



New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116

John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph. D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

MEETING SUMMARY

Scallop Advisory Panel

Hilton Garden Inn, Boston, MA

November 29th, 2017

The Scallop Advisory Panel met in Boston, MA on November 29th, 2017 to: (1) review Framework 29 alternatives and preliminary analysis, (2) identify final preferred alternative recommendations for Framework 29, and (3) discuss other business.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Ronald Enoksen, James Gutowski (Advisory Panel Chair), Eric Hansen, Kirk Larson, Brady Lybarger, Michael Marchetti, Ed Mullis, Paul Parker, Kristan Porter, Tom Reilly, Charles Quinn, Paul Vifides, and Jonathon Peros (PDT Chair).

Vincent Balzano, Chair of the Scallop Committee, was in attendance, along with approximately 8 members of the public.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION: (1) [Staff Presentation](#), 1a) [Meeting Agenda](#), 1b) [Meeting Memo from Mr. Vincent Balzano, Scallop Committee Chair](#), (2) [Draft Framework 29](#)—(a) [FW29 Decision Document](#), (b) [Draft Framework 29 economic analysis](#), (3) [Scallop Framework 29 Action Plan](#), (4) [Memo from Scallop PDT to Scallop Committee re: Evaluation of Projected Flatfish Catch in Framework 29 \(November 22, 2017\)](#), 5) [Memo from Scallop PDT to SSC re: OFL and ABC values for 2018 and 2019 \(default\)](#), 6) Recent Meeting Summaries—(a) [October 25, 2017 Joint Scallop AP/PDT meeting summary](#), (b) [October 26, 2017 Scallop Committee meeting summary](#), (c) [November 9, 2017 Scallop PDT meeting summary](#), (7) [Council staff memo re Scallop fishery catch of CC/GOM yellowtail flounder](#), (8) [Scallop PDT memo to Groundfish PDT re: Scallop fishery bycatch projections for FY2018](#), (9) Correspondence, and (10) [Memo on Executive Committee recommendations for 2018 Priorities & Council rankings](#).

KEY OUTCOMES:

- The Scallop Advisory Panel provided the Scallop Committee with recommendations on final preferred alternatives for Scallop Framework 29.

The goal of this meeting was to review Framework 29 measures and supporting analysis, and to potentially identify preferred alternative recommendations for the Scallop Committee. AP motions are provided here with a brief summary of discussion relevant to each motion.

OFL and ABC Motions:

Motion 1- Parker/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt Alt. 4.1.2 as preferred for Alternative 4.1, Overfishing Limits and Acceptable Biological Catch.

Rationale: These values reflect estimates that use the most recent survey information (2017). These values are conservative, and account for slow growth in NLS and ET Flex.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was no discussion relative to Motion 1.

Northern Gulf of Maine Motions:

Motion 2 - Lybarger/Hansen

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt Alt. 4.2.2.2 as preferred. (Fish NGOM at $F=0.18$, FY 2018: 200,000 lb overall TAC, FY 2019: 135,000 lb overall TAC)

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was no discussion relative to Motion 2.

Motion 3 - Porter/Marchetti

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt Alt. 4.2.2.2.1b as preferred. (70k, then 50/50 split. LAGC TAC=135,00 lbs and LA TAC at 65,000 lbs).

The motion failed on a show of hands. (5/6/0)

Discussion: Several members of the AP did not support Motion 3 because they felt a 50/50 split would set an unwanted precedent for the Limited Access share of the TAC in future years. Additionally, some AP members and members of the public believed a 25/75 LAGC/LA split would be more appropriate. Members of the AP and public supported Motion 3, noting the 50/50 split as a short term solution that would allow for both components to fish the NGOM in FY2018.

Motion 4: Lybarger/Mullis

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt Alt. 4.2.2.2.2b as preferred for Northern Gulf of Maine TAC split. (LAGC TAC=121,250 lbs and LA TAC at 78,750 lbs in FY 2018)

Rationale: This would increase the LAGC TAC in the area. More comfortable with the 25/75 split in the short term.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (6/4/0)

Discussion: Several members of the AP supported Motion 4 because they believed a 25/75 split would set a more realistic expectation for the LA share of the NGOM TAC in the future.

Motion 5: Hansen/Larson

The AP recommends that the Committee recommend that the Council recommend limiting vessels fishing RSA compensation fishing in the NGOM to 1 declaration.

Rationale: Limiting trips by trip limits/pounds may be a deterrent for vessels to fish the NGOM.

The motion was withdrawn without objection.

By Consensus (#6), the AP supports the following process for awarding NGOM RSA:

1. Successful projects indicate interest in fishing NGOM RSA
2. Priority is given to projects doing research in NGOM
3. NMFS only allocate NGOM RSA pounds up to the LA TAC

Discussion: With regard to Motion 5 and consensus statement (#6), the AP and members of the public were in agreement that the LA share of the NGOM TAC (i.e. NGOM RSA compensation lbs) should act as ‘flex’ pounds; for example, LA vessels would be able to either fish NGOM RSA lbs exclusively from the NGOM, or, fish them exclusively from outside the NGOM.

Closed Area I Carryover Motion:

Motion 7: Mullis/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt Alt. 4.3.2 as preferred for CAI carryover.

Rationale: Follows the PDT recommendation, time to fish three pounds.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: Some AP members believed that the LAGC component should be allocated a 5% portion of any CAI carryover pounds that may be fished by the LA component in FY2018. Generally, the AP did not support this rationale because the LAGC component already received and fished the proportional allocation of these carryover pounds were, which were allocated in a previous action (i.e. not Framework 29).

Motions for Specifications Alternatives:

Motion 8: Hansen/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt 4.4.4.2 as preferred if both CAI and NLS-West are available. (6 trips at $F=0.295$)

Rationale: This option reduces area swept and bycatch. This open area F rate is below what the fishery has operated in recent years. This is the AP's first choice as an alternative if both NLS-W and CAI open.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was no discussion with regard to Motion 8.

Motion 9: Lybarger/Larson

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt 4.4.5.2 as preferred if only NLS-West is open. ($F=0.40$ with 31 DAS)

Rationale: Two days of steam time to go out to the east could help to get vessels to fish in the CAII-ext.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: One member of the AP believed that the open area F rate of Alternative 4.4.5.2 ($F=0.40$) and resulting days at sea was not in line with previous AP discussion, which emphasized the importance of being conservative with open area fishing during the absence of incoming recruitment. Several members were supportive but had concerns around the impact of landing 60 million lbs relative to market prices, crew shares, and the resource.

Motion 10: Hansen/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt 4.4.6 as preferred if only CAI opens.

Rationale: Prefer to have 2 AA trips in the MAAA vs. 3 trips.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: Alternative 4.4.6 did not include a run with an F of 0.40 because the Scallop Committee believed this scenario (where only CAI is available post-OHA2) was unlikely to occur.

Motion 11: Hansen/Lybarger

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt 4.4.2.2 as preferred for FW 29 specifications if there is no change through OHA2.

Rationale: This is only preferred if there are no changes made through OHA2. F=0.4 is lower than F rates fished in recent actions.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was not discussion relative to Motion 11.

Motions for LAGC IFQ Access Area Fishing:

Motion 12: Parker/Porter

The AP recommends that the Committee select 4.5.1.2 and 4.5.2.2 as preferred for LAGC IFQ AA allocations.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was no discussion around Motion 12.

Motion re: LA Part-Time Allocations and FY 2019 default measures:

Motion 13: Parker/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee recommend LA PT measures and FY 2019 default measures (4.4.8) as written in FW29.

Rationale: Follows the approach used in FW28.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was no discussion with regard to Motion 13.

Motions on measures to reduce fishery impact:

Motion 14: Hansen/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee select 4.6.2 as preferred for measures to reduce fishery impacts.

Rationale: Opening some access areas will alleviate issues of price on 2018 RSA comp trips. This adds flexibility to get more value for RSA pounds.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: GARFO staff noted that vessels could elect to fish 2017 RSA compensation pounds in access areas that may become available to the fishery in FY2018 pending OHA2 approval

before May 31st, 2018. In this scenario, vessels would have to be reissued another LOA following May 31st, 2018.

Motions on Flatfish Accountability Measures:

Motion 15: Lybarger/Mullis

The AP recommends that the Committee select 4.7.3.1 as preferred for Northern Windowpane AMs.

Rationale: This is sub-option 1 for Alt. 3. Gear modification for both large and small AM. Prefer GRA over area closure.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Motion 16: Hansen/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee select 4.8.3.1 as preferred for Georges Bank Yellowtail AMs.

Rationale: This is sub-option 1 for Alt. 3. Gear modification for both large and small AM. Prefer GRA over area closure.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Motion 17: Hansen/Marchetti

The AP recommends that the Committee select 4.9.2 as preferred for SNE YT flounder AMs.

Rationale: Gear modification for both large and small AM. Prefer GRA over area closure. Consistent with SNE MA windowpane approach.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: There was no discussion relative to Motions 15-17.

Motion 18: Hansen/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee not proactively apply the Northern Windowpane reactive AM.

Rationale: Uncertainty around stock assessment, NWP is zero possession for all fisheries, several measures in place that already reduce flatfish bycatch.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (11-0-0)

Discussion: Several members of the AP voiced support for the rationale of Motion 18. A member of the public was concerned that a proactive AM in Closed Area II Access Area from

November 16th – December 31st would displace effort into other times of the year when bycatch rates are also high.

Other Business:

Motion 19: Parker/Reilly

Consider the CAI carryover pounds as part of the APL. The consequence would be that the LAGC IFQ would get 5.5% of the LA Carryover as quota and proportional AA trips.

Rationale: There have been two different ways to calculate the LAGC quota. 5.5% of landings (A11, FW28), and 5.5% of ACL (A15). The LAGC is on track to land 2 million lbs this year of 50 million lbs of landings.

The motion failed on a show of hands. (2/6/2)

Motion 20: Parker/Reilly

The AP supports addressing the LAGC IFQ trip limit for 2018 Priorities.

Rationale: The AP made this recommendation after reviewing the Nov. 21, 2017 memo to the Council on 2018 priorities.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (8/0/3)

Discussion: Council staff cited recent discussion had by the Executive Committee (see Doc 10 for details) and asked the AP for input on preferred work priorities for 2018. The AP agreed that, since a short-term solution to NGOM management has been developed in FW29, addressing the LAGC IFQ trip limit in 2018 may provide the fishery with more impactful near term benefits compared to the NGOM.

Motion 21: Larson/Reilly

The AP supports addressing looking into how LA vessels with LAGC IFQ could lease their quota to LAGC IFQ only vessels in the 2018 LAGC IFQ trip limit priority.

Rationale: The lease would be one directional – only FT LA vessels could lease to GC IFQ. LA vessels would not be able lease LA quota or LAGC IFQ quota. The one way flow of leasing has the potential to help smaller operators.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (9/0/1)

Discussion: There was no discussion around Motion 21.

The meeting ended at 3:05 pm.