



## New England Fishery Management Council

50 WATER STREET | NEWBURYPORT, MASSACHUSETTS 01950 | PHONE 978 465 0492 | FAX 978 465 3116  
John F. Quinn, J.D., Ph.D., *Chairman* | Thomas A. Nies, *Executive Director*

### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 13, 2019  
**TO:** Scallop Committee and Advisory Panel  
**FROM:** Vincent Balzano, Scallop Committee Chair  
**SUBJECT:** **Purpose for Scallop Committee meetings on November 19 & 20, 2019**

There is a Scallop AP meeting at the Hilton in Providence, RI on Tuesday, Nov. 19, 2019 at 8:30 AM. The Scallop Committee will convene on Wednesday Nov. 20, 2019 at 8:30am that same location. Paper copies will not be mailed to you before the meeting. Documents for this meeting will be e-mailed to you as they become available.

**Purpose:** The main goals of the AP and Committee meeting are to:

- 1) Review Framework 32 alternatives and analyses.
- 2) Review PDT progress on tasking from the October Committee meeting.
- 3) Identify final preferred alternatives recommendations for Framework 32.
- 4) Other Business.

The AP and Committee will NOT meet again before the Council takes final action on Framework 32. The full Council is scheduled to take final action on Framework 32 at the December Council meeting in Newport, RI. The Scallop Report will be in the morning on December 5, 2018.

**Meeting Materials:** Paper copies of the documents listed below will be provided at the meeting. A PDF of each document will be posted to [www.nefmc.org](http://www.nefmc.org). Staff will provide copies of any additional meeting materials that are not included in this package. If you have any questions about the documents, please contact Jonathon Peros ([jperos@nefmc.org](mailto:jperos@nefmc.org); 978-465-0492 ext. 117).

#### Documents:

1. Meeting Agenda
  - a. Staff presentation (*to be provided*)
2. Meeting Memo from Committee Chair, Mr. Vincent Balzano
3. Scallop Framework 32 (draft)
  - a. Framework 32 Decision Document
  - b. Draft Economic impact analyses
  - c. FW32 Specifications options with preliminary impact tables (Econ. & Bio)
  - d. NGOM TAC options for FW32
  - e. Trip trading considerations
4. Memo from Scallop PDT to SSC re: OFL and ABC values for FY 2020 and FY 2021
5. Recent Meeting Summaries:
  - a. Scallop PDT meeting summaries (Sept. 2019 through November 2019)

- b. October 23, 2019 Joint Scallop AP/PDT meeting summary
- c. October 24, 2019 Scallop Committee meeting summary
- 6. Scallop PDT memo to Groundfish PDT re Scallop fishery bycatch projections for FY2020
- 7. Correspondence

**Additional materials may be added, and presentations will be shared as they become available.**

### **Framework 32 Specifications and Management Measures**

**Recent Activity:** The Scallop PDT has by webinar several times since the October AP and Committee meetings review to: 1) SAMS model results from Committee tasking; 2) bycatch projections for FY 2020; 3) NGOM TAC estimates for 2020/2021; 4) other issues relevant to this action. The PDT has developed several recommendations for the AP and Committee to consider.

**Next Steps:** Council staff will present information on the range of alternatives under consideration in Framework 32. The AP and Committee will have the opportunity to select preferred alternatives at this meeting. This is the final opportunity for both groups to weigh in on FW32 development before the Council takes final action on December 5, 2019 in Newport, RI. Council staff recommends that the AP and Committee work through Framework 32 decisions in the order specified in Anticipated Outcomes (below). This list is intended to help guide discussion and does not preclude either group from developing additional recommendations.

**Anticipated Outcomes: *Please Review Document 3a – FW32 Decision Document***

1. Prior to selecting preferred alternatives, the AP and Committee will receive a presentation on specification alternatives, including information on flatfish bycatch. In October, the Committee signaled that it would review bycatch estimates associated with spatial management alternatives and then determine next steps for mitigating impacts. Since some spatial measures are expected to reduce flatfish bycatch in the Georges Bank stock area, the AP and Committee should plan to discuss if additional measures are needed after identifying a preferred alternative in Section 4.3.
2. Select *preferred alternative* for FY 2020 and FY 2021 OFL and ABC (Section 4.1)
3. Select *preferred alternatives* for Northern Gulf of Maine Management Measures (Section 4.2)
  - a. Select a *preferred alternative* for closure of Stellwagen Bank to protect small scallops.
  - b. Select a *preferred alternative* for 2020/2021 NGOM TAC.
4. Select a *preferred specifications alternative* for FY 2020 and FY 2021 specifications (4.3)
  - a. Modify alternatives, as necessary. For example, the PDT discussed seasonal closures of open bottom areas on Eastern Georges Bank. Confirm the re-opening of the NLS-Hatchet area.
  - b. Select a *preferred specifications alternative* for FY 2020 and FY 2021 specifications.
  - c. Determine if additional measures are recommended to mitigate impacts on GB YT flounder. If so, consider a motion or consensus statement.
  - d. Provide input on *preferred approach* to trip trading (motion or consensus).
5. Select a *preferred alternative* for allocating LAGC IFQ access area trips.
6. Select a *preferred alternative* for additional measures to reduce fishery impacts.
  - a. Select a *preferred alternative* for RSA compensation fishing.
  - b. If necessary, select a *preferred alternative* for measures to mitigate impacts on GB YT.
7. Consider moving measures to considered and rejected.

## Other Business

**Anticipated Outcomes:** Additional items and issues may be taken up under other business.

Please review all documents before the meeting.

If you have any questions about these enclosures please contact Jonathon Peros (978-465-0492 ext. 117).

### Summary of Allocations Associated with Each Specification Alternative in FW32

**Table 1 - Summary of Allocations Associated with Each Specification Alternative in FW32**

Alternative In FW32	Description	Overall F rate	FT DAS	Open area F	Annual Projected Landings (APL)	APL w/ set-asides removed	LA Share (94.5%)	LAGC IFQ Share (5.5%)
4.3.1	No Action	0.061	18	0.24	27,593,057	25,292,158	23,901,089	1,391,069
4.3.2.1	CAII ext Open 20 DAS	0.18	20	0.24	48,633,975	46,333,076	43,784,757	2,548,319
4.3.2.2	CAII ext Open 22 DAS	0.183	22	0.27	50,353,581	48,052,682	45,409,784	2,642,897
4.3.2.3	CAII ext Open 24 DAS	0.189	24	0.3	52,046,731	49,745,832	47,009,811	2,736,021
4.3.3.1	CAII ext Closed 20 DAS	0.177	20	0.27	48,307,691	46,006,792	43,476,418	2,530,374
4.3.3.2	CAII ext Closed 22 DAS	0.18	22	0.3	49,972,181	47,671,282	45,049,361	2,621,921
4.3.3.3	CAII ext Closed 24 DAS	0.182	24	0.33	51,619,034	49,318,135	46,605,638	2,712,497
4.3.4.1	SF & CAII ext Closed 20 DAS	0.171	20	0.3	46,693,907	44,393,008	41,951,393	2,441,615
4.3.4.2	SF & CAII ext Closed 22 DAS	0.175	22	0.34	48,208,483	45,907,584	43,382,667	2,524,917
4.3.4.3	SF & CAII ext Closed 24 DAS	0.18	24	0.38	49,696,603	47,395,704	44,788,940	2,606,764

**Table 2 - Comparison of open area F, open area landings, and APL after set-asides (used for 94.5/5.5 split).**

<b>FW Section</b>	<b>FT LA DAS</b>		<b>18 DAS</b>	<b>20 DAS</b>	<b>22 DAS</b>	<b>24 DAS</b>
<b>4.3.1</b>	<b>No Action</b>	Open Area F Open Area Landings APL after set-asides	0.24 (17.2) [25.3]			
<b>4.3.2</b>	<b>"Base" CAII ext Open</b>	Open Area F Open Area Landings APL after set-asides		0.24 (18.6) [46.3]	0.27 (20.3) [48]	0.3 (22) [49.7]
<b>4.3.3</b>	<b>CAII ext Closed</b>	Open Area F Open Area Landings APL after set-asides		0.27 (18.2) [46]	0.3 (19.9) [47.6]	0.33 (21.5) [49.3]
<b>4.3.4</b>	<b>SF &amp; CAII ext Closed</b>	Open Area F Open Area Landings APL after set-asides		0.3 (16.6) [44.4]	0.34 (18.1) [45.9]	0.38 (19.6) [47.4]

**Table 3 - Comparison of F, LPUE, area swept, and landings estimates.**

<b>FW32 Alternative</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Open Area F</b>	<b>Open Area LPUE</b>	<b>Overall LPUE</b>	<b>Bottom Area Swept (km<sup>2</sup>)</b>	<b>Projected Landings</b>	<b>LAGC IFQ Share (5.5%)</b>
<b>4.3.1</b>	<b>No Action</b>	0.24	2512	2659	2832	27,593,057	1,391,069
<b>4.3.2.1</b>	<b>CAII ext Open 20 DAS</b>	0.24	2532	3005	2399	48,633,975	2,548,319
<b>4.3.2.2</b>	<b>CAII ext Open 22 DAS</b>	0.27	2520	2980	2591	50,353,581	2,642,897
<b>4.3.2.3</b>	<b>CAII ext Open 24 DAS</b>	0.3	2509	2956	2790	52,046,731	2,736,021
<b>4.3.3.1</b>	<b>CAII ext Closed 20 DAS</b>	0.27	2486	2984	2583	48,307,691	2,530,374
<b>4.3.3.2</b>	<b>CAII ext Closed 22 DAS</b>	0.3	2473	2957	2803	49,972,181	2,621,921
<b>4.3.3.3</b>	<b>CAII ext Closed 24 DAS</b>	0.33	2459	2931	3034	51,619,034	2,712,497
<b>4.3.4.1</b>	<b>SF &amp; CAII ext Closed 20 DAS</b>	0.3	2261	2882	2849	46,693,907	2,441,615
<b>4.3.4.2</b>	<b>SF &amp; CAII ext Closed 22 DAS</b>	0.34	2248	2850	3108	48,208,483	2,524,917
<b>4.3.4.3</b>	<b>SF &amp; CAII ext Closed 24 DAS</b>	0.38	2235	2819	3380	49,696,603	2,606,764