



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, Providence, RI

November 27th, 2018

The Scallop Advisory Panel met in Providence, RI on November 27th, 2018 to: (1) review Framework 30 alternatives and analyses, (2) identify final preferred alternative recommendations for Framework 30, and (3) discuss other business.

MEETING ATTENDANCE

James Gutowski (Advisory Panel Chair), Mike Bomster, Ronald Enoksen, Eric Hansen, Kirk Larson, Brady Lybarger, Michael Marchetti, Ed Mullis, Paul Parker, Kristan Porter, Tom Reilly, Bob Maxwell, Brent Fulcher, Jonathon Peros (PDT Chair), and Sam Asci (Council Staff).

Vincent Balzano, Chair of the Scallop Committee, was in attendance, along with approximately 10 members of the public.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION: (1) [Meeting Agenda](#), (1a) [Staff Presentation](#), (2) [Meeting Memo from Committee Chair, Mr. Vincent Balzano](#), (3) [Scallop Framework 30 \(draft\)](#)—(3a) [FW30 Decision Document](#), (3b) [FW30 Action Plan](#), (3c) [Draft Economic Impact Analyses](#), (4) [Memo from Scallop PDT to SSC re: OFL and ABC values for FY 2019 and FY 2020](#), (5) Recent Meeting Summaries –(a) [Scallop PDT meeting summaries \(Sept. 28, 2018 through November 16, 2018\)](#), (b) [October 23, 2018 Joint Scallop AP/PDT meeting summary](#), (c) [October 24, 2018 Scallop Committee meeting summary](#), (6) [Scallop PDT memo to Groundfish PDT re: Scallop fishery bycatch projections for FY2019](#), and (7) [Correspondence](#).

KEY OUTCOMES:

- The Scallop Advisory Panel provided the Scallop Committee with recommendations on final preferred alternatives for Scallop Framework 30.

The goal of this meeting was to review Framework 30 measures and to identify preferred alternative recommendations for the Scallop Committee. AP motions are provided here with a brief summary of discussion relevant to each motion. Meeting materials can be accessed through the Council's website using the links provided above.

To add additional options to FW30:

Motion 1: Lybarger/Mullis

Add a specifications alternative to FW30 in Section 4.3 that would allocate:

- Two sub-options: FT LA 24 DAS or 26 DAS
- 6 AA Trips with a trip limit of 18,000lbs
 - 1 in CA 1 (flex option)
 - 2 in NLS West
 - 3 in MAAA
- Corresponding IFQ quota

Rationale: The NLS-W has a high concentration of scallops. There could be safety issues, and it is a safer approach to take two this season. The 2018 open bottom fishery was 24 DAS, and this would have comparable DAS.

The motion carried 7-6 with the Chair breaking the tie.

Discussion points:

- AP members in support of Motion 1 found it worthwhile to include a six-trip option in the discussion of selecting a final preferred specifications alternative for FY2019. Many felt that 2 trips (instead of 3) to the NLS-West could improve safety in the area due to the majority of biomass in this area being tightly concentrated.
- AP members opposed to Motion 1 did not see the utility of limiting effort in the NLS-West due to this area being dominated by one exceptionally large year class that did not appear to grow between the 2017 and 2018 surveys. Some expressed concern that adding in new alternatives this late in the process could delay implementation of FY 2019 specifications.
- A member of the audience was strongly opposed to considering Motion 1 due to concerns that developing a new option could slow the implementation of FW30. They also suggested that reducing effort in the NLS-West in FY2019 would not optimize fishing opportunities there in FY2020 based on the lack of growth observed between the 2017 and 2018 surveys.

Selection of preferred alternatives:

Motion 2: Hansen/Enoksen

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.3, Alternative 4.3.3.1 as preferred. This alternative would allocate:

- 7 Access area trips (18,000 lb trip limit):
 - 1 Closed Area I FLEX
 - 3 Nantucket Lightship-West
 - 3 Mid-Atlantic Access Area
 - FT LA DAS: 26 (F=0.25)
- *2020 Default*: 1 trip to MAAA, 1 trip to NLS-West (18k lbs), 19.5 FT LA DAS

Rationale: Long term projections for all runs are similar, harvest animals when they are available to the fishery this is conservative relative to where the fishery has been historically.

The motion failed on a show of hands 4-8-0.

Discussion points:

- AP members in support of Motion 2 felt that it was consistent with the PDT recommendation from rotational access, and that fishing the open bottom at an F=0.25 would be lower than the anticipated open area F in FY 2018 at 24 DAS. Some AP members felt that the PDT recommended open area F of 0.23 was overcautious. Other AP members and a member of the audience in favor of Motion 2 supported the PDT recommendation, but felt that the additional two days would help minimize operating costs for vessels that choose to fish open area DAS on Georges Bank (ex: in the Southeast Parts).
- AP members opposed to Motion 2 felt the need to be more conservative to potentially improve fishing opportunities in the near future. Several AP members disagreed with the motion because they felt that captain/crews who run two or three boats will not be able to fish the seven access area trips during the time of year with the best meat yield.
- A member of the AP also felt that increasing harvest in FY2019 relative to expected harvest in the current fishing year would not necessarily increase overall revenue. They felt it unnecessary to increase the volume of landings as it may lead to a reduction in ex-vessel price.

Motion 3: Fulcher/Mullis

Recommend that the Committee adopt in AP Motion 1 preferred. This alternative would allocate:

- 26 DAS FT LA DAS
- 6 AA Trips with a trip limit of 18,000lbs
 - 1 in CA 1 (flex option)
 - 2 in NLS West
 - 3 in MAAA
- Corresponding IFQ quota
- PT vessels would receive 1 FLEX trip, 1 in the MAAA, and 1 in the NLS-W with 14,400 lb trip limit.
- 2020 Default: 1 trip to MAAA, 1 trip to NLS-West (18k lbs), 19.5 FT LA DAS

Rationale: The NLS-W has a high concentration of scallops. There could be safety issues, and it is a safer approach to take two this season. The 2018 open bottom fishery was 24 DAS, and this would have comparable DAS.

The motion carried on a show of hands 5-4-3.

Motion 4: Fulcher/Mullis:

Motion to reconsider the previous motion.

Rationale: Reconsider the preferred alternative for FW30 in order to try to come to a stronger consensus.

The motion carried on a show of hands: 10-1-0.

Discussion points:

- Members of the AP and public were both for and against Motion 3 for the same reasons outlined in discussion around Motion 1 (see above).
- Some members of the AP agreed that vessel safety was an important consideration due to the relatively small area in the NLS-West where most of the fishing could be expected to occur. Other members of the AP and public felt differently and provided examples from past rotational openings, such as the Asia Rip area of the Nantucket Lightship North, where the fleet had directed access area effort into a smaller area than what could be expected for the NLS-West in FY2019.
- The AP revisited past discussion re: potentially combining the NLS-West and NLS-South; however, the group ultimately agreed that not fishing the NLS-South in FY2019 would likely improve fishing opportunities in FY2020.
- Following the vote on Motion 3, the AP agreed that it was important to strengthen consensus around their preferred specifications recommendation to the Committee and moved to reconsider Motion 3 (see Motion 4).

Motion 5: Fulcher/Bomster:

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.3 Alternative 4.3.3.2 as preferred. This alternative would allocate:

- 7 Access area trips (18,000 lb trip limit)
 - 1 Closed Area I FLEX
 - 3 Nantucket Lightship-West
 - 3 Mid-Atlantic Access Area
 - FT LA DAS: 24 (F=0.23)
 - *2020 Default:* 1 trip to MAAA, 1 trip to NLS-West (18k lbs), 18 FT LA DAS

The motion carried on a show of hands: 10-1-0.

Discussion points:

- Following a brief break in the meeting, the AP recommended that the Committee adopt Alternative 3 Sub-Option 2 (Section 4.3) as the preferred specifications alternative for Framework 30 (see Motion 5). There was limited discussion around Motion 5; however, the AP generally expressed support for the PDT recommendation.

Motion 6: Hansen/Enoksen

The AP recommends that the Committee adopt in Section 4.1, Alternative 4.1.2, Updated OFL and ABC for FY 2019 and FY 2020, as the preferred alternative.

Rationale: utilizes the latest available science.

The motion carried on a show of hands 9-0-0.

There was not discussion around Motion 6.

Motion 7: Porter/Fulcher

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.2, Alternative 2 sub-Option 1 (4.2.2.1), Set NGOM TAC using exploitable biomass projections for 2019 and 2020, cap removals for all fishery components, and apply LA share of TAC toward RSA compensation fishing. NGOM TAC split: first 70,000 lbs to LAGC, then 50/50 split. Set the NGOM TAC at F=0.20 (2019 TAC at 205,000, 2020 TAC at 170,00) as the preferred alternative.

Rationale: Fishing the NGOM at F=0.2 is a conservative approach, most fishing will occur on Stellwagen Bank.

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

Discussion: It was clarified that RSA compensation fishing in the NGOM would be preferential to those research groups/vessels that participate in NGOM survey efforts.

Motion 8: Marchetti/Fulcher

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.4, Alternative 2 (4.4.2), total LAGC IFQ access area trips based on 5.5% of the total access area allocations, allocate trips proportionally to each area, and allocation Flex trips to Closed Area I, as the preferred alternative.

Rationale: Support the PDT recommendation. This option would offer more flexibility to the GC.

The motion carried on a show of hands (12-0-0).

There was not discussion around Motion 8.

Motion 9: Enoksen/Hansen

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.5, Alternative 2 (4.5.2), as the preferred alternative. (Prohibit RSA compensation fishing in CAI and limit RSA compensation fishing in the NGOM).

Rationale: Reduce RSA compensation fishing.

The motion carried on a show of hands 11-1-0.

Discussion: A member of the AP suggested that prohibiting compensation fishing in CAI is probably not necessary because the structure of RSA compensation is essentially a ‘flex trip’ (i.e. vessels have the ability to direct effort away from an area if it is not supporting compensation fishing).

Motion 10: Fulcher/Maxwell

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.6, Alternatives 4.6.1.2, Standardize default open-area DAS for the LA component and LAGC IFQ quota allocation at 75% of the preferred alternative for the previous Fishing Year allocation, as the preferred alternative;

and

Recommend that the Committee adopt in Section 4.6, Alternatives 4.6.2.2, Standardize LAGC IFQ access area allocations as 5.5% of the total expected access area harvest, as the preferred alternative.

The motion carried on a show of hands (12-0-0).

Discussion: It was clarified that the Council can elect to revisit the standard default measures (Section 4.6) at any time when developing specifications in the future.

Motion to Adjourn – Bomster and Hansen (without objection).

The meeting adjourned at 12:56pm.