Tab D

Shrimp Committee Report
October 28, 2026
Chris Schieble, Chair

The Committee adopted the agenda **(Tab D, No. 1)** with updates on the Shrimp Futures Program workshop and on Shrimp Amendment 19 under Other Business. The Committee approved the August 2026 meeting minutes **(Tab D, No. 2)**.

Draft Membership List for Review Panel for Shrimp Permit Pool (Tab D, No. 4)

Council staff reviewed the draft membership list and charge for a shrimp permit pool review panel. He noted that Shrimp Amendment 17B states that the review panel will consist of Shrimp Advisory Panel (AP) members, Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) members, NMFS staff, and Council staff. Southeast Regional Office (SERO) staff provided an update on the number of valid or renewable federal Gulf shrimp permits. As of October 16, 2026, there are 1,172 valid or renewable permits, which are 3 permits below the threshold to establish the review panel.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, to adopt the draft membership list.**

Draft Membership List

Chris Londrie	Shrimp AP
Justin Versaggi	Shrimp AP
Jim Nance	SSC
Andrew Ropicki	SSC
Frank Helies	NMFS Staff – Southeast Regional Office
Jessica Stephen	NMFS Staff – Southeast Regional Office
Matt Freeman	Council Staff

Motion carried unanimously.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, to adopt the draft charge of Shrimp Permit Pool Review Panel.**

Draft Charge of Shrimp Permit Pool Review Panel

As established in Shrimp Amendment 17B, the Shrimp Permit Pool Review Panel will review the details of a permit pool and other options. The Panel would determine if action was needed in response to permits reaching the Panel threshold of 1,175 valid or renewable federal Gulf shrimp permits and make recommendations to the Council. That action could be to establish criteria for issuance and maintenance of permits from the permit pool or to establish any other management measure. Any recommended action would be developed through the Council

process. Recommendations from the Review Panel will be presented to the Council at a future meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

Draft Shrimp Amendment 20 – Status Determination Criteria for the Penaeid Shrimp (Tab D, No. 5a)

Council staff reviewed the current Purpose statement and reviewed the motion from the Shrimp AP to reword the Purpose statement. During the Committee's discussion of the Shrimp AP's motion, NOAA General Counsel commented that stock status determination criteria only include the overfishing and overfished thresholds, so biological reference points should be included in the Purpose statement. NOAA GC also noted that the term 'new population metrics' is unclear.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, to revise the Purpose statement as follows:**

The purpose of this action is to adjust biological reference points and stock status determination criteria based on the recent stock assessment for the Gulf penaeid shrimp.

Motion carried unanimously.

Council staff then presented an IPT recommended change to the Need statement, which is inclusive of a Shrimp AP motion.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, to revise the Need statement as follows:**

The need for this action is to have biological reference points and status determination criteria for Gulf penaeid shrimp stocks based on the best available science.

Motion carried unanimously.

Council staff reviewed the alternatives in Action 1. He noted that the empirical dynamic modeling (EDM) approach produced MSY values for brown and white shrimp, but a proxy was needed for pink shrimp, since pink shrimp has a shorter time series of fishery-independent trawl data, so the EDM approach could not currently be used. He stated that the SSC considered average landings from a reference time series as a maximum sustainable yield (MSY) proxy for pink shrimp before recommending use of the third highest landings, based on the Carruthers et al. (2014) paper. He noted that the highest and second highest landings for pink shrimp occurred in 1964 and 1960, respectively, and that the third highest landings occurred in 1996. He reviewed the Shrimp AP's motion to use the highest landings for pink shrimp as the MSY proxy. A Committee member stated that landings from the 1960s do not reflect what is occurring in the shrimp industry now, and if landings were to increase, the Council could evaluate that as needed. Another Committee member stated that he supported the SSC's recommendation, which steered away from using the most extreme option of the highest landings. A Committee member stated that penaeid shrimp are an annual species, so he did not understand the issue of increasing the MSY proxy for pink shrimp. Ms. Bosarge (Shrimp AP Chair) requested that the SSC discuss

updates to penaeid shrimp landings and reconsider the MSY proxy recommended for pink shrimp. NOAA General Counsel stated that there are no automatic restrictions to shrimp harvest if the OFL were exceeded in a given year. Council staff stated that, if the Committee pursued the Shrimp AP's motion, the SSC would need to reconsider the MSY proxy for pink shrimp, potentially at its February 2027 meeting, so the amendment would be back on the agenda for the April 2027 Council meeting at the earliest. A few Committee members expressed concerns about delaying final action for this amendment by at least two Council meetings, given that recent pink shrimp landings are well below the MSY proxy in Alternative 2. Mr. Moncrief (SSC Chair) stated that the SSC, in its discussion of setting the MSY proxy, recognized that penaeid shrimp are an annual species and considered the impacts of setting the MSY proxy at the third highest landings, based on the state of the industry.

> The committee recommends, and I so **move, to request that the SSC revisit the Pink Shrimp MSY proxy recommendation as soon as possible**.
>
> *Motion carried with 2 opposed.*

Council staff then reviewed the alternatives in Action 2, noting that the values in Alternative 2 are overfishing limits, whereas the values in Alternative 1 are instantaneous fishing mortality rates at MSY. He stated that brown shrimp has two seasonal rates for harvest, as discussed in Appendix B prepared by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC), so having the overfished status determination criteria expressed in pounds was more appropriate. Expression in pounds also made more sense for annual monitoring, since a stock assessment would be required to determine if the rates had been exceeded. He reviewed the Shrimp AP's motion selecting Alternative 2 as the preferred, contingent upon sufficient clarification of the rationale for that alternative. He stated that SEFSC staff had assisted in further development of Action 2's discussion as well as the addition of Appendix B and thanked them for their assistance, as there was only 1 week between the Shrimp AP meeting and the October 2026 Council meeting.

NOAA General Counsel stated that the overfishing status determination criteria could be expressed as either a rate or in pounds. Ms. Bosarge commented that the Shrimp AP wanted the overfishing status determination criteria expressed as a rate, not in pounds, with the addition of a clearer discussion in the amendment. Dr. Walter (SEFSC) referenced Figure 1 in Appendix B and noted that the biomass rapidly changes for the small size class of brown shrimp in summer, in contrast to fall. Adding the summer and fall rates to obtain one annual rate was not an appropriate benchmark; having an overfishing limit (OFL) in pounds would be appropriate, as well as make annual monitoring straightforward. A Committee member noted that the Shrimp AP viewed both a rate and a poundage for the overfishing status determination criteria at its October 2026 meeting and that only the rate had been removed for the October 2026 Council meeting.

> The committee recommends, and I so **move, in Action 2, to make Alternative 2 the preferred**.
>
> **Alternative 2:** Revise the overfishing status determination criteria to include the OFL for the penaeid shrimp stocks equal to the MSY or MSY proxy resulting from the

SEDAR 87 stock assessments, following recommendations from the Council's SSC. The OFL values are as follows:

- Brown shrimp: 215,070,000 lb of tails
- White shrimp: 87,800,000 lb of tails
- Pink shrimp: 19,300,000 lb of tails

Motion carried unanimously.

Council staff then reviewed the alternatives in Action 3. He noted that a previous draft had included alternatives for setting the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) for brown shrimp and white shrimp at 0.8*B_{MSY} and at 0.9*B_{MSY}. The IPT had removed those alternatives and replaced it with the current Alternative 3, setting MSST for brown and white shrimp at 0.5*B_{MSY}, which is the minimum allowed by National Standard 1 Guidelines. He added that Alternative 3 would have the lowest probability of an overfished status and was recommended by the Shrimp AP. He stated that the corresponding pink shrimp values in pounds for MSST in Alternatives 2 and 3 were undefined. A Committee member stated that, for Alternatives 2 and 3, the formulas for pink shrimp's MSST could be defined, while the values could be left undefined.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, in Action 3, to make Alternative 3 the preferred as modified**.

Alternative 3: Revise the MSST for the penaeid shrimp stocks based on the results of the SEDAR 87 stock assessments and recommendations of the Council's SSC as follows:

- Brown shrimp: 0.50*B_{MSY} (202,695,000 lb of tails)
- White shrimp: 0.50*B_{MSY} (74,175,000 lb of tails)
- Pink shrimp: 0.50*B_{MSY} (undefined)

Motion carried unanimously.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, in Action 3, to modify Alternative 2 as follows:**

Alternative 2: Revise the MSST for the penaeid shrimp stocks based on the results of the SEDAR 87 stock assessments and recommendations of the Council's SSC as follows:

- Brown shrimp: B_{MSY} (405,390,000 lb of tails)
- White shrimp: B_{MSY} (148,350,000 lb of tails)
- Pink shrimp: B_{MSY} (undefined)

Motion carried unanimously.

Council staff then reviewed the alternatives in Action 4, noting that an ABC is required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. He reviewed the Shrimp AP's motion to select Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative.

The committee recommends, and I so **move, in Action 4, to make Alternative 2 the preferred**.

Alternative 2: Establish an ABC for each Gulf penaeid shrimp stock that is equal to the OFL for that stock.

Motion carried unanimously.

Council staff stated that the plan is to have the SSC reconsider the MSY proxy for pink shrimp, but not review all of Shrimp Amendment 20, at a future SSC meeting and then report back from the SSC at a future Council meeting. Dr. Walter stated that he would provide additional text to Council staff for the discussion of Action 4.

2024 Shrimp Effort in Relation to Threshold for Juvenile Red Snapper

Dr. Lowther (SEFSC) presented on the Gulf shrimp industry's effort in 2024 in relation to the threshold for juvenile red snapper (in statistical zones 10-21, 10-30 fathoms deep). He noted that the Gulf shrimp fishery effort is still well within the target reduction goal. A Committee member inquired, relative to this threshold, is that something that changes relative to assessments. Dr. Walter stated that it was updated about a decade ago, given mortality of juvenile red snapper, which reduced the impact of the shrimp industry.

Status Update on Working Group to Address Interactions and Bycatch of Protected Resources in Shrimp Trawls

Council staff provided a status update on the Working Group. The Working Group had been scheduled to meet December 1-2, 2026, but based on a motion from the Shrimp AP, the meeting has been rescheduled for January 11-12, 2027, to avoid a scheduling conflict with a NMFS Shrimp Futures Program meeting.

Remaining Items from Summary of the October 2026 Shrimp Advisory Panel Meeting

Council staff stated that all motions from the Shrimp AP had been discussed under previous Shrimp Committee agenda items.

Other Business

Update on Shrimp Futures Program Workshop (Tab D, No. 9a)

Dr. Walter (SEFSC) provided an update on the Shrimp Futures Program workshop scheduled for December 1-2, 2026, in Baton Rouge, LA, and he explained the anticipated outcomes of the workshop. The draft agenda for the workshop has been added to the Council's October 2026 meeting website as Tab D, No. 9a. He noted that the workshop is open to the public.

Update on Shrimp Amendment 19

Mr. Strelcheck (SERO) provided an update on Shrimp Amendment 19. The proposed rule was published, and the comment period has ended. The final rule is under review. While the

moratorium expired October 26, 2026, a federal Gulf shrimp permit is still required. In the meantime, the agency can renew existing permits, but permit transfers are on hold. New permits cannot be issued.

Madam Chair, this concludes my report.