



New England Fishery Management Council

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

E.F. "Terry" Stockwell III, *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

MEETING SUMMARY

Scallop Advisory Panel Meeting

Radisson – Warwick, RI

November 18, 2015

The Scallop Committee met on November 18, 2015 to identify final preferred alternatives for Amendment 19, Framework 27, and 2016 work priorities.

This meeting was held right before the December Council meeting so the summary is brief with final motions only.

AMENDMENT 15

Motion 1: Larson/Lybarger

Recommend Alternative 2.2 (implement a specifications process) as preferred for final action in Scallop Amendment 19.

Vote: 11:1:0, carries

Motion 2: Larson/Lybarger

Recommend Alternative 2.3 (change the start of the fishing year to April 1) as preferred for final action in Amendment 19.

Vote: 9:2:1, carries

FRAMEWORK 27

- Clarifications

By consensus, the AP supports the clarifying alternatives developed by the PDT for state water catch, lottery allocation options for LA FT and PT access area allocations, allocation options developed for LAGC IFQ trips in access areas, and additional measures to reduce impacts on small scallops.

Motion 3: Gutowski/Maxwell

Recommend default measures for FY2017 include the equivalent of one access area trip poundage in the Mid-Atlantic Access Area (MAAA) starting April 1, 2017 for LA vessels as well as the same default level of MAAA trips the LAGC fishery was allocated in Framework 26.

Vote: 12:0:0, carries

- Preferred Alternatives

Motion 4: Gutowski/Hansen

AP Recommends the Committee adopt Alternative 2.1.2, updated OFL and ABC, as a preferred alternative in Framework 27.

Vote: 11:0:1, carries

Motion 5: Hansen/Larson

AP recommends a new alternative be added to Framework 27 for specifications including the items below for FY2016:

1. 34.69 DAS for FT LA vessels (same as Alternative 3)
2. Creation of another closure south of the current CA2 access area with the intent the area stay closed for one year but would remain closed until a subsequent action is considered (same as Alternative 3)
3. No limited access AA effort would be allocated in CA2 south or NL north
4. Each FT LA vessel get 54,000 pounds in MAAA
5. AP does not support expansion of ETA closure; maintain current closure only

The AP recommends this be identified as the preferred alternative for section 2.2.1.

Vote: 11:0:0 carries

Motion 6: Gutowski/Larson

Overall the AP supports flexible access area allocations for LA PT vessels and does not support access in NL north for the limited access fishery. However, if NL north is open then a lottery should be set up for LA PT vessels as described in Option 3 on page 27 of Framework 27.

Vote: 10:0:2, carries

Motion 7: Parker/Maxwell

AP supports Access Area Allocation Option 2 for Section 2.2.3.1, the same method used in FW26 which is based on the proportion of total projected catch from access areas.

Vote: 9:0:3, carries

Motion 8: Parker/Keese

For the purposes of analysis, the AP recommends the Committee request the PDT look at the biological impact of allowing some level of access for general category allocation in NL north. Similar to Alternative 2.2.3.2.3 (Area Option 3), which would allocate 19% of the total LAGC gen cat fleetwide trips from NL north. The AP supports the potential use of higher observer coverage in NL to address concerns about highgrading; for example, a higher target level of observer coverage could be set for that area.

Vote: 4:7:1, fails

Motion 9: Gutowski/Larson

For Section 2.2.4, the AP recommends the preferred alternative be Alternative 3, RSA fishing allowed in any area open to the fishery, but prohibited in NL north whether that area is open to the fishery or not.

Vote: 11:0:1, carries

PRIORITIES

Motion 10: Hansen/Gutowski

AP recommends that the next scallop framework consider modifications of current reactive YT AMs to be more consistent with the AMs in place for windowpane.

Vote: 11:0:1, carries

Motion 11: Gutowski/Enoksen

AP recommends that a future scallop action consider potential modifications to the management buffers currently used in the Scallop FMP for both LA and LAGC fisheries.

Vote: 12:0:0, carries