

#76

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH)	PROTECTED RESOURCE IMPACTS (Turtles)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
2.2 NO ACTION (page 17)				
2.2.1	No action	Impacts on the scallop resource and EFH would be minimal, except F would be higher in the ETA than recommended, lower on GB due to no access trips, and keeping the Channel open could forego some potential yield.	If additional ETA trips occur in the season that turtles are present there is a higher chance of interaction with scallop gear compared to all four scenarios under consideration. However no Delmarva trip allocated, which reduces interaction.	Expected to result in less than optimal long-term landings and economic benefits compared to the alternatives included in this Framework
2.2.2	No action if IFQ program is not fully implemented by March 1, 2010	No expected impacts on scallop resource or EFH.	No expected differences in impacts on protected resources if the limited access fishery lands these scallops or the general category fishery.	This measure will have positive impacts on the general category vessels by doubling their net revenues and negative impacts on limited access vessels by reducing their net revenues by 5% in 2010.
2.2.3	Measures in effect March 1, 2010 until FW21	If measures adopted to prevent excess fishing in period before FW21 implemented no impacts on EFH or scallop resource	No impact	No impact
2.3	Acceptable Biological Catch	Long-term positive impacts on scallop resource by preventing overfishing.	No expected impacts on protected resources.	Long-term positive impacts on fishery by preventing overfishing.
2.4 FW21 ALLOCATION SCENARIOS (page 21)				
	NCLF20	The no closure scenarios have higher LPUE in the near-term and lower area swept, both of which are good for the resource and habitat. These benefits decrease in the long-term. NCLF24 has the lowest cumulative projected exploitable biomass and landings for 2010-2016.	No closure alternatives potentially have fewer impacts on protected resources compared to closure scenarios because effort patterns will be similar to recent years and DAS allocations are lower - so less chance effort would increase in open areas in MA when turtles present.	Lower landings, revenues, and total economic benefits in the short term. The reverse is true in the long-term.
	NCLF24			Higher landings, revenues, and total economic benefits in the short term. The reverse is true in the long-term.
	CLF20	Negative effects expected on the resource and EFH. This scenario increases DAS and F beyond acceptable levels and is likely to cause problems with bycatch as well.	Shift of effort to open areas in the Mid-Atlantic from the channel closure would have negative effects on PR. If effort is higher in June-October when turtles are present, impacts on protected resources may be greater compared to alternatives with lower open area DAS allocations. Impacts expected to be reduced after channel re-opens.	Higher landings, revenues, and total economic benefits in the short term. The reverse is true in the long-term.
	CLF18	In general, the closure scenarios cause lower LPUE and higher area swept in the short term, which is bad for the resource and EFH. Long-term effects are more beneficial, and effects on biomass and habitat within the closure are positive. This scenario has the highest cumulative exploitable biomass and landings.		Lower landings, revenues, and total economic benefits in the short term. The reverse is true in the long-term. This alternative gives the highest overall landings and long-term benefits.

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scaalop resource, EFH)	PROTECTED RESOURCE IMPACTS (Turtles)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
2.5.1.1	Adjustments when YTF catch reaches 10% TAC Limit	Increased impacts on EFH if more bottom time is used on DAS in the open areas compared to the bottom time required to harvest trip limit in AA trip.	If the YTF bycatch TAC is reached in NLCA, LA vessels would be permitted to use AA trips at a compensation rate (set at 5:4 DAS) in open areas. If NLCA closes early those DAS can be used in open areas in the Mid-Atlantic, which could have negative impacts on turtles if they were used during the summer/fall months.	Positive economic impacts compared to vessels losing this trip due to closure of access area
2.5.1.2	TAC set-asides for observers (1%) and research (2%)	Indirect benefits on resource, EFH, PR and fishery from information collected through research and observer programs.		
2.5.1.4	DAS adjustments if the LAGC IFQ program is not implemented by March 1, 2010	No expected impacts on scallop resource or EFH.	No expected differences in impacts on protected resources if the limited access fishery lands these scallops or the general category fishery.	Positive benefit for the LAGC fishery, may have some geographic redistributions of the landings stream of scallops from ports that are predominantly limited access-based to those that are predominantly LAGC, in the short-term.
2.6. MEASURES FOR GENERAL CATEGORY VESSELS (PR29)				
2.6.1	Measures if IFQ program is delayed	No expected impacts on scallop resource or EFH.	No expected differences in impacts on protected resources if the limited access fishery lands these scallops or the general category fishery.	Positive benefit for the LAGC fishery, may have some geographic redistributions of the landings stream of scallops from ports that are predominantly limited access-based to those that are predominantly LAGC, in the short-term.
2.6.1.1	Quarterly hard-TAC for transition period to limited entry	Not expected to have impacts on the resource or habitat.	Not likely to have measurable impacts on protected resources except that it could potentially mitigate the possibility of concentrated effort over protracted periods of time.	a hard TAC can bring about derby fishing with its attendant negative impacts, the use of a quarterly hard TAC is designed to lessen that tendency and as such may lessen the negative impacts in the interim.
2.6.2	Georges Bank access area management		If the YTF TAC is reached in NLCA there could be negative impacts on protected resources because of effort shifts to MA. Positive impacts on YT bycatch within NL.	
2.6.3	Mid-Atlantic access area management		Seasonal ETA closure rollover expected to have positive effects on protected resources.	
2.6.4	NGOM Hard-TAC	Positive impacts on resource and EFH by preventing overfishing in this area.	No expected impacts on protected resources.	TAC would provide a marginal source of revenue for permitted vessels until the resource status can be better determined.
2.6.5	Estimate of catch from LA incidental permits	Indirect benefits on resource by removing this source of mortality before allocations are made to the fishery.	No expected impacts on protected resources.	Positive impacts on vessels that do not qualify for a LAGC permit because it will allow them to earn some income from scallops under the incidental permit, and may provide more flexibility for vessels that do qualify for the LAGC permit but opt for this permit instead.
2.6.6	Allow leasing of partial general category IFQ allocations during the fishing year	No direct impacts on EFH or resource	No expected impacts on protected resources.	Will provide flexibility for the general category vessels and have positive impacts on their economic profits.

SECTION ALTERNATIVES ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH) PROTECTED RESOURCE IMPACTS (Turtles) ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)

2.7 CONSIDERATION OF ROTATIONAL AREA IN THE GREAT SOUTH CHANNEL (page 30)			
2.7.1.1	No action		Closure and low F is estimated to increase scallop revenues by 28.4 and total economic benefits by \$22.1 million in the long-term for the period from 2010-2016 compared to the status quo. The high F option with closure will reduce the total economic benefits by \$25.8 million during the same period. Social impacts include less flexibility for businesses stemming from possible short-term decreases in revenue, which would especially affect businesses with smaller cash flows, or less access to economic and social resources. Social impacts will predominantly be felt in the Northern fleet and for small boats/businesses due to decreased flexibility.
2.7.1.2	New rotational area in the Channel north of Nantucket Lightship and west of CAI	Beneficial to EFH and scallop resource within the closure area, however, closure would increase overall bottom area swept for the stock since that area includes some of the higher LPUJ areas left in open areas. In the longer term projected exploitable biomass higher overall if area closed.	Not likely to confer benefits to turtles because of their general scarcity in the area and because effort could potentially shift to the Mid-Atlantic where sea turtles have a higher risk of interaction with the fishery. If the channel is closed area swept likely to be higher in MA and overall, which could have impacts on non-target species in those areas.
2.8 ALTERNATIVES TO COMPLY WITH RPM (page 34)			
2.8.1.1	Restrict number of OA DAS an individual can use in the Mid-Atlantic during a certain window of time	Impacts on resource and EFH difficult to predict because we do not know how fishing behavior will change. In general, shifting effort from Jun-Oct to rest of the year is expected to increase F overall since meat weight yields lower in winter and spring compared to summer, on average.	Estimated to reduce the scallop fleet revenues by \$536,410 (Status Quo) to \$573,927 (CF20) if 10% of the open area effort is shifted from the June 16 - Oct 14 window to the rest of the year by restricting the open area DAS allocations in Mid-Atlantic during this season. Those negatively impacted are fishermen who have traditionally fished in a given area, who have smaller vessels or who are homeported nearby and are less mobile - distributional impacts expected.
	<i>Option A for Area - south of LI</i>		
	<i>Option B for Area - subareas based on SST</i>		
	<i>Option A for time window - June 16 - Oct 14</i>		
	<i>Option B for time window - June 15 - Oct 31</i>	Good for resource if effort shifts from late October to more productive months since meat weights lower in late fall.	If 10% of total effort in that area and time are shifted to other seasons or areas as a result of either RPM Alternative #1 or #2, overall impacts on turtles are expected to be positive since less effort will be permitted in the area and time of year when turtle interactions are most likely. Restrictions through late Oct would be more precautionary and could have positive effects if migratory patterns change.

SECTION		ALTERNATIVES		ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH)		PROTECTED RESOURCE IMPACTS (Turtles)		ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)	
2.8.1 ALTERNATIVES TO COMPLY WITH FISHING REGULATIONS (Pages 24)									
2.8.1.2	Restrict number of AA trips in the Mid-Atlantic that can be used during a certain window of time	Option A for time window - June 16 - Oct 14	Impacts on resource and EFH difficult to predict because we do not know how fishing behavior will change. In general, shifting effort from Jun-Oct to rest of the year is expected to increase F overall since meat weight yields lower in winter and spring compared to summer, on average.	If 10% of total effort in that area and time are shifted to other seasons or areas as a result of either RPM Alternative #1 or #2, overall impacts on turtles are expected to be positive since less effort will be permitted in the area and time of year when turtle interactions are most likely. Restrictions through late Oct would be more precautionary and could have positive effects if migratory patterns change.	Estimated to reduce the revenues relatively more compared to Alternative 1 for each scenario and season, ranging from a \$358,928 loss (NCP20) for the longer season with a 10% effort shift to \$1,691,600 for a 100% effort reduction in the access areas during the turtle window. Given potential in loss of access trips to the Mid-Atlantic, the social impacts from loss of revenue could be substantial and would impact the Mid-Atlantic and Southern fleet disproportionately. This could impact fishermen and fishing households, and communities and the infrastructures that landing activity helps to sustain. Shifting effort out of summer months could have safety-at-sea implications.				
2.8.1.3	Consider a seasonal closure for Delmarva	Option B for time window - June 15 - Oct 31	Good for resource if effort shifts from late October to more productive months since meat weights lower in late fall.	Restrictions through late Oct would be more precautionary and could have positive effects if migratory patterns change.	Because this alternative shifts effort to a window when the meat weight of scallops are larger, it results in an increase in revenue ranging from \$400,606 (CP20, short-period) to \$484,266 (NCF20, long-period) if possession limit were increased outside of window to maintain the same F. If possession limits are not increased, overall F would likely decline, and landings and revenue would be the same. Fishermen who combine scallop fishing with other fisheries could be negatively impacted if prevented from participation in other fisheries by time conflicts. Shifting effort out of fall months when weather is relatively calm compared to other times of the year could have safety-at-sea implications.				
		Option A - Sept 1 - Oct 31	Beneficial to resource if effort shifts to months with higher meat weight yields. Reducing effort in the area during months of lower meat yields will reduce mortality. Some effort from Sept-Oct could also shift to months with lower meat weights as well - so impacts still uncertain.	Will depend on when and where effort is displaced. If effort redistributes to surrounding time periods such as Nov and Dec, then the number of turtle interactions would likely decrease because effort is shifting into cooler-water months when sea turtles are not likely to be in the area, positively impacting protected resources.	Largest negative impact on revenue since reduction in possession limit would reduce the landings from access areas during all periods, rather than shifting the landings from one period to another. Revenue reduction would range from about \$13 million with a 10% reduction in possession limit to about \$66.5 for a 10% shift in effort during the turtle window. Loss of revenue of a large scale can not only impact fishermen and fishing households, but communities and the infrastructures that landing activity helps to sustain.				
		Option B - Oct 1 - Oct 31							
2.8.1.4	Reduce possession limits in ETA and/or Delmarva to reduce fishing time		Beneficial to resource due to lower effort levels and presumed increase in stock biomass.	Likely to be positive for protected resources because this alternative does not allow effort to be shifted to other seasons or areas, it simply reduces it for the entire area and year.					

**SECTION ALTERNATIVES ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS
(Scallop resource, EFH) PROTECTED RESOURCE
IMPACTS (Turtles) ECONOMIC IMPACTS
(Economic and Social environments)**

2.9 IMPROVEMENTS TO THE OBSERVER SET-ASIDE PROGRAM (page 37)			
2.9.1.1	No action	No direct impacts.	No direct impacts.
2.9.1.2	Provisions to discourage vessels owners from not paying deployed observers	No direct impacts on scallop resource; potential indirect positive impacts from better monitoring coverage.	No direct impacts on protected resources; potential indirect positive impacts from better monitoring coverage.
2.9.2	Limit the amount of observer compensation general category vessels can get per observed trip in access areas	No direct impacts on scallop resource; potential indirect positive impacts from better monitoring coverage.	No direct impacts on protected resources; potential indirect positive impacts from better monitoring coverage.

