



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 Meeting

September 23, 2020

Webinar Meeting

The Scallop Advisory Panel met via webinar on September 23, 2020 to: 1) review Amendment 21 including public hearing comments and recommend final preferred alternatives, 2) discuss 2020 fishery performance and review timelines for Framework 33, 3) discuss and recommend potential 2021 work priorities, and 4) discuss other business.

MEETING ATTENDANCE:

James Gutowski (AP Chair), Jonathon Peros (Plan Coordinator), Sam Asci (Council staff), Kirk Larson, Ron Enoksen, Bob Maxwell, Ed Mullis, Brent Fulcher, Kristan Porter, Ben Martens, Cassie Canastra, Chris Merl, Charlie Quinn, Paul Vafides, Paul Parker, Tom Coley, Mike Marchetti, Brady Lybarger, and Eric Hansen.

Vincent Balzano (Scallop Committee Chair) was in attendance on the webinar along with approximately 60 members of the public.

The meeting began at 8:31 AM. Advisory Panel Chair Jim Gutowski welcomed the AP and members of the audience to the webinar. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all Council related meetings have been transitioned to webinars including the Scallop AP and Committee meetings. Staff reviewed instructions for participating in the webinar and gave an overview of the goals and objectives for the day's meeting.

Key Outcomes:

- The AP made recommendations to the Committee on final preferred alternatives for Amendment 21.
- The AP recommended that harvesting uncaught FY2019 NLS-West allocations in the NLS-South in FY2021 be evaluated through Framework 33.
- The AP recommended that NMFS send a bulletin to all scallop permit holders reminding them of the regulations around interactions with fixed gear.

Amendment 21 Alternatives and Discussion

Council staff presented on the range of alternatives in A21 and provided a summary of comments received during the public comment period. Following some clarifying questions on the presentation, the AP discussed each action in Amendment 21 and made recommendations to the Committee on final preferred alternatives. The following sections describe motions and AP discussion for each action.

Action 1: NGOM Catch Limits

Motion 1: Lybarger/Fulcher

Move that the AP select in Action 1 – Northern Gulf of Maine Catch Limits, Alternative 2 (4.1.2), Account for the Northern Gulf of Maine as part of the ABC and ACL, as preferred.

Rationale: As the NGOM fishery matures and we are receiving regular surveys of the area, it is time to incorporate the area into the fishery completely.

The motion carried by unanimous consent.

There was not discussion on Motion 1.

Action 2 – Northern Gulf of Maine Allocations

Motion 2: Hansen/Mullis

Move that the AP select in Action 2 – Northern Gulf of Maine Allocations, Alternative 2 Option 3 (4.2.2.3), Create a NGOM set-aside with a NGOM set-aside trigger of 500,000 pounds, as preferred. Pounds above the trigger would be split 5% for the NGOM set-aside and 95% for the NGOM APL.

Rationale: This represents a compromise that the AP reached in June. The most important part is the 95/5 split. One of the foundations of any allocation decision is historic and recent landings. For instance, in setting the percentage allocated to the General Category scallop fishery the Council considered the 2.5% historic share of the fishery and the recent landings that were as high as 14%, and settled on 5% as a compromise between the historic and recent averages. Allowing a NGOM set aside of 500,000 pounds is more than 7 times the historical average of 70,000 pounds and is an increase from recent landings from the area. Since the set aside is not a hard cap, it allows for growth in the fishery if the biomass grows in the area. With the 95/5 split after 500,000 pounds, the LA fleet and the NGOM fleet will achieve parity at just over a million pounds of allocation, which represents a level of catch that has been documented in the area. Conversely, if the Council were to choose a 75/25 split, then the fleets would not achieve parity until 2 million pounds of catch, a level we have not seen in the NGOM area. To allocate higher than this level would violate the principals of the Magnuson Act by ignoring the history of the fishery and the capacity of the fleet. Climate change is real – and there has been a noticeable shift north in many species. If the total allocation goes down to 20 million pounds, this hard cap of 500k lbs is a good percentage of the overall allocation.

Motion to substitute: Martens/Porter

Move that the AP select in Action 2 – Northern Gulf of Maine Allocations, Alternative 2 Option 2 (4.2.2.2), Create a NGOM set-aside with a NGOM set-aside trigger of 600,000 pounds, as preferred. Pounds above the trigger would be split 25% to the NGOM set-aside and 75% for the NGOM APL up to 3 million pounds, then 5% for the NGOM set-aside and 95% for the NGOM APL.

Rationale: The Council’s preferred alternative, and the majority of public comment on Amendment 21 came back in support of this option. This option has been discussed at length at the Council. No new information has come forward that changes thinking on this.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)		No		
Cassie Canastra		No		
Tom Coley		No		
Ronnie Enoksen		No		
Brent Fulcher		No		
Kirk Larson		No		
Brady Lybarger		No		
Michael Marchetti		No		
Ben Martens	Yes			
Bob Maxwell		No		
Chris Merl		No		
Ed Mullis		No		
Paul Parker		No		
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn		No		
Paul Vafides		No		
TOTAL VOTE	2	14	0	0

Back to the Main Motion
Motion 2: Hansen/Mullis

Move that the AP select in Action 2 – Northern Gulf of Maine Allocations, Alternative 2 Option 3 (4.2.2.3), Create a NGOM set-aside with a NGOM set-aside trigger of 500,000 pounds, as preferred. Pounds above the trigger would be split 5% for the NGOM set-aside and 95% for the NGOM APL.

Rationale: This represents a compromise that the AP reached in June. The most important part is the 95/5 split. One of the foundations of any allocation decision is historic and recent landings. For instance, in setting the percentage allocated to the General Category scallop fishery the Council considered the 2.5% historic share of the fishery and the recent landings that were as high as 14%, and settled on 5% as a compromise between the historic and recent averages. Allowing a NGOM set aside of 500,000 pounds is more than 7 times the historical average of 70,000 pounds and is an increase from recent landings from the area. Since the set aside is not a hard cap, it allows for growth in the fishery if the biomass grows in the area. With the 95/5 split after 500,000 pounds, the LA fleet and the NGOM fleet will achieve parity at just over a million pounds of allocation, which represents a level of catch that has been documented in the area. Conversely, if the Council were to choose a 75/25 split, then the fleets would not achieve parity until 2 million pounds of catch, a level we have not seen in the NGOM area. To allocate higher than this level would violate the principals of the Magnuson Act by ignoring the history of the fishery and the capacity of the fleet. Climate change is real – and there has been a noticeable shift north in many species. If the total allocation goes down to 20 million pounds, this hard cap of 500k lbs is a good percentage of the overall allocation.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley	Yes			
Ronnie Enoksen	Yes			
Brent Fulcher	Yes			
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti	Yes			
Ben Martens		No		
Bob Maxwell	Yes			
Chris Merl	Yes			
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker	Yes			
Kristen Porter		No		
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides	Yes			
TOTAL VOTE	14	2	0	0

The AP deliberated Action 2 (NGOM allocations) at length through several motions. A motion was brought forward recommending Alternative 4.2.2.3 (500,000-pound trigger with 95/5 split, same recommendation made by the AP in June). A motion to substitute was then raised in support of the Council's preliminary preferred Alternative 4.2.2.2 (600,000-pound trigger with 75/25 split up to 3 million pounds then 95/5 split). Discussion for the higher trigger versus lower trigger followed the same theme as it has in the past and was very similar to comments received during the A21 public comment period. The majority of the AP supported a 500,000 pound trigger with 95/5 split because they felt it to be a good compromise and that access to the NGOM in the future would be more balanced compared to a higher trigger with a 75/25 split. The maker of the motion for 500,000 with 95/5 split said that the 95/5 split was the most important part of the motion. Several comments from AP members in the LAGC fishery noted that, in the face of declining biomass over the next several years, it's possible that the Council preferred allocation alternative could result in the NGOM Set-Aside being greater than the total allocation to the IFQ fleet. Concerns were raised about how important access to the NGOM could be for the LA fleet in the future if the scallop resource shifts north and as access to other fishing grounds is lost due to offshore wind development. Those in support of the motion to substitute cited the many comments received during the public comment period which were in favor of the Council's preliminary preferred. Ultimately, the motion to substitute failed and the main motion recommending the 500,000 pound trigger with 95/5 split passed by a roll call vote.

Action 3 – Monitoring Directed Scallop Fishing in the Northern Gulf of Maine

Motion 3: Mullis/Fulcher

Move that the AP select in Action 3 – Monitoring Directed Scallop Fishing in the Northern Gulf Of Maine (NGOM) Management Area, Alternative 2 (4.3.2), Monitor directed scallop fishing in the NGOM by expanding the Scallop Industry Funded Observer program, use a portion of the NGOM Allocation to off-set monitoring costs, as preferred.

Rationale: Scalloping is a high value fishery, which means one, you need to have observers to monitor activity, and two, the fishery can fund the monitors thru a set aside of quota.

The motion carried on unanimous consent.

There was no discussion on Action 3.

Action 4 – Support Scallop Research using Scallops from the Northern Gulf of Maine

Motion 4: Lybarger/Hansen

Move that the AP select in Action 4 – Support Scallop Research using Scallops from the Northern Gulf of Maine, Alternative 2 Option 4 (4.4.2.4) Allocate a portion of the NGOM Allocation to increase the overall Scallop RSA and support Scallop RSA compensation fishing, allocate 25,000 pounds of NGOM Allocation to increase the overall RSA to 1.275 million pounds, as preferred.

Rationale: Currently the NGOM is a significant beneficiary of RSA research (a 170,000 pounds of RSA scallops this year alone), but does not contribute any pounds into the RSA fund. The NGOM needs to have some skin in the game and 25,000 pounds covers the cost of a single survey in the area, which is the minimum amount of research anticipated in the area. The 25,000 lb fixed limit is frameworkable – could be adjusted to meet needs in the area. Percentages for RSA allocations do not work well.

The motion carried on unanimous consent.

Discussion clarified that the 25,000-pound contribution to the overall research set-aside could be adjusted by the Council in a future specifications or framework action.

Action 5 – Northern Gulf of Maine Fishing Season

Motion 5: Lybarger/Hansen

Move that the AP select in Action 5 – Northern Gulf of Maine Fishing Season, Alternative 1 (4.5.1) No Action, as preferred

Rationale: No additional restrictions are needed on the area at this time. This maintains the position of the Council and AP from their June motions.

The motion carried on unanimous consent.

There was no discussion on Motion 5.

Action 6 - Cumulative Maximum Dredge Width

Motion 6: Mullis/Hansen

Move that the AP select in Action 6 – Cumulative Maximum Dredge Width That Can Be Fished in The Northern Gulf of Maine Management Area, Alternative 1 (4.6.1) No Action, as preferred.

Rationale: There is no biological benefit to the resource in mandating smaller dredge sizes for the LA fleet in the NGOM. A mandate of this nature would not meet any of the Magnuson National Standards and is therefore unsupportable.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley	Yes			
Ronnie Enoksen	Yes			
Brent Fulcher	Yes			
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti	Yes			
Ben Martens		No		
Bob Maxwell	Yes			
Chris Merl	Yes			
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker	Yes			
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides	Yes			
TOTAL VOTE	15	1	0	0

For Action 6, all but one AP member was in support of the Council’s preliminary preferred alternative of No Action. They did not offer a different alternative, but did note that some comments made during the public comment period were concerned about concentrated effort on fishing grounds in the area with a larger dredge size.. Overall, the AP was in support of No Action noting that the NGOM is part of the federal fishery and that gear regulations should be consistent (see Motion 6).

Action 7 – Increase the LAGC IFQ Possession Limit

Motion 7: Hansen/Coley

Move that the AP select in Action 7 – Increase the LAGC IFQ Possession Limit, Alternative 1 (4.7.1), No Action, as preferred.

Rationale: Reinforces discussion from June 2020. We do not support an increase in the trip limit until more is done to increase enforcement of an individual vessel adhering to its quota. The vast majority of LAGC landings occur at small ports and offloading takes a matter of minutes. There are numerous reports of vessels under reporting their landings. An increase in the trip limit will only exacerbate this problem. Until there is an increase in dockside monitoring or a bag tag program or some other enforcement improvement, we cannot support an increase in the daily catch limit.

Motion to substitute Motion 7: Fulcher/Martens

Move that the AP select in Action 7 – Increase the LAGC IFQ Possession Limit, Alternative 2 Option 2 (4.7.2.2), Increase the LAGC IFQ possession limit to 800 pounds per trip for only access area trips, as preferred.

Rationale: Provides additional flexibility for the LAGC IFQ. Help offset increases in operating costs, while not requiring much additional time to catch the additional 200 pounds. Council’s preferred alternative.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)		No		
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley		No		
Ronnie Enoksen	Yes			
Brent Fulcher	Yes			
Kirk Larson		No		
Brady Lybarger		No		
Michael Marchetti		No		
Ben Martens	Yes			
Bob Maxwell	Yes			
Chris Merl		No		
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker	Yes			
Kristen Porter		No		
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides		No		
TOTAL VOTE	8	8	0	0

The motion failed for a lack of majority.

Back to the Main Motion 7: Hansen/Coley

Move that the AP select in Action 7 – Increase the LAGC IFQ Possession Limit, Alternative 1 (4.7.1), No Action, as preferred.

Rationale: This motions reinforces the earlier AP discussion from June 2020. We do not support an increase in the trip limit until more is done to increase enforcement of an individual vessel adhering to its quota. The vast majority of LAGC landings occur at small ports and offloading takes a matter of minutes. There are numerous reports of vessels under reporting their landings. An increase in the trip limit will only exacerbate this problem. Until there is an increase in dockside monitoring or a bag tag program or some other enforcement improvement, we cannot support an increase in the daily catch limit. Increasing the trip limit may lead to increases in vessel and crew sizes, and increase the derby in the fishery. A higher trip limit would mean fewer total access area trips, and increase the incentive to catch the entire trip limit on each trip. The crew will not make more money, would need to increase the crew size to cut the scallops.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra		No		
Tom Coley	Yes			
Ronnie Enoksen	Yes			
Brent Fulcher		No		
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti	Yes			
Ben Martens		No		
Bob Maxwell		No		
Chris Merl	Yes			
Ed Mullis		No		
Paul Parker		No		
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides	Yes			
TOTAL VOTE	10	6	0	0

The AP deliberated alternatives for increasing the LAGC IFQ possession limit through two motions: a motion recommending No Action, and a motion to substitute recommending the Council preliminary preferred option of increasing the trip limit to 800 pounds in access areas only. Those in support of the Council preferred felt it would add flexibility to the IFQ fishery and reduce operating costs for vessels that fish in access areas. Those in support of No Action expressed concerns around the impact it will have on the nature of the day boat fishery and how it could advantage larger boats. A point was made that management of the LAGC IFQ component should focus on biology and sustaining the resource, and less so on economic aspects. The motion to substitute was a split vote and failed by lack of majority—the underlying motion in support of No Action passed (see Motion 7).

Action 8 – Increase the Amount of Observer Compensation Available for LAGC IFQ vessels

Motion 8: Fulcher/Lybarger

Move that the AP select in Action 8 – Increase the Amount of Observer Compensation Available for LAGC IFQ vessels, Alternative 1 (4.8.1), No Action, as preferred.

Rationale: With no increase in the daily catch limit this provision is unwarranted. In addition, the regulations use to allow LAGC vessels extra compensation for trips over 24 hours. LAGC vessels routinely purposely used this loophole in the past and the Council appropriately closed the loophole. We should not reopen the loophole.

The motion carried by unanimous consent.

There was limited discussion around Action 8—The AP recommended No Action for increasing the amount of compensation that IFQ vessels can receive when carrying an observer on board because they recommended no increase for the IFQ possession limit (see Motion 8).

Action 9 – One-way Transfer of Quota from LA with IFQ to LAGC IFQ Only

Motion 9: Lybarger/Larson

Move that the AP select in Action 9 – One-Way Transfer of Quota from LA with IFQ to LAGC IFQ-Only, Alternative 2 Option 1 (4.9.2.1), Allow temporary transfers of quota from LA vessels with IFQ to LAGC IFQ-only with no change to LAGC IFQ quota accumulation caps (5% of APL), as preferred.

Rationale: This will give needed flexibility to the fishery and allow for training opportunities.

The motion carried by unanimous consent.

There was no discussion on Motion 9.

Action 10 – Specifications and Framework Adjustment Process

Motion 10: Mullis/Lybarger

Move that the AP select in Action 10 – Specifications and Framework Adjustment Process, Alternative 2, Expand the list of measures that can be addressed through specifications and/or framework adjustments, as preferred.

Rationale: More flexibility in the management process is a good thing. Opportunity to move forward in a more expedient manner.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley		No		
Ronnie Enoksen	Yes			
Brent Fulcher	Yes			
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti		No		
Ben Martens	Yes			
Bob Maxwell		No		
Chris Merl		No		
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker	Yes			
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides	Yes			
TOTAL VOTE	12	4	0	0

There was some clarifying discussion around Action 10 and a concern was raised that expanding the list of issues that can be addressed in specifications or framework actions could provide too much flexibility for issues that should really be handled through the amendment process. Staff explained that Alternative 2 would not expand the existing authority to make changes in a Framework or Specifications package, it would only provide a list of management concepts that were discussed during the development of Amendment 21. The AP recommended Alternative 2 for Action 10 by a roll call vote (see Motion 10).

Framework 33

Several AP members expressed gratitude for the Scallop RSA program and participating survey groups for adjusting survey coverage in light of the pandemic. There was some discussion around recent fishing reports and the outlook for FY2021. Some feedback and ideas that surfaced during this discussion were to:

- Delay the access area openings on Georges Bank to allow yield to improve.

- Consider how to structure access to high-density areas to reduce non-harvest mortality and optimize harvests.
- Yield from older scallops in deeper water of Georges Bank was lower than expected in 2020 (large shells and small meats in CAI and CAII).

Motion 11: Fulcher/Quinn

Move that the AP requests that the Committee recommend that the Council add “evaluate the harvest of uncaught 2019 NLS-West allocation in FY 2021 in NLS-S Access Area” as part of FW33 and work 2020 priorities.

Rationale: The science suggested that the NLS-West could support three trips in FY 2019. The biomass is not in NLS-West to support further harvest in the area. This will give everyone a chance to catch their 2019 allocations. Consider how the NLS-S is fished in 2021 if it is an access area – look at impacts of large number of vessels fishing a small area at the same time.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley	Yes			
Ronnie Enoksen (DNV)				
Brent Fulcher	Yes			
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti	Yes			
Ben Martens	Yes			
Bob Maxwell (DNV)				
Chris Merl	Yes			
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker	Yes			
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides	Yes			
TOTAL VOTE	14	0	0	0

The AP discussed correspondence submitted to the Council suggesting that uncaught FY2019 allocation in the NLS-West be moved to the NLS-South for harvest in FY2021. The AP supported this idea and recommended that it be added as a new 2020 priority and addressed through Framework 33 (see Motion 11). In general, the group felt it will be important to evaluate the best approaches to access scallops in small areas with high concentrations such as the NLS-West and NLS-South.

2021 Priorities

Motion 12: Fulcher/Mullis

Move that the Scallop AP recommends that the Scallop Committee recommends to the Council that access to the Northern Edge, including development of an access area program, be prioritized for the Habitat Committee for 2021.

Rationale: AP has requested access to the Northern Edge in the past. With lean fishing years ahead, looking to access scallops that are likely to die of natural mortality if the area remains closed.

The motion carried by unanimous consent.

Motion 13: Fulcher/Enoksen

Move that the Scallop AP recommend the following priorities, ranked in order of importance and in addition to the standing Staff/PDT requirements & ongoing work, to the Scallop Committee for 2021:

1. Prepare a specifications package to set FY 2022 (2023 Default) specifications (i.e. setting DAS, access area trips, Northern GOM TAC, limited access general category IFQ allocations, etc.)
2. Complete ongoing actions (Amendment 21 & Framework 33)
3. Develop an amendment to address limited access vessel DAS and access area trip leasing suggested by the Scallopers Campaign.

Rationale: This would add one new work priority for 2021, the other priorities are ongoing and part of general workload. The request is to develop an amendment to consider developing LA DAS and AA leasing pilot program.

Motion to substitute 13: Hansen/Mullis

Move that the Scallop AP recommend the following priorities, ranked in order of importance and in addition to the standing Staff/PDT requirements & ongoing work, to the Scallop Committee for 2021:

1. Prepare a specifications package to set FY 2022 (2023 Default) specifications (i.e. setting DAS, access area trips, Northern GOM TAC, limited access general category IFQ allocations, etc.)
2. Complete ongoing actions (Amendment 21 & Framework 33)
3. Develop a LA AA program for access to the Northern Edge.
4. Conduct outreach to assess perspectives on LA DAS and AA leasing.

Rationale: The AP just requested additional work with evaluating Options for harvest of the NLS-West in the NLS-South area, this will take place in 2020 and 2021. The intent is to match workload with available time in 2021. Open to having a discussion about the LA DAS and AA leasing.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley	Yes			
Ronnie Enoksen		No		
Brent Fulcher		No		
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti	Yes			
Ben Martens	Yes			
Bob Maxwell (DNV)				
Chris Merl	Yes			
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker (DNV)				
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn		No		
Paul Vafides		No		
TOTAL VOTE	10	4	0	0

Main motion as substituted (13): Hansen/Mullis

Move that the Scallop AP recommend the following priorities, ranked in order of importance and in addition to the standing Staff/PDT requirements & ongoing work, to the Scallop Committee for 2021:

1. Prepare a specifications package to set FY 2022 (2023 Default) specifications (i.e. setting DAS, access area trips, Northern GOM TAC, limited access general category IFQ allocations, etc.)
2. Complete ongoing actions (Amendment 21 & Framework 33)
3. Develop a LA AA program for access to the Northern Edge.
4. Conduct outreach to assess perspectives on LA DAS and AA leasing.

Rationale: The AP just requested additional work with evaluating Options for harvest of the NLS-West in the NLS-South area, this will take place in 2020 and 2021. The intent is to match workload with available time in 2021. Open to discussing the LA DAS and AA leasing.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse
Scallop AP				
James Gutowski (Chair)				
Eric Hansen (VC)	Yes			
Cassie Canastra	Yes			
Tom Coley	Yes			
Ronnie Enoksen		No		
Brent Fulcher	Yes			
Kirk Larson	Yes			
Brady Lybarger	Yes			
Michael Marchetti	Yes			
Ben Martens	Yes			
Bob Maxwell				
Chris Merl	Yes			
Ed Mullis	Yes			
Paul Parker				
Kristen Porter	Yes			
Charlie Quinn	Yes			
Paul Vafides	Yes			
TOTAL VOTE	13	1	0	0

There was a lengthy discussion on 2021 priorities that included three motions. The first motion, Motion 12, recommended that the Council prioritize scallop fishery access to the Northern Edge—the AP acknowledged that this process would start with the Habitat Committee. Motion 12 passed by unanimous consent.

The second motion focused on other items: 1) preparing a specifications package for FY2022, 2) completing on-going actions (i.e. A21 and FW33), and 3) developing an amendment to address limited access vessel DAS and access area trip leasing. The AP and members of the public focused their comments on developing an amendment to address limited access vessel DAS and

access area trip leasing. Those in favor felt that developing a leasing program could increase operational flexibility in the LA fishery. Those opposing to initiating an amendment to develop a leasing program felt that consolidation could have negative downstream impacts to fishermen and shoreside operations, and potentially open doors for outside interests to buy up the fishery from underneath the fishermen. Some suggested that there are other priorities that need more attention at this time.

Several people on both sides of the argument acknowledged that the discussion around leasing should occur, but many were hesitant to begin those discussions as part of a formal amendment process because they felt it would be difficult to drop the subject once the amendment gets underway. The AP found a compromise through a substitute motion, recommending that the Council conduct outreach to assess perspectives on a LA leasing program as opposed to initiating a full amendment. The substitute motion passed on a roll call vote and passed as the main motion (see Motion 13) with the following priorities in rank order:

1. Prepare a specifications package to set FY 2022 (2023 Default) specifications (i.e. setting DAS, access area trips, Northern GOM TAC, limited access general category IFQ allocations, etc.)
2. Complete ongoing actions (Amendment 21 & Framework 33)
3. Develop a LA AA program for access to the Northern Edge.
4. Conduct outreach to assess perspectives on LA DAS and AA leasing.

Other Business

Consensus Statement:

Recommend that the Committee recommends that that Council send a letter to NMFS requesting that a bulletin be sent to permit holders advising of fixed gear in the area of Lobster Area 4 and reminding vessels to avoid fixed gear.

Under other business, Vincent Damm, a lobster and fixed gear fisherman from Montauk, NY provided correspondence to the AP detailing substantial gear loss over the last two years. He joined the call, and explained the gear loss issues he has been having to the AP. The AP reviewed the map Mr. Damm shared, and acknowledged that the area was on the western side of the Block Channel and is regularly fished by scallopers. The AP discussed fishing practices in the area that Mr. Damm identified, and passed a consensus statement requesting that a bulletin be sent to permit holders advising of fixed gear in the Lobster Area 4 and reminding vessels to avoid fixed gear.

No other business was discussed. The meeting adjourned at 4:03 PM.