

## SELECTION OF PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES FOR SCALLOP FRAMEWORK 23

### DECISION DOCUMENT

---

This 'decision document' lists alternatives in Framework 23.

Alternatives are broken up by section and listed in table form with a summary of impacts analysis.

Following each section's table, alternatives are broken down with input from the PDT, AP, and Committee.

*Disclaimer: It is impossible to capture the detailed analyses of these alternatives in a sentence or two.*

*It is important to reference the full Draft Environmental Assessment when considering identification of preferred alternatives.*

*This summary is only intended to help the Council get through the agenda and make recommendations for final action on Framework 23.*

## Section 2.1 – Turtle Deflector Dredge (TDD)

### Decision 1. REQUIRE TURTLE DEFLECTOR DREDGE (page 7-10)

| SECTION      | ALTERNATIVE                                   | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH., Protected resources and bycatch)   | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS   |
|--------------|---|--|---|
| <b>2.1</b>   | <b>TURTLE DEFLECTOR DREDGE (TDD)</b>          |  |   |
| <b>2.1.1</b> | <b>No Action TDD</b>                          | No impacts   | No impacts  |
| <b>2.1.2</b> | <b>TDD Requirement Alternative – Figure 1</b> | <p>Potentially positive for scallop resource since the TDD estimated to be slightly more efficient – 4% more scallop catch. Positive for protected resources – minimum of 56% reduction of mortality on turtles compared to standard dredge without chain mat.</p> <p>EFH – Overall shifts in fishing location that could result in changes to EFH impacts would likely be minimal</p> <p>Bycatch - The TDD generally reduced the capture of flatfish and some skates however, these differences were not statistically significant.</p> | The increase in costs in the short-term, but positive indirect economic impacts on the fishery over the long-term if implementation of the TDD result in fewer effort limits that are placed on this fishery under ESA. |

#### *Notes/Clarifications:*

AP suggested several technical modifications to the TDD requirement language. Committee approved those modifications – Section 2.1.2 of FW23

#### *Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:** None.
- **AP:** Motion 1: Recommend that the Committee approve Alternative 2.1.2 - Requirement of Turtle Deflector Dredge. Vote: 7:1:3, carries
- **Committee:** Motion 1: Approve Section 2.1.2 (Require the turtle deflector dredge alternative) as preferred with the adjustments made by the AP related to the dredge requirements. Vote: 8:0:0, carries

## Decision 2. TDD Spatial boundary options (page 11-14)

| SECTION   | ALTERNATIVE                         | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)   | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS  |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2.1.2.1   | <i>TDD Spatial boundary options</i> |  | <i>Section 4.1.1.1., Tables 7 and 8</i>  |
| 2.1.2.1.1 | Option 1 – 71W                      | There may be some amount of effort that could shift from the Mid-Atlantic to a different area not included in the TDD boundary options, but that total amount of effort is limited overall and is not expected to have direct impacts on the scallop resource, EFH or protected resources. In addition, since the amount of scallop fishing is relatively limited in the area that is different between the two boundary options (area east of 72° W and north of 40° N), there is essentially no difference in terms of impacts on the scallop resource between the two boundary options. Option 1 is more precautionary in terms of potential benefits for turtles and may have more conservation benefit since that boundary option includes more area where turtles are distributed and some scallop fishing occurs. | Although this option would minimize the economic impacts for scallop vessels that fish solely in Georges Bank east of 71° and those that fish in Gulf of Maine, it could have adverse impacts on some LAGC vessels since it includes 3-digit areas 539 and a third of 537 that are the main grounds for these vessels.   |
| 2.1.2.1.2 | Option 2 – RPM line                 |  | Option 2 would exclude those areas that LAGC vessels are active and would minimize the negative economic impacts of TDD requirement on those vessels. If, however, TDD is required only of the limited access (LA) vessels, the economic impacts of Option 1 would not be very different than of Option 2, with the exception that Option 2 would provide more flexibility to the scallop vessels fishing in the excluded areas. |

*Notes/Clarifications:* None

*Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:**
- **AP:** Motion 2. Recommend that the Committee approve Alternative 2.1.2.1.1 Option 1 related to TDD spatial boundary (71W). Vote: 10:1:0, carries
- **Committee:** Motion 2: Select 2.1.2.1.1 Option 1 related to TDD spatial boundary (71 W). Vote: 8:0:0, carries

### Decision 3. TDD Seasonal Options (page 15)

| SECTION   | ALTERNATIVE                  | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)   | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS  |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|--|
| 2.1.2.2   | <i>TDD Seasonal options</i>  |  | <i>Section 4.1.1.2, Tables 9 to 11</i>   |
| 2.1.2.2.1 | Option 1 - June 1-October 31 | Overall, since these three seasonal options are relatively long in length, 5-7 months, it seems unlikely that a limited access scallop vessel currently fishing in the Mid-Atlantic would not invest in the new gear, and only fish in the months not included in the range (December-April). And since the gear is not expected to impact efficiency of the gear, impacts on the resource should be neutral. The relative difference among the seasonal options is minimal. | In general, shorter seasons for the TDD requirement will provide more flexibility with some potentially positive economic impacts. The differences in impacts of the three options are expected to be small for the LA vessels since they are not likely to change the dredge during the year once they make the investment in TDD. These options could impact LAGC IFQ vessels in relatively greater degree than the LA vessels because the cost of TDD could be too large for some to want to invest in new gear. Option 1 could have the least impacts since 54.49% of the LAGC landings took place from June to October while Option 3 would have the largest impacts since 73% of their landings occurred May to November in 2010. But these impacts depend on what vessel option is selected – Section 2.1.2.3 |
| 2.1.2.2.2 | Option 2 - May 1-October 31  |  |  |
| 2.1.2.2.3 | Option 3 - May 1-Nov 30      |  |  |

*Notes/Clarifications: None*

*Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:**
- **AP:** Motion 3: Identify Alternative 2.1.2.2.2 Option 2 as preferred for TDD seasonal options (May 1 – October 31) since that is when observed takes have occurred. Vote: 7:1:3, carries
- **Committee:** Motion 3: Identify Option 2, May 1-Oct 31, as preferred as the TDD seasonal alternative. Motion to substitute (3a) Identify Option 3, May 1 – November 30, as preferred as the TDD seasonal alternative. Vote to substitute motion: 1:7:0, failed  
**Vote on main motion (Option 2: May 1-Oct 31): 7:0:1, carries**

## Decision 4. Vessel options for TDD (page 16)

| SECTION   | ALTERNATIVE  | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)  | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS   |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 2.1.2.3   | <i>TDD Vessel options</i>  |   | <i>Section 4.1.1.3--Tables 12 to 16.</i>  |
| 2.1.2.3.1 | Option 1 – LA vessels only   | Ecological impacts of these three options depend on whether or not vessels will shift effort to different areas or seasons as a result of being required to use the TDD. For Option 1, it seems unlikely that a limited access vessel that primarily fishes in the Mid-Atlantic would not invest in new gear if the alternative to that is being restricted to either fish on Georges Bank or to be restricted to fish in the Mid-Atlantic during the months outside the range of the seasonal options. Therefore, there are no substantial ecological impacts expected from Option 1. It is more difficult to predict changes in fishing behavior under Options 2 and 3 for smaller and general category vessels that may have only qualified for limited amount of resource since the cost associated with new gear may not be outweighed by the flexibility to fish in areas and times that may be more desirable. In general, if Options 2 and 3 cause a vessel to fish in an area that is less efficient in order to avoid having to purchase new gear, that could have potentially negative impacts on the environment if that effort shifts to a time or area with lower scallop catch rates, more vulnerable habitats, or higher bycatch rates. | Small increase in the costs for these vessels as a % of their revenue. The increase in costs is expected to be outweighed by the positive impacts of TDD over the long-term. (Table 12 to 13)   |
| 2.1.2.3.2 | Option 2 – LA and LAGC vessels   |   | This option could have negative impacts on the LAGC vessels and result in effort shifts. The cost TDD could amount to 5% to 12% of the median revenue for the LAGC fleet (Table 14)   |
| 2.1.2.3.3 | Option 3 – All LA vessels and all LAGC vessels that use a dredge greater than or equal to 10 feet six inches |   | Since the scallop revenue for the vessels that use a dredge smaller than 10.5ft is lower compared to other vessels, exempting these vessels option would minimize the economic impacts on the small vessels. This option could have negative economic impacts on the LAGC vessels that use a dredge 10.5ft or larger, however, since the average scallop revenue for this fleet (\$127,281 in 2010) is a small fraction of the average revenue for the LA FT vessels (\$1.3 million in 2010) and is about 1/3 to 1/4 <sup>th</sup> of the scallop revenues of the part-time LA vessels. (Table 15 to 17). If the TDD is required for LAGC vessels, as under Options 2 and 3, this restriction could increase the amount of IFQ that is leased among the LAGC fishery. |

*Notes/Clarifications:* Option 3 was not drafted accurately in the document the Committee reviewed. It was revised by the AP and approved by the Committee as written in the current document.

### *Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **AP:** Motion 7: All LA vessels (all permit categories), and all LAGC vessels fishing a dredge greater than or equal to 10 feet 6 inches, would be required to use a TDD. Vote: 9:2:0, carries
- **Committee:** Motion 4: Accept AP motion #7 as revised for Option 3 related to which vessels would be required to use a TDD. Final option would include additional language related to exemption for bump out and this option is identified as preferred. Vote: 8:0:0, carries

## Decision 5. Implementation options for TDD (page 17)

| SECTION   | ALTERNATIVE                                 | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)  | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS  |
|-----------|---|---|--|
| 2.1.2.4   | <i>TDD Implementation options</i>           |   | Section 4.1.1.4  |
| 2.1.2.4.1 | Option 1 – 90-180 days                      | Overall the implementations options for the TDD Requirement Alternative, ranging between 90 days to 2-years, are not expected to have direct impacts on the scallop resource and bycatch because there is no statistical difference between the standard commercial dredge and the TDD in terms of catch and selectivity. Fishery allocations are annual, so whether the effective date is 90 days or 2-years, vessels cannot increase catch above their annual allocation in anticipation of a gear change requirement. Overall the impacts of the three timing alternatives for the TDD requirement are expected to have similar impacts on turtles. The sooner a TDD could be implemented the better, in terms of reducing the severity of impacts on sea turtles that interact with scallop gear. But the relative difference between these three timing alternatives is minimal overall. | This option may not be a feasible and may increase the production costs since so many dredges need to be built within a short time period, and 180 days (September 1) does not benefit turtles much for that fishing year since the majority of the turtle season has already passed.  |
| 2.1.2.4.2 | Option 2 – one year after FW23 implemented  |   | A one year option and implementation by March 1, 2013 could give enough time to build dredges and give vessels time to fish with the new dredge before the turtle season begins in May. This could have relatively more benefits compared to a two year option, if any future biological opinions are not able to account for conservation benefit from measures approved but not effective yet. |
| 2.1.2.4.3 | Option 3 – two years after FW23 implemented |   | The two year implementation option could lower the costs for some vessels by providing more flexibility and time to plan buying and installing a TDD, but could delay the benefits from using the TDD.   |

### Notes/Clarifications:

### Input/Preferred Alternative:

- **PDT:**
- **AP:** Motion 9: AP supports 2.1.2.4.2 Option 2 related to implementation for TDD –one year after implementation of FW23. Vote: 7:3:1, carries
- **Committee:** Motion 5: Accept AP recommendation and identify Option 2.1.2.4.2, Option 2 for one year implementation date for TDD. Vote: 8:0:0, carries

## Section 2.3– Modification to the NGOM LAGC Program

**Decision 6. Require that if a vessel with a federal NGOM permit wants to fish in state waters and not have that catch apply to the federal NGOM TAC, that vessel is restricted to fish in state waters only for that trip (NGOM Alternative) (page 30)**

**AND**

**If NGOM Alternative selected, which vessels?**

**AND**

**What should TAC be?**

*Table on next page*

*Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:** None
- **AP:** *By consensus:* Support 2.3.1 No Action related to NGOM management program.
- **Committee:** Motion 6: Committee recommends Alternative 2.3.2 (NGOM Alternative) as preferred. In addition, Option 2 (2.3.2.1.2) should be preferred regarding which vessels (exemption would be for all vessels with a federal NGOM permit regardless of homeport state). Lastly, Option 2 (2.3.2.2.2) related to adjusting the NGOM hard TAC be preferred (31,000 pounds). Vote: 7:0:1, carries

## Decision 7. Section 2.3.3

**Allow LAGC IFQ vessels to fish exclusively in state waters and catch would not apply against their federal IFQ allocation (page 32)**

*Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:** This alternative requires an amendment to change the state waters exemption program, thus should be moved to the considered and rejected section of FW23. Impacts not analyzed.
- **AP:** *None*
- **Committee:** *None*

## NGOM Measures

| SECTION   | ALTERNATIVE  | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)   | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS   |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| 2.3       | <i>Modifications to the NGOM program</i>             |  | Section 4.1.3.1 --No changes.   |
| 2.3.1     | No Action NGOM                                       | Impacts are neutral compared to No Action because current effort levels are very low in this area. If effort increases in the future there is increased risk of fishing pressure in state and federal waters from this option, but current and proposed state programs are expected to address potential increased catch levels.   | Section 4.1.3.2, Table 28   |
| 2.3.2     | NGOM Alternative                                     |  | If the scallop resource abundance and landings within the Maine State waters increases in the future, the proposed alternative would prevent a reduction in landings from NGOM. This could potentially have positive economic impacts on the vessels that fish both in the state and federal waters. Impacts vary by state because of state water restrictions.   |
| 2.3.2.1   | <i>Options for which vessels</i>                     |  | <i>Section 4.1.3.2.1 Tables 29 and 30</i>   |
| 2.3.2.1.1 | Option 1 - ME vessels only                           | The state of Maine has similar, and in some cases more restrictive regulations in state waters compared to the Federal NGOM program, it is unlikely that fishing effort will increase in state waters (Option 1 or 2). In Massachusetts there is currently no possession limit, so vessels with a state only permit can land scallops with no possession limit, but vessels with a Federal permit have to abide to the more restrictive rules (200 pounds). Therefore, this alternative is not expected to increase fishing effort in state waters compared to No Action (Option 2). | Option 1 is unlikely to lead to an increase in effort in Maine or in the waters of the other states.  |
| 2.3.2.1.2 | Option 2 - All NGOM vessels                          |  | Option 2 could benefit more vessels but have the potential to increase effort in other state scallop fisheries. On the other hand, the regulations would require that every NGOM vessel follow the same 200 possession limits regardless of which state they fish if the modifications are made to the current program. This should minimize the impacts on the scallop resource and any negative impacts on yield and scallop revenues in the State waters of Massachusetts as well. |
| 2.3.2.2   | <i>Options to adjust 2012 and 2013 NGOM hard-TAC</i> |  | <i>Section 4.1.3.2.2</i>  |
| 2.3.2.2.1 | Option 1 - No Action – 70,000 pounds                 | Increased risk of impacts on the scallop resource in federal waters if the TAC is higher than biomass, since the current TAC was elevated to recognize that about half of current catch from state waters.   | Could lead to overfishing of federal resource in NGOM with negative impacts on the scallop resource and on long-term yield and benefits from the NGOM fishery.  |
| 2.3.2.2.2 | Option 2 - Adjust NGOM TAC – 31,000 pounds           | If this action allows a federally-permitted NGOM vessel to fish in state waters in the NGOM and not have that catch be applied against the NGOM TAC, then Option 2 (31,000 pounds) is an appropriate value to use which is based on the best available science and would help reduce negative impacts on the scallop resource if the TAC were set too high in the federal portion of this management area.   | Adjusting the federal TAC downward would prevent excess fishing in federal waters in the NGOM and prevent the negative impacts on the scallop resource, future yield, revenues and overall economic benefits from the fishery.  |



## Section 2.4 – Modification to Vessel Monitoring System

### Decision 8. Limited access and LAGC vessels can declare into the scallop fishery west of the demarcation line, not necessarily from port (page 34)

| SECTION | ALTERNATIVE                | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)   | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS   |
|---------|----------------------------|--|---|
| 2.4     | <i>Modification to VMS</i> |  |   |
| 2.4.1   | No Action VMS              | VMS measures are predominantly administrative in nature and do not have direct impacts on the scallop resource.  | Section 4.1.4.1- No change in benefits. Under this system a vessel may need to enter a port it is not familiar with in order to start that trip, which could pose safety risks. In addition, the extra steaming time to the port adds to the fishing costs including the costs of fuel and oil. |
| 2.4.2   | VMS Alternative            | Not expected to have direct impacts on the scallop resource since this is an administrative issue and DAS used are already calculated from the demarcation line. Therefore, the estimate of fishing time will not increase as a result of this change so no impacts are expected on the scallop resource. If it is determined later that fishing time has increase adjustments will need to be made. | Section 4.1.4.2 -- Vessel could steam closer to the fishing grounds and declare into the fishery from VMS demarcation line instead from a port. This would reduce the steam time and the fuel and oil costs increasing the economic benefits from the scallop fishery.                          |

#### *Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:** None
- **AP:** Motion 12: AP recommends adoption of 2.4.2 as preferred. Allow a vessel to declare into the fishery from the demarcation line rather than port. Vote: 9:0:2, motion carries
- **Committee:** Motion 7: Accept AP recommendation that Alternative 2.4.2 (VMS Alternative) as preferred. Vote: 8:0:0, carries

## Section 2.2 – Review and revise accountability measures for the yellowtail flounder sub-ACL

### Decision 9. Refine YT AM seasonal closure schedule for SNE/MA and GB YT AMs (page 20)

| SECTION | ALTERNATIVE                                   | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)  | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS   |
|---------|---|---|---|
| 2.2.1   | <i>Refine YT AM seasonal closure schedule</i> |   |   |
| 2.2.1.1 | No Action                                     |   |   |
| 2.2.1.2 | Refine YT AM seasonal closure schedule        |   | Section 4.1.2.2   |
|         | SNE/MA –<br>Table 2 on<br>page 21             | <p>For the SNE/MA AM schedule, the major difference is that the proposed closure is primarily in the early spring and winter first, rather than starting with spring and summer under the current AM. Closing the area in the winter and early spring (proposed) compared to the spring and summer (No Action) will have beneficial impacts on the scallop resource because meat weights are generally highest in late spring and early summer. Overall, the SNE/MA YT AM area is not a primary fishing area for the scallop fishery. Therefore, the total amount of effort shift is minimal for the resource even if the area is closed for the entire year.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts expected for YT since schedule better reflects months with highest bycatch rates.</p> | <p>Overall, the SNE/MA closures are not expected to have large impacts on the limited access fleet given that a small proportion of the landings for full-time come from these areas. But for a subset of vessels that fish in those areas, when the yellowtail overage is relatively small (8% or less), the proposed closures will shift relatively more landings to the other areas and seasons compared to the Amendment 15 schedule. This could reduce flexibility for vessels and increase fishing costs. On the other hand, shifting effort to other seasons when the meat weights are highest could benefit the scallop resource and increase landings and revenues to some extent offsetting the negative effects of the effort shifts. At overage rates 9% and higher, the proposed closures will affect a smaller proportion of landing compared to the Amendment 15 schedule, however. This will have a favorable impact on vessel flexibility and fishing costs with positive impacts on profits. (Table 18 to Table 21)</p> |
|         | GB –<br>Tables 3 and 4<br>on page 22          | <p>As for GB, the major difference compared to No Action for revising the YT AM schedule is that the proposed AM closure schedule would begin in the fall followed by the winter months, when YT bycatch rates are highest. This is also the time of year when scallop meat weights are least, so impacts on the scallop resource should be less compared to No Action, which closes the area beginning in March through the spring and summer when scallop meat weights are larger.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts expected for YT since schedule better reflects months with highest bycatch rates.</p>  | <p>Shifting effort to times of the year with higher scallop meat weights will have positive impacts on the scallop resource and overall landings and revenues from this area. Fishing during seasons with higher abundance could also lower the fishing costs if the same pounds could be landed within a shorter time period (Tables 22 and 23). If the overage is 39% or less Closed Area II would be closed from August-January and effort would be shifted to the remaining months the area is open, June 15-July 31 when scallop meat weights are greater compared to the fall and winter. This will have a positive economic impact on scallop vessels by increasing flexibility and reducing the amount of effort that has to be shifted to other areas and seasons. Changing the schedule when CAI is closed is expected to have negligible impacts.</p>  |

*Notes/Clarifications:*

Committee discussed issue of AMs being triggered based on preliminary estimate of YT bycatch (or scallop catch) compared to final estimate. Chair is going to investigate with staff if flexibility can be given to the Regional Administrator to make adjustments to an AM if final estimate of bycatch (or scallop catch) is different than preliminary estimate. Could AM be modified based on final estimate?

*Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:** None
- **AP:** Motion 16: AP recommends Section 2.2.1.2 – Refine YT AM seasonal closure schedule for the LA AMs for both YT stock areas. Without objection motion passes
- **Committee:** Motion 8: Committee recommends Alternative 2.2.1.2 refined YT AM seasonal closure schedule as the preferred alternative, both YT stock areas. Vote: 7:1:0, carries

Note Section 2.2.3 includes a summary of the proactive AMs already in place that reduce YT bycatch in the scallop fishery. These “proactive” AMs do not require action in FW23 since they have been implemented already in previous actions, or are voluntary measures, but they have been summarized in FW23 to document that these “proactive” AMs exist.

## Decision 10. Separate YT AM for LAGC IFQ fishery (page 22) – See Document #7 as well

| SECTION | ALTERNATIVE   | ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS<br>(Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)  | ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS  |
|---------|---|---|--|
| 2.2.2   | <i>Separate YT AM for LAGC IFQ fishery</i>          |   | Section 4.1.2.3 Tables 24 to 27.   |
| 2.2.2.1 | No Action – LAGC IFQ vessels exempt from YT AM      | No change.  | No change.   |
| 2.2.2.2 | Implement a separate YT AM for the LAGC IFQ fishery |   | This could have some negative impacts on the LAGC but positive impacts on the LA fishery.  |
|         | SNE/MA – Table 2 on page 21                         | Overall the impacts on the scallop resource are neutral because this area is not heavily fished. Some effort will be shifted but relatively small amounts. Any AM on the LAGC fishery is expected to have potentially positive impacts on YT bycatch if effort is shifted from areas and seasons with higher bycatch rates, but those benefits are limited since only 12% of total LAGC catch from the SNE/MA YT AM area. | Closing these areas during different months of the year will increase the costs of fishing for the LAGC vessels. As the effort shifts to other areas and/or months, the steaming time and duration of the trip for those vessels that normally fish in 537, 539 and 613 will increase. This increase in costs could be minimized to some extent by leasing of quota to vessels that fish in other areas. Although, the impacts on the overall LAGC fishery will be small, there will be some distributional impacts on vessels from different states and ports. The closures will impact vessels home ported in RI most (Tables 24 to 27). |
|         | GB – Tables 3 and 4 on page 22                      | Essentially no LAGC fishing in 562 now, so almost no effort shift expected from this action. Therefore, minimal impacts on the scallop resource, EFH and bycatch either way.  | Currently, LAGC vessels are not fishing in 562 because this area is too far to justify the higher steaming costs. Therefore, the impacts of an AM in that area should be minimal.  |

### *Input/Preferred Alternative:*

- **PDT:** None
- **AP:** Motion 14: AP recommends 2.2.2.2 - separate YT AMs for LAGC IFQ fishery. The LAGC has taken a substantial portion of the SNE/MA YT sub-ACL and should be managed on its own to provide incentive to reduce YT catch. Vote: 8:2:1, carried
- **Committee:** Motion 9: Committee recommends Alternative 2.2.2.1 No Action for a separate YT AM for the LAGC IFQ fishery.
  - Motion to substitute:**  
Committee recommends a separate YT AM for the LAGC IFQ fishery in SNE/MA as described in Table 4 of FW23 and the same YT AM as the LA fishery for GB, as amended in FW23.  
Vote on substitute motion: 7:1:0, carries
  - Vote on main motion as substituted: 7:1:0, carries**  
(with an understanding that the PDT will try to develop a separate SNE/MA YT AM for LAGC fishery with a different boundary)

### **See Document #7 related to potential YT AMs for the LAGC trawl fishery**

Council needs to decide what to do with new information related to YT bycatch in the LAGC trawl fishery and how it impacts final action for FW23.

## **Committee actions not related to Framework 23**

- Turtle Chain Mat

**Without objection the Chair will bring AP motions #4, #10 and #11 to the Council. If the Council agrees, these issues will be forwarded to NMFS related to the turtle chain mat regulations.**

- 2012 Priorities

### **Motion 12**

Committee agrees with the consensus statement of the AP, and is not in favor of pursuing A16 to consider IFQs at this time, and recommends it be put below the line.

Vote: 5:0:3, carries

### **Motion 13**

Committee recommends the adoption of Motion 19 from the Scallop AP meeting of September 12, 2011 as a priority for 2012.

#### Motion 19 from AP:

AP recommends adding an item to the list that combines several issues related to managing YT bycatch under the Scallop FMP. The Council should consider a wide range of potential options to address this issue that may require an Amendment and involvement of the GF Cmte. For example, sub-dividing the YT sub-ACL, participation in GF sectors for LAGC fishery, changing the sub-ACL to a baseline allocation rather than based on projected catch, re-designing the access area program etc.

This action would focus on YT initially, but could be expanded to other bycatch species if needed. This issue should be elevated above the line as a priority for 2012.

Vote: 10:0:0, carries

Vote: 4:0:4, carries