Based on issues raised during the public comment period, additional background and analyses on the impacts of Amendment 15 alternatives on other fisheries will be incorporated in the FEIS. This information will be available before the Council makes final decisions on Amendment 15.

1.1 IMPACTS ON OTHER FISHERIES

1.1.1 Background

The Amendment 15 alternatives are evaluated below for their impacts on other fisheries. Emphasis has been added on those fisheries that limited access and general category scallop vessels have other permits for.

The scallop fishery is year round and extends from Maine to North Carolina. Therefore, the potential impacts on other fisheries depend on where vessels are generally homeported, and the amount of time their vessel has to engage in other fisheries. In recent years scallop vessels have reduced the amount of time they are targeting scallops. Days fished have been dramatically reduced since limited entry was adopted with a DAS system in 1994. Furthermore, since area rotation was formally established in 2004, DAS-used have reduced even further (See Table 53 in 5.4.3).

Table 1 lists the permits held in other fishery management plans (FMPs) by scallop limited access (LA) permit holders, and Table 2 gives those for the LAGC separated out by permit category. It is clear from these Tables that the majority of LA and LAGC vessels have permits in several fisheries other than scallops including monkfish, multispecies, summer flounder and skates just to name a few. Not all of the LA and LAGC vessels with multiple fishery permits were active in those fisheries, however. For the full-time and part-time LA vessels, monkfish (242 FT, 28 PT vessels active in 2009) and summer flounder (68FT, 22PT vessels active in 2009) were the top fisheries with the highest rate of participation, followed by sea bass and squid fisheries which have a considerably less participation especially by the FT vessels (Table 3 and Table 4). The same is true for LAGC vessels except that their activity is distributed in a wider range of fisheries including multispecies, lobster, squid, scup and small mesh fisheries (Table 5).

In order to investigate how behavior might change with alternatives in this document and what impact they could have, it is necessary to know what the major controls are for each fishery and how the plan works for vessels with LA and LAGC scallop permits in those fisheries. The type of effort controls and management scheme will play a role in determining the potential magnitude of potential impacts from this action. For example, the surf clam fishery is an ITQ managed fishery, so even if a vessel with a clam permit leased all scallop effort they can't increase their clam catch beyond what they have quota for. However, some of the other fisheries are managed by hard TACs, so it is conceivable that if a scallop vessel got rid of the scallop effort it could increase effort in other fisheries and land more of these TAC managed species than it currently is; potentially having negative impacts on other vessels in these fisheries. Table 7 lists the main management measures for all FMPs that have permits on scallop vessels.

When assessing potential impacts, it is also important to get a sense of how catch has been in these fisheries. If the TACs in a plan are reached or close every year, an increase in effort

brought about by stacking and leasing measures is more likely to have an impact than if the fishery is seldom near the allotted catch. A rough description of fishery catch levels in relation to their respective controls are provided for fisheries that have catch information readily available in Table 8.

Table 1. Other Fishery Management Plan permits held FY 2009, by scallop limited access boats.

Plan	# held	%
BLUEFISH	317	91
BLACK SEA BASS	141	41
DOGFISH	333	96
SUMMER FLOUNDER	294	85
HERRING	284	82
LOBSTER	223	64
MULTISPECIES	331	95
MONKFISH	341	98
OCEAN QUAHOG	285	82
SCALLOP-LA	347	100
SCALLOP-LAGC	180	52
SCUP	133	38
SURF CLAM	282	81
SMB	326	94
RED CRAB	268	77
SKATE	310	89
TILEFISH	301	87

Table 2. Other Fishery Management Plan permits held FYI 2009, by scallop LAGC boats, separated by permit category.

	CAT A: IFQ		CAT B: NGOM		CAT C: Incidental	
Plan	**# held**	**%**	**# held**	**%**	**# held**	**%**
SCALLOP-LAGC	284	100	113	100	278	100
BLUEFISH	254	89	103	91	245	88
BLK S. BASS	100	35	26	23	138	50
DOGFISH	254	89	107	95	262	94
SMR FLOUNDER	162	57	45	40	207	74
HERRING	225	79	106	94	237	85
LOBSTER	166	58	89	79	199	72
MULTISPECIES	241	85	106	94	255	92
MONKFISH	269	95	106	94	265	95
OCEAN QUAHOG	182	64	59	52	215	77
SCALLOP-LA	40	14	27	24	113	41
SCUP	109	38	32	28	146	53
SURF CLAM	178	63	61	54	217	78
SMB	244	86	100	88	252	91

RED CRAB	196	69		79	70	219	79
SKATE	256	90		100	88	249	90
TILEFISH	220	77		85	75	245	88

Table 3. Number of Full-time vessels with landings of corresponding species (includes fisheries with 5 or more vessels participating)

Species	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010*
MONKFISH (ANGLER)	251	257	277	277	242	204
BLUEFISH	25	24	20	21	18	8
BUTTERFISH	5	6	12	13	13	3
COD	13	14	6	8	7	6
CROAKER, ATLANTIC	8	6	6	14	9	4
FLOUNDER, AM. PLAICE	14	10	5	6	8	6
FLOUNDER, SUMMER	79	86	82	66	68	56
FLOUNDER, WINTER	24	29	37	22	14	9
FLOUNDER, WITCH	17	17	12	11	15	6
FLOUNDER, YELLOWTAIL	18	15	14	10	17	48
HADDOCK	13	10	6	7	6	6
LOBSTER	21	12	12	11	11	11
SCALLOP, SEA	304	312	316	308	308	301
SCUP	18	17	16	20	16	23
SEA BASS, BLACK	28	26	24	26	24	16
SKATES(HEADS)	12	8	5	7	6	6
SQUID (LOLIGO)	31	31	19	27	22	10
WEAKFISH, SQUETEAGUE	12	13	16	12	7	5

*2010 numbers are preliminary

Table 4. Number of Part-time and occasional vessels with landings of corresponding species (includes fisheries with 5 or more vessels participating)

Species	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010*
ANGLER	28	35	29	28	28	24
BLUEFISH	11	17	11	11	15	3
BUTTERFISH	7	8	9	8	6	2
CROAKER, ATLANTIC	6	8	8	5	6	2
FLOUNDER, SUMMER	24	27	25	20	22	21
MACKEREL, ATLANTIC	6	7	7	5	6	7
SCALLOP, SEA	32	36	34	32	34	34
SCUP	12	15	14	8	13	15
SEA BASS, BLACK	19	19	20	17	15	16
SQUID (LOLIGO)	17	20	19	15	15	5
WEAKFISH, SQUETEAGUE	7	11	9	8	7	4

*2010 numbers are preliminary

Table 5. Number of LAGC-IFQ vessels with landings of corresponding species (includes fisheries with 10 or more vessels participating in 2008)

Species	2008	2009	2010*
SCALLOP, SEA	229	247	168
MONKFISH	210	222	167
FLOUNDER, SUMMER	122	120	110
FLOUNDER, WINTER	92	74	59
LOBSTER	88	75	61
COD	84	74	70
FLOUNDER, YELLOWTAIL	80	76	70
SKATES(HEADS)	80	76	59
FLOUNDER, WITCH	79	66	61
HADDOCK	70	62	53
FLOUNDER, AM. PLAICE	69	66	52
BLUEFISH	66	81	51
POLLOCK	63	56	46
SEA BASS, BLACK	61	55	55
SQUID (LOLIGO)	59	64	45
HAKE, WHITE	57	51	45
FLOUNDER, SAND-DAB	52	43	7
HAKE, SILVER	52	54	41
WOLFFISHES	50	38	15
SCUP	44	48	56
HALIBUT, ATLANTIC	41	38	23
BUTTERFISH	40	58	36
REDFISH	39	43	35
WEAKFISH, SQUETEAGUE	37	42	20
CUSK	35	33	27
DOGFISH SPINY	33	59	28
SKATE, WINTER(BIG)	33	44	34
BASS, STRIPED	27	15	10
CROAKER, ATLANTIC	26	35	13
HAKE, RED	26	28	23
DOGFISH SMOOTH	25	38	27
MACKEREL, ATLANTIC	22	33	19
EEL, CONGER	17	15	13
WHITING, KING	15	25	5
SEA ROBINS	14	17	10
TAUTOG	14	9	9
HERRING, ATLANTIC	13	12	15
JOHN DORY	12	8	7
WHELK, CHANNELED	12	14	12
TILEFISH, GOLDEN	11	10	15

Table 6. Number of LAGC-NGO vessels with landings of corresponding species (includes fisheries with 10 or more vessels participating in 2009)

Species	2008	2009	2010*
ANGLER	69	80	66
COD	51	65	54
FLOUNDER, AM. PLAICE	46	57	48
FLOUNDER, WITCH	48	56	44
HADDOCK	49	54	44
POLLOCK	47	54	43
HAKE, WHITE	43	50	41
FLOUNDER, WINTER	38	48	38
FLOUNDER, YELLOWTAIL	37	48	49
LOBSTER	49	47	29
REDFISH	42	46	37
WOLFFISHES	45	46	19
SCALLOP, SEA	23	37	33
HAKE, SILVER	24	36	29
CUSK	33	35	26
DOGFISH SPINY	24	34	26
SKATES(HEADS)	22	31	29
BLUEFISH	13	26	14
HALIBUT, ATLANTIC	19	25	21
SHRIMP (PANDALID)	14	23	12
FLOUNDER, SUMMER	6	21	14
MACKEREL, ATLANTIC	11	18	3
SEA BASS, BLACK	5	17	10
SQUID (LOLIGO)	8	16	9
FLOUNDER, SAND-DAB	11	15	2
SCUP	5	13	12
BUTTERFISH	5	11	7

1.1.2 No Action

If No Action is taken under Amendment 15 there are not expected to be any additional impacts on other fisheries since vessels will likely continue fishing has they have been. The alternatives under consideration for ACLs are expected to have no impacts since they are related to increased accountability and payback type of measures for the fishery if catch limits are exceeded. No Action for the measures to address excess capacity (stacking and leasing), should have neutral impacts on other fisheries. However, there is already a significant amount of latent effort in the limited access scallop fishery at the current allocation levels for open area DAS and access area trips. For example, total DAS-used for an average FT vessel is estimated to be below 70 days for 2010 fishing year, providing ample opportunity for these vessels to engage in other fisheries (Table 10). Therefore, even under no action alternative, it is possible for some vessels to increase their participation in other fisheries if there is a significant change in market conditions and in factors that affect profitability of scallop fishery relative to other fisheries. At the current market prices for scallops and high profitability of the scallop fishery it is unlikely, however, for an effort increase in other fisheries.

Taking no action on the alternative to revise the overfishing definition is not expected to have direct impacts on other fisheries. If No Action is taken on any of the measures under consideration for adjustments to the general category management program, no direct impacts are expected on other fisheries.

No Action on the measure to address EFH closed areas would not have direct impacts on other fisheries; however, having both Amendment 10 and Amendment 13 EFH boundaries apply to the scallop fishery prevents allocating scallop access into areas with the highest catch rates and reduces the benefits of area rotation. If no action is taken for this alternative, effort is shifted into areas with lower scallop catch rates, increasing area swept and potentially time it takes to harvest scallops. More time spent scalloping arguably reduces time those same vessels could pursue other fisheries, but this difference is not expected to be very substantial.

If no action is taken on the measures to improve the research set-aside program, other fisheries would not be impacted. Lastly, if no action is taken on changing the scallop fishing year there are no expected impacts on other fisheries.

Table 7. Summary of management measures for other FMPs with permits on scallop boats.

FMP	How Managed
BLUEFISH	The Atlantic bluefish fishery is managed by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. This fishery utilizes an annual coastwide quota to manage the commercial and recreational fishing fleets.
BLACK SEA BASS	The commercial fishery is managed through an annual coastwide quota. Recreational regulations are generally the same in Federal and state waters. In cases where state and Federal regulations differ, federally permitted charter/party vessels are required to abide by the more restrictive measure.
DOGFISH	This open-access fishery utilizes an annual coastwide quota for commercial fisherman, split into two semi-annual periods, with daily possession limits designed to discourage a directed fishery.
SUMMER FLOUNDER	The annual coastwide commercial quota is allocated to the coastal states based upon percentage shares specified in the FMP. Recreational targets (in number of fish) are established by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.
HERRING	The fishery is managed under a limited-access program, and utilizes an annual coastwide, total allowable catch (TAC), which is split into four area-specific TACs. When an area-specific TAC is reached, the directed fishery in that area is closed, and only incidental catches of herring area allowed.
LOBSTER	The fishery regulations control lobster trap fishing effort based on historic participation in three Lobster Management Areas (LMAs) including LMA 3, the offshore waters of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), and LMAs 4 and 5, the nearshore EEZ from New York to North Carolina. Federal lobster permit holders who intend to fish for lobster with trap gear during the fishing year are required to designate lobster management areas and tag all lobster traps. Federal lobster regulations require Federal permit holders to abide by the most restrictive of either state or Federal trap limits.
MULTISPECIES	This fishery is managed using a variety of management tools, including days-at-sea, special management programs, and sectors.
MONKFISH	The fishery is managed by means of a limited entry program where qualified participants are allocated a specified number of days-at-sea, trip limits (directed and incidental), a minimum size limit, and gear restrictions.
OCEAN QUAHOG	This fishery utilizes an individual transferable quota (ITQ) to regulate commercial fishing.
SCUP	The commercial fishery is managed by trimester (Winter I, Summer, Winter II) subquotas. The recreational scup fishery is managed under separate regulations for Federal and state waters. In cases where state and Federal regulations differ, federally permitted charter/party vessels are required to abide by the more restrictive measure.
SURF CLAM	This fishery utilizes an individual transferable quota (ITQ) to regulate commercial fishing.
Squid	These fisheries utilize annual coastwide quotas to manage fishing fleets and are harvested with small mesh trawl gear. The annual harvest quota for Loligo is divided into trimester allocations spaced throughout the fishing year.
Mackerel	This fishery utilizes an annual coastwide quota to manage commercial and recreational fishing fleets. Mackerel is a large volume fishery primarily harvested with mid-water trawl gear.
Butterfish	This fishery utilizes an annual coastwide quota to manage fishing fleets and is primarily harvested with small mesh trawl gear. Currently, there is not a directed fishery for butterfish. Instead, most butterfish are harvested as bycatch with squid. Because the butterfish stock was declared overfished, the Council is currently developing a rebuilding plan for butterfish.
RED CRAB	This fishery uses days-at-sea, an annual quota, and gear restrictions to manage the commercial fishing fleet.
SKATE	This index-based fishery is managed by both direct and indirect controls on skate fishing mortality, including possession limit restrictions, prohibitions on landing overfished species of skates and management measures in other fisheries that impact skates.
TILEFISH	This fishery uses an Individual Fishing Quota program to manage the commercial fishing fleet.

Table 8. Recent catch trajectories of FMPs with permits in the scallop fishery.

FMP	Current catch (2010)	2009 catch
BLUEFISH	44% quota	61%
BLACK SEA BASS	68%	97%
DOGFISH	have been catching period quota	period quota caught
SUMMER FLOUNDER	69%, quota transfer between states occurring	closed for year in MA; 91% caught overall
HERRING	area closures occurred	high, area closures occurring
SCUP	57%	winter quota met in 2009, closure on 12/9/09
SQUID	61% Illex, 19% Loligo	77% of annual quota Illex; 44% annual quota Loligo
MACKEREL	10%	23%
BUTTERFISH	recently declared overfished, recent closure	closed for year on 11/25/09

*only plans for which catch information was readily available are included at this time.

1.1.3 Compliance with re-authorized Magnuson-Stevens conservation and management act (MSA)

The majority of measures under consideration for this section have no direct impacts on other fisheries. Within this section there are alternatives for accountability measures (AMs) for the scallop fishery and for a sub-ACL of YT flounder. AMs that reduce future scallop allocations could give vessels more time to fish in other fisheries, but not substantially more than recent trends. Overall landings and revenue from other fisheries has not been substantial in recent years, and minor reductions in DAS or seasonal closures from a few of the YT AM alternatives are not expected cause significant increases in effort in other fisheries.

1.1.4 Measures to address excess capacity in the limited access scallop fishery and provide more flexibility for efficient utilization of the resource

1.1.4.1 No Action

If this alternative is selected, then no additional measures would be implemented to reduce capacity in the limited access scallop fishery. All current restrictions would remain in place. Nevertheless, there is already a significant amount of latent effort in the limited access scallop fishery at the current allocation levels for open area DAS and access area trips as discussed in the following section. For example, total DAS-used for an average FT vessel is estimated to be below 70 days for 2010 fishing year, providing ample opportunity for the limited access vessels to engage in other fisheries (Table 10). As a result, even under no action alternative, it is possible for some vessels to increase their participation in other fisheries if there is a significant change in market conditions and in factors that affect profitability of scallop fishery relative to other fisheries.

1.1.4.2 Permit stacking and leasing

In very general terms, permit stacking is expected to have neutral or even positive impacts on other fisheries because vessels that participate in stacking will have less time to potentially prosecute other fisheries, a single platform will likely be more profitable with two scallop allocations reducing incentive to target other fisheries, and when permits stack any duplicate permits cancel. Therefore, overall permits in other fisheries are likely to decline as a result of permit stacking. However, if de-stacking is approved and the Council decides to allow permits in other fisheries to be held dormant while the scallop permits are stacked, but enable those permits in other fisheries to again become active when the scallop permits de-stack, overall impacts would be neutral in this case since those permits exist now. Compared to stacking, permit leasing could have potential negative impacts on other fisheries if a vessel leases out its scallop allocation and increases effort in other fisheries. However, as it is noted below, impacts are expected to be marginal because effort levels are low now even with relatively low annual scallop allocations, and some fisheries have limits that would prevent large increases in effort by vessels that have not previously participated in that fishery. The ultimate impacts of leasing on other fisheries are uncertain and greatly depend on the level of leasing that would occur if adopted, as well as the level of potential latent effort that exists in the fishery.

Because most limited access vessels have permits in and derive an income from other fisheries, there is a concern that leasing under Amendment 15 could lead to higher activity in those fisheries as some vessels cease participating in the scallop fishery by either leasing their allocations or transferring them to other vessels through permit stacking. Indeed, the number of vessels that are presently active in the scallop fishery could decline by as much as 50% under a maximum consolidation scenario from 347 vessels (2010 fishing year) to 174 vessels after consolidation. Assuming that 95% of these vessels have permits in other fisheries, total number of vessels that exit scallop fishery and could target other fisheries could increase to 165 vessels, or 155 FT equivalent vessels. On the other hand, permit stacking/leasing will reduce the number of vessels by the same amount because those vessels that bought/leased permits and doubled their allocations will have much less time to participate in other fisheries. This could offset the increase in effort in other fisheries depending on the impacts of stacking/leasing on total DAS-used in the scallop fishery.

This is illustrated in Table 10 using 2010 allocations as an example. Presently, FT vessels are allocated 38 open area days and 4 access trips and part-time vessels are allocated 15 open area days and 2 access trips. Using an average trip length of 7.25 days, total access area DAS-used per FT vessel is estimated to be 29 days and per part-time vessel 14.5 says. As a result, total DAS-used is estimated to be 67 days for an average full-time vessel and about 30 days for an average part-time vessel. This indicates that the limited access vessels have already excess days that they can direct to other fisheries, even for smaller vessels that have longer access area trips.

After stacking/leasing, however, total DAS-used for those vessels that remain in the scallop fishery would increase to 128 days for FT vessels and to 58 days for PT vessels assuming that total days used will decline by about 5% , or by 989 days, due to FPA and/or mortality adjustments and increase in efficiency. If we assume that 95% of these days (assuming the highest proportion of permits in other fisheries) belong to the FT limited access vessels, this increase in DAS (989*0.95=939) would translate into 7 more FT vessels using 128 days in other

fisheries under a maximum consolidation scenario. Therefore, effort in other fisheries could possibly increase because of the leasing/stacking alternatives as the total DAS-used and the number of active vessels in the scallop fishery decline.

The net result on the effort in other fisheries depends on two counteracting factors. The first factor is that the current activity of the limited access vessels in the scallop fishery are quite limited, less than 80 days (even assuming 10 day access area trips) because of the restrictions on open area DAS and access area trip allocations. Therefore, there is already a lot of room for these vessels to participate in other fisheries, even under no action scenario, if they choose to do so. With stacking or permit leasing, as the DAS and access area trip allocations are doubled on half of the fleet (assuming a maximum consolidation scenario), the availability to participate in other fisheries for half of the fleet will decline, but the other half will be freed and could to be used solely targeting other fisheries. For example, an owner that has two boats using each half of the year in the scallop fishery and half of the year in squid fishery, after leasing can use one boat for fishing in the scallop fishery alone and the other boat solely for the squid fishery. As long as total DAS used targeting other fisheries with one boat does not exceed the previous effort level using two boats, there might be very little change in effort in other fisheries if the vessels are already used in multiple fisheries.

The second factor has to do with the potential decline in total DAS used in the scallop fishery leading to more effort in other fisheries especially if dedicating one boat solely for one fishery provides extra incentive to increase effort. As pointed out by some members of the fishing industry, vessels could re-rig and fish for other species they have permits for but have not fished for. It was also pointed out that some vessels that lease out scallop effort may shift into other fisheries just to get history in those fisheries. If this happens, leasing could lead to some excess capacity in other fisheries where the effort is regulated by annual and seasonal quotas. The fisheries like black sea bass, dogfish, summer flounder, scup, butterfish and possibly squid (more Illex than Loligo) are the fisheries in which effort is closest to capacity and thus might be impacted by a shift caused by leasing/stacking. The major factor that would encourage some vessels to participate in other fisheries is the profitability of scallop and the other fisheries, however. As discussed above, effort could increase even under no action conditions if there is an increase in the profitability in those fisheries that scallop vessels participate in varying degrees. Therefore, it is uncertain to what extent permit stacking/leasing could lead to increased effort in other fisheries compared to the no action. If the effort is directed to other fisheries, there will be negative economic impacts on the current participants of those fisheries. However, the economic impacts on the scallop vessels that lease or stack permits and target other species will be positive.

Table 9. Number of vessels with limited access permits in the scallop fishery before and after consolidation

Permit category	Number of vessels in 2009-2010 fishing years	Number of vessels after stacking (maximum consolidation	Number of vessels exiting scallop fishery and have permits in other fisheries
Full-time (cat=2)	250	125	119
Part-time (cat=3)	2	1	1
Full-time small dredge (Cat=5)	52	26	25
Part-time small dredge (cat=6)	32	16	15
Full-time net (cat=7)	11	6	5
Grand Total	347	174	165

Table 10. DAS-used before and after stacking/leasing

	DAS-used by vessel in 2010			
Permit category	2010 DAS-used-open	Total access area DAS-used (7.25*number of trips)	Total DAS used per vessel	Total DAS –used by the limited access fleet
Full-time (cat=2)	38	29	67	16750
Part-time (cat=3)	15	14.5	29.5	59
Full-time small dredge (Cat=5)	38	29	67	3484
Part-time small dredge (cat=6)	15	14.5	29.5	944
Full-time net (cat=7)	38	29	67	737
Grand Total				**21974**
	After Leasing/Permit Stacking			
Permit category	2010 DAS-used-open	Total access area DAS-used	Total DAS used per vessel	Total DAS –used by the limited access fleet
Full-time (cat=2)	73	55	128	15996
Part-time (cat=3)	29	28	56	56
Full-time small dredge (Cat=5)	73	55	128	3327
Part-time small dredge (cat=6)	29	28	56	902
Full-time net (cat=7)	73	55	128	704
Grand Total				20985
Decline in DAS-used in Scallop fishery				989
% Decline in DAS-used				5%

Table 11 includes revenues from other fisheries for the full-time vessels which totaled more than $400,000 in any given year, and for the part-time vessels it includes revenues which totaled more than $100,000 in any given year. Yellowtail and monkfish revenues included even when they were small compared to revenues from other fisheries. This table indicates that revenues from other fisheries constituted less than 1% of the total revenue by the full-time fleet. For the part-

time fleet, however, other important sources of revenue were summer flounder (7% to 15% of total in 2005-2009), shrimp, menhaden, and squid in 2009 fishing year.

Table 12 shows the percentage of revenue earned from each of these other fisheries by the limited access full-time and part-time vessels. The share of full-time scallop vessels in total monkfish, summer flounder and squid fishery revenues were 4% or more during 2005-2008. Part-time fleet had a share of 3% or more in summer flounder, scup and sea bass fisheries during the same time period.

Table 11. Composition of Revenue for the Limited Access vessels

Permit type	All Species		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 (YTD)
	Sea Scallops	Value	345,708,369	307,792,971	343,366,447	316,497,595	322,467,793	132,170,210
		% of total	97.4%	97.5%	97.2%	97.2%	97.9%	98.1%
	Monkfish	Value	2,240,078	2,038,301	3,714,976	2,481,260	1,677,261	406,821
		% of total	0.6%	0.6%	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%
	Yellowtail	Value	148,212	6,331	47,066	51,131	52,995	30,529
		% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Summer flounder	Value	1,791,436	1,966,539	996,734	1,352,661	1,185,205	460,046
		% of total	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
	Squid (Loligo)	Value	1,339,105	1,472,007	1,726,287	1,432,213	1,053,330	180,390
		% of total	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%
	Sea Bass (black)	Value	418,366	229,858	314,969	350,186	351,128	261,610
		% of total	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
	Haddock	Value	406,924	272,657	358,516	599,053	444,602	459,932
		% of total	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%
	Lobster	Value	276,225	300,267	268,212	264,685	497,084	108,050
		% of total	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
FULL-TIME	**Sea Scallops**	Value	14,335,969	10,072,123	12,128,286	10,954,792	10,181,736	6,333,480
		% of total	82%	71%	77%	84%	78%	89%
	Summer Flounder	Value	1,588,704	2,202,178	1,226,856	756,502	977,016	408,203
		% of total	9%	15%	8%	6%	7%	6%
	Shrimp (Brown)	Value	1,453	155,256	63,547	.	449,583	.
		% of total	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	0%
	Menhaden	Value	.	96,334	74,615	107,390	444,117	.
		% of total	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	0%
	Squid (Loligo)	Value	604,024	370,924	421,506	279,880	230,273	28,794
		% of total	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	0%
	Squid (Illex)	Value	48,438	19,916	67,855	311,729	239,886	.
		% of total	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	0%
	Other Shellfish	Value	.	188,639	852,908	.	114,221	.
		% of total	0%	1%	5%	0%	1%	0%
	Monkfish	Value	71,056	94,976	96,534	79,557	47,495	17,903
		% of total	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%
	Yellowtail	Value	14,415	732	152,142	256	79	97
		% of total	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%

Table 12. Revenue from other fisheries by limited access vessels as a percentage of total revenue from that fishery

Other fisheries	Permit		2005	2006	2007	2008
Monkfish	Total fishery revenue	Value	42,252,278	33,458,992	28,819,653	24,563,651
	Full-time	% of total	5%	6%	13%	10%
	Part-time	% of total	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Yellowtail Flounder	Total fishery revenue	Value	10,631,665	7,105,935	7,216,080	5,437,264
	Full-time	% of total	1%	0%	1%	1%
	Part-time	% of total	0.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
Summer Flounder	Total fishery revenue	Value	30,118,259	28,643,391	24,125,601	22,164,328
	Full-time	% of total	6%	7%	4%	6%
	Part-time	% of total	5%	8%	5%	3%
Shrimp (Brown)	Total fishery revenue	Value	156,025,654	181,510,196	180,710,196	155,114,005
	Full-time	% of total	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Part-time	% of total	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Menhaden	Total fishery revenue	Value	62,519,721	69,682,661	93,098,638	88,766,700
	Full-time	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Part-time	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Squid (Loligo)	Total fishery revenue	Value	28,766,828	27,703,213	9,810,398	6,907,218
	Full-time	% of total	5%	5%	18%	21%
	Part-time	% of total	2%	1%	4%	4%
Scup	Total fishery revenue	Value	7,351,491	8,221,718	9,997,474	6,162,392
	Full-time	% of total	2%	1%	2%	6%
	Part-time	% of total	4%	3%	3%	2%
Sea Bass (Black)	Total fishery revenue	Value	7,929,257	8,807,189	7,542,616	5,920,736
	Full-time	% of total	5%	3%	4%	6%
	Part-time	% of total	2%	3%	3%	2%

Note: Total fishery value for each species is obtained from NMFS website, commercial fisheries at http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/pls/webpls/FT_HELP.SPECIES. Latest year available was 2008.

1.1.5 Measures to adjust specific aspects of FMP to make overall program more effective

This section contains alternatives for various measures that are already in place. The topics include adjustments to the overfishing definition, modifications to the limited access general category program, revision of the EFH closed areas if Phase II to the Habitat Omnibus Amendment is delayed, improvements to the research set-aside program, and changing the fishing year.

1.1.5.1 Measures to adjust the current overfishing definition (OFD)

The alternatives to revise the overfishing definition are not expected to have direct impacts on other fisheries.

1.1.5.2 Minor adjustments to the limited access general category management program

These alternatives include several potential modifications to the general category fishery. The IFQ rollover provision should not have any impacts on other fisheries. As for the possession limit alternatives, increasing the possession limit or removing would likely reduce the days used by these vessels to land their IFQ. It is uncertain, however, to what extent the reduction in general category effort in scallop fishery could lead to an increase in effort in other fisheries. Because many general category vessels have relatively small IFQ amounts and the availability of annual days to participate in other fisheries is not constrained significantly by their activity in the scallop fishery (Table 13). Therefore, for these vessels, an increase in the possession limit would probably not have any significant impact in other fisheries. But for the large IFQ holders, reducing possession limit could free some time to be used fishing for other species. Most of the GC vessels participate in fisheries like Multispecies, Monkfish and Lobster fisheries which are managed by individual DAS, sectors and other measures limiting the effort of the individual vessels, so a potential increase in effort in those fisheries are unlikely (Table 7). On the other hand, some vessels participate in fisheries such as summer flounder, skates, scup, squid (Loligo), and silver hake, or in fisheries managed by annual and/or seasonal quotas. As a result, a decline in DAS-used due to the increase in the possession limit for general category fishing could lead to some increase in effort in those fisheries with some negative impacts on the current participants although it is uncertain if these impacts will be more than marginal.

The alternative under consideration to increase the maximum quota one vessel can fish from 2% to 2.5% of the total general category allocation is not expected to have substantial impacts on other fisheries. For example, if a owner currently has 5% of the total general category IFQ split on three vessels (2% on one, 2% on a second vessel and 0.5% on a third vessel) he could consolidate his scallop quota on two vessels leaving one vessel to potentially pursue other fisheries exclusively. Arguably, the more scallop quota on one vessel, the less time that vessel would have to target other species. On the other hand, a vessel that relinquishes all of it's scallop quota could spend more time fishing for other species. Ultimately however, the vast majority of IFQ permit holders received a relatively small allocation of scallop quota, so they already have most of the year to fish for other species they have permits for. Therefore, this change is likely marginal and is not expected to impact other fisheries in any substantial way.

Table 13 – Summary of IFQ permit holders by allocation range for 2010 (LAGC only and LA with LAGC)

Allocation Range (lb) for IFQ-only vessels	# Permits	%
500-2,000	112	35%
2,001-5,000	66	20%
5,001-10,000	59	18%
10,001-15,000	35	11%
15,001-20,000	21	7%
20,001-25,000	10	3%
25,001-30,000	12	4%
30,001-36,000	7	2%

Range (lb) for LA vessels with IFQ	# Permits	%
500-2,000	20	50%
2,001-5,000	8	20%
5,001-10,000	4	10%
10,001-15,000	3	8%
15,001-20,000	3	8%
20,001-25,000	0	0%
25,001-30,000	1	3%
30,001-35,000	0	0%
35,001-40,000	1	3%

The alternative that would allow LAGC IFQ permit owners to permanently transfer some or all of their quota allocation independent of their IFQ permit to another LAGC IFQ permit holder or CFA holder while retaining the permit itself is not expected have substantial impacts on other fisheries. Under No Action LAGC vessels have to sell all their permits as a package since there is no permit splitting, so if quota is allowed to be separated from a LAGC permit more permanent transfers may occur because it will not be as costly. However, these vessels were not likely to use their scallop IFQ so transferring it to another vessel is for economic reasons, and therefore, transferring their quota to other participants should not affect fishing behavior or other fisheries in any significant way. Similarly, the alternative that would implement community fishing associations is not expected to have impacts on other fisheries in the absence of a change in possession limit and fishing time.

1.1.5.3 Measures to address EFH closed areas if the EFH Omnibus Amendment 2 is delayed

This alternative would consider making the EFH closed areas consistent under both the scallop and multispecies FMPs if the EFH Omnibus Amendment 2 timeline is delayed. If selected, only the areas closed for EFH under Amendment 13 would be closed to scallop gear; the areas closed for EFH under Amendment 10 would be eliminated.

Having both sets of EFH areas closed to scallop gear for the last several years has affected where scallop effort is allocated. Overall, more open area DAS have been allocated than the plan would have done if there were not constraints on access areas within GB closed areas (primarily because the boundaries in Closed Area I have prevented allocating scallop access in that area). The scallop resource available in the remaining "sliver" of Closed Area I has not been sufficient to allocate an access area trip in that area. As a result, additional open area DAS have been allocated to meet fishing targets, which puts effort in areas with lower catch rates. These additional DAS are potentially days that these vessels are unable to spend targeting other species, but again the magnitude of days is not large and if vessels were going to target other species this small difference is not likely the reason they will decide to. For example, most full-time limited access scallop vessels are fishing less than 100 days a year, so already have over 250 days to potentially fish for other species. If a few extra days are allocated because access is limited on GB due to habitat closed areas, the difference between 250 days the vessel is not scalloping and 255 may not impact the amount of time that vessel decides to pursue other fisheries.

1.1.5.4 Measures to improve research set-aside program

The measures to improve the research set-aside program are designed to improve the timing and administration of the program. None of these alternatives are expected to have direct impacts on other fisheries. A handful of vessels that participate in research may have less time to pursue other fisheries, but that represents a relatively small number of vessels on limited trips.

1.1.5.5 Measures to change the scallop fishing year

The scallop fishing year is out of sync with the framework adjustment process and the timing of when the scallop survey data become available for analysis, so this action is proposing changing the fishing year to May 1 from March 1. This alternative should not have any direct impacts on other fisheries.