

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.2</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE WITH RE-AUTHORIZED MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT - page 11</b>		
<b>3.2.1 and 3.2.2</b>	Definition and integration of new terms	No alternatives - No impacts	No alternatives - No impacts
<b>3.2.3</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR IMPLEMENTING ACLs IN THE SCALLOP FMP - page 19</b>		
<b>3.2.3.1</b>	No Action	Stauts quo.	Status quo.
<b>3.2.3.2</b>	ACL Structure	In theory these measures should help prevent overfishing, with beneficial impacts on the resource. Implementation of these measures overall should not have any impacts on EFH or protected resources.	The overall results on the scallop fishery will depend on how these methods will affect the total scallop landings compared to status quo methods. In general, the differences in the yield streams are not expected to be significant and the AMs are expected to have beneficial impacts on the resource by minimizing the risks due to the scientific and management uncertainty. This in turn is expected to have positive impacts on the scallop yield and overall positive impacts on revenues, producer and consumer surpluses and net economic benefits from the fishery.
<b>3.2.3.3</b>	Northern Gulf of Maine ACL		
<b>3.2.3.4</b>	Other sources of scallop fishing mortality		
<b>3.2.3.5</b>	ACL sub-components		
<b>3.2.3.6</b>	Placement of terms and buffers for uncertainty		
<b>3.2.3.7</b>	Description of scientific uncertainty	The Magnuson Act requires the FMP describe specific sources of management and scientific uncertainty. The magnitude of uncertainty affects buffers placed between fishing threshold and targets.	Because the Council is not permitted to set catch above ABC, having an ABC control rule should help prevent overfishing and have beneficial impacts on the scallop resource, scallop yield, revenues, and producer and consumer surpluses, leading to net positive benefits for the fishery.
3.2.3.7.1	Qualitative analysis of scientific uncertainty		
3.2.3.7.2	Quantitative analysis of scientific uncertainty		
3.2.3.7.3	ABC control rule		
<b>3.2.3.8</b>	Description of management uncertainty		
<b>3.2.3.8.1</b>	<b>BUFFER BETWEEN LIMITED ACCES SUB-ACL AND ACT - page 40</b>		
	LA ACT set at F rate with 25% probability of exceeding LA portion of total ACL = ABC	By setting fishing targets lower than ABC/ACL, the chance of overfishing should be reduced, having beneficial impacts on the resource.	The short-term and long-term economic benefits of setting ACTs will depend on the difference of annual ACTs from the landing streams that would be projected to materialize without the change in management process; i.e., under the status quo scenario. If the new system results in a similar landings stream as expected, there would be no change in economic benefits from the status quo levels. Even if the landing streams changed as a result of the new measures, the risk to the resource from overfishing either due to the scientific or management uncertainty would be minimized by the better accounting of sources of uncertainty in the proposed measures.
	Identify a specific buffer based on results of new analyses of A) variability in estimate of LPUE, or B) projected LPUE compared to actual estimates from open area DAS.		
<b>3.2.3.8.2</b>	<b>BUFFER BETWEEN GENERAL CATEGORY SUB-ACL AND ACT - page 46</b>		
	Zero buffer (LAGC ACL = LAGC ACT)	By setting fishing targets lower than ABC/ACL, the chance of overfishing should be reduced, having beneficial impacts on the resource.	
	Up to 5% buffer to account for potential monitoring concerns, IFQ carryover provision and other implementation error		

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH. Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.2.9</b>	<b>ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES FOR SCALLOP ACLs</b>		
<b>3.2.3.9.1</b>	<b>LIMITED ACCESS AMs - page 47</b>		
	Use of ACT	AMs will hold the fishery more accountable for any overages; therefore having beneficial impacts on the resource.	If AMs help prevent overfishing, then the positive impacts to the resource will in the long-run provide positive economic impacts and social benefits for scallop fishermen and communities.
	Overall DAS reduction in the subsequent year to account for overage		
	Include a disclaimer for when LA AM would not be triggered		
<b>3.2.3.9.2</b>	<b>GENERAL CATEGORY AMs - page 48</b>		
	Use of ACT	AMs will hold the fishery more accountable for any overages; therefore having beneficial impacts on the resource.	Although the first measure would be more economically beneficial to the general category fishery in the short-term, the second one could have potential positive economic benefits only if a large percentage of qualifiers exceed their IFQ, which is unlikely.
	IFQ reduced in subsequent fishing year		
<b>3.2.3.9.3</b>	<b>NGOM AMs - page 48</b>		
	Reduce Hard TAC subsequent year	AMs will hold the fishery more accountable for any overages; therefore beneficial impacts on the resource	
<b>3.2.3.10</b>	Scallop ACLs for other fisheries		
<b>3.2.3.11</b>	<b>ACLs SET IN OTHER FMPs FOR THE SCALLOP FISHERY</b>		
3.2.3.11.1	Analysis used to identify potential non-target species	No alternatives - No impacts.	No alternatives - No impacts.
<b>3.2.3.11.2</b>	<b>YELLOWTAIL FLOUNDER - page 52</b>		
3.2.3.11.2.1.1	Seasonal closure of a portion of the stock area pre-identified as having high bycatch	Effort shifts are expected with all of the YT AMs under consideration, and effort shifts can have negative consequences on the scallop resource if effort is shifted to less optimal areas and into seasons with lower meat weights. Some of the in-season YT AMs could cause derby fishing, which can also have negative consequences on the scallop resource if effort is merged into a smaller window of time when scallop meat weights are not optimal. Several of the YT AMs could have negative impacts on sea turtles if they shift effort to the Mid-Atlantic when turtles are present. If other YT stock areas close to the fishery more effort is expected in open areas in the Mid-Atlantic.	Effort shifts can have negative economic impacts if effort is shifted to less optimal areas and into seasons with lower meat weights. Some of the in-season YT AMs could cause derby fishing, which can also have negative impacts on prices and revenues if effort is merged into a smaller window of time when scallop meat weights are not optimal. The options which would be based on identification of areas that have higher bycatch rates within a YT stock area and closing only these portions, or the options that would remove the overages in the next year for example from individual DAS would not have the negative impacts of in-season YT AMs. Individually based allocation of DAS will prevent derby fishing and allowing vessels to trade area specific DAS/IFQ would reduce distributional impacts with positive economic impacts on the participants.
<i>Option A</i>	In-season		
<i>Option B</i>	AM effective in year 3		
3.2.3.11.2.1.2	In-season closure of entire YT stock area		
3.2.3.11.2.1.3	Fleet wide maximum of DAS and percent of IFQ that can be used in a stock area		
3.2.3.11.2.1.4	Individual maximum of DAS and percent of IFQ that can be used in a stock area		
3.2.3.11.2.1.5	Revise the opening date of access areas on Georges Bank		

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH. Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
3.3	<b>MEASURES TO ADDRESS EXCESS CAPACITY IN THE LIMITED ACCESS FISHERY</b>		
3.3.1	No Action	No impacts on scallop resource expected from no action. The fishery has sufficient measures to prevent overfishing, and if OF does occur, corrective measures can be taken in a framework action to reduce effort.	If this alternative is selected the excess capacity in the scallop fishery will remain and the economic benefits derived from the scallop fishery will be less than they could be if the vessels are operated at technically efficient levels. On the other hand, under no action the employment levels will probably be higher and some of the distributional impacts of stacking would be prevented.
<b>3.3.2</b>	<b>PERMIT STACKING - page 60</b>		
3.3.2.1	Restrict action to two permits only		Reducing excess capacity by having a smaller number
<b>3.3.2.2</b>	<b>Fishing power adjustment for stacking permits</b>	If the fishing power adjustments are sufficient to prevent potential increases in catch, then there are no impacts expected on the scallop resource. Selecting a higher percentage for the mortality adjustment would reduce potential risks of increased catch. It is possible that the alternative that restricts stacking between vessels that meet the replacement criteria could increase catch and F because analyses support that even when vessels are the same length and horsepower catch on one can be greater. Vessel age and increased flexibility can have impacts on catch that would not be accounted for with this alternative. The third alternative has similar risks of increased catch for vessels with the same replacement criteria described above. Neutral impacts on EFH and PR expected.	of vessels harvesting ACT would increase the technical efficiency, reduce fishing costs, and increase profits and producer surplus. This would also help to reduce congestion at the docks, and reduce the waste of fuel, electricity and lower maintenance costs. Permit stacking and leasing options could lead to increased safety if the open area DAS and access area trips are fished on newer boats. On the other hand, permit stacking and/or DAS leasing could have adverse economic impacts on vessels that are not involved with DAS transfers if no adjustments are made to transferred DAS to keep the fishing mortality constant. The social impact section summarizes the negative impacts from consolidation from various other fisheries worldwide. These negative impacts would tend to be on those less powerful segments of the fishing industry, including crew and/or the small business owners without a fleet of vessels or vertically integrated business. Overall increases in personal income are expected for vessel owners and crew that remain.
3.3.2.2.1	Permits can be stacked provided there is a fishing power adjustment		
3.3.2.2.2	Permits can only be stacked which meet replacement criteria		
3.3.2.2.3	Permits in same replacement criteria category have no adjustment applied and permits from different categories would be subject to adjustment		
3.3.2.2.4	Restriction on stacking for trawl permits	The alternative that puts restrictions on trawl vessels that stack with dredge permits would reduce potential future increases of F if that vessel converted back to a trawl permit and fished both permits with trawl gear. Trawl gear is capable of catching smaller scallops, so more animals are killed for the same weight, leading to a higher F.	
3.3.2.3	Status of stacked permits		
<i>Option A</i>	Permits can de-stack	De-stacking removes the possibility to permanently eliminate capacity in the fishery; however, excess capacity does not directly impact the resource so long as there are sufficient measures in place to limit catch and mortality.	Job losses are expected under stacking, in the most extreme example - 50% of vessels stack- about 250 jobs would be lost, primarily crew and manufacturing jobs that support vessel services. The most significant benefits of permit stacking would be a reduction in the fixed costs, resulting in higher overall profits for the scallop fleet. For example, in the case of maximum stacking scenario, the fixed costs are estimated to decline by 24%, trip costs by 6% and the profits are estimated to increase by 26% to 30%. If the permit stacking is less than maximum, the overall fleet savings in fishings costs and the increase in fleet profits will be smaller, but the individual vessels that are involved with permit stacking/leasing would still be able to increase their profits significantly.
<i>Option B</i>	Permits cannot de-stack		

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.3.3</b>	<b>LEASING - page 67</b>	<p>If the fishing power adjustments are sufficient to prevent potential increases in catch, then there are no impacts expected on the scallop resource. Most of the provisions related to leasing do not have direct impacts on the resource. Neutral impacts on EFH expected.</p>	<p>Similar conclusions are valid for the impacts of leasing alternatives, except that, in the case of leasing, the saving in the fixed costs would be lower than compared with stacking options, but leasing will provide some additional flexibility to some vessels that are not able or need to buy a whole permit to increase their operations to the optimal levels.</p>
3.3.3.1	Leasing of open area DAS		
3.3.3.1.1	Fishing power adjustment for leasing open area DAS		
3.3.3.1.2	Maximum DAS that can be leased		
3.3.3.1.3	DAS and landings history		
3.3.3.2	Leasing of access area trips		
3.3.3.3	Ownership cap provisions		
3.3.3.4	Leasing restrictions options		
3.3.3.5	Application requirements		
3.3.3.6	Leasing from vessels in CPH		
	Allow leasing from vessels in CPH		
	Prohibit leasing from vessels in CPH		
3.3.3.7	Sub-leasing		
3.3.3.8	Other Leasing Provisions		
<b>3.4</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADJUST SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF FMP AND MAKE OVERALL PROGRAM MORE EFFECTIVE</b>		
<b>3.4.1</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADJUST THE CURRENT OFD TO BE MORE COMPATIBLE WITH AREA ROTATION - page 71</b>		
3.4.1.1	No action.	<p>The SQ OFD underestimates the effects of fishing mortality because F is averaged across closed, access, and open areas, which all receive different amounts of fishing pressure. Yield-per-recruit is reduced with a spatially averaged OFD (current) because the yield is far lower in open areas. In the near term SQ OFD would produce higher landings, but over time they would reduce. None of these alternatives are expected to have impacts on EFH or PR.</p>	<p>The A10-modified definition is expected to increase catch by 10% with larger average scallop size in the long term. If these objectives are materialized, this measure could increase landings and revenues and reduce costs for the scallop fishery resulting in higher producer, consumer and net national benefits compared to the no action alternative. By removing the influence of the un-harvested biomass from closed areas from the open areas' mortality estimate, the expected higher Ftarget would provide greater fishing opportunities in line with rotational management, with positive social impacts for scallop fishermen.</p>
3.4.1.2	A10 OFD – Time averaged within specific areas	<p>A10 OFD averages F over time with in particular areas and removes the influence of the unharvested biomass in closed areas. Yield-per-recruit is increased compared to No Action. It also reduces impacts on bycatch and habitat by reducing area swept because F is lower in open areas.</p>	
3.4.1.3	Hybrid overfishing definition alternative	<p>Similar to A10 definition, but the Fthreshold would stay the same, but the target would be set based on time averaged F from areas open to fishing. An additional restriction would be set that the spatially averaged F shall not be higher than 80% of threshold. Similar impacts on resource, EFH and bycatch to A10 definition.</p>	

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.4.2</b>	<b>MINOR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE LIMITED ACCESS GENERAL CATEGORY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</b>		
<b>3.4.2.1</b>	<b>PROVISION TO ALLOW IFQ ROLLOVER - page 77</b>		
3.4.2.1.1	No action		
3.4.2.1.2	Allow rollover of up to 15% of IFQ	This should not pose any impacts on the resource because the rollover catch is accounted for in Year 1, but may be caught in Year 2. This could cause issues with annual catch limits, but in terms of impacts on the resource it should be neutral. Neutral impacts on EFH and PR as well.	A rollover allowance would provide greater flexibility for fishermen with positive economic and social impacts. On the other hand, allowing IFQ rollover could increase management uncertainty for the following fishing year, increasing the likelihood of a larger buffer and reducing the total quota allocated to the general category fishery.
<b>3.4.2.2</b>	<b>CONSIDERATION OF A GENERAL CATEGORY SECTOR APPLICATION - page 77</b>		
	One application was received but withdrawn		
<b>3.4.2.3</b>	<b>MODIFY THE GENERAL CATEGORY POSSESSION LIMIT - page 78</b>		
3.4.2.3.1	No action		
3.4.2.3.2	Modify the possession limit up to 1000 lbs	No impacts on resource provided the size composition of catch does not decrease. Neutral impacts on EFH and PR.	Modifying the general category possession limit (3.4.2.3) might increase economic returns for these fishing trips, with positive social impacts, but the further the fishery moves from trip limits to a pure ITQ, the further it moves from the small-scale, day-boat fishery that Amendment 11 sought to ensure. An increase in the general category possession limit is expected to reduce fishing costs and increase profits for these vessels. As a result, total producer surplus and net economic benefits could increase. The results would depend on the costs per day and the steaming time.
3.4.2.3.3	Eliminate the possession limit		
<b>3.4.2.4</b>	<b>MODIFY THE MAXIMUM QUOTA ONE VESSEL CAN FISH - page 78</b>		
3.4.2.4.1	No action	No direct impacts on the resource, EFH or PR.	
3.4.2.4.2	Modify the maximum quota one vessel can fish from 2% to 2.5% of total general category allocation	No direct impacts on the resource, EFH or PR.	Making the ownership restrictions consistent would provide more flexibility for vessels to adjust their harvest levels based on changes in scallop resource conditions, and will have positive impacts on profits.
<b>3.4.2.5</b>	<b>ALLOW LAGC QUOTA TO BE TRANSFERRED FROM IFQ PERMITS - page 79</b>		
3.4.2.5.1	Allow LAGC IFQ permit owners to permanently transfer some or all quota allocation to another IFQ permit holder	No direct impacts on the resource. Neutral on EFH and PR.	Could move the fishery closer to a pure ITQ with a host of potential negative impacts (see stacking and leasing above). The transfer of quota to a community-based trust; however, could have many positive impacts, as the literature on co-management and community-based management suggests. Under these alternatives general category scallop TAC is likely to be fully utilized by qualifiers with positive impacts on revenues and producer and consumer benefits.
3.4.2.5.2	Allow LAGC IFQ permit owners to permanently transfer some or all allocation to a community-based trust or permit bank	No direct impacts on the resource. Neutral impacts on EFH and PR.	

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
3.4.2.6	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY FISHING ASSOCIATIONS (CFAs) - page 80</b>		
3.4.2.6.1	No action		
3.4.2.6.2	Establish process for CFAs	No direct impacts on the resource, EFH, or PR.	<p>The establishment of CFAs will not impact overall scallop landings and revenues from the general category fishery. It will have positive impacts on the participants, however, by allowing fishermen to combine their allocations and to fish using fewer vessels in order to reduce fishing costs. This will provide an opportunity for fishermen to establish and benefit from an economically viable operation when the allocations of individual vessels are too small to make scallop fishing profitable. Under these conditions, general category scallop TAC is likely to be fully utilized by qualifiers with positive impacts on revenues and producer and consumer benefits. There is some concern that CFAs could change the nature of the general category fishery from a small day-boat fishery to a fishery dominated by a few large boats fishing like offshore boats with multiple day trips. As long as general category fishery is subject to a 400 lb. possession limit per trip, however, there will be less incentive to consolidate shares on boats with higher fishing power or to invest in larger capacity boats.</p>
	What can a CFA own and lease out	There could be some indirect positive impacts if the associations identify ways to fish more efficiently, reduce bycatch, and prevent interactions with the protected species.	<p>It remains to be seen how CFAs will affect employment and crew incomes in the general category fishery. Although scallop fishing with fewer vessels would reduce employment to some extent, given that many general category vessels participate in other fisheries as well, these negative impacts on crew could be small.</p>
	<i>Option A - quota only</i>		
	<i>Option B - quota and permits</i>		

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH. Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.4.3</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADDRESS EFH CLOSED AREAS IF EFH OMNIBUS AMENDMENT 2 IS DELAYED - page 85</b>		
3.4.3.1	No action		
3.4.3.2	Modify EFH closed areas to scallop gear under A10 to be consistent with MS Amendment 13	<p>Having both sets of EFH areas closed to scallop gear has had impacts on the fishery. Additional open area DAS have been allocated to meet fishing targets, which puts effort in areas with lower catch rates. This increases impacts on the scallop resource if fishing is in suboptimal areas, and increases bottom time which has impacts on bycatch and EFH. If some open area DAS are currently used in the Mid-Atlantic that would have been used in access areas on GB, limiting EFH areas on GB should revert some effort back to GB. When considering joint Frameworks 16/39 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop and Northeast Multispecies FMPs, the Council concluded that the potential habitat gain from protecting the southern part of the access area in Closed Area I that has not been part of a previous access program did not outweigh the economic costs of preventing the scallop fleet from accessing this area.</p>	<p>In future acts (FW22) effort could be allocated to Closed Area 1 where the scallops are larger instead of allocating more open area effort in areas with lower catch rates. This in turn could have positive effects on the scallop resource and future yield. According to the estimates, the future yield could increase by 526mt or by 1.2 million lb. a year, resulting in about \$8 million (assuming a price of \$7 per lb.) more revenues from the scallop fishery per year. Fishing in more productive areas would also reduce the fishing costs. Therefore this alternative is expected to increase revenues, profits and producer and consumer surpluses from scallop fishery with overall positive impacts on net economic benefits by increasing potential areas for scallop area rotation.</p>
		<p>However, this future change, as well as any other scallop access area changes, would be analyzed in a joint framework action (likely Framework 22, 2011-2012 fishing year) in light of their potential positive impacts on the scallop fishery, and considering potential negative impacts on the finfish bycatch and on EFH. At this time, it is anticipated that the Swept Area Seabed Impact Model will be available for comparing the vulnerability of particular areas to scallop dredge gear.</p>	

SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.4.4</b>	<b>MEASURES TO IMPROVE RESEARCH SET-ASIDE PROGRAM - page 87</b>		
3.4.4.1	No action		
3.4.4.2	Publish federal funding opportunity as early as possible		If improvements enhance the possibilities for and benefits from research, there would be positive indirect economic and social benefits for scallop fishermen and communities that participate in the fishery.
3.4.4.3	Extend the RSA program to be multi-year	If the program can be more streamlined and worthwhile projects can occur with less obstacles, better and more timely research will result. This will have indirect benefits on the scallop resource. None of the RSA alternatives are expected to have impacts on EFH.	
3.4.4.4	Modify open area RSA allocation from DAS to pounds		
3.4.4.5	Modify entire RSA allocation to a fixed poundage rather than a percent		
3.4.4.6	Separate RSA TAC into 2 subsets (survey and other)		
3.4.4.7	Remove additional TAC specific for survey work in addition to 2% set-aside	Having dedicated resource for funding research to survey access areas would improve ability to allocate the appropriate amount of effort to prevent overfishing and optimize yield.	
3.4.4.8	Rollover of RSA TAC		
3.4.4.8.1	Rollover of unused RSA TAC to the next FY	All rollover measures have indirect benefits to the resource because it increases the ability to use all catch set-aside for research. However, if research set-aside is not used it remains in the ocean and is beneficial to the resource by adding to future yield and recruitment.	
3.4.4.8.2	Rollover of unused RSA TAC to second solicitation in same FY		
3.4.4.8.3	Rollover of unused TAC to same individuals for program development funds		
3.4.4.8.4	Rollover of unused TAC to help fund observer program		
3.4.4.8.5	Rollover of unused TAC to compensate awarded projects		
3.4.4.9	Extension for harvesting compensation TAC		
3.4.4.10	Increase public input of RSA review process		
3.4.4.11	Regulations from which RSA projects are exempt	Eliminating the crew restriction and requirement to return to port if fishing in more than one area are not expected to have impacts on resource, bycatch or EFH provided compensation does not involve harvesting smaller scallops. Fishing in ETA in Sept and Oct would have higher F and impacts on turtles compared to some other seasons of the year, but getting data on turtles during that period should greatly improve our understanding of turtle interactions with the scallop fishery. It is not clear if the potential impacts on turtles would be outweighed by the potential benefits of conducting research in that area during that season when interaction rates are expected to be highest. It is unlikely that all the RSA set aside for ETA would be harvested during this seasonal closure because this time of year has lower meat weights and quality is not optimal. However, there is demand for Elephant Trunk scallops and if the rest of the fishery is closed out of the area, prices may be higher for pounds from that area during the seasonal closure.	



SECTION	ALTERNATIVES	ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS (Scallop resource, EFH, Protected resources)	ECONOMIC IMPACTS (Economic and Social environments)
<b>3.4.5 MEASURES TO CHANGE THE SCALLOP FISHING YEAR - page 90</b>			
3.4.5.1	No Action	This would improve integration of best available science having indirect benefits on the resource. Council is considering this again in this action based on new ACL requirements. No direct impacts on EFH or PR.	A more accurate estimation of TACs for the access areas will reduce uncertainty associated with the rotational area management, and an implementation time that coincides better with the fishing year will benefit the scallop fishery and have positive economic impacts on the participants. On the other hand, there will be some business risks associated when the fishing year starts at a later date. It will require a change in the business plans of the scallop fishermen and create some risks if plans do not materialize due to unforeseen conditions. Presently, the fishing year begins at a time when meat-weight of scallops begins to increase and a higher yield per unit effort could be obtained from scallop fishing. As a result, the vessels start using their day-at-sea based on the current resource and market conditions and fishing costs (such as fuel prices). If the fishing year starts in May, the vessel owners may need to postpone part of their day-at-sea allocations until the following March, since 15% to 18% of scallops are usually landed during the months of March and April.
3.4.5.2	Change start of fishing year from March 1 to May 1		Market conditions, bad weather, and unforeseen conditions could affect how many of the day-at-sea allocations could be used at the end of the fishing year. DAS carryover provisions help to some degree, but changing the YT later could create different risks and reduced predictability. Negative impacts associated with this change could decline over time, however, as the vessel-owners gain experience with the new fishing year and learn to adjust their business plans more efficiently to the new conditions. Even though there could be some short-term decline in producer benefits, there is no question that more accurate estimation of area TACs and day-at-sea allocations will improve scallop yield over the long-term, increase revenues, and reduce the business costs associated with constantly changing regulations. Therefore, the positive economic impacts of changing the fishing year are expected to outweigh the negative impacts in some circumstances when the scallop resource and market conditions turn out to be less favorable than expected.
3.4.5.2 (cont'd)			