

Amendment 21 & 2020 Priorities

**Scallop AP and Committee
September 18 & 19, 2019
Boston, MA**

Amendment 21 Timeline

2019	
JAN	NEFMC - review action plan and approve scoping document
FEB-APR	NOI for developing an EIS is published – Scoping period
JUN	NEFMC - Review Amendment 21 scoping comments; develop goals and objectives;
JULY-JAN	Scallop PDT, AP, Committee work to develop background information and alternatives regarding Northern Gulf of Maine, LAGC IFQ possession limits, and one way transfer of IFQ from LA w/ IFQ to IFQ only. Scallop PDT reviews scoping comments, discusses technical analyses to support A21.
2020	
JAN	NEFMC – Approve range of alternatives for Draft EIS
JAN-MAY	Impact Analyses
MAY	Staff completes draft DEIS submission
JUN	NEFMC - Review/approve Draft EIS for public hearings, select preferred alternatives
JUN-AUG	NMFS review of DEIS
AUG	Final submission of DEIS to NMFS
SEP	NMFS publishes DEIS
SEP-DEC	Public comment period and public hearings
2021	
JAN	Committee and AP meetings
JAN	NEFMC – Review public comments, select final preferred alternatives
TBD	Preliminary submission of amendment document including EIS
TBD	Final submission of amendment document including EIS
TBD	Implementation – Start of FY 2021?

Quickly
Approaching

PDT progress since June:

- Discussion on A2I at several recent PDT meetings, focus has been on develop NGOM options for the Committee to consider.
- See Document 4a.
- Recent survey results in NGOM (p.7)
- Fishery participation and activity (p.8)
- Review of data on multiple sailings per day (p.13)
- Need to keep developing options to have full range of alternatives ready for January vote.

Committee Tasking addressed in PDT Strawman

- Document 4a, pp 4-11.
- “Task PDT to develop alternatives that will hardwire future access for the LA fishery in NGOM based upon increased stock biomass levels.”
- “Task PDT to develop alternatives that will establish a NGOM RSA program.”
- “Task PDT to develop alternatives that will reliably monitor and report NGOM catch and bycatch.”

Considerations for developing options

- Under any approach that brings NGOM into ACL flowchart and annual allocations, need to consider the LAGC IFQ.
 - Not a “simple” split between the GC and LA.
- How to account for three permit categories in this management area? (PDT strawman is one way...others?)
 - LAGC NGOM (no individual allocations – area TAC)
 - LAGC IFQ (5.5% of APL, vessel level allocations)
 - LA (94.5% of APL, vessel level allocations)

NGOM allocation strawman:

The architecture of the strawman is intended to address Committee tasking:

- Support Research: Increase the Scallop RSA
- Fund monitoring in the NGOM (observers, EM?)
- Support directed General Category fishery
- Access for IFQ and LA at higher level of biomass
- Reflect existing management approaches
- Administratively efficient

Looking for feedback from the AP and Committee.

Mechanics of Strawman:

Basics:

1. Incorporate scallops in the NGOM into the OFL & ABC
2. Contribute to, and utilize, the observer set-aside to fund monitoring with pounds from the fishery
3. Establish a NGOM Set-Aside to support research, GC harvest in NGOM
4. Allocate to IFQ and LA at higher level of biomass, reflect existing management approaches

Looking for feedback from the AP and Committee.

Mechanics of Strawman:

Assumptions:

1. No change to the NGOM management area boundary.
2. LAGC trip limit in NGOM at 200 lbs per day.
3. LAGC IFQ vessels still use their IFQ when fishing in the area.

Looking for feedback from the AP and Committee.

Strawman: How would it work?

What are the steps?

1. Incorporate scallops in the NGOM into the OFL & ABC (Not an “allocation” – for accounting, AMs)
2. Council: Determine a NGOM set-aside “maximum” and fishing mortality rate (F) for the area.
3. Survey the area, run projections in SAMS model.
4. If exploitable biomass in **open areas** of NGOM is less than the set-aside maximum: Only GC fishing and RSA support.
5. If exploitable biomass in **open areas** of NGOM is more than the set-aside maximum: Allocate pounds over the maximum to IFQ and LA, add the IFQ share to General Category NGOM TAC.

Strawman: How would it work?

What are the steps?

6. LAGC IFQ allocation would be allocated as individual IFQ to all permit holders.
7. LAGC IFQ vessels could fish their “NGOM” pounds in that area, or choose to fish them somewhere else. (Same approach as in access areas)
8. The Council would determine how the LA could fish in the NGOM in the specs action/FW (AA trips, DAS exchange to fish other areas).

Strawman Example: 300,000 pounds

1. MAXIMUM value for NGOM set-aside at 500,000 lbs
 2. F rate for open area harvest in NGOM at $F=0.3$ results in a 300,000 pound harvest
- Projection is BELOW the maximum set-aside value:
 - Allocate 10% to RSA (add 30,000 lbs to RSA set-aside)
 - Allocate 270,000 lb. harvest to General Category in NGOM
 - NO allocation to IFQ
 - NO allocation to LA, NO LA fishing in the NGOM area

500,000 lbs and $F=0.3$ is for discussion purposes. PDT can plug in different numbers or approached to this framework.

Strawman Example: 1,000,000 pounds

1. MAXIMUM value for NGOM set-aside at 500,000 lbs
 2. F rate for open area harvest in NGOM at $F=0.3$ results in a 1,000,000 pound harvest
- Projection is ABOVE the maximum set-aside value:
 - First 500,000 goes to the NGOM set-aside
 - Allocate 10% of set-aside to RSA (add 50,000 lbs to RSA set-aside)
 - Allocate 450,000 lb. harvest to General Category in NGOM
 - Next 500,000 lbs is part of Annual Projected Landings (APL), and is ALLOCATED to the IFQ (5.5%) and LA (94.5%).
 - IFQ share would be 27,500 lbs, LA share 472,500 lbs.
 - Add the 27.5k to 450k to set GC allocation (477.5k lbs)
 - GC and LA allocation split would be around 50/50.

Strawman Example: 3,000,000 pounds

1. MAXIMUM value for NGOM set-aside at 500,000 lbs
 2. F rate for open area harvest in NGOM at $F=0.3$ results in a 3,000,000 pound harvest
- Projection is ABOVE the maximum set-aside value:
 - First 500,000 goes to the NGOM set-aside
 - Allocate 10% of set-aside to RSA (add 50,000 lbs to RSA set-aside)
 - Allocate 450,000 lb. harvest to General Category in NGOM
 - Next 2,500,000 lbs is part of Annual Projected Landings (APL), and is ALLOCATED to the IFQ (5.5%) and LA (94.5%).
 - IFQ share would be 137,500 lbs, LA share 2,362,500 lbs.
 - Add the 137.5k to 450k to set NGOM GC allocation (587.5k lbs)
 - GC and LA allocation split would be around 20/80.

Example: 3,000,000 pounds, 50/50 split

1. MAXIMUM value for NGOM set-aside at 500,000 lbs
 2. F rate for open area harvest in NGOM at $F=0.3$ results in a 3,000,000 pound harvest
 3. Split NGOM allocation above set-aside 50/50 between IFQ and LA
- Projection is ABOVE the maximum set-aside value:
 - First 500,000 goes to the NGOM set-aside
 - Allocate 10% of set-aside to RSA (add 50,000 lbs to RSA set-aside)
 - Allocate 450,000 lb. harvest to General Category in NGOM
 - Next 2,500,000 lbs is part of Annual Projected Landings (APL), and is ALLOCATED to the IFQ (50%) and LA (50%).
 - IFQ share would be 1.25 mil lbs, LA share 1.25 mil lbs.
 - Add the 1.25 mil. to 450k to set NGOM GC allocation (1.7 mil lbs)
 - GC and LA allocation split would be around 48/42.
 - Moving to a 50/50 split in the NGOM would change realized allocation split for the LAGC IFQ and LA across the entire fishery.
 - The IFQ share would be larger than 5.5%.

Allocation Strawman recap:

- First time reporting to the Committee since May tasking.
 - The PDT is looking for feedback today to keep A2I moving.
- Do you like the strawman concept? YES! NO 😡
 - Examples were for discussion – based on how the Council currently manages the scallop fishery. Need your input.
 - What would you change?
- Does the AP/Committee recommend addressing the Committee tasking in a different way? (Motions, Consensus)

Minimize current derby style fishery

Tasking	“Task PDT to develop alternatives that will minimize the current derby style fishery, including but not limited to one sailing per calendar day.”
Committee Rationale	“Current derby scenario creates opportunities for some, but not others. Looking to expand opportunities across the fishing year, particularly if the biomass is dispersed across the NGOM area.”

The PDT seeks clarification about the problem (or objective) and the range of alternatives that should be developed. Should the focus be on minimizing derby, or ways to expand opportunities across the fishing year?

- Concepts are related, but the objectives of may be different. Can the Committee refine the objectives or problem this is addressing?
- Recruitment event on Stellwagen suggests that portioning NGOM into multiple areas could be appropriate. (dispersed biomass in NGOM)

Limit Derby Style Fishery:

- See Document 4a. Page 13.
- PDT options:
 1. No Action
 2. Limit the number of landings per LAGC vessel per week in the Northern Gulf of Maine Management Area.
 3. Limit vessels to one sailing per day
 4. Partition NGOM TAC into multiple areas
- Other approaches?

Other Progress on Amendment 2I

- See Document 4a.
- Committee tasking was prescriptive on IFQ trip limits.
 - 800, 1000, 1200 pound options in all areas and AA only.
- Council and GARFO staff are preparing an explanation of how the one-way transfer of IFQ from LA to LAGC IFQ could work for the October or November AP/CTE meetings.
- Drafting A2I document – ready to share later this fall.

Document 2a, page 2

2020 Priorities
Initial Task List
9/05/2019

Number		Priority/Task Title	Status	Multi_Year	Le
Sea Scallops					
18		<u>Prepare a specifications package to set FY 2021 (2022 default) specifications (i.e. setting DAS, access area trips, Northern GOM TAC, limited access general category IFQ allocations, etc.).</u>			
19		Complete Amendment 21: NGOM management, LAGC trip limits, state waters fishing by LAGC vessels	Ongoing	Y	
20		Support action for access to Northern Edge HMA (see Habitat)		Y	
21		Review and implement recommendations from 2015 scallop survey review panel			
22		Modify RSA program as recommended by RSA Program Review (see below)			
23		Performance report for the LA component			
24		Evaluate rotational management program			
25		Evaluate options for harvesting slow growing scallops in Nantucket Light Ship-South Deep			
26		Develop limited access vessel DAS leasing pilot project suggested by East Coast Scallop Harvester's Association			
27		Adjustments to scallop industry funded observer program (IFO coverage vs. required SBRM coverage, etc.)			
28	Staff	NMFS and PDT have annual responsibilities related to estimating scallop, yellowtail, and windowpane catch during the year (i.e. LA AM exception, re-evaluation of YT sub-ACL based on updated information).	Ongoing		
29	Staff	Support annual scallop RSA process, including priority setting, and technical and management reviews.	Ongoing		

2020 Priorities

Anticipated Outcomes.

- Review document 2a.
- The AP and Committee may wish to recommend that additional priorities be added to the list for consideration later this year by the Council.
- NOT ranking items at this meeting, only recommending new items for the list.

2020 Priorities

- Priorities under other FMPs that would require work by Scallop PDT and/or Staff time to complete:
 - **GF:** Explore alternative ways to manage yellowtail flounder for the groundfish and scallop fisheries
 - **Habitat:** Initiate action to revise Habitat Management Areas on Northern Edge of Georges Bank
 - **Research:** Consider implementation of RSA Program review recommendations for the sea scallop, monkfish, and herring FMPs.
 - Form a group to address recommendations 2 and 3;
 - Form a group to design an overall strategic approach to scallop surveys and implementation and funding of the design;
 - Council, GARFO, and NEFSC evaluate and document RSA program administrative capacity

2020 Priorities

PDT Input:

- Anticipate a busy year working on Amendment 21 and specs.
- Combine the evaluation of rotational management and performance report for the LA component.
- Combine “Review and implement RSA recommendations” with the review of the 2015 survey review panel.
 - Can this be external work? RSA priority/award? Contractor?
- “Adjustments to Scallop IFO program” → consider referring to the Observer Policy Committee, and work on this at a later date.



Other Business