

Final Decision Document for AMENDMENT 11 to the Scallop Fishery Management Plan (FMP)

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT 11

Background

The general category scallop fishery is currently an open access fishery that was created in Amendment 4 when limited access was implemented for the scallop fishery (1994). Since 1999, there has been considerable growth in fishing effort and landings by vessels with general category permits, primarily as a result of resource recovery and higher scallop prices. This additional effort is likely a contributing factor to why the FMP exceeded the fishing mortality targets in recent years. Without additional controls on the general category fishery, there is a great deal of uncertainty with respect to potential fishing mortality from this component of the scallop fishery, thus the potential for overfishing is increased.

Purpose and Need for Action

The primary need for this action is to implement more effective management measures to control fishing mortality by the general category component of the scallop fishery. The first purpose of this amendment is to consider measures that will address capacity and fishing mortality in the general category fishery and allow the Council to develop alternatives that will more directly control the level of mortality from the general category fleet. A secondary need identified for this action is related to allowing for better and more timely integration of sea scallop assessment results in the management process. The scallop fishing year is out of sync with the framework adjustment process and the timing of when survey data become available for analysis.

Vision Statement

During the Amendment 11 process the Council decided to develop a vision statement to guide development and selection of alternatives to control capacity and mortality from the general category scallop fishery. Below is a summary of the vision statement approved by the Council. Section 1.3 of the DSEIS includes the full description of what the Council envisions the general category fishery to be after Amendment 11 is implemented to stabilize capacity and prevent overfishing.

The general category scallop fishery has changed since development and implementation of Amendment 4 in 1994. While some of the participants are the same, many have changed and fishing behavior has evolved with time. The fishery is very diverse; some general category vessels fish for scallops full-time but only seasonally, another component of the fleet lands scallops above incidental levels while fishing for other species, and some are full-time day boat vessels that target scallops year round. The overall intent of this action is to stabilize capacity and prevent overfishing from the general category fishery, to maintain the diverse nature and flexibility within this component of the scallop fleet, and preserve the ability for vessels to participate in the general category fishery at different levels. The Councils' vision for the general category fishery after Amendment 11 is implemented is a fleet made up of relatively small vessels, with possession limits to maintain the historical character of this fleet and provide opportunities to various participants including vessels from smaller coastal communities.

MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION

Section 3.0 of the DSEIS includes a detailed description of all the alternatives under consideration in Amendment 11. Table 1 (on page (x) of the Executive Summary) in the DSEIS summarizes all the alternatives under consideration.

The Council identified a number of “preferred alternatives” at the April Council meeting before the DSEIS went out for public comment. Six public hearings were held in May 2007 and the Scallop Committee reviewed input from the hearings as well as written public comments received to date. Based on public comment, the Committee recommended changing one Council preferred alternative, and the Committee identified recommended preferred alternatives for the remaining sections of the DSEIS that did not have preferred alternatives. By consensus, the Scallop Committee agreed to forward Amendment 11 to the Council with a full list of preferred alternatives with clarifications for several aspects of the alternatives as one package. The final Committee recommendation is summarized in Table 1 below. The only two issues without a preferred alternative recommendation are: 1) interim measures for the transition period to limited entry, and 2) measures for incidental catch. Several necessary clarifications and additions have been recommended by the Committee and they are summarized in the bulleted list on page 7 of this decision document. The clarifications are related to stacking alternatives, and the addition is related to interim measures for the transition period to limited entry.

This decision document identifies the original preferred alternatives identified by the Council, at the April Council meeting the new recommendations by the Scallop Committee, and any relevant input from public comments received for each management topic. Some of the final recommendations from the Committee are the **SAME** as the original Council preferred alternative, one is **DIFFERENT** after consideration of public comment, and some are **NEW** for alternatives that the Council did not identify preferred alternatives for. If the Council is interested in revisiting any of the preferred alternatives, or selecting different preferred alternatives then the Scallop Committee recommendations, summary tables of all the alternatives are provided in the public hearing document (Document #2).

Table 1 – Summary of Scallop Committee final recommendation for Amendment 11

(The committee either recommended the same or different preferred alternative based on public input, or identified new preferred alternatives for topics the Council did not identify preferred alternatives for).

| SECTION in DSEIS | DSEIS PAGE # | ALTERNATIVE | DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | FINAL RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SCALLOP COMMITTEE BASED ON INPUT FROM PUBLIC COMMENT [SAME, DIFFERENT OR NEW] |
|------------------|--------------|---|--|---|
| 3.1 | | MEASURES TO CONTROL CAPACITY AND MORTALITY IN THE GENERAL CATEGORY FISHERY | | |
| 3.1.2 | p.10 | Limited Entry | Only vessels that qualify for a permit would be permitted to fish under general category rules. | Most public comment agreed there should be some controls. Some supported limited entry, but some supported No Action, and some favored a hard-TAC. Ultimately, the Committee agreed limited entry should remain the preferred alternative. [SAME] |
| 3.1.2.1 | | Landings qualification criteria | | |
| 3.1.2.1.2 | p.13 | Permit before control date and 1,000 annual pounds | In order to qualify - must have permit before control date (Nov. 1, 2004) and at least 1,000 pounds of scallops in one year during the qualification time period | Public input varied on this topic. Some against use of control date, some supported use of control date. Some supported more restrictive criteria, and others less restrictive. Several suggested that having VMS is the qualification that should be used. Ultimately, the Committee still recommended the 1,000 lb. criteria. [SAME] |
| 3.1.2.2 | | Qualification time period alternatives | | |
| 3.1.2.2.3 | p.14 | March 1, 1994- November 1, 2004 | Qualification would have to be during these eleven fishing years, note last fishing year only eight months long (Mar.1 94 - Nov.1 04) | Public input varied on this topic. A few supported use of the 2-year time period, some for the 5-year and others for the 11-year time period. Some argued that years before the general category permit was issued in 1994 should be used, and others argued that years after the control date should be considered. Ultimately, the Committee still recommended the 11-year time period. [SAME] |
| 3.1.2.3 | | Determination of qualification amount | | |
| 3.1.2.3.2 | p.15 | Best year indexed by number of years active in the scallop fishery | A vessels best year would be taken from the qualification time period selected as their contribution amount. That amount would then be multiplied by an index of years active in the scallop fishery. Option A is a range of index values from 0.9 to 1.1 for one to >5 years respectively. Option B is 0.75 to 1.25 for one to >5 years respectively (preferred). The final value would then be scaled based on projected TAC and percent given to the general category fishery. | Only a few public comments discussed this topic. The Committee decided to maintain the Council preferred alternative to multiply a vessel's historic contribution by an index of years active in the general category scallop fishery. [SAME] |

| SECTION in DSEIS | DSEIS PAGE # | ALTERNATIVE | DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | FINAL RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SCALLOP COMMITTEE BASED ON INPUT FROM PUBLIC COMMENT [SAME, DIFFERENT OR NEW FROM COUNCIL] |
|------------------|--------------|--|---|--|
| 3.1.2.4 | | Allocation of access for qualifiers | | |
| 3.1.2.4.1 | p.17 | Individual allocation | Every vessel that qualifies would be allocated an individual amount of quota in pounds (Option A) or number of trips (Option B). Option B is preferred. Once their allocation is caught they can't land scallops under general category permit. | Some public comments supported other allocation alternatives (i.e. a tier system or a fleetwide TAC). Some supported individual allocation, but noted problems associated with allocation in trips. The Committee discussed several possible modifications to potentially address these concerns, but ultimately decided to recommend allocation in pounds (Option A). [DIFFERENT] * Staff note: Council may want to give advice on what should be done with rounding a vessels contribution (i.e. 2.4 trips) |
| 3.1.2.5 | | Limited Entry Permit Provisions | | |
| 3.1.2.5.1 | p.23 | Fishing history and permit transfers | | |
| 3.1.2.5.1.2 | | One vessel potentially qualifying more than one permit | If a vessel owner sells his permits to another vessel, but retains the general category scallop history on the purchase and sales agreement, the seller should be able to qualify for a permit. The buyer cannot qualify under that history; however, if the buyer qualifies under its own landings after the sale, but during the qualification period, the buyer could be granted a permit as well. | Some public comment suggested this alternative would permit too many vessels and could be abused. Others suggested that this alternative would not help them anyway because they purchased a new vessel during the qualification time period and did not retain their history, and were issued a new general category permit number with their new vessel. However, the Committee agreed this should remain the preferred alternative. [SAME] |
| 3.1.2.5.2 | p.26 | Vessel upgrades | | |
| 3.1.2.5.2.2 | | 10:10:20 upgrade restriction | A vessel may be upgraded, but HP can only increase 20% once, length, GRT and NT can only increase 10% once. | There was not much public input on this topic, but some supported it and some did not. The Committee recommended this be the preferred alternative, but the tonnage provision be dropped in light of discussions in the multispecies fishery. [NEW – if Council agrees, need to drop GRT and NT] |
| 3.1.2.5.2.2.1 | | Vessel baselines | If an upgrade restriction is adopted, establishing a baseline is necessary. A vessels baseline would be the specifications when a vessel qualifies for a limited access permit. | <i>The Committee did not include this alternative in a specific motion (it was overlooked), but if an upgrade restriction is adopted, establishing a baseline would be necessary.</i> |
| 3.1.2.5.3 | p.26 | Vessel replacements | A qualifying vessel would be permitted to replace that vessel in the future, but the same entity must own the vessel that is being replaced and the replacement vessel. | The Committee recommended that this provision should be adopted to be consistent with other limited entry permit programs. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.5.4 | p.26 | Permit stacking | | |
| 3.1.2.5.4.3 | | Allow stacking up to 60,000 lb. or 150 trips | A vessel that qualifies could stack up to 60,000 pounds or 150 trips onto one vessel. | Mixed input from the public. Ultimately, the Committee recommended the same Council preferred alternative. They did identify several clarifications in response to comments raised by NMFS. [SAME – but see bullets below]. |

| SECTION in DSEIS | DSEIS PAGE # | ALTERNATIVE | DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | FINAL RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SCALLOP COMMITTEE BASED ON INPUT FROM PUBLIC COMMENT [SAME, DIFFERENT OR NEW FROM COUNCIL] |
|------------------|--------------|---|--|---|
| 3.1.2.5.5 | p.27 | Voluntary Relinquishment of Eligibility | A vessel that qualifies can voluntarily exit the fishery. If relinquished, no limited access permit can be reissued to another vessel. | The Committee recommended that this provision should be adopted to be consistent with other limited entry permit programs. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.5.6 | p.28 | Permit splitting | If limited entry is approved in this action, that permit would have to be sold as a package, like all other limited access permits. | The Committee recommended that this provision should be adopted to be consistent with other limited entry permit programs. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.5.7 | p.28 | Permit renewals and CPH | A vessel owner must maintain the limited access permit status by renewing permits on an annual basis or applying for issuance of a CPH. | The Committee recommended that this provision should be adopted to be consistent with other limited entry permit programs. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.5.8 | p.29 | Percentage ownership restriction | | |
| 3.1.2.5.8.1 | | Maximum of 1-5% of total number of limited access general category permits | A vessel would be restricted to owning 1-5% of the total permits. If a vessel owns more than the limit when the plan is implemented, they would be grandfathered in. | The Committee agreed that this should remain the preferred alternative. [SAME - However, after the Council identifies the final recommendation in terms of qualification criteria, a final percent value will have to be identified (i.e. 1%, 2%, etc.)] |
| 3.1.2.5.9 | p.29 | Multispecies permit restrictions would not apply for limited entry general category qualifiers | In terms of not being permitted to have a limited entry scallop permit on a limited entry multispecies vessel, if limited entry is adopted for the general category fishery this alternative clarifies that one vessel would be permitted to have both a limited entry multispecies permit and a limited entry general category permit | The Committee recommended that this provision should be adopted to clarify that a qualifying vessel would be permitted to have other limited entry permits. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.6 | | Measures to reduce incentive for limited entry qualifiers to fish for scallops with trawl gear | | |
| 3.1.2.6.1 | p.30 | No Action | If a vessel qualifies for a permit using a trawl they would be permitted to land scallops up to 400 pounds per trip | There was some public comment on this topic. The Committee recommended that No Action be taken because the newer directed trawl effort in the south is not expected to continue since many of these vessels will not qualify. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.7 | p.32 | Sectors and Harvesting Cooperatives | Establish a process for creation of voluntary sectors in the general category fishery. | Public comment on this issue was split. Ultimately the Committee recommended that a mechanism to apply for sectors be adopted for limited access general category qualifiers. [NEW] |
| 3.1.2.7.1 | | 20% maximum allocation per sector | One sector could not be allocated more than 20% of the total general category allocation. The maximum percent value could be changed in a future framework, perhaps after the Council considers an overall sector policy. | <i>The Committee did not identify this alternative as preferred, but it may have been overlooked.</i> |

| SECTION in DSEIS | DSEIS PAGE # | ALTERNATIVE | DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | FINAL RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SCALLOP COMMITTEE BASED ON INPUT FROM PUBLIC COMMENT [SAME, DIFFERENT OR NEW FROM COUNCIL] |
|------------------|--------------|---|---|---|
| 3.1.2.8 | p.36 | Interim measures for transition period to limited entry | | |
| 3.1.2.8.1 | | Transition to limited entry with hard-TAC | General category qualifiers (and vessels under appeal) will be limited to a 10% of total projected annual scallop catch | There was some public comment related to this topic. Most supported some controls, but some felt 10% was too high. Others suggested that a hard TAC – regardless of the amount would have negative derby consequences. <i>The Committee did <u>not</u> identify a preferred alternative for this topic.</i> <i>One related addition was suggested – see below</i> |
| 3.1.2.8.2 | | Transition to limited entry without hard-TAC | General category qualifiers (and vessels under appeal) will be permitted to fish under current restrictions – not hard TAC for the component of the fishery overall | |
| 3.1.4 | p.38 | Establish a NGOM Scallop Management Area | | |
| 3.1.4.3 | | Establish a limited entry program for the NGOM | This alternative would develop a separate limited entry general category program in either Option A (the GOM exemption area north of 42°20N) or Option B (EEZ north of 43N). Option A preferred. The area would have a separate hard TAC. Separate qualification criteria are being considered as well as different trip and gear restrictions from the general category limited entry program. If a vessel qualifies for a limited entry general category permit and wants to fish in the NGOM area it will have to declare it is on a NGOM trip. | Most public comment received on this topic supported a separate management system for NGOM. The Committee discussed this alternative in detail at the meeting in response to concerns raised in the comment letter from NMFS, but ultimately did not make any changes. [SAME] |
| 3.1.5 | p.43 | Monitoring provisions | | |
| 3.1.5.1 | | Require landings and declaration of scallop trip through VMS | Require vessels to declare they are going on a general category trip and report scallop landings through VMS. | There was not much public input on this topic. Ultimately, the Committee recommended reporting through VMS, even though the comment letter from NMFS suggested that VMS reporting may not be necessary. [NEW] |
| 3.1.6 | p.43 | Limited access fishing under general category rules | | |
| 3.1.6.1.1 | | Permit limited access vessels that qualify | Any full-time, part-time, or occasional vessel that qualifies to fish under the same criteria selected for the general category fishery would receive a permit to land scallops under general category while not on a scallop DAS. | Public comment on this topic was split. Some supported a limited level of limited access effort under general category, and others felt it should be prohibited. Ultimately, the Committee agreed to maintain the original Council preferred alternative. [SAME] |
| 3.1.6.2 | p.44 | Allocation of quota to limited access vessels under general category rules | | |
| 3.1.6.2.2 | | Landings deducted from separate allocation – 0.5% of total projected annual scallop catch | The landings from limited access qualifiers under general category would be deducted from a separate TAC just for limited access fishing under general category rules- 0.5%. | Most public comments supported a separate allocation for limited access vessels under general category. Some voiced support for a higher amount closer to historical averages. Ultimately, the Committee agreed to maintain the original Council preferred alternative. [SAME] |

| SECTION in DSEIS | DSEIS PAGE # | ALTERNATIVE | DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | FINAL RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SCALLOP COMMITTEE BASED ON INPUT FROM PUBLIC COMMENT [SAME, DIFFERENT OR NEW FROM COUNCIL] |
|------------------|--------------|--|---|--|
| 3.1.7 | | Allocation between limited access and general category fisheries | | |
| 3.1.7.2 | p.45 | Allocation for general category fishery of 2.5-11% of projected TAC | The general category fishery would be implemented a specific percent of the total scallop catch. It is understood that the amount will change based on estimated yield, but the percent would remain the same. The range being considered in 2.5 to 11% of the total. Preferred allocation value is 5.0%. | Public comment was split on this topic. Some voiced support for a value closer to historical averages (2-3%) and others felt the allocation should be much higher than the range under consideration. Lastly, some voiced support for 5%. [SAME] |
| 3.1.7.3 | | Allocation of yellowtail flounder bycatch TAC in access areas | | |
| 3.1.7.3.1 | p.47 | No Action | The yellowtail flounder bycatch TAC is for both components of the scallop fishery. When the TAC is projected to be caught, the area closes to both fisheries. | Some public comment supported No Action and others supported a separate allocation equal to the scallop catch allocation (2.5-11%). Ultimately, the Committee identified No Action as preferred due to monitoring concerns raised by NMFS. [NEW] |
| 3.1.8 | p.48 | Incidental Catch | | |
| 3.1.8.1 | | No Action | No change to incidental rules, 40 lb. possession limit not for resale. No permit needed – any vessel in the region is permitted to possess/land (but not sell) up to 40 lb. | Some public comments raised concern about incidental catch. Some related to mortality from this component of the fishery, and some related to increased bycatch for vessels that are not going to qualify for a limited entry general category permit. There was some support for the new incidental catch permit from the Committee, but there was concern that 40 pounds will not be enough for some non-qualifying vessels. <i>The Committee did not identify a preferred alternative for this topic.</i> |
| 3.1.8.2 | | New Incidental Catch Permit | A vessel that qualifies under the general category qualification time period alternative selected but not the landings criteria would qualify for this permit and could possess and sell up to 40 lb. of scallop meat per trip. A vessel that qualifies for a limited entry general category permit could opt for this permit instead. If this alternative is selected the current privilege for any vessel to possess (for personal use – cannot be sold) up to 40 lb. scallop meat would be eliminated. | |
| 3.2 | p.49 | MEASURES TO ALLOW BETTER AND MORE TIMELY INTEGRATION OF RECENT DATA | | |
| 3.2.1.1 | | Change issuance date of permit | Change the issuance date of general category permit from May 1 to March 1 | Almost all public comments did not support changing the fishing year. A few supported changing the issuance date for general category permits. The comment letter from NMFS noted that the DSEIS should include more information about why No Action outweighs benefits of changing the fishing year to improve integration of survey and fishery data. The Committee heard some testimony from the public about those reasons (see June 6 Cmte meeting summary) and ultimately they supported this alternative as preferred. [NEW] |

| SECTION in DSEIS | DSEIS PAGE # | ALTERNATIVE | DESCRIPTION OF COUNCIL PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | FINAL RECOMMENDATION FROM THE SCALLOP COMMITTEE BASED ON INPUT FROM PUBLIC COMMENT [SAME, DIFFERENT OR NEW FROM COUNCIL] |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|---|--|
| 3.3 | p.50 | OTHER MEASURES | | |
| 3.3.1.2 | | Clarification of trawl gear restriction | This alternative would clarify that the 144 ft. net sweep restriction is intended for vessels in the scallop fishery only, and does not apply to vessels participating on other trawl fisheries that catch scallops as bycatch. Specifically, if a vessel is fishing under a multispecies or monkfish DAS, and have a general category 1B permit, or a limited entry general category permit if one is adopted in this action, would be permitted to possess up to 400 pounds of scallops and would not be restricted by the 144 net sweep restriction. | The Committee agreed with public comment that vessels that are not directing on scallops should not be restricted to the 144ft. net sweep restriction. Therefore, the Committee identified this alternative as preferred. [NEW] |
| 3.3.2.2 | | Possession limit of 50 bu. Shoreward of the VMS demarcation line and up to 100 bushels east of the line | This modification would allow a general category vessel to be in possession of up to 100 bushels east of the demarcation line only. Once shoreward of the line a vessel can only be in possession of 50 bushels. | The Committee agreed with public comment that the possession limit should be increased for vessels while fishing so that they are not in violation of the 50 bu. possession limit while shucking scallops. Therefore, the Committee identified this alternative as preferred. [NEW] |

CLARIFICATIONS AND ADDITIONS (as recommended by the Scallop Committee)

Clarifications:

- Section 3.1.2.5.4 (permit stacking) is for limited access general category qualifiers only – these alternatives would not apply to limited access vessels who may also qualify for a general category permit. Those vessels would not be permitted to stack limited access general category permits on a vessel that is limited access already.
- Clarify language of stacking alternatives to be that stacking could be permanent or on an annual basis and that a vessel could only lease/sell their entire allocation – not a portion of their allocation.
- When a vessel wants to permanently stack a general category limited entry permit they also must either transfer all of their federal limited access permits OR permanently cancel such permits.

Additions:

- NMFS consider a 90-day requirement for vessels to apply for a limited entry permit once Amendment 11 is effective.

If treated as a package the following tables summarize some of the expected impacts of these measures in terms of how many vessels are expected to qualify and what average individual allocations may be. Section 5.0 of the public hearing document is a summarized discussion of the expected impacts of these alternatives on the affected environment (scallop resource, EFH, protected resources, economic and social environment, and non-target species). In addition, Section 5.0 of the DSEIS is a more detailed description of the various expected impacts.

Overall, if limited entry is adopted under the preferred alternatives for qualification (1,000 lbs. and 11-year time period) approximately 459 general category vessels will qualify, and approximately 226 limited access vessels will qualify to fish under general category rules (Table 2 and Table 3).

The allocations for individual vessels that qualify for limited access will vary from the averages shown in Table 4. The averages are shown in three groups according to their best year scallop landings during the qualification period. If the total TAC is assumed to be 50 million pounds, and the preferred alternative for general category allocation of 5% is adopted, then general category qualifiers will be allocated 2.5 million pounds. For vessels in the “top – tier” (over 20,000 annual pounds) the average best year landings was 35,000 pounds. Under a 5% TAC and 50 million total TAC that would translate to an average allocation of 20,522 pounds under the preferred alternative in pounds (or 51 trips). Vessels in the “lower tier” (less than 5,000 annual pounds) had an average best year landings of about 2,300 pounds and their average allocation under the preferred alternative would be about 1,905 pounds or 5 trips. Since the qualifiers are so diverse, the minimum allocation under the same scenario (2.5 million TAC) is about 600 pounds (less than 2 trips) and the maximum allocation would be about 30,000 pounds (75 trips). As for limited access vessels that qualify under general category, Table 5 summarizes the expected number of trips or pounds those vessels could be allocated under the preferred 0.5% allocation alternative (average of 2,000 pounds or 5 trips under a total 50 million catch scenario).

Table 2 – Potential number of qualifying general category vessels under the different qualification alternatives

| Time period (Up to the control date) | Qualification Criteria | Number of vessels that were active and qualify for limited access |
|---|-----------------------------|---|
| 1994-2004 4777 unique general category permits, 924 active vessels | 100 lb. Criteria | 705 |
| | 1000 lb. Criteria | 459 |
| | 5000 lb. Criteria | 203 |
| 2000-2004 3562 unique general category permits, 677 active vessels | Stand-alone ITQ alternative | 677 |
| | 100 lb. Criteria | 548 |
| | 1000 lb. Criteria | 369 |
| | 5000 lb. Criteria | 188 |
| 2003-2004 2876 unique general category permits, 482 active vessels | 100 lb. Criteria | 399 |
| | 1000 lb. Criteria | 277 |
| | 5000 lb. Criteria | 143 |

Preferred alternative shaded

Table 3 – Potential number of limited access qualifying vessels under the different qualification alternatives

| Time period (Up to the control date) | Qualification Criteria | Number of vessels that were active and qualify for limited access | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | | Full-time | Part-time and occasional |
| 1994-2004 367 vessels landed trip less than 400 pounds | 100 lb. Criteria | 267 | 78 |
| | 1000 lb. Criteria | 96 | 30 |
| | 5000 lb. Criteria | 22 | 7 |
| 2000-2004 231 vessels landed trip less than 400 pounds | Stand-alone ITQ alternative | 174 | 57 |
| | 100 lb. Criteria | 144 | 49 |
| | 1000 lb. Criteria | 38 | 19 |
| | 5000 lb. Criteria | 12 | 7 |
| 2003-2004 131 vessels landed trip less than 400 pounds | 100 lb. Criteria | 88 | 23 |
| | 1000 lb. Criteria | 26 | 9 |
| | 5000 lb. Criteria | 7 | 5 |

Preferred alternative shaded

Table 4 - Distributional impacts of qualification criteria and time period alternatives combined with % TAC, assuming 50 mil. total scallop catch.

| Best year landings per vessel (lb) | 11 Year period | | | 5 year period | | | | 2 year period | | | |
|--|------------------|--|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | 100 lb. Criteria | 1000 lb. Criteria | 5000 lb. Criteria | Stand alone-ITQ | 100 lb. criteria | 1000 lb. Criteria | 5000 lb. Criteria | 100 lb. Criteria | 1000 lb. Criteria | 5000 lb. Criteria | |
| >=20,000 lb. (average pounds of scallops per vessel were about 35,000 lb.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of vessels | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 44 | 44 | 44 | |
| % share of TAC | 49.7% | 50.9% | 59.1% | 53.6% | 53.8% | 54.9% | 61.4% | 51.1% | 52.0% | 58.1% | |
| % TAC | GC TAC (Mil.lb.) | Average allocation (pounds) per general category vessel at 50 million lb. scallop harvest | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.3 | 10,419 | 10,671 | 12,398 | 11,241 | 11,276 | 11,508 | 12,867 | 15,084 | 15,376 | 17,170 |
| 2.50% | 2.5 | 20,037 | 20,522 | 23,842 | 21,617 | 21,685 | 22,131 | 24,744 | 29,008 | 29,569 | 33,019 |
| 5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7% | 3.5 | 28,052 | 28,730 | 33,379 | 30,264 | 30,360 | 30,983 | 34,641 | 40,612 | 41,396 | 46,226 |
| 10% | 5.0 | 40,074 | 41,043 | 47,684 | 43,235 | 43,371 | 44,262 | 49,488 | 58,017 | 59,137 | 66,038 |
| 11% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.5 | 44,081 | 45,147 | 52,452 | 47,558 | 47,708 | 48,688 | 54,436 | 63,818 | 65,051 | 72,642 |
| 5000 lb. to 19,999 lb. (average pounds of scallops per vessel were over 10,000 lb.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of vessels | 141 | 141 | 141 | 126 | 126 | 126 | 126 | 99 | 99 | 99 | |
| % share of TAC | 34.3% | 35.2% | 40.9% | 33.8% | 33.9% | 34.6% | 38.6% | 36.8% | 37.5% | 41.9% | |
| % TAC | GC TAC (Mil.lb.) | Average allocation (pounds) per general category vessel at 50 million lb. scallop harvest | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.3 | 3,167 | 3,243 | 3,768 | 3,482 | 3,493 | 3,565 | 3,986 | 4,832 | 4,925 | 5,500 |
| 2.50% | 2.5 | 6,090 | 6,237 | 7,246 | 6,697 | 6,718 | 6,856 | 7,666 | 9,292 | 9,471 | 10,577 |
| 5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7% | 3.5 | 8,526 | 8,732 | 10,145 | 9,376 | 9,405 | 9,599 | 10,732 | 13,009 | 13,260 | 14,807 |
| 10% | 5.0 | 12,179 | 12,474 | 14,492 | 13,394 | 13,436 | 13,712 | 15,331 | 18,584 | 18,943 | 21,153 |
| 11% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.5 | 13,397 | 13,721 | 15,942 | 14,733 | 14,780 | 15,084 | 16,864 | 20,442 | 20,837 | 23,269 |
| <5000 lb. (average pounds of scallops per vessel ranged between 1,300 lb. with 100 lb. criteria to 2,300 lb. with 1000 lb. criteria) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of vessels | 502 | 256 | None | 489 | 360 | 181 | None | 256 | 134 | None | |
| % share of TAC | 16.0% | 13.9% | 0.0% | 12.6% | 12.4% | 10.6% | 0.0% | 12.2% | 10.5% | 0.0% | |
| % TAC | GC TAC (Mil.lb.) | Average allocation (pounds) per general category vessel at 50 million lb. scallop harvest | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1.3 | 572 | 980 | No allo. | 465 | 618 | 1,049 | No allo. | 855 | 1,404 | No allo. |
| 2.50% | 2.5 | 1,113 | 1,905 | No allo. | 904 | 1,202 | 2,041 | No allo. | 1,662 | 2,731 | No allo. |
| 5% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7% | 3.5 | 1,558 | 2,667 | No allo. | 1,266 | 1,683 | 2,857 | No allo. | 2,326 | 3,823 | No allo. |
| 10% | 5.0 | 2,226 | 3,809 | No allo. | 1,809 | 2,404 | 4,081 | No allo. | 3,324 | 5,461 | No allo. |
| 11% | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 5.5 | 2,449 | 4,190 | No allo. | 1,990 | 2,644 | 4,489 | No allo. | 3,656 | 6,007 | No allo. |

Preferred alternative for allocation and qualification shaded, assuming total scallop catch of 50 million pounds

Table 5 – Summary of impacts on average allocation per limited access vessel assuming 0.5% preferred allocation alternative

| Qualification period | | | 11 year period | | | 5 year period | | | 2 year period | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------------|--|-------|--------|-----------------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|--------|--------|
| Qualification Criteria (lb.) | | | 100 | 1000 | 5000 | Stand-alone ITQ | 100 | 1000 | 5000 | 100 | 1000 | 5000 |
| Number of qualified vessels | | | 345 | 126 | 29 | 231 | 193 | 57 | 19 | 111 | 35 | 12 |
| Scallop lb. per vessel (Best year) | | | 2,427 | 5,665 | 17,004 | 9,303 | 2,973 | 7,707 | 17,862 | 4,224 | 10,508 | 19,341 |
| Total scallop landings (mill. lb., Best year) | | | 0.71 | 0.60 | 0.39 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.27 | 0.22 |
| Scallop Harvest (mil.lb.) | % TAC | Limited access TAC (mill. lb.) | Average allocation per vessel (POUNDS) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 100 | 1000 | 5000 | Stand-alone ITQ | 100 | 1000 | 5000 | 100 | 1000 | 5000 |
| 40 | 0.5% | 0.20 | 580 | 1,587 | 6,897 | 866 | 1,036 | 3,509 | 10,526 | 1,802 | 5,714 | 16,667 |
| 50 | 0.5% | 0.25 | 725 | 1,984 | 8,621 | 1,082 | 1,295 | 4,386 | 13,158 | 2,252 | 7,143 | 20,833 |
| 60 | 0.5% | 0.30 | 870 | 2,381 | 10,345 | 1,299 | 1,554 | 5,263 | 15,789 | 2,703 | 8,571 | 25,000 |
| 70 | 0.5% | 0.35 | 1,014 | 2,778 | 12,069 | 1,515 | 1,813 | 6,140 | 18,421 | 3,153 | 10,000 | 29,167 |

Preferred alternative shaded