenda item, staff will
28 provide an update on the working group to address interactions and
29 bycatch of protected resources in shrimp trawls. The committee
30 should consider the information provided, ask questions, and
31 determine if they concur, via a motion, with the proposed working
32 group approach.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Freeman. I think, Dr.
35 Simmons, you're up.

36
37 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay,
38 and so Bernie has got up Tab , Number 5. Our staff worked on this,
39 as well as some Regional Office staff, and I believe the Science
40 Center has maybe had a chance to take a peek at this, hopefully,
41 and so this is our draft workplan and proposed membership for
42 another working group to address protected resources interactions
43 with the Gulf federal shrimp trawls.

44
45 The objective of this work group is to consider, as part of its
46 deliberations, the status, behavior, and biology of giant manta
47 ray and smalltooth sawfish, look at the observer data and bycatch
48 estimation processes, and the management, operation, and behavior

1 of the Gulf federal shrimp fleet.

2
3 The primary objective is to consider and identify workable
4 solutions that aim to reduce interactions with smalltooth sawfish
5 and giant manta ray in the Gulf federal shrimp trawl fishery, and
6 there's some very specific objectives that I assume would be put
7 on, and we would have the materials for on the agendas, the way we
8 would set these working group meetings up.

9
10 These are the things that the group would be presented with.
11 They're going to get an overview of the Section 7 consultation
12 process, and the requirements as it pertains to the shrimp fleet.
13 They would review relevant data on the life history and ecology of
14 these protected resources, being the giant manta ray and smalltooth
15 sawfish as the primary focus.

16
17 They would evaluate the seasonal and spatial overlap between the
18 shrimp trawl effort and any hotspots that we have information on
19 for these species, using the most recent terminal years for effort
20 information, for example the NMFS observer data and the electronic
21 logbook, and maybe even some information from the Early Adopter
22 Program, as well as any new information we have on research about
23 these animals.

24
25 They're going to potentially evaluate the gear and the operational
26 tactics and other management measures used globally, or
27 regionally, to mitigate large elasmobranch interactions and
28 bycatch. Evaluate the technical feasibility, safety, and economic
29 impact of potential modifications to the shrimp fishery
30 operations, including gear alterations or updated safe handling
31 and release protocols for protected resources.

32
33 They're going to review and consider any improvements to safe
34 handling and release management practices, and I think I said that
35 one. Okay, and there's also a working group in the South Atlantic
36 that's addressing this, and I think their primary effort is on the
37 smalltooth sawfish. I don't believe giant manta ray is an issue
38 over there, and so we're going to discuss the South Atlantic
39 Council's working group recommendations on management measures
40 proposed in that region, and if there's any applications that we
41 might want to consider in the Gulf, and then we provide those
42 recommendations to the Gulf Council for discussion, and
43 consideration for a management document is the end goal here, I
44 believe.

45
46 We put quite a bit of background in here for your information.
47 This has been presented at various stages to the Shrimp AP, and
48 then you'll recall, in August of 2025, and some phase-in also to

1 the SSC. In May of 2025, the SSC was presented with some
2 information on the population viability analysis for smalltooth
3 sawfish, and they provided several recommendations on that, and so
4 there's some history and information there as part of the
5 background.

6
7 Then, in August of 2025, the council received the presentation
8 from Ms. Lee, who is also in the audience if I need some help
9 answering questions, and she is from the Protected Resources
10 Division at the Southeast Regional Office, and she came to you
11 all, in August of 2025, and provided some information on the
12 Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation, and she said that
13 we needed to start working on this effort.

14
15 You'll see your motion that you passed there from August of 2025,
16 which talks about populating this group, and so, just to remind
17 everybody, that's what we said we would do, and this is the draft
18 that you guys are looking at that's proposing this work, and so
19 let's go down a little bit.

20
21 Okay, and let's skip to our draft working participants first,
22 working group participants first, and then come back to the
23 potential timeline.

24
25 What we have proposed here is thirteen members currently, made up
26 of council staff, SSC representation, and we have one Special
27 Shrimp SSC member on there, and Science Center staff, with various
28 expertise from the gear research effort and observer program. Ms.
29 Lee at the Regional Office, and Dr. Nathan Putman is a researcher
30 with LGL who has been working closely with the industry on the
31 Early Adopter program, and then, right now, we have three industry
32 representatives that we've reached out to, and these folks have
33 agreed to participate.

34
35 We've kind of tried to explain to them what we think the number of
36 meetings and the commitment will be, although, you know, that can
37 change, and we're asking people to be flexible. We have reached
38 out to these folks, and they are willing to put in the work, and
39 the time, as we think that it's going to play out.

40
41 Just a reminder, and so Ms. Leann Bosarge, and everyone is familiar
42 with her, and she's homeported in Mississippi. She and her family
43 have a fleet of vessels. They fish both in the Gulf and the South
44 Atlantic regions, and so we think she's a valuable contributor.

45
46 Ernie Aparicio is homeported in Texas. However, he fishes about
47 90 to 95 percent of his time in the pink shrimp fishery, and then
48 Cheri Blanchard is home ported in Louisiana, and she operates in

1 the region where there is observed the giant manta ray
2 interactions, and so we do have two additional slots here.

3
4 I don't know that we necessarily have to have five members on this
5 group, because it can be quite cumbersome logistically to get
6 everybody together, based on schedules, but we are thinking, and
7 we've heard perhaps it might be useful, to have an additional pink
8 shrimp shrimper from the industry that would be able to perhaps
9 come from more of the Fort Myers region.

10
11 Staff is working on that, if that's the direction the committee
12 might want to consider for Full Council, and we can bring some of
13 that information back to you, so we can hopefully finalize that
14 group.

15
16 Before we open up for questions, can we possibly go back to the
17 timeline? All right, and so this is what we've proposed. Again,
18 this is open for discussion. Maybe we want to start with an in-
19 person meeting, but we weren't sure. Sometimes it takes us a while
20 to get our ducks in a row, and figure out what all information is
21 available, and so, right now, we're thinking virtual meetings
22 starting in July, September, and October and then an in-person
23 meeting in November.

24
25 Then those recommendations -- I mean, we would give the council
26 updates along the way, as appropriate, but those would go to the
27 Standing and Special Shrimp SSCs and the Shrimp Advisory Panel,
28 and then all of that, as we work through the management process,
29 the council would be briefed on.

30
31 Then, at some point, we've got to figure out how this is going to
32 mesh with what the South Atlantic Council is doing, as far as what
33 we need to do and the information we have in the Gulf versus the
34 South Atlantic, as it pertains to smalltooth sawfish, and so, Mr.
35 Chair, that's my overview, and hopefully you follow that.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dr. Simmons, and so I just -- Help
38 me with the timeline here, and so we're looking at potentially
39 getting this in front of the Shrimp AP for their next March 2027
40 meeting, would be the culmination of the results of the in-person
41 meeting from November, correct, and then it goes to the SSC, and
42 then the AP would receive it in March?

43
44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I'm not exactly sure on the timing of
45 when it will go to the SSCs and the Shrimp AP. I think we're going
46 to have to kind of be a little flexible there, and see how much
47 progress this working group makes, and when it's appropriate.

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and I know -- Maybe Andy can help me
2 with this a little bit, but, when we first received this back in
3 August of last year, I remember that they made some statements
4 about the clock is ticking at this point, and like we were on the
5 clock, once it started the process, right, and help me out with
6 that. I don't know where we are in that timeline. Mr. Strelcheck.

7
8 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Chris, and so there's no specific
9 deadline, but, obviously, the sooner the better, and what we've
10 been working toward is finalizing some data and information for
11 the ESA consultation.

12
13 We do plan to initiate consultation likely by the end of the year,
14 whether this workgroup has wrapped up its work or not. Obviously,
15 right now, it seems like we're kind of on a good path, in terms of
16 the workgroup finalizing their recommendations, and providing
17 that, obviously, to the council, APs, and SSCs by year-end, which
18 would mirror, obviously, kind of the timing for all of the data
19 and information that we're gathering for the consultation.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Andy. That's helpful. Okay,
22 do we have any other questions around the table? Dr. Sweetman.

23
24 **DR. C.J. SWEETMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your
25 committee, but I was just going to speak to what Dr. Simmons was
26 referencing relative to looking for someone in the shrimp fleet in
27 the Fort Myers region. Just looking at kind of the industry reps
28 there, I think what we might be missing are people that might
29 interact with sawfish, and that seems to be more focused on kind
30 of the manta interaction industry reps, because it's just very
31 spatially limited for where the sawfish interactions occur, and so
32 I think that's a good idea.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Mr. Strelcheck.

35
36 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, so I'm supportive of, obviously, an industry
37 representative that would be involved in the pink shrimp fishery
38 to be added. I guess the question, for Carrie and team, is so we
39 have two council staff, and we've got four NMFS members. I was
40 trying to be strategic with the Regional Office, only adding one
41 person, and then we have these support staff.

42
43 We are kind of light on researchers that work directly on sawfish
44 or manta rays, and I see an opportunity where we could actually
45 add some people, but I don't want to make the committee too large,
46 like Carrie was saying, and it seems like we would have to swap
47 some people out if we were going to do that, and I know, for
48 example, Dean Grubbs at FSU does a lot of sawfish research, and we

1 have FWC that does a lot of sawfish research, and we've got Jessica
2 Pate that does manta ray research, right, and so do you see them
3 providing more of a support staff role, or could those be added as
4 work group members?

5
6 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Simmons.

7
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I think
9 we see those folks as more being like presenters coming and
10 participating in the meetings, but not necessarily on the
11 workgroup, per se, and so they're not reviewing their own work.
12 They're saying this is the work that we found, helping be involved
13 in discussion, and answer questions to understand what's actually
14 happening out there with those species, was my thought process on
15 that.

16
17 As far as the pink shrimp industry representative, yes, we agree.
18 Staff is suggesting one more, but, to be clear, Mr. Aparicio does
19 operate in the pink shrimp fishery primarily, about 90 to 95
20 percent in Florida, even though he's homeported in Texas, yes, and
21 he docks, I believe, in this Tampa area.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Any other further questions, or
24 comments, regarding the list of working group membership? It looks
25 like none, and so I guess we will strive -- Or our goal will be to
26 try to finalize this when we get the Full Council, correct?

27
28 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Yes.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Correct. Okay. Moving on to the last agenda
31 item for the Shrimp Committee is the Status Determination Criteria
32 for Penaeid Shrimp, Tab D, number 6. Dr. Freeman, can you run us
33 through the action guide real quick on that?

34
35 **DRAFT OPTIONS: STATUS DETERMINATION CRITERIA FOR THE PENAEID**
36 **SHRIMP**

37
38 **DR. FREEMAN:** Certainly, and so, for this item, the committee will
39 be presented with a draft amendment to establish or modify status
40 determination criteria for the penaeid shrimp. Staff will review
41 the draft purpose and needs statements and draft alternatives.
42 The committee should ask questions and provide staff with further
43 direction of the draft amendment.

44
45 Just before I delve into the document itself, I did just want to
46 remind the committee that, as part of the motion for staff to start
47 work on this, there was a specific request that it include
48 examining an adjustment to the minimum threshold number of federal

1 Gulf shrimp permits, which was set in Amendment 17B.

2
3 There is not an action in this document related to that for you
4 all to review at this time, but I just wanted to give you all an
5 update. We sent a request to Dr. Porch and Mr. Strelcheck on April
6 20 requesting that NMFS work on that updated analyses, and so
7 certainly that will need to as well be reviewed by the SSC, and
8 likely the Shrimp AP would also like to weigh in on it, but I just
9 wanted to let the committee know we've not forgotten that part of
10 the document. We just don't have the materials yet for that
11 particular action.

12
13 A little bit -- Again, just as a reminder of the background, the
14 materials in this stem from what came out of SEDAR 87, which
15 addressed the three penaeid shrimp stocks, brown, white, and pink.

16
17 Previously, the status determination criteria for those species
18 relied on Stock Synthesis, which is an age-structured model, and,
19 through the SEDAR process, they determined that it was not
20 necessarily well suited for an annual species like shrimp, and so
21 where they moved to was an empirical dynamic model, or EDM, which
22 they found was better suited for modeling annual environmentally-
23 driven species like you would find with shrimp.

24
25 Bernie, if we could go ahead and move down to the purpose and need,
26 and I will add, again, as an additional action is introduced
27 potentially to deal with that minimum threshold number of permits,
28 that as well would come into play in the purpose and need
29 statements, and so this is addressing solely the four actions
30 that are in the document in front of you right now.

31
32 The purpose of this action is to establish or modify MSYs, ABCs,
33 overfishing thresholds, and overfished thresholds for the Gulf
34 shrimp penaeid shrimps. The need is to have biological reference
35 points that can be used for determining status of the Gulf shrimp
36 penaeid shrimp, or sorry. The Gulf shrimp penaeid stocks.

37
38 Bernie, if we go ahead to Action 1, I'll note -- So there's four
39 actions in front of you all. Actions 1 through 3 only have two
40 alternatives, whereas Action 4 has four alternatives.

41
42 Action 1, and I will also -- I apologize, and I probably should
43 have stated it upfront, when I was mentioning the empirical dynamic
44 model. The values that you'll find in these actions, the empirical
45 dynamic model was able to produce values for white and brown
46 shrimp. Pink, however, has a shorter series of data, and so they
47 found that the empirical dynamic model did not fit pink shrimp,
48 because of that abbreviated time series, and that's -- Some more

1 background information is provided in the background on that
2 particular issue. EDM can be revisited for pink shrimp as
3 additional years of data are collected.

4
5 With Action 1, Alternative 2 is using the EDM results for both
6 brown and white shrimp and adjusting, or revising, the MSY values.
7 For pink shrimp though, again, there was a need to sort of find a
8 proxy, or workaround, for that, since EDM cannot produce. at this
9 time, a MSY value for that particular shrimp species, and so the
10 recommendation, which the SSC agreed with, was using the third-
11 highest catch of pink shrimp as the MSY value, and that occurred
12 in 1986, and so that was the 19,300,000 pounds of tails.

13
14 The full time series of landings for brown, white, and pink shrimp
15 are listed in Table 2.1 as well, and so I will pause there and see
16 if there's any questions before we move on to the next section.

17
18 Okay, and so, Bernie, if we can move on to Action 2, and here we
19 are looking at establishing an ABC for penaeid shrimp. Currently,
20 there is not an ABC value for Gulf penaeid shrimp stocks. As part
21 of MSA, even for an annual stock that is a requirement, and so
22 Alternative 2 would establish that ABC for each Gulf penaeid shrimp
23 stock, setting it equal to the MSY for that stock. Again, I will
24 pause and see if there's any questions, and, if not, we will move
25 forward.

26
27 All right, and so we'll move on to Action 3, Bernie, and so Action
28 3 modifies the overfishing threshold for penaeid shrimp.
29 Alternative 1, our no action, those values are listed there.
30 Alternative 2 revises the overfishing threshold values using the
31 results of SEDAR 87, and so you'll see, again, for brown and white,
32 EDM was able to produce values, setting those overfishing
33 thresholds as defined as the MFMT.

34
35 For pink shrimp, again, looking for sort of a workaround until
36 additional years of data are available to run EDM for that
37 particular species, the suggestion there, which the SSC
38 recommended, was to use a ratio basically of annual landings
39 relative to the MSY proxy, and then, if that ratio were to exceed
40 one, then it would be determined that the stock status of pink
41 shrimp would be overfishing, and Dr. Froeschke is going to add on
42 a little bit of the difference in the values between Alternative
43 1 and Alternative 2 for brown and white shrimp.

44
45 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay, and so just a little bit of background
46 information, and so if you look at -- You can leave it on
47 Alternative 1 and 2 there, Bernie.

1 If you look at Alternative 1, for example, brown shrimp, versus
2 Alternative 2, you see that the magnitude of those values are
3 totally different, and so we followed-up with the Science Center
4 as to why, and to make sure we interpret that -- So I'll just say
5 Alternative 1, for the purpose of this, is based on the previous
6 stock assessment, and it's really not a viable alternative.

8 In the previous -- Part of the reason that all of this exploration
9 of different models, and empirical dynamic models, and all this
10 different stuff was done, is because, the way that was done before,
11 they no longer considered that to be the best method moving
12 forward, and so they have a whole new paradigm, but, in short, the
13 way that it used to be done, and so it was done in a Stock Synthesis
14 model, which is made for age-structured animals.

16 Shrimp are not age-structured, per se, and they're almost always
17 age-one. but the way they did it is they essentially modeled each
18 month as a year, and then, as a result of that, they multiplied
19 the values by twelve to get annual estimates, and I think, after
20 looking at that, they decided that's probably not the right way,
21 and that was one of the many factors that contributed to doing
22 something different.

24 Anyway, that multiplication scheme is why the Alternative 1 values
25 are so different from Alternative 2, and so it isn't bearing on
26 what we're going to do here, but just so, if you look at it, and
27 you wonder why, that's the basis.

29 **DR. FREEMAN:** All right, and so we'll move to Action 4, and so
30 Action 4 looks at modifying the overfished threshold for the
31 penaeid shrimp. Here, with Alternative 2, again, it would be
32 revising for brown and white, based off the results of SEDAR 87.
33 For pink shrimp, there was no recommended workaround for that
34 species, and so the MSY would be undefined for that species.

36 Alternatives 3 and 4 are related to Alternative 2, in the sense
37 that MSST can be set below the MSY, but no lower than half of the
38 MSY, and so Alternative 3 is taking 0.9 multiplied by the MSY for
39 brown and white shrimp, and Alternative 4 is taking 0.8 multiplied
40 by the MSY for brown and white shrimp.

42 Those alternatives are in consideration in part because it allows
43 for environmentally-driven fluctuations in stock size, which would
44 be very reasonable given the life history of our penaeid shrimp,
45 and so Alternatives 3 and 4, as a result, reduce the likelihood
46 that the overfished threshold may be met for brown or white shrimp,
47 and so I will pause there and, again, see if there's any questions.

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Chairman.

2
3 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Mr. Schieble. Dr. Freeman, first,
4 thank you for this document only being twenty-seven pages.
5 Secondly, for the committee, are we looking to pick preferreds
6 here?

7
8 **DR. FREEMAN:** So that's a good question. This is just the sort of
9 first round of you all viewing this. I think it may be
10 advantageous, one, to wait until we have the additional action
11 related to adjusting that minimum threshold, and the other thing
12 is the -- While the SSC was able to provide recommendations related
13 to these values from SEDAR 87, the Shrimp AP has not had a chance.

14
15 This is the first preview of this document, and so the committee
16 and council may wish to wait until the Shrimp AP can weigh-in,
17 which, again, my hope is that, when we do bring it to the Shrimp
18 AP, at that point, we would also have that updated analysis from
19 NMFS, and so that, at the same time, they can weigh in on that
20 potential change to the minimum threshold number of permits.

21
22 This is simply having it in front of you all, making sure that,
23 what we do have presented, that there are no other suggestions, or
24 recommendations at this point, but selecting a preferred is not
25 necessarily needed just yet.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Froeschke.

28
29 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Just as a follow-up, I mean, if you do have feedback
30 on the range of alternatives, and is there something that you don't
31 see that you would like to see, or something that you see that you
32 don't want to see again, and that would be helpful.

33
34 Specific to this action, the minimum stock size threshold is a
35 little bit different with shrimp, as compared to what you're used
36 to seeing with finfish, and so, with finfish, typically you'll see
37 an MSY value, and then we have some value, some percent scale below
38 that, and say, in many of our reef fish, you can set it as low as
39 50 percent of that.

40
41 More recently, we've been doing 75, or something, and what that
42 does is it allows for some environmentally-driven variation in the
43 stock size that allows that to occur without triggering overfished
44 status, and rebuilding plans, but the idea is it doesn't -- You
45 know, after you get below a certain amount, then you probably have
46 a fishing problem as well, and so it tries to provide that.

47
48 With shrimp, being that it's an annual species, and we think that

1 most of the variance in population size is environmentally driven,
2 rather than fishing mortality, historically it's been set at MSY,
3 MSST, and what council staff tried to do here was to provide these
4 0.8 and 0.9 just for ideas. It does allow some of that
5 environmentally-driven variation.

6
7 We think that would be reasonable, without getting this too far
8 below MSY, and so those are kind of there, and, if that's not
9 something that you want, or if it's something you want in a little
10 bit different way, we're happy to entertain that, but I just wanted
11 to provide that context.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Froeschke, and so, just
14 for clarity, for my sake here, looking at Alternative 2 in Action
15 4, I have the February Standing SSC and Shrimp SSC meeting report
16 up in front of me here, and we received this at the April council
17 meeting, and the motion that came out of the SSC is essentially
18 the equivalent of what Alternative 2 is in the document, and is
19 that correct, Dr. Freeman?

20
21 **DR. FREEMAN:** That is correct, and there seemed to be -- When that
22 was presented to the council, there did seem to be some interest,
23 at the last council meeting, in exploring, again, a little bit of
24 a range. Our Shrimp AP chair was also available, and she weighed-
25 in on that, and made that suggestion as well, to consider a little
26 bit larger range of alternatives in this document.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Froeschke.

29
30 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, and, just as a reminder, the status
31 determination criteria, for example the MSST, that's a council
32 decision, and so it's certainly weighed-in on by the SSC and
33 things, but you all do have some flexibility, I presume, within
34 bounds on how to do that.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Yes, and that's understandable. I just want
37 everyone to understand that 2 was the -- Alternative 2 was the
38 direct motion that came from the SSC, and these are options that
39 go with that, just at least for clarity sake. Okay, Dr. Freeman.

40
41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so, in this case, we will -- If it suits
42 the committee, we will wait to bring this back until we have
43 additional information on that analysis from NMFS on the minimum
44 threshold number of permits, and, ideally, we'll have presented
45 that analysis, at a minimum, to the SSC, but, ideally, as well to
46 the Shrimp AP, and so, following that, we will bring this document
47 back for consideration with the committee.

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and so then we'll add an Action 5 to the
2 document after that, and is that correct?

3
4 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir. That's the plan.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Mr. Strelcheck.

7
8 **MR. STRELCHECK:** The council shared with us a request to,
9 obviously, evaluate the permit threshold. I believe you had
10 requested a mid-July deadline. We are having some internal
11 workgroup meetings over the course of the next few weeks, and I'll
12 need to coordinate with Carrie and team, if we're going to be able
13 to meet that deadline or not.

14
15 As we've been going through this, we were reviewing kind of the
16 rationale for the previous permit threshold, and it was hinging on
17 optimum yield, but also an effort threshold for sea turtles, which
18 no longer is part of our biological opinion.

19
20 It was superseded by the 2020 biological opinion, and so that's
21 out-of-date, in terms of a methodology and approach, and so this
22 may be a little bit more complicated, with regard to kind of
23 redetermining what the appropriate permit threshold is, but we
24 have some ideas, and we're exploring some options, and they can
25 bring that back to the council for consideration, and I'll talk to
26 Carrie about timing of when we can have that analysis.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Simmons.

29
30 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. That sounds
31 good. I think the reason we were shooting for July is we had
32 planned that Special SSC meeting, with the Special Shrimp folks
33 involved, because we were going to do the report-out from the
34 finfish bycatch working group, and then hopefully start this
35 discussion with the permit threshold, and so I think that was our
36 thoughts, but we can regroup if we need to change that timeline.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

39
40 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and, at minimum, if we don't have any sort
41 of analysis at that point, it would be at least good to maybe talk
42 about some of the methodologies, things that we could be
43 considering at that stage, and so we'll try to have as much
44 available as possible.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. That sounds really helpful. That would
47 be good. Dr. Freeman, do we have any more for this document? Dr.
48 Simmons.

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so just a
3 question, as we're, you know, planning and talking about stock
4 assessments, and the next time this information may be updated, I
5 guess, for the Science Center is, you know, this was a big
6 undertaking.

7
8 It was a research track, and I think it involved two analysts.
9 You guys did a lot of work to try to include some economic
10 indicators in there.

11
12 We also tried to look at environmental indicators when we looked
13 at this, and so I guess, just moving forward, what are you all
14 envisioning as far as how often this is going to be updated, and
15 how much resources are going to be involved in that? You don't
16 have to answer right now, but I do think we need to talk about
17 that at some point.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Walter.

20
21 **DR. WALTER:** I can briefly answer it. The primary thing that goes
22 into it is going to be the SEAMAP indices, and so it's relatively
23 straightforward, and quick to update, and I guess the question
24 would be how often does the council need to update any management
25 advice on this, and probably not that often here, and so unless -
26 - It's something that certainly we can update with the EDM process
27 quickly, and it doesn't require all the other variables to do, and
28 so we can probably update it faster than this council needs advice
29 on it, and so I think that we talk about that maybe in the SEDAR
30 Steering Committee, how often that advice changes may be desired.
31 Thanks.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Walter. Dr. Simmons.

34
35 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Okay. Thank you for that. Well, I
36 was hoping we wouldn't have to put this back on the SEDAR Steering
37 Committee request, but we can talk a little bit more about it
38 offline. I mean, I think about every five years is what we've
39 asked for historically, and so we can think about that some more.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Do we have any other further questions
42 or discussion regarding this draft document? Seeing none, Dr.
43 Freeman, that brings us to the end of the action guide, correct?

44
45 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir. It's been a while since this has happened,
46 but I'm pleased to say I think we may be concluding early for the
47 Shrimp Committee.

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Our minutes will not be sixty-seven pages.
2 All right. Well, Mr. Chair, that concludes the Shrimp Committee
3 report, and we have no other business scheduled, and so I'll turn
4 it back over to you.

5
6 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 1, 2026.)

7
8 - - -
9