

Appendix I

Summary of Past, Present, or Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

APPENDIX I

The actions summarized in the table below are presented in chronological order, and codes indicate whether an action relates to the past (P), present (Pr), or reasonably foreseeable future (RFF). When any of these abbreviations occur together, it indicates that some past actions are still relevant to the present and/or future. A brief explanation of the rationale for concluding what effect each action has (or will have) had on each of the VECs is provided in the table and is not repeated here.

Table I-1. Impacts of Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions on the five VECs. These actions do not include those which were considered to have little impact on the fishery or actions under consideration in this Amendment.

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS						
<p>^P Prosecution of the groundfish fisheries by foreign fleets in the area that would become the U.S. EEZ (prior to implementation of the MSA)</p>	<p>Foreign fishing pressure peaked in the 1960s and slowly declined until passage of the MSA in 1974 and implementation of the Multispecies FMP</p>	<p>Direct High Negative Foreign fishing depleted many groundfish stocks</p>	<p>Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on discarding, but fishing effort was very high and there were no gear requirements to reduce bycatch</p>	<p>Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on protected resources encounters, but fishing effort was very high</p>	<p>Potentially Direct High Negative Limited information on habitat, but fishing effort was very high</p>	<p>Potentially Indirect Negative Revenue from fishing was split between foreign and domestic communities, rather than just domestic communities</p>
<p>^P Original FMP implemented in 1977</p>	<p>Established management of cod, haddock and yellowtail via catch quotas, quota allocations by vessel class and catch limits</p>	<p>Direct Positive Provided slight effort reductions and regulatory tools available to rebuild and manage stocks</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort on cod, haddock and yellowtail which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability</p>

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P Interim Plan (1982)	Implemented GB seasonal closed areas, minimum fish size requirements in GB and GOM and permit requirements	Direct Positive Reduced directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability
P Multispecies Plan (1986)	Revised FMP to include pollock, redfish, winter flounder, American plaice, witch flounder, windowpane flounder and white hake. Allowed additional minimum fish size restrictions, extended GB spawning area closures and a SNE closure to protect yellowtail flounder	Direct Positive Reduced directed fishing effort and provided the opportunity to manage additional groundfish species	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
<p>^P Amendments 1-4 to the Multispecies FMP (1987-1991)</p>	<p>Implemented closure in SNE/MA to protect yellowtail, extended GB RMA, added minimum mesh size requirements to SNE, excluded scallop dredge vessels from SNE closure, incorporated silver hake, red hake and ocean pout into the FMP</p>	<p>Direct Positive Reduced directed fishing effort and provided the opportunity to manage additional groundfish species</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability</p>
<p>^P Multispecies Emergency Action (1994)</p>	<p>Implemented 500-lb haddock trip limit, expanded CA II closure time and area, prohibited scallop dredge vessels from possessing haddock from Jan-Jun and prohibited pair-trawling for multispecies</p>	<p>Direct Positive Reduced directed fishing effort</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat</p>	<p>Indirect Positive Increased probability of long term sustainability</p>

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr Amendment 5 to the FMP (1994)	Made the above Emergency Action measures permanent, enacted a moratorium on new participants in the fishery, reduced DAS for most vessels by 50% over a 5-7 year period, implemented mandatory reporting and observer requirements, etc.	Direct High Positive Reduced directed fishing effort and capped the number of participants allowed to direct on the fishery	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability by limiting the number of participants in the directed fishery. However, there was a negative impact for fishermen and communities where participation was reduced
,Pr Emergency Action (1994)	Implemented additional closed areas, prohibited scallop vessels from fishing in the closed areas, disallowed any fishery using mesh smaller than minimum mesh requirements, prohibited retaining regulated species with small mesh, etc.	Direct High Positive Reduced directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but effort reductions result in short term lost revenues for fishermen and communities

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr Framework 9 (1985)	Made the above Emergency Action measures permanent	Direct High Positive Reduced directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but effort reductions result in short term lost revenues for fishermen and communities
P, Pr Amendment 7 to the Multispecies FMP (1996)	Accelerated Amendment 5 DAS reduction schedule, implemented seasonal GOM closures, implemented 1,000 lb haddock trip limit, expanded the 5% bycatch rule, etc.	Direct High Positive Reduced directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but effort reductions result in short term lost revenues for fishermen and communities

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr Framework 20 (1997)	Implemented GOM cod daily trip limit of 1,000 lb, increased the haddock daily trip limit to 1,000 lb and added gillnet effort-reduction measures such as net limits	Mixed Reduced directed fishing effort but allowed for an increase in haddock landings	Mixed Gillnet restrictions and reduced effort on cod helped reduce discards/bycatch but this may have been offset by increased effort on haddock	Indirect Positive Although the haddock daily trip limit increased, gillnet restrictions provide an overall positive impact	Mixed Reduced cod daily trip limit would be offset by increase haddock daily landing limit	Mixed Reduced revenues from a smaller cod daily trip limit could be offset by the increased haddock daily landing limit but gillnet effort reductions also have negative eco/soc impacts
P, Pr Framework 24 (1998)	Implemented an adjustment to GOM cod daily trip limit by requiring vessels to remain in port and run their DAS clock for a cod overage and implemented the DAS carryover provisions	Direct Low Positive Implemented minor effort reductions	Indirect Low Positive Implemented minor effort reductions which resulted in minor discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Low Positive Slightly reduced fishing effort, thus reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Low Positive Reduced fishing effort, thus reduced gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Vessels must remain in port with their clock running for a cod overage which has a negative impact but vessels may carryover DAS from one fishing year into the next.
P, Pr Framework 25 (1998)	Implemented GOM inshore closure areas, the year-round WGOM closure, the CLCA and reduced the GOM cod daily trip limit to 700 lb	Direct Low Positive Implemented effort reductions via reduced cod trip limit and closure areas	Indirect Low Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Effort controls result in reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect High Positive Closure areas and effort controls reduce gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but short term negative eco/soc impacts

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr Framework 26 (1999)	Expansion of April GOM inshore closure area and, additional seasonal inshore GOM and GB area closures	Direct Low Positive Implemented effort reductions via closure areas	Indirect Low Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard bycatch reductions	Indirect Positive Effort controls result in reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect High Positive Closure areas and effort controls reduce gear interactions with habitat	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but short term negative eco/soc impacts
P, Pr, RFF Amendment 11 (1998)	Designated EFH for all species in the multispecies FMP and required Federal agencies to consult with NMFS on actions that may adversely effect EFH	Indirect Low Positive A consultation with NFMS that leads to the protection of multispecies EFH is beneficial to multispecies stocks	Indirect Low Positive A consultation with NFMS that leads to the protection of multispecies EFH is beneficial to other stocks that share the same EFH as multispecies stocks	Indirect Low Positive Consultation with NFMS that leads to the protection of multispecies EFH is beneficial to protected resources that share a need for the same habitat that multispecies stocks require	Direct High Positive Consultation with NMFS on activities that may adversely effect habitat provides NMFS the opportunity to mitigate or even prevent EFH impacts	Indirect Low Positive For instances where NMFS consults on projects impacting multispecies EFH, the overall health of the stocks should improve which would lead to long term sustainability

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr Framework 27 (1999)	Established large GOM rolling closures, modified CLCA, decreased GOM daily trip limit to 200 lb with subsequent reduction to 30 lb, increased haddock trip limit to 2,000 lb and increased minimum mesh size	Mixed Reduced directed fishing effort while also allowing the haddock trip limit to increase	Mixed A reduction in directed effort helped minimize bycatch and discards but increased haddock trip limit was somewhat offsetting	Mixed Reduced directed effort helps minimize protected species encounters but this was somewhat offset by the increased haddock trip limit	Indirect Positive Reduced directed effort and closed areas help improve habitat, this may be slightly offset by the increased haddock trip limit	Mixed Short term negative from closed areas and the reduced cod trip limit which were not offset by the increased haddock trip limit. Long term positive because of increased probability of sustainable stocks
P Interim Rule (1999)	Revised GOM cod trip limit to 100 lb/day up to 500 lb max and revised the DAS running clock to allow a 1-day overage only	Direct Positive Reduced directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Low Positive Effort controls result in reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect Low Positive Effort controls result in reduced habitat interactions	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but short term negative eco/soc impacts
P, Pr, RFF Amendment 9 (1999)	Prohibited used of brush sweep trawl gear, added halibut to the FMP with a 1-fish per trip possession limit	Direct Positive Reduced directed fishing effort	Indirect Positive Reduced directed fishing effort which resulted in discard/bycatch reductions	Indirect Low Positive Effort controls result in reduced interactions with protected species	Indirect High Positive Effort controls result in reduced habitat interactions	Mixed Increased probability of long term sustainability but short term negative eco/soc impacts

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr Framework 31 (2000)	Increased GOM Daily limit to 400 lb/day up to 4,000/lb per trip, added Feb GOM inshore closure and extended 1999 Interim Rule running clock measure	Mixed Increased cod directed fishing effort while also reducing effort via closure area and cod running clock measure	Mixed Increased effort on cod could lead to greater discards/bycatch which would be somewhat offset by effort reductions via closure area and cod running clock measure	Mixed Increased cod effort could increase interactions but somewhat offset by effort reductions via closure area and cod running clock measure	Indirect Low Positive Minor positive impacts from inshore closure area	Mixed Short term positive from increased cod trip limit but long-term sustainability of the cod resource was effected
P, Pr Framework 33 (2000)	Added GB seasonal closure area, added conditional GOM closure areas and increase haddock trip limit to 3,000 lb	Mixed Increased haddock directed fishing effort while also reducing effort via closure areas	Mixed Increased effort on haddock could lead to greater discards/bycatch which would be somewhat offset by effort reductions via closure areas	Mixed Increased haddock effort could increase interactions but somewhat offset by effort reductions via closure areas	Indirect Low Positive Minor positive impacts from closure areas	Mixed Short term positive from increased haddock trip limit but negative impacts resulting from closure areas

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Interim Action (Settlement Agreement; 2002)	Restricted DAS use, modified DAS clock for trip vessels, added year-round closure of CLCA, expanded rolling closures, prohibited front-loading DAS clock, increased GOM trawl and gillnet mesh size, added new limitations on Day gillnets and further restricted charter/party vessels	Direct High Positive Implemented substantial directed fishing reductions	Indirect High Positive Implemented substantial directed fishing reductions which also reduced discards/bycatch	Indirect Positive Fishing reductions and expanded closure areas reduce protected species interactions	Indirect High Positive Fishing reductions and expanded closure areas reduce negative impacts to habitat	Mixed Short term impacts due to restrictions were highly negative but positive regarding the long term sustainability of the fishery

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Interim Action (Settlement Agreement Continued; 2002)	Continued above interim measures, further reduced DAS allocations, prohibited issuance of additional handgear permits, eliminated GOM Jan and Feb closures, increased SNE trawl and GB/SNE gillnet mesh sizes, further limited day and trip gillnets, added longline gear restrictions, added possession limit and restrictions on yellowtail catch and increased GOM cod daily trip limit to 500/4,000 lb max	Direct High Positive Implemented substantial directed fishing reductions	Indirect High Positive Implemented substantial directed fishing reductions which also reduced discards/bycatch	Indirect Positive Fishing reductions reduce protected species interactions	Indirect Positive Fishing reductions reduce negative impacts to habitat	Mixed Short term impacts due to restrictions were highly negative but improving the long term sustainability of the fishery was positive

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Amendment 13 (2004)	Adopted new rebuilding periods and a new rebuilding program that included periodic adjustments and default DAS reductions to reduce effort over time, allowed DAS to be leased or transferred, created sector allocation and special access programs to allow access to stocks that can support an increase in catch	Direct High Positive Implemented substantial directed fishing reductions	Mixed Implemented substantial directed fishing reductions which also reduced discards/bycatch. However, the more stringent restrictions created pressure to direct on other stocks (e.g., monkfish)	Indirect Positive Fishing reductions reduce protected species interactions	Indirect Positive Fishing reductions reduce negative impacts to habitat	Mixed Short term impacts due to restrictions were highly negative but improving the long term sustainability of the fishery was positive
P, Pr, RFF Framework 40A (2004)	Created additional SAPs to target healthy stocks	Direct Positive Directing effort toward healthy stocks relieved pressure on stocks of concern	Indirect Negative Increased bycatch of monkfish and skates	Negligible Although effort increased slightly, no effort shifts impacting protected species are known to have occurred	Negligible Although effort increased slightly, no effort shifts impacting habitat are known to have occurred	Indirect Positive Provided vessels the opportunity for greater revenue while relieving pressure on stocks of concern

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Framework 40B (2005)	Relaxed DAS leasing and transfer requirements, created new yellowtail flounder SAP, provided greater opportunity for vessels to participate in the GB Cod Hook Sector, removed the net trip limit for gillnets, etc.	Negligible Mix of alternatives, some of which slightly increased effort and others that slightly decreased effort. Overall, changes did not threaten rebuilding targets established by Amendment 13	Indirect Low Negative Mix of alternatives that primarily had little impact on discards/bycatch with the exception of removing the net trip limit for gillnets which increased monkfish effort	Negligible Slight effort changes did not have measurable impacts to protected species	Negligible Slight effort changes did not have measurable impacts to habitat	Indirect Low Positive Slight changes to the leasing and transfer programs along with greater opportunities to participate in SAPs provides an opportunity for greater revenue
P, Pr, RFF Framework 41 (2005)	Allowed for participation in the Hook Gear Haddock SAP by non-Sector vessels	Direct Low Positive Encouraged effort on haddock, a healthy stock, and thus away from other stocks of concern	Indirect Low Negative Although directed effort shifted to a healthier stock, there was an overall effort increase resulting in a greater opportunity for bycatch/discards	Negligible Slight effort changes did not have measurable impacts to protected species	Negligible Slight effort changes did not have measurable impacts to habitat	Indirect Low Positive Greater opportunity to fish for a healthy stock provides increased revenue

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
P Emergency Action (2006)	Implemented differential A DAS of 1.4:1, restricted the B Regular DAS program and US/CA Haddock SAP and reduced trip limits on cod, yellowtail, etc.	Direct High Positive Implemented effort reductions that anticipated achieving mortality reductions needed to keep stocks on track to rebuild	Mixed Effort reductions lead to reduced discards/bycatch but the B Regular DAS program increased monkfish and skate bycatch	Negligible Effort changes did not have measurable impacts to protected species	Negligible Effort changes did not have more than minimal impacts to habitat	Mix Short term effort reductions have a negative impact on revenues but increase long term sustainability of stocks
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Framework 42 (2006)	Reduced the number of A DAS available, modified differential DAS counting to 2:1 in the GOM and SNE, reduced trip limits for several stocks, increased recreations minimum fish sizes, required use of VMS by all vessels, modified the SAPs, limited the bycatch of monkfish and skates for vessels using a haddock separator trawl, etc.	Direct High Positive Implemented effort reductions that anticipated achieving mortality reductions needed to keep stocks on track to rebuild	Indirect Positive Effort reductions lead to reduced discards/bycatch and measures were implemented to control monkfish and skate bycatch	Indirect Low Positive Overall effort reductions have a positive impact, particularly to protected species in high use areas such as the GOM and SNE where strict differential counting rules are in effect	Indirect Low Positive Overall effort reductions have a positive impact	Mixed Effort reductions have a significant negative impact to vessel owners and communities, primarily due to loss of revenues. Over the long term however, stocks should remain sustainable

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFF Framework 43 (2006)	Established a haddock incidental bycatch limit in the herring fishery on GB	Mixed While the incidental haddock allowance allows some legal catch of haddock which has a negative impact, the area is closed after the bycatch cap is reached which prohibits further harvest (positive impact)	Negligible The herring fishery is fairly clean and the increased haddock bycatch problem arose from strong 2003 and 2004 year classes. Allowing legal retention of haddock bycatch should not alter fishing practices in a manner that would impact species taken as bycatch	Negligible Although attaining the bycatch cap could reduce effort on GB, the extent of this reduction was not expected to have an overall impact on protected species	Negligible Gear used to target herring have been found not to have an impact on habitat	Mixed Allowing herring vessels to continue fishing practices on GB has a positive impact on those vessels and communities. However, the loss of the potential haddock catch has a negative impact on fishermen targeting groundfish
RFF Framework 44 (2010)	Would set ACLs, establish TACs for transboundary U.S./CA stocks, and possibly make adjustments to trip limits/DAS measures	Unknown Analysis is not complete however, positive impacts are likely as effort would be further managed for sustainability	Unknown Analysis is not complete however, positive impacts are likely as effort would be further managed for sustainability	Unknown Analysis is not complete however, positive impacts are likely as effort would be further managed for sustainability thus potentially reducing opportunities for interactions with protected species	Unknown Analysis is not complete however, positive impacts are likely as effort would be further managed for sustainability thus potentially reducing effort and gear impacts	Negative Analysis is not complete however, negative short-term impacts are likely as any further effort reductions would further reduce revenues

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
MULTISPECIES FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
^{RF} Sector EAs (2010)	Sector EAs would be prepared for each sector approved under this Amendment. These documents would assess impacts from exemptions granted to individual sectors that go beyond the universal exemptions	Negligible Because exemptions granted to sectors must strive to have neutral impacts compared to common pool vessels, impacts would be negligible	Negligible Because exemptions granted to sectors must strive to have neutral impacts compared to common pool vessels, impacts would be negligible	Negligible Because exemptions granted to sectors must strive to have neutral impacts compared to common pool vessels, impacts would be negligible	Negligible Because exemptions granted to sectors must strive to have neutral impacts compared to common pool vessels, impacts would be negligible	Low Positive Because one of the intents of sectors is to provide participants greater freedom to maximize their operations, revenues would be expected to be slightly higher
OTHER FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS						
^{P, Pr, RF} Atlantic Sea Scallop FMP – a series of amendment and framework actions from the mid-1990s through the present	Implementation of the Atlantic Sea Scallop FMP and continued management of the fishery, primarily through effort controls	Direct Positive Effort reductions taken over time have resulted in a sustainable scallop fishery	Indirect Positive Effort reductions taken over time also reduced bycatch, including gear modifications that improved bycatch escapement	Mixed Effort reductions taken over time reduced interactions with protected species however, turtle interactions remain problematic	Indirect Positive Effort reductions reduced gear contact with habitat and the current rotational access program focuses fishing effort on sandy substrates which are less susceptible to habitat impacts	Indirect Positive Initial negative impacts due to effort reductions have been supplanted by a sustainable, profitable fishery

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
OTHER FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
^{P, Pr, RFF} Monkfish FMP – a series of amendment and framework actions from implementation of the FMP in 1999 through the present	Implementation of the monkfish FMP and continued management of the fishery, primarily through effort controls	Direct Positive Effort reductions have resulted in a fishery that is no longer overfished, nor is overfishing occurring	Indirect Positive Effort reductions taken over time also reduced bycatch	Indirect Positive Reducing effort reduced opportunities for interactions with protected species	Indirect Positive Reducing effort reduced opportunities for habitat interactions	Indirect Positive Reducing effort has created a sustainable fishery
^{Pr, RFF} Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Amendment (2008)	Removed the DAM program, will implement sinking ground lines for lobster gear, includes more trap/pot and gillnet fisheries under the protection plan and requires additional markings on gear to improve information regarding where and how entanglements occur	Negligible Changes implemented through the amendment are not expected to have substantial changes on groundfish	Negligible Changes implemented through the amendment are not expected to have substantial changes on non-groundfish species	Direct Positive New regulations implemented to protect large whales are expected to have a positive impact on large whales by reducing incidental takes	Negligible Changes implemented through the amendment are not expected to have substantial changes to habitat	Indirect Negative Changes implemented through the amendment require some gear changes for gillnet fisheries which have minor negative economic impacts

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
OTHER FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
^{RF} Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan Amendment (~2010)	Options are currently under development to reduce takes of harbor porpoise toward the long-term zero mortality rate goal	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact groundfish	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact non-groundfish species	Direct Positive Changes to protect harbor porpoise have a positive impact on protected species	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact habitat	Unknown If current measures such as closure areas and the use of pingers are expanded upon or modified, it could impact human communities
^{RF} Essential Fish Habitat Omnibus Amendment (~2010/2011)	This amendment would revised EFH designations for all New England fisheries, possibly establish new HAPCs and consider measures to further protect critical habitat	Unknown If new measures are implemented to protect habitat, they would likely have a positive impact on groundfish	Unknown If new measures are implemented to protect habitat, they could have a positive impact non-groundfish species	Unknown If new measures are implemented to protect habitat, they could potentially impact protected species	Direct Positive New measures implemented to protect habitat would have a positive impact on habitat	Unknown If new measures are implemented to protect habitat, they would likely impact human communities
^{RF} Amendment 3 to the Skate FMP (2010)	This amendment would address rebuilding of winter and thorny skates and reduce mortality on little and smooth skates	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact groundfish	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact non-groundfish species	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact protected species	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact habitat	Unknown If actions are taken to reduce skate mortality, they could impact human communities

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
NON FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS						
P, Pr, RFFA Agriculture runoff	Nutrients applied to agriculture land are introduced into aquatic systems	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality negatively affects resource viability and can lead to reduced income from fishery resources
P, Pr, RFFA Port maintenance	Dredging of wetlands, coastal, port and harbor areas for port maintenance	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality negatively affects resource viability in the immediate project area
P, Pr, RFFA Offshore disposal of dredged materials	Disposal of dredged materials	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Reduced habitat quality negatively affects resource viability in the immediate project area

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
NON FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
P, Pr, RFFA Beach nourishment	Offshore mining of sand for beaches	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Mixed Positive for mining companies, possibly negative for fisheries
	Placement of sand to nourish beach shorelines	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Positive Improves beaches and can help protect homes along the shore line
P, Pr, RFFA Marine transportation	Expansion of port facilities, vessel operations and recreational marinas	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Direct Negative Reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Mixed Positive for some interests, potential displacement for others
P, Pr, RFFA Installation of pipelines, utility lines and cables	Transportation of oil, gas and energy through pipelines, utility lines and cables	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Initially reduced habitat quality in the immediate project area	Mixed End users benefit from improved pipelines, cables, etc., but reduced habitat quality may impact fisheries and revenues

Action	Description	Impacts on Regulated Groundfish Stocks	Impacts on Non-groundfish species	Impacts on Endangered and Other Protected Species	Impacts on Habitat – Including Non-fishing Effects	Impacts on Human Communities
NON FISHERY-RELATED ACTIONS CONTINUED						
Pr. RFFA Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) terminals (w/in 5 years)	Transportation of natural gas via tanker to terminals located offshore and onshore (Several LNG terminals are proposed, including ME, MA, NY, NJ and MD)	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality possible in the immediate project area	Mixed End users benefit from a steady supply of natural gas but reduced habitat quality may impact fisheries and revenues
RFFA Offshore Wind Energy Facilities (w/in 5 years)	Construction of wind turbines to harness electrical power (Several facilities proposed from ME through NC, including off the coast of MA)	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Indirect Negative Initially localized decreases in habitat quality in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality possible in the immediate project area	Potentially Direct Negative Localized decreases in habitat quality possible in the immediate project area	Mixed End users benefit from a clean energy production but reduced habitat quality may impact fisheries and revenues