

# Council Actions in Response to Motions from the Oct '23 Shrimp AP Meetings

**\*Reminder: Quorum was not reached  
for this Shrimp AP meeting.**



# AP Motion #1

**Motion:** At this time, based on the most recent NMFS cVMS testing, the Shrimp AP would request that the Tracker One and NEMO units not be included in the Early Adopter Program. If improved versions of those units are available at a later date, the Shrimp AP could consider them at that point. The Shrimp AP further requests NMFS widely distribute the results of the NMFS cVMS testing directly to federal shrimp permit holders.

**Status:** *No Council motions made.*



# AP Motion #2

**Motion:** To request BOEM continue to collaborate closely with NOAA NCCOS and the Gulf shrimp industry through the GOMW-2 process to avoid and minimize any adverse impacts of offshore wind energy development on the Gulf shrimp industry and associated ecosystem.

**Status:** *No Council motions made.*



# AP Motion #3

**Motion:** To request the Council and NMFS to consider the comments submitted by the Southern Shrimp Alliance regarding the Proposed Rule to designate critical habitat for the Green Sea Turtle, and to further request NMFS to carefully reevaluate any areas within the range of the North Atlantic DPS, and identified in the Proposed Rule as having a “Moderate” or “High” conservation value, for exclusion from designation as critical habitat because the benefits of such exclusion may outweigh the benefits of critical habitat designations for these areas.

**Status:** *No Council motions made.*



# AP Motion #4

**Motion:** To request the Council and NMFS consider the comments submitted by the Southern Shrimp Alliance regarding the Proposed Rule to designate critical habitat for the Rice's Whale, and to further request NMFS to revise the proposed inner boundary of the Critical Habitat Area from the 100m isobath to no less than the 120m isobath, and to revise the proposed outer boundary of the Critical Habitat Area from the 400m isobath to no greater than the 350m isobath particularly in those portions of the proposed critical habitat area to the west of the Core Habitat area.

**Status:** *No Council motions made.*



# Oct '23 Council Motion

**Motion:** To direct the Council to write a letter to Dr. Rubino requesting consideration and priority for the shrimp industry situation as part of the National Seafood Strategy Implementation plan.

*Motion carried with no opposition.*



# Jan '24 Council Motion

**Motion:** To support the Shrimp Futures Project.

*Motion carried with no opposition.*



# Reminder: Two of the AP Motions from March '23 Meeting

**These are two motions that the AP may want to recall when the draft framework action is discussed during this meeting.**

**Motion:** To inform the Council that the Shrimp AP opposes the implementation of a VMS requirement at this time.

**Motion:** If the Shrimp AP is unable to review the framework action again, prior to the Council selecting a preferred alternative, then the Shrimp AP recommends, based on current available information, to the Council, that it selects as its preferred alternative in Action 1, Alternative 1.

