



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

Hilton Garden Inn – Boston, MA

June 7, 2016

This summary consists of final advisory panel motions only.

**MEETING ATTENDANCE:** Peter Hughes (Chairman); James Gutowski (Vice Chair); Scott Bailey, Ron Enoksen, James Fletcher, Eric Hansen, Kirk Larson, Michael Marchetti, Brady Lybarger, Robert Maxwell, Paul Parker, and Edward Welch. Deirdre Boelke and Jonathon Peros (NEFMC staff) and Mary Beth Tooley (Chair of the Committee)

AP members absent: Bob Keese, Gary Hatch, and Charles Quinn. In addition, approximately fifteen members of the public attended.

### **Scallop RSA**

#### **Motion 1: Hansen/Enoksen**

The AP requests that the Committee recommend that NMFS institute a cap for what indirect costs can be for all Scallop RSA projects (the cap should be 15-20%).

*Rationale: Since government funds are not involved in RSA grants, there should not be a limit on what can and cannot be required in terms of caps on indirect costs. The AP believes that a cap would help keep the playing field level for applicants.*

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

## **Motion 2: Fletcher/Maxwell**

The AP requests that the Committee request that the Council to write a letter to the Protected Resources Division at NOAA NMFS requesting a review of the health effects for the sea scallop population from the reduction of nematodes in turtles.

*Rationale: The AP is unclear what the impacts of parasitic worms are on both scallops and turtles and requests NMFS evaluate these potential impacts as well as whether there are measures to help prevent the spread of this parasite (e.g. vaccination). Finally, the AP is looking for advice on how to proceed with research on this topic, what do we know and what do we need to know.*

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

## **Consensus Statement 1:**

***Add reference of “marketability” and “food safety” to priority item #3, scallop meat quality research.***

## **Motion 3: Gutowski/Maxwell**

The AP recommends moving part of Priority 7) “(3) research to evaluate the potential impacts of scallop spat and seeding projects” from other to a MEDIUM priority. The second part of this sentence, “research to actively manage spat and seeding”, would remain in #7 under other priorities.

*Rationale: The AP is very supportive of research to increase scallop production and recommends it be higher on the list of priorities. The AP agreed that research to evaluate the potential impacts of seeding should be supported before full scale seeding projects, especially in light of recent disease and quality issues. Therefore, the AP recommends moving that aspect higher, and leaving direct seeding projects lower until more information is known about the potential negative impacts.*

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

#### **Motion 4: Lybarger/Maxwell**

The AP recommends forwarding to the Committee the PDTs recommended Scallop RSA priorities as modified today (Motion #3 and consensus statements).

*Rationale: The AP supports the modifications that have been made by the PDT, with two additions related to where seeding projects should be prioritized and some additional examples of research topics for scallop meat quality issues.*

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

#### **Motion 5: Fletcher/Bailey**

The AP recommends to the Committee that a summary of all RSA project proposals (funded and unfunded) with a summary of reviewer comments and rationale for funding decision be made available to the public.

*Rationale – The AP would like more transparency in the review process overall. Specifically, the AP recommends that applicants of unfunded projects should receive detailed reviewer comments to assist future proposals. In addition, it would help the priority setting process if the AP and public had a summary of all proposals, funded and unfunded, including a review of the comments and rationale for funding decisions.*

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

### **Draft Framework 28 Action Plan and Potential Management Measures**

#### **Consensus Statement 2:**

*No changes to the Draft Action Plan for Scallop Framework 28.*

#### **Consensus Statement 3:**

*The AP recommends the Committee expand Option A in the ACL flowchart document to include a 1% buffer for management uncertainty in the LAGC IFQ fishery.*

**Consensus Statement 4:**

*The AP supports the development of potential access in the northern part of CAI in Framework 28, and not modifying the other GB access areas at this time (e.g. CAInorth and NL west).*

**Motion 6: Hansen/Gutowski**

Recommend the Committee not consider a shorter apron and reduced hanging ratio as a gear modification to reduce impacts on small scallops, but instead consider making all AMs consistent in the Scallop FMP in this action instead (yellowtail and windowpane).

**Motion 7: Larsen/Enoksen**

Motion to split.

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

**Motion 8: Hansen/Gutowski**

The AP requests that the Committee recommend that the Council not consider a shorter apron and reduced hanging ratio as a gear modification in this Action to reduce impacts on small scallops because the data is not ready and other gear modifications are being tested.

*Rationale: The AP feels that additional data on gear modifications is needed before pursuing this priority further in an upcoming scallop action.*

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

**Motion 9: Hansen/Gutowski**

The AP recommends that the Committee recommend making all flatfish bycatch accountability measures consistent with the gear modification accountability measure for southern windowpane flounder in the Scallop FMP in this action.

*Rationale: The AP feels that consistency across accountability measures would simplify regulations. For example, yellowtail flounder accountability measures are time/area closures, which windowpane flounder accountability measures require a gear modification.*

The motion carried on a show of hands 9-1-0.

**Motion 10: Fletcher/Larsen**

The AP recommends to the Committee that the Council consider moving that the SNE/MA windowpane AM boundary be consistent the 39 N – southern port transit declaration line as part of FW28.

The motion failed on a show of hands 1-7-2.