

**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
<b>DECISIONS RELATED TO FISHERY SPECIFICATIONS – SECTION 2.1 AND 2.2</b>			
SECTION 2.1  <b>1. OFL and ABC</b>  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		<b>Nov. Cmte Motion #1:</b>  <b>The Committee recommends Alternative 2 for OFL/ABC for FW26 (updated OFL/ABC values) (Supports AP Motion #3).</b>  <b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b>
SECTION 2.2.1  <b>2. Specification Scenario (Alternatives 1-4)</b>  (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>  Alt 1 – No Action Alt 2 – Base Run Alt 3 – New closed areas Option 1 – CA2 extension Option 2 – NL extension Option 3 – Inshore ETA Alt 4 – Reduced F	While finalizing alternatives PDT identified several issues that need to be clarified. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Default measures for FY2016</li> <li>2. NGOM and incidental TACs</li> <li>3. Transit provisions for closed area options</li> </ol> <p><b><i>PDT Recommends Alternative 3 as preferred</i></b></p> <p><b><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.</i></b></p>	Committee clarified three issues related to specifications at October meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Default measures – <b><u>Oct Motion 4</u></b></li> <li>2. Included NGOM and Incidental TACs – no motion</li> <li>3. Approved transit rules – <b><u>Oct Motion #2</u></b></li> </ol> <p><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #2</b> <b>The Committee recommends Alternative 3 (Section 2.2.1.3) with Option 2 and 3 only as preferred for overall specifications for FW26. This would close NL extension (Option 2) and inshore ETA (option 3), not CA2 extension (Option 1) (Supports AP Motion #4).</b> <b>Vote: 4:0:3, carries</b></p> <p><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #4:</b> <b>The Committee recommends the default measures be modified to include one access area trip in default measures for FY2016 (equivalent to 17,000 pounds for a full time vessel in the “megatron” Mid-Atlantic access area, assuming that is adopted). Area would</b></p>

		<p><i>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>	<p>be open to LAGC IFQ vessels as well, and the number of LAGC trips would be equivalent to the same proportion of catch allocated to those vessels in access areas in FW26. Access area should not open until April 1, 2016 for the fishery and RSA compensation fishing should not be allowed in the area until subsequent framework implemented (Supports AP Motion #5)  <b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b></p>
<p>SECTION 2.2.2</p> <p><b>3. Allocation of LAGC IFQ trips in access areas</b></p> <p><i>(pages 42-43)</i></p>	<p>FW26 considering 4 options – <u>Table 15 on page 43</u></p> <p>Option 1 – no trips (0%)</p> <p>Option 2 – 1,758 trips (5.5%)</p> <p>Option 3 – 3,333 trips (10.4%)</p> <p>Option 4 – 2,065 trips (6.5%)</p>	<p>Sept Council meeting motion passed to include an option up to 2 million pounds.</p> <p>PDT developed Option 4 as another potential option – same proportion of catch from access areas as overall fishery.</p>	<p>Cmte added option 4 – <b><u>Oct Motion #1</u></b></p> <p><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #3:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends Option 4 in Section 2.2.2 for allocation of LAGC IFQ trips in access areas for FW26 (Allocate fleetwide trips to LAGC vessels in access areas equivalent to the overall proportion of total catch from access areas compared to total catch) be the preferred alternative (Supports AP Motion #6).</b>  <b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b></p>
<p>SECTION 2.2.3</p> <p><b>4. Additional measures to reduce impacts on small scallops</b></p> <p><i>(page 43)</i></p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 options</p> <p>Option 1 – no crew limit in access areas</p> <p>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><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #5:</b></p> <p><b>For Section 2.2.3 the Committee recommends adding a new alternative that would allow crew limits to increase by one in all access areas above open area limits (max would be 8 crew for FT LA vessels, 8 crew for both PT LA vessels and 6 crew for FT LA small dredge vessels). This should be the preferred alternative (support AP Motion #7). The Committee clarified that this change in crew limit in access areas should remain in place for all access areas unless changed in a future action.</b>  <b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b></p>

<p>SECTION 2.3</p> <p><b>5. Allocation method for Mid-Atlantic access area trips in 2015 only</b></p> <p><i>(pages 44-45)</i></p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 options –</p> <p>2.3.1 No Action – 2 trips for all vessels in ETA and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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>Committee requested the PDT explore if additional monitoring requirements are necessary/feasible?</p> <p><i><b>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.</b></i></p> <p><i><b>The PDT does not support flexible allocation unless the closure in ETA is adopted.</b></i></p>	<p><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #6:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends Alternative 2.3.2 for Section 2.3 as preferred. Allocation method for Mid-Atlantic access area trips in 2015 should be the flexible method (megatron) (Supports AP Motion #8)</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 7:0: 0, unanimous</b></p>
<p>SECTION 2.4</p> <p><b>6. Adjustments to provisions related to allocating and monitoring AA trips</b> <i>(p.47-49)</i></p> <p><b>7. Requirement for vessels to cross demarcation line within last 60 days for carryover provision</b></p>	<p>FW26 considering 2 alternatives</p> <p>2.4.1 – No Action</p> <p>2.4.2 – Replace broken trip process with prelanding report</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><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #7:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends Alternative 2.4.2 – replace broken trip process with prelanding report and Alternative 2.4.2.2 (Option 2) carryover would be automatic. Both of these should be preferred in FW26 (Supports AP Motion #10).</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b></p>

OTHER MEASURES – SECTION 2.5 – 2.9			
<p>SECTION 2.5</p> <p><b>8. Measures to allow fishing in state waters after federal NGOM TAC is reached</b></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><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #8:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends as preferred Alternative 2.5.3, which would revise state waters exemption program provisions to allow a state to request specific exemption related to fishing for scallops in state waters after federal NGOM TAC reached (Supports AP Motion #11).</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b></p>
<p>SECTION 2.6</p> <p><b>9. Measures to make turtle regulations consistent</b></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><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #9:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends Alternative 2.6.2 to make turtle regulations consistent (May-November and west of 71W for both turtle deflector dredge and turtle chain mat) as preferred (Supports AP Motion #12).</b></p> <p><b>The Committee also recommends Alternative 2.9.2 to modify flaring bar regulations for turtle deflector dredge requirement as preferred (Supports AP Motion #13).</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous</b></p>

<p>SECTION 2.7</p> <p><b>10. New AMs for northern WP and revise AMs for GB YT and SNE/MA YT</b></p> <p>(p. 55 – 65)</p>	<p>FW26 considering 11 alternatives</p> <p><b>2.7.1 – Northern WP</b>  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><b>2.7.2 – Modify GB and SNE YT</b>  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><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #10:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends that Alternatives 2.7.1.2, 2.7.2.2 and 2.7.2.5 (Develop reactive WP AMs and revise current reactive YT AMs) be moved to the considered but rejected section in FW26. This topic should be added to work priorities for 2015 (FW27).  Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous</b></p> <p><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #11:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends Alternatives 2.7.1.3, 2.7.2.3 and 2.7.2.6 for proactive AMs as preferred in FW26. These measures would modify the regulations so that a scallop vessel (LA and LAGC) could not fish with more than 7 rows in the apron of a scallop dredge in all areas (Supports AP Motion #15).  Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous</b></p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>SECTION 2.8</p> <p><b>11. Allow LA vessel to declare out of fishery on return to homeport</b></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.</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><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #12:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends Alternative 2.8.4 (DOF from Cape May only) as preferred, and supports the three consensus statements from the PDT about allocating a fraction of a DAS, adjustment be applied at 40% for part-time vessels, and the adjustment should be applied for at least two years. The Committee recommends the DOF location be clarified to be inside of VMS demarcation line south of Cape May. Additionally, the Committee recommends including options a, b, c, and d provisions only (Supports AP Motion #1)</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous</b></p> <p><b>Nov. Cmte Motion #13:</b></p> <p><b>The Committee recommends the DAS adjustment for the DOF Cape may Alternative be 0.14 (equivalent to a 3.5 hour adjustment for FT vessels), based on assumption that 25 is a more realistic estimate of the number of vessels that are currently returning to ports south of Cape May to land scallops (Supports AP Motion #2).</b></p> <p><b>Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous</b></p>
<p>SECTION 2.9</p> <p><b>12. Modify flaring bar regulations for turtle deflector dredge requirement</b></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>See Cmte Motion #9 – addressed with Decision 9</i></p>



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

November 14, 2014

Revere MA

---

1. Robins/Kendall

The Committee recommends Alternative 2 for OFL/ABC for FW26 (updated OFL/ABC values) (Supports AP Motion #3).

Vote: 7:0:0, carries

2. Kaelin/Quinn

The Committee recommends Alternative 3 (Section 2.2.1.3) with Option 2 and 3 only as preferred for overall specifications for FW26. This would close NL extension (Option 2) and inshore ETA (option 3), not CA2 extension (Option 1) (Supports AP Motion #4).

Vote: 4:0:3, carries

3. Quinn/Robins

The Committee recommends Option 4 in Section 2.2.2 for allocation of LAGC IFQ trips in access areas for FW26 (Allocate fleetwide trips to LAGC vessels in access areas equivalent to the overall proportion of total catch from access areas compared to total catch) be the preferred alternative.(Supports AP Motion #6).

Vote: 7:0:0, carries

4. Robins/Kendall

The Committee recommends the default measures be modified to include one access area trip in default measures for FY2016 (equivalent to 17,000 pounds for a full time vessel in the “megatron” Mid-Atlantic access area, assuming that is adopted). Area would be open to LAGC IFQ vessels as well, number of LAGC trips equivalent to the same proportion of catch allocated to those vessels in access areas in FW26. Access area should not open until April 1, 2016 for the fishery and RSA compensation fishing should not be allowed in the area until subsequent framework implemented (Supports AP Motion #5).

Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous

5. Kaelin/Sissenwine

For Section 2.2.3 the Committee recommends adding a new alternative that would allow crew limits to increase by one in all access areas above open area limits (max would be 8 crew for FT LA vessels, 8 crew for both PT LA vessels and 6 crew for FT LA small dredge vessels). This should be the preferred alternative (support AP Motion #7). The Committee clarified that this change in crew limit in access areas should remain in place for all access areas unless changed in a future action.

Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous

6. Robins/Quinn

The Committee recommends Alternative 2.3.2 for Section 2.3 as preferred. Allocation method for Mid-Atlantic access area trips in 2015 should be the flexible method (megatron) (Supports AP Motion #8).

Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous

7. Kaelin/Kendall

The Committee recommends Alternative 2.4.2 – replace broken trip process with prelanding report and Alternative 2.4.2.2 (Option 2) carryover would be automatic. Both of these should be preferred in FW26 (Supports AP Motion #10).

Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous

8. Robins/Kaelin

The Committee recommends as preferred Alternative 2.5.3, which would revise state waters exemption program provisions to allow a state to request specific exemption related to fishing for scallops in state waters after federal NGOM TAC reached (Supports AP Motion #11).

Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous

9. Robins/Kaelin

The Committee recommends Alternative 2.6.2 to make turtle regulations consistent (May-November and west of 71W for both turtle deflector dredge and turtle chain mat) as preferred (Supports AP Motion #12).

The Committee also recommends Alternative 2.9.2 to modify flaring bar regulations for turtle deflector dredge requirement as preferred (Supports AP Motion #13).

Vote: 7:0:0, unanimous

10. Kaelin/Alexander

The Committee recommends that Alternatives 2.7.1.2, 2.7.2.2 and 2.7.2.5 (Develop reactive WP AMs and revise current reactive YT AMs) be moved to the considered but rejected section in FW26. This topic should be added to work priorities for 2015 (FW27).

Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous

11. Kaelin/Robins

The Committee recommends Alternatives 2.7.1.3, 2.7.2.3 and 2.7.2.6 for proactive AMs as preferred in FW26. These measures would modify the regulations so that a scallop vessel (LA and LAGC) could not fish with more than 7 rows in the apron of a scallop dredge in all areas (Supports AP Motion #15).

Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous

12. Robins/Kaelin

The Committee recommends Alternative 2.8.4 (DOF from Cape May only) as preferred, and supports the three consensus statements from the PDT about allocating a fraction of a DAS, adjustment be applied at 40% for part-time vessels, and the adjustment should be applied for at least two years. The Committee recommends



the DOF location be clarified to be inside of VMS demarcation line south of Cape May. Additionally, the Committee recommends including options a, b, c, and d provisions only (Supports AP Motion #1).

Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous

13. Robins/Kaelin

The Committee recommends the DAS adjustment for the DOF Cape may Alternative be 0.14 (equivalent to a 3.5 hour adjustment for FT vessels), based on assumption that 25 is a more realistic estimate of the number of vessels that are currently returning to ports south of Cape May to land scallops (Supports AP Motion #1).

Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous

**Other Business**

14. Kaelin/Kendall

The Scallop Committee recommends that the Council consider that any bycatch sub-allocation be based on projected catch of WP in the scallop fishery or an average of the % of WP catch in scallop fishery for the last 3-5 years (up to 2013 if available) (Supports AP Motion #17).

Vote: 5:0:1, carries

15. Kaelin/Sissenwine

The Scallop Committee recommends the Council add an amendment limited to developing measures to streamline the scallop specifications process be added to Council work priorities for 2015 “above the line” (Supports AP Motion #19).

Vote: 6:0:0, unanimous



**New England Fishery Management Council**  
**DRAFT Scallop Advisory Panel Meeting Motions**

November 13, 2014

Revere MA

---

1. Gutowski/Welch

AP support Alternative 2.8.4 (DOF from Cape May only) as preferred, and the AP supports the three consensus statements from the PDT about allocating a fraction of a DAS, adjustment be applied at 40% for part-time vessels, and the adjustment should be applied for at least two years. The AP recommends the DOF location be clarified to be inside of VMS demarcation line south of Cape May.

Vote: 11:0:0, unanimous

2. Enoksen/Gutowski

AP recommends the DAS adjustment be 0.14 (equivalent to a 3.5 hour adjustment for FT vessels), based on assumption that 25 is a more realistic estimate of the number of vessels that are currently returning to southern ports to land scallops.

Vote: 11:0:0, unanimous

3. Gutowski/Lybarger

AP recommends Alternative 2 for OFL/ABC for FW26 (updated OFL/ABC values).

Vote: 11:0:0, unanimous

4. Hansen/Enoksen

AP supports Alternative 3 (Section 2.2.1.3) with Option 2 and 3 only as preferred for overall specifications for FW26. This would close NL extension (Option 2) and inshore ETA (option 3), not CA2 extension (Option 1).

Vote: 6:0:5, carries

5. Welch/Gutowski

Include one access area trip in default measures for FY2016 (17,000 pounds for a full time vessel in all three MA access areas). Area would be open to LAGC IFQ vessels as well, number of LAGC trips equivalent to the same proportion of catch allocated to those vessels in access areas in FW26. Access area should not open until April 1, 2016 for the fishery and RSA compensation fishing should not be allowed in the area until subsequent framework implemented.

Vote: 11: 0:0, unanimous

6. Parker/Maxwell

AP recommends Option 4 in Section 2.2.2 for allocation of LAGC IFQ trips in access areas for FW26 (Allocate fleetwide trips to LAGC vessels in access areas equivalent to the overall proportion of total catch from access areas compared to total catch).

Vote: 11:0:0, unanimous

7. Lybarger/Fletcher  
For Section 2.2.3 the AP recommends a new alternative that would allow crew limits to increase by one in access areas above open area limits (max would be 8 crew for FT LA vessels, 6 crew for both PT LA vessels and FT LA small dredge vessels).  
Vote: 11:0:0, unanimous
8. Enoksen/Gutowski  
AP recommends Alternative 2.3.2 for Section 2.3. Allocation method for Mid-Atlantic access area trips in 2015 should be the flexible method (megatron), based on AP Motion #4, which recommends closing the inshore part of ETA in 2015.  
Vote: 10:0:1, carries
9. Fletcher/  
AP supports No Action for Section 2.4.  
*Failed for lack of a second*
10. Lybarger/Welch  
AP supports Alternative 2.4.2 – replace broken trip process with prelanding report and Alternative 2.4.2.2 (Option 2) carryover would be automatic.  
Vote: 10:1:0, carries
11. Enoksen/Fletcher  
AP supports Alternative 2.5.3 that would revise state waters exemption program provisions to allow a state to request specific exemption related to fishing for scallops in state waters after federal NGOM TAC reached.  
Vote: 10:0:0, unanimous
12. Enoksen/Gutowski  
AP supports Alternative 2.6.2 to make turtle regulations consistent (May-November and west of 71W for both turtle deflector dredge and turtle chain mat).  
Vote: 9:0:1, carries
13. Fletcher/Welch  
AP supports Alternative 2.9.2 to modify flaring bar regulations for turtle deflector dredge requirement.  
Vote: 10:0:1, carries
14. Hansen/  
AP supports Alternative 2.7.1.4, 2.7.2.4, and 2.7.2.7 as a proactive AM to reduce flatfish bycatch (*eliminate* the provision that restricts the number of rows in the apron of all scallop dredges).  
*Fails for lack of a second*
15. Quinn/Gutowski  
AP supports Alternatives 2.7.1.3, 2.7.2.3 and 2.7.2.6 for proactive AMs as preferred in FW26. These measures would *modify* the regulations so that a scallop vessel (LA and LAGC) could not fish with more than 7 rows in the apron of a scallop dredge in all areas.  
Vote: 6:0:5, carries

16. Fletcher/

If a vessel desires to fish with more than 7 rows must stop dredges for 3 minutes before hauling back. Vessel must provide proof that dredges were stopped before hauling back.

*Failed for a lack of a second*

## **Other Business**

### **Groundfish Framework 53**

17. Gutowski/Welch

The AP would like to express significant concern about the range of allocation alternatives for a sub-ACL for N WP being considered in FW 53 to the GF plan. The current alternatives in the document do not represent a fair and equitable allocation of the resource. The AP recommends that the Scallop Committee recommend that any future allocation in FW 53 should be based on projected catch of WP in the scallop fishery or an average of the % of WP catch in scallop fishery for the last 3-5 years (up to 2013 if available).

Vote: 11:0:0, unanimous

## **Priorities**

18. Lybarger/Fletcher

AP recommends the Committee consider a future work priority that would consider measures to address observer fees when a vessel is transiting. For example, currently an observer company charges from dock to dock, but if a vessel steams inside demarcation at the beginning and the end of a trip, that vessel is not compensated with observer set-aside for that transit time.

Vote: 2:4:5, motion fails

19. Hansen/Maxwell

The AP moved to recommend the Committee suggest the Council initiate an amendment to streamline the scallop specification process to the work priorities for 2015.

Vote: 10:0:1, carries