

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF FW26 MEASURES AND INPUT FROM PDT, AP, AND COMMITTEE

Decision # (FW26 page #)	Description	PDT input since September Council Meeting	AP and Committee input on preferred alternatives
DECISIONS RELATED TO FISHERY SPECIFICATIONS – SECTION 2.1 AND 2.2			
SECTION 2.1 1. OFL and ABC Alt.1 - No Action Alt.2 – Updated OFL/ABC (pages 24-25)	No Action – Table 6 2015 OFL = 34,247 mt ABC = 29,693 mt Updated OFL/ABC – Table 8 2015 OFL = 38,061mt ABC = 31,459 mt		
SECTION 2.2.1 2. Specification Scenario (Alternatives 1-4) (pages 26-41)	FW26 considering 4 overall allocation alternatives. All have the same LAGC IFQ and set-asides. But LA specifications vary for each including the number of DAS and access area allocations For a comparison of alternatives: <u>Table 14 on page 41 of FW 26 alternatives document</u>	While finalizing alternatives PDT identified several issues that need to be clarified. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Default measures for FY2016 2. NGOM and incidental TACs 3. Transit provisions for closed area options <p><i>PDT Recommends Alternative 3 as preferred</i></p> <p><i>The PDT does not believe the trip limit should exceed 17,000 pounds per access area trip. The model output is the best information available for setting possession limits, but there are several issues that are not incorporated in the model. Overall the PDT would not oppose a lower possession limit, and lower total catch from the access areas (i.e. 15,000 pounds per trip and total allocation of 45,000 pounds) to recognize some of the uncertainties; however, the PDT did not recommend one. If ETA is not closed than the possession limit should be lower to protect small scallops in the access areas (i.e. 16,000 pounds as in reduced F option).</i></p> <p><i>The PDT is not supportive of adding access area allocations as default measures for 2016.</i></p>	Committee clarified three issues related to specifications at October meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Default measures – <u>Oct Motion 4</u> 2. Included NGOM and Incidental TACs – no motion 3. Approved transit rules – <u>Oct Motion #2</u> <p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>

<p>SECTION 2.2.2</p> <p>3. Allocation of LAGC IFQ trips in access areas</p> <p>(pages 42-43)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 4 options – Table 15 on page 43</p> <p>Option 1 – no trips (0%) Option 2 – 1,758 trips (5.5%) Option 3 – 3,333 trips (10.4%) Option 4 – 2,065 trips (6.5%)</p>	<p>Sept Council meeting motion passed to include an option up to 2 million pounds. PDT developed Option 4 as another potential option – same proportion of catch from access areas as overall fishery.</p>	<p>Cmte added option 4 – <u>Oct Motion #1</u></p> <p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i> <i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>
<p>SECTION 2.2.3</p> <p>4. Additional measures to reduce impacts on small scallops</p> <p>(page 43)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 options</p> <p>Option 1 – no crew limit in access areas Option 2 – same crew limit in access areas as open areas</p>	<p>PDT did not identify a preferred alternative, but recommended Option 2 be included to reduce impacts on small scallops from highgrading.</p>	<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i> <i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>
<p>SECTION 2.3</p> <p>5. Allocation method for Mid-Atlantic access area trips in 2015 only</p> <p>(pages 44-45)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 options –</p> <p>2.3.1 No Action – 2 trips for all vessels in ETA and 3rd trip by lottery (56% HC and 44% Delmarva)</p> <p>2.3.2 Flexible – “megatron” All 3 MA AA considered one area – a vessel could fish freely within all three access areas</p>	<p>PDT notes that the Cmte should clarify the possession limit for part-time vessels – PDT recommends Table 16.</p> <p>Committee requested the PDT explore if additional monitoring requirements are necessary/feasible? <i>PDT does not recommend any specific/new monitoring requirements for the flexible allocation alternative. NMFS will not be able to track catch by current access area if this is selected. Even if additions were considered to report catch by area per day through VMS for example, funding constraints currently prevent any changes to VMS that are not directly supporting enforcement.</i></p> <p><i>The PDT does not support flexible allocation unless the closure in ETA is adopted. The added flexibility is positive, but it comes with a cost and should not be adopted unless the inshore area of ETA is closed.</i></p>	<p>Cmte clarified ? – <u>Nov Motion #</u></p> <p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i> <i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>
<p>SECTION 2.4</p> <p>6. Adjustments to provisions related to allocating and monitoring AA trips</p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 alternatives</p> <p>2.4.1 – No Action 2.4.2 – Replace broken trip process with prelanding report</p>		<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i> <i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>

<p>(p.47-49)</p> <p>7. Requirement for vessels to cross demarcation line within last 60 days for carryover provision</p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 options for what a vessel would need to do to carryover unused AA catch</p> <p>2.4.2.1 Option 1 – Require vessels cross demark and submit preland in last 60 days of FY</p> <p>2.4.2.2 Option 2 – Carryover would be automatic, vessel would not need to break a trip and cross demark</p>		<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(Nov Motion #)</i></p>
<p>OTHER MEASURES – SECTION 2.5 – 2.9</p>			
<p>SECTION 2.5</p> <p>8. Measures to allow fishing in state waters after federal NGOM TAC is reached</p> <p>(p. 50-51)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 3 alternatives</p> <p>2.5.1 – No Action</p> <p>2.5.2 – Vessel with both federal NGOM and state permit can fish for scallops in state waters after federal NGOM TAC reached</p> <p>2.5.3 – Revise state water exemption program provisions to allow a state to request specific exemption related to fishing for scallops in state waters after federal NGOM TAC reached</p>	<p><i>Note that burden on state to apply for this exemption. State would need to clarify what federal permit types would potentially be exempt (i.e. NGOM, IFQ, Incidental, LA).</i></p>	<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(Nov Motion #)</i></p>
<p>SECTION 2.6</p> <p>9. Measures to make turtle regulations consistent</p> <p>(p.52 – 54)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 alternatives</p> <p>2.6.1 – No Action – turtle chain mat and TDD requirements do not overlap (Figure 11)</p> <p>2.6.2 – Revise season and boundaries to be consistent - May-November and west of 71W for both measures</p>		<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(Nov Motion #)</i></p>

<p>SECTION 2.7</p> <p>10. New AMs for northern WP and revise AMs for GB YT and SNE/MA YT</p> <p>(p. 55 – 65)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 11 alternatives</p> <p>2.7.1 – Northern WP 2.7.1.1 – No Action – No AMs 2.7.1.2 – Reactive AM 2.7.1.3 – Proactive AM (modify to max of 7 rows in apron) in all areas 2.7.1.4 – Proactive AM (eliminate number of rows provision all together)</p> <p>2.7.2 – Modify GB and SNE YT 2.7.2.1 – No Action – Current AMs remain in place – seasonal area closures by permit type 2.7.2.2 – Reactive AM for GB YT 2.7.2.3 – Proactive AM for GB YT (modify to max of 7 rows in apron) in all areas 2.7.2.4 – Proactive AM for GB YT (eliminate number of rows provision all together) 2.7.2.5 – Reactive AM for SNE/MA YT 2.7.2.6 – Proactive AM for SNE/MA YT (modify to max of 7 rows in apron) in all areas 2.7.2.7 – Proactive AM for SNE/MA YT (eliminate number of rows provision all together)</p>	<p><i>PDT has not been able to complete development and analysis of reactive AMs for northern WP (Alternative 2.7.1.2). Recommend this move to considered but rejected section of FW26.</i></p> <p><i>PDT has not been able to complete development and analysis of modified reactive AMs for GB or SNE/MA YT (Alternatives 2.7.2.2 and 2.7.2.5). Recommend these measures move to considered but rejected section of FW26.</i></p>	<p>Cmte clarified ? – <u>Nov Motion #</u></p> <p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>
---	--	---	---

<p>SECTION 2.8</p> <p>11. Allow LA vessel to declare out of fishery on return to homeport</p> <p>(p. 66 – 70)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 4 alternatives</p> <p>2.8.1 – No Action</p> <p>2.8.2 – Inshore transit corridor</p> <p>2.8.3 – DOF from everywhere with additional provisions</p> <p>2.8.4 – DOF from Cape May only with additional provisions</p>	<p><i>PDT developed a method to identify a potential DAS adjustment for both DOF alternatives. A worst case scenario as well as a realistic scenario was developed to inform what the adjustment could be.</i></p> <p><i>The PDT did not identify a final recommendation because it is very dependent on changes in fishing behavior; therefore, the AP may be better suited to identify the final adjustment value for each alternative.</i></p> <p><i>The PDT noted that since the adjustments may be a fraction of a DAS (i.e. 0.2 DAS), future allocations should be to the tenth decimal place, and not rounded to the nearest DAS.</i></p> <p><i>The PDT recommends that the adjustment be applied to part time vessels the same way total DAS are calculated; the adjustment would be 40% of FT adjustment.</i></p> <p><i>The PDT recommends the adjustment be applied for at least two years.</i></p>	<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>
<p>SECTION 2.9</p> <p>12. Modify flaring bar regulations for turtle deflector dredge requirement</p> <p>(p. 71)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 alternatives</p> <p>2.9.1 – No Action</p> <p>2.9.2 – Modify flaring bar provision to allow it to be attached in more than one place</p>		<p><i>AP Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred</i></p> <p><i>Cmte Recommends Alternative ??? as preferred(<u>Nov Motion #</u>)</i></p>



**New England Fishery Management Council
DRAFT Scallop Committee Meeting Motions**

November 14, 2014

Revere MA

Committee members in attendance:

DRAFT Scallop AP Meeting Motions– November 13, 2014

AP Members in Attendance: