



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*

Amendment 21 to the Scallop FMP Public Hearing Summary

Webinar
August 27th, 2020

Hearing Officer: Vincent Balzano, Scallop Committee Chair

Council Staff: Jonathon Peros (Scallop Plan Coordinator), Sam Asci

Attendance: 21 on the webinar

The meeting began at approximately 4:00 pm. Vincent Balzano, Chair of the Scallop Committee, welcomed members of the audience to the public hearing and provided opening comments about Amendment 21 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan (FMP). He explained that this was the third of four public hearings being held and is the public's opportunity to provide comments on the preliminary preferred alternatives selected by the Council prior to final action. Jonathon Peros and Sam Asci provided an overview Amendment 21 including details on the Council's preferred alternatives. Following an opportunity for questions on the presentation, Mr. Balzano opened the meeting for public comment.

Eric Hansen—New Bedford, MA; Scallop Advisor; Hansen Scallop Inc., F/V Endeavor, F/V Intrepid; Limited Access vessel owner: I'd just like to point out that global warming is a real thing and it is going to affect the scallop fishery. A 600,000-pound Northern Gulf of Maine trigger does not sound like much now when the Limited Access fishery is targeting 50 million pounds, but if the annual harvest were to go down to 20 million pounds, 600,000 pounds in the NGOM would make up 3% of that. That is a huge amount for vessels that did not qualify for Limited Access or LAGC IFQ permits. I'd like to speak against the Council's preferred alternative of a 600,000-pound trigger with a 75/25 split over the trigger and go back to the 200,000-pound trigger with a 95/5 split. I would support the Advisory Panel's recommendation of a 500,000-pound trigger with 95/5 split over the trigger, but I think the recommendation from the Committee was too generous with what is happening with global warming right now. With today's numbers it's not too bad, but global warming is real and there will be a shift in scallop distribution. The Limited Access fishery also has other problems its dealing with like gray meats, scallop disease, parasite issues, and we've also got offshore wind energy coming in on our fishing grounds. We will probably lose some access in the future as a result of these things, so a 20-million-pound allocation to the Limited Access fishery is not out of the question and it could even be less. If the species shifts into the colder waters of the Gulf of Maine, it is very possible that you'll have a fishery with a large chunk of the overall allocation that did not qualify and invest in it like the Limited Access fishery has.

Ben Martens—Maine Coast Fishermens Association; Scallop Advisor: We work with Maine's Northern Gulf of Maine scallop fleet. I'd like to support the Council's preferred alternatives throughout document. We think the preferred alternatives are a fair compromise—

the Council spent a lot of time and energy trying to find some middle ground that supported some shared growth within the industry in the NGOM. The one place I disagree with the Council preferred alternative is related to the NGOM gear restriction section of the Amendment. The scallop resource in the NGOM behaves differently compared to other offshore fishing grounds. The NGOM is made up of inshore fishing grounds that are smaller areas, and as such we support moving to Alternative 3 in Section 4.6, a combined dredge width maximum of 15.5 feet because this area is unique and we've seen that when too many scallops are taken too quickly from the NGOM at once, the resource doesn't bounce back. We want to be building something that can be sustaining for the long-term for the fleet in Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts so that everybody can take advantage of this opportunity.

Damian Parkington—Provincetown, MA; scallop fisherman; LAGC IFQ and LAGC NGOM vessel owner: I've been following the discussion about future management in the NGOM and it's obvious to me that harvest timing will be critical to both sustainability of the biomass and equitable allocation to the various communities that fish there. I support the recommended alternatives for Actions 1 through Action 4, specifically with accountability in mind, I think the Council should vote to include its rationale for NGOM management in Amendment 21 when the time comes to decide how the allocation split can be harvested, consider ways to minimize unintended mortalities. I strongly encourage this Council to take up Action 10 as I believe the recommended alternatives are a thoroughly thought through plan.

James Gutowski—Barnegat Light, NJ; Scallop AP Chair; LA and LAGC IFQ vessel owner: I am in support of five out of the six Council preferred alternatives related to the NGOM. I do not support the Council's preferred alternative for the NGOM allocation trigger and sharing arrangement. The Advisory Panel spent a lot of time going back and forth in serious negotiations on this, with both sides putting their best foot forward, and came up with a unanimous recommendation for a 500,000-pound trigger with 95/5 split which I think is a reasonable compromise. This is far above the historical average, almost triple recent catch levels, and more than 10 times the catch that was seen in this area when it was first established. These scallops are all considered one stock and I think they should be treated consistently throughout their range. With regard to the LAGC IFQ measures in Amendment 21—as far as the LAGC IFQ trip limit increase is concerned, years ago we had an inshore depletion workshop sponsored by the Council. The preferred alternative of an 800-pound trip limit for access areas only doesn't do a whole lot for inshore depletion and I cannot support it if it doesn't also include open area trips. I think if the trip limit is increased in only access areas that it will increase derby-style fishing in the General Category sector. I support the preferred alternative that would increase the amount of observer compensation that LAGC IFQ vessels can receive. I also support the one-way transfer of quota from Limited Access vessels with IFQ to LAGC IFQ-only—I think it would give the General Category some more pounds that they can use, and it will give Limited Access vessels more flexibility in being able to transfer it down. For Action 10, the Council didn't select a preferred and right now I am okay with that.

The public hearing was closed by the Committee Chair at 5:06 pm.

Scallop Amendment 21

Public Hearing

Webinar

Audience List

Date	August 27, 2020
Start time	4:00 PM
End time	5:06 PM
Number of participants	21

Scallop Committee Chair: Vincent Balzano

Council Staff (5): Jonathon Peros, Sam Asci, Tom Nies, Chris Kellogg, Janice Plante

Participants

	Name		Affiliation (if known)
1	Togue	Brawn	Downeast Dayboat
	Ronald	Enoksen	Eastern Fisheries, Limited Access vessel owner, Scallop Advisor
	Travis	Ford	GARFO
	Melanie	Griffin	NEFMC/MA DMF
	James	Gutowski	Limited Access and LAGC IFQ vessel owner, Scallop Advisory Panel Chair
	Eric	Hansen	Hanson Scallop Inc., Limited Access vessel owner, Scallop Advisor
	Shannah	Jaburek	GARFO
	Jim	Kendall	New Bedford Seafood Consulting
	George	Lapointe	Blue Harvest Fisheries
10	Amber	Lisi	Maine DMR
	Ben	Martens	Maine Coast Fishermen's Association
	Drew	Minkiewicz	Fisheries Survival Fund
	Scott	Olszewski	NEFMC
	Damian	Parkington	Scallop fisherman, LAGC IFQ and LAGC NGOM vessel owner
	Cheri	Patterson	NEFMC
	Daniel	Salerno	NEFMC
	Melissa	Smith	NEFMC/Maine DMR
	Stephanie	Sykes	Cape Cod Fishermen's Alliance
	Mary Beth	Tooley	O'Hara Fisheries
20	Alan	Tracy	NEFMC
	Kelly	Whitmore	MA DMF