



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 Committee Meeting

Waypoint Event Center, New Bedford, MA

September 14, 2016

This summary consists of final Committee motions only.

Georges Bank Yellowtail Flounder:

Motion #1: Quinn/Hughes

Scallop Committee recommends that the Council include in Groundfish FW56 alternatives to change the current Georges Bank Yellowtail AM triggers for the scallop fishery (currently 100% of sub-ACL & 100% of ACL, and 150% of scallop sub-ACL). The Committee recommends that the Council remove the scallop AM trigger when the fishery's estimated catch exceeds 150% of the sub-ACL, and keep the AM trigger when the scallop sub-ACL is exceeded AND the overall GB YT ACL is exceeded.

Rationale: The US Georges Bank Yellowtail Flounder ACL has not been utilized in recent years. Under the 150% trigger threshold, the scallop fishery may be subject to an AM even if the overall ACL is not exceeded.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (5-0-1)

Framework 28 - Specifications

Motion #2 – Hughes/Pappalardo

Committee directs the PDT to explore a potential run considering: 1 trip in CA II S, 2 trips in Nantucket Lightship (split between the north and the south, 1 in each area), 2 trips in the MAAA (Megatron) keeping Delmarva part of the area and using a F=0.1 in Delmarva. Elephant Trunk Closed Area would stay closed, the Closed Area II extension would stay closed.

Rationale: Multiple trips in the NLS as a single area would result in the majority of fishing in the northern portion, and may result in a situation where people would have allocated trips that they are not able to attain.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (6-0-0)

Motion #3 – Hughes/Quinn

The Committee directs the PDT to keep open area DAS at 30 days as the “anchor run” (1st run, top priority for analysis). The Committee suggests exploratory runs using an F=0.4, F=0.48, and Status Quo DAS (34.6 DAS).

Rationale – Given information about the lack of incoming recruitment and the biomass currently in access areas (potential for several AA trips), the Committee would like to see multiple runs for open areas. The Committee viewed this as a starting range, and noted that exploitable biomass estimates for FY2017 will be forthcoming.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (6-0-0)

Motion #4: Hughes/Quinn

The Committee recommends that RSA compensation fishing be prohibited in: 1) NGOM management area; 2) NLS North; 3) CA I; 4) CA II S (yellowtail concern).

The motion carried on a show of hands. (6-0-0)

Motion #5: Hughes/Quinn

The Committee tasks the PDT to evaluate how CAI carryover trip could be taken in FY2017 by evaluating AA where RSA compensation fishing is not prohibited or open bottom.

Motion to Amend #6: Griffin/Pappalardo

The Committee tasks the PDT to evaluate how CAI carryover trips could be taken in FY2017. In doing so the PDT would evaluate how to AA and Open area fishing would impact the specifications setting process.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (5-0-1)

Rationale: This would task the PDT to evaluate the mechanics (regulatory) of allowing CA I carryover trips to be taken in open bottom.

Main Motion as Amended #6: Griffin/Pappalardo

The Committee tasks the PDT to evaluate how CAI carryover trips could be taken in FY2017. In doing so the PDT would evaluate how to AA and Open area fishing would impact the specifications setting process.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (5-0-1)

Motion #7: Griffin/Hughes

The Scallop Committee tasks the PDT to analyze the range of quartile values at $F=0.2$ from $q.1$ to $q.25$ for the NGOM TAC in FW28.

Rationale: The ME DMR survey indicates that the biomass has increased in the NGOM area, and this approach expands the range of potential choices the Council will have when setting the NGOM TAC. The Committee discussed revisiting these numbers again before final action to potentially narrow the range of alternatives in the FW28.

The motion carried on a show of hands. (6-0-0)

Framework 28 Management Measures:

Motion #8: Pappalardo/Hughes

That the Committee supports 2.1.2 (in document #8), Fishery allocations based on spatial management. The Committee does not support the concept of a ceiling for the LAGC IFQ. Furthermore, The Committee recommends that the Council move Alternative 2.2 (Doc.8), Management Uncertainty for the LAGC IFQ component, to Considered but Rejected.

Rationale: All components would be allocated from projected landings to reflect the spatial management of the fishery. Applying a management uncertainty buffer to the ACL would not functionally limit LAGC IFQ allocations that would be based on projected landings under spatial management. The intent is to move the ceiling concept to “considered but rejected.”

The motion carries on a show of hands. (6-0-0)

Motion #9: Pappalardo/Hughes

The Committee supports the expansion of the CA I boundary for follow the Habitat Management Area boundary to the north (“Option 2” in document #8, Figure 10, p.18).

The motion carried on a show of hands. (5-0-1)

By consensus (#10) the Scallop Committee supports removing the small-dredge exemption areas as a groundfish priority for 2017.