

## Scallop Advisory Panel Chair Report

Mr. James Gutowski

January 26, 2022

### Updates and Overview of 2022 Work Plan

There were no questions or comments following the presentation by Council staff on general updates. Following the presentation on 2022 priorities, there was some clarifying discussion around the next LAGC IFQ program review. This review is required to occur every 5 to 7 years, and the Council elected to not start working on it in 2022, meaning it will likely get underway sometime in 2023.

There was some discussion around recent industry funded research by Coonamessett Farm Foundation focused on scallop transplanting, and the general interest of scallop industry members to put more focus into scallop enhancement techniques. In preparation for the next specifications cycle, the AP recommended that the Committee task the Scallop PDT to review the CFF report, and assess the utility of the NLS-Triangle as a closed area in 2023, and to examine the application of transplanting scallops in future Council actions (see Motion 1).

### Scoping for Leasing in the Limited Access Fishery

The AP spent the majority of the meeting discussing scoping for leasing in the limited access fishery, specifically on the scoping process and contents of the draft scoping document included in meeting materials. The discussion included comments from members of the public. Here is a summary of the AP's input:

- Scoping meetings in May and June would overlap with the busiest time of year for scallop fishermen which may make it difficult for them to attend scoping meetings. It was suggested that there should be two meetings in New Bedford held several weeks apart to help account for the busy time of year, understanding that the majority of vessels and fishermen operate out of New Bedford. There were several advisors that felt a scoping meeting in Gloucester would not be necessary because of how few limited access vessels operate north of Boston. Several advisors also suggested that a meeting in Rhode Island might be appropriate because many LA vessels have been operating out of Point Judith recently.
- There was some discussion on how scoping comments will be weighted. During the Amendment 21 scoping process, comments were summarized in terms of the number of individuals and how many times they commented. For example, if the same person commented at six meetings, this the scoping summary did not count this as six different people making the same comment. The AP felt it will be important to ensure that scoping results are not skewed from the same people making the same comments at several meetings.
- There were several comments that suggested scoping should be confined to a leasing program, and that permit stacking should not be part of the discussion.
- The AP identified several questions that they felt should be included in the scoping document that could help prompt comments, including:
  - How might a leasing program affect the scallop resource?
  - Should a leasing program have conservation benefits? What are the possible business and economic impacts? How might leasing effect your participation in the scallop fishery?

- Should leasing of DAS and access area allocations be allowed, or limited to one or the other?
- Should vessel power adjustments be considered when leasing days-at-sea?
- Should temporary and permanent leasing be allowed?
- Should caps be considered on the amount of days-at-sea and(or) access area allocations that a vessel can lease in?
- Should the existing 5% ownership cap apply to allocations that are leased in?
- If permanent leasing is allowed, how might displaced scallop vessels impact other fisheries?
- If leasing program is developed, how should permit identities (i.e., landing history, vessel characteristics, permit type, etc.) be maintained and tracked?
- How might a leasing program impact shoreside businesses?
- How might a leasing program impact captains and crew – for example, would captains and crew need to lay for lease costs to go fishing?
- How might a leasing program affect fleet capacity? How might a leasing program reduce carbon emissions?
- How might a leasing program affect the seasonality of fishing, and if so, how could that impact the scallop resource?

## Other Business

The AP discussed several topics under other business. The first topic was related to the LAGC IFQ possession limit when fishing in the NGOM. The maker of Motion 2 was interested in considering an increase of the IFQ trip limit when there is enough biomass in the NGOM to allocate NGOM APL to the limited access and LAGC IFQ components. After some clarifying discussion noting that this is something that the Council would consider anyways, the motion was withdrawn without objection.

An advisor asked for an accounting of the cost recovery fees that LAGC IFQ permit holders are required to pay at the end of the year. They asked for more details on how the cost recovery fees are used in administration of the LAGC IFQ fishery. GARFO staff noted that they could provide a detailed breakdown in the future, but that the majority of fees are used to support staff time and software needed to administer lease transactions.

The last topic discussed under other business related to the LAGC IFQ possession limit for in-shell scallops. An LAGC IFQ fisherman from the Cape noted that there is a niche market for live in-shell scallops. A member of the public who sent in correspondence on this topic stated that a problem they are facing is that the in-shell possession limit is lower than the meat weight equivalent. They suggested that action should be taken to simplify the conversion between meat pounds and live weight so that the amount of live scallops they are allowed to land is closer to the meat pound equivalent. GARFO staff explained the origin of the live weight to meat pound conversion factor, which was established by the Council through Framework 14 to the Scallop FMP.

No other business was discussed.