


New England Fishery Management Council

50 Water St., The Tannery – Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950
Tel (978) 465-0492 • Fax (978) 465-3116



FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 15

to the

ATLANTIC SEA SCALLOP FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN

and Environmental Assessment

To adjust the annual day-at-sea allocation for 2003
and to
continue the access program for
the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas

Prepared in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council

Initial framework meeting: July 23, 2002
Final framework meeting: September 12, 2002
Final action submitted: October 31, 2002
Document revised: December 12, 2002

1.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	I
1.1	LIST OF TABLES	IV
1.2	LIST OF FIGURES.....	VII
1.3	LIST OF MAPS.....	VIII
2.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
3.0	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND.....	1
4.0	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION	9
4.1	ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS; NEPA.....	10
4.2	SUMMARY OF DAY-AT-SEA, TAC, AND TRIP ALLOCATION EFFECTS FOR FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 15.....	11
4.3	RATIONALE FOR THE COUNCIL’S PROPOSED ACTION	16
5.0	MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES AND QUALITATIVE IMPACTS	19
5.1	PROPOSED ACTION.....	19
5.1.1	<i>Annual Day-at-sea Allocations for Limited access Scallop Vessels.....</i>	<i>19</i>
5.1.1.1	120 Full-time, 48 Part-time, and 10 Occasional Day-at-Sea Allocations during the 2003 Fishing Years (Status quo)	19
5.1.2	<i>Controlled access program for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas</i>	<i>20</i>
5.1.2.1	Boundaries and Seasons	21
5.1.2.1.1	Boundaries of area access program (to apply to the Hudson Canyon Area and/or the VA/NC Area).....	21
5.1.2.1.2	Season.....	23
5.1.2.1.3	In-season adjustment procedure	24
5.1.2.2	Effort and Catch Limits	25
5.1.2.2.1	Rotational management target (F=0.32) - Total Allowable Catch (TAC), trip allocations, and TAC set-asides	25
5.1.2.2.2	Triggered Area Closure	31
5.1.2.2.3	Day-at-sea restrictions and tradeoffs.....	31
5.1.2.2.4	Maximum trip length.....	32
5.1.2.3	Eligibility.....	32
5.1.2.3.1	Limited access scallop vessels.....	32
5.1.2.3.2	Eligibility to receive more Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas trips from an in- season adjustment	33
5.1.2.4	Gear restrictions.....	34
5.1.2.4.1	Dredges and trawls	34
5.1.2.4.2	Twine tops	34
5.1.2.5	Possession limits.....	35
5.1.2.5.1	Scallop possession limit for limited access vessels.....	35
5.1.2.5.2	Vessels with General Category scallop permits	37
5.1.2.5.3	Shellstock – 50 US Bushels	37
5.1.2.6	Enforcement Provisions.....	38
5.1.2.6.1	Trip Declaration and Notification.....	38
5.1.2.6.2	Vessel operation and landing	38

5.1.2.6.3	Penalties for Controlled Access Area Fishery Violations	38
5.1.2.7	Reporting requirements	38
5.1.2.7.1	Vessel monitoring systems (VMS)	39
5.1.2.7.2	More frequent polling of VMS equipment	39
5.1.2.7.3	Vessel trip reports (VTR).....	39
5.1.2.8	Observer requirements	40
5.1.2.8.1	Vessels must carry observers on 10 percent of Hudson Canyon Area trips and 20 percent of VA/NC Area trips	40
5.1.2.9	Day-at-sea adjustments for broken trips to the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas.....	42
5.1.2.9.1	No Action - NMFS will Continue to Address Broken Trips through Policy.....	43
5.2	NON-PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES	43
5.2.1	<i>Annual Day-at-sea Allocations for Limited access Scallop Vessels.....</i>	43
5.2.1.1	45 Full-time, 18 Part-time, And 4 Occasional Day-at-Sea Allocations during the 2003 Fishing Year; (No Action)	43
5.2.1.2	100 Full-time, 40 Part-time, and 8 Occasional Day-at-Sea Allocations during the 2003 Fishing Years.....	44
5.2.1.3	140 Full-time, 56 Part-time, and 12 Occasional Day-at-Sea Allocations during the 2003 Fishing Years.....	46
5.2.2	<i>Controlled access program for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas</i>	47
5.2.2.1	Amendment 7 target (F=0.20) - Total Allowable Catch (TAC), trip allocations, and TAC set-aside	47
5.2.2.2	Total Allowable Catch (TAC) for the Amendment 7 target.....	47
5.2.2.3	Trip allocations with the Amendment 7 target TAC.....	48
5.2.2.4	TAC set-asides to fund research, to fund observers, and for access by General Category scallop vessels	50
5.2.2.5	Day-at-sea adjustments for broken trips to the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas.....	51
5.2.2.5.1	Implement through Regulation an Exemption Program for Broken Trips	51
5.3	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED, BUT REJECTED FOR THE FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT	53
5.3.1	<i>Temporarily close new areas to scallop fishing to protect small scallops and/or have other beneficial effects.....</i>	53
5.3.2	<i>Prohibit scallop dredging in gravel, cobble, and other hard-bottom areas.....</i>	54
5.3.3	<i>Prohibit scallop dredging in areas containing sensitive EFH for overfished species.....</i>	55
5.3.4	<i>Create spawning sanctuaries to improve scallop recruitment.....</i>	56
5.3.5	<i>Area closures to protect other at-risk species.....</i>	56
5.3.6	<i>Re-open portions of the Georges Bank closed areas for scallop fishing</i>	57
5.3.7	<i>Require gear modifications to reduce bycatch, bycatch mortality, and/or habitat impacts.....</i>	59
5.3.8	<i>Require gear modifications to improve size selection of sea scallops or to reduce non-catch mortality</i>	59
5.3.9	<i>Increase annual day-at-sea allocations above the 2002 allocations for limited access scallop vessels.....</i>	59
5.3.10	<i>Increase the crew limit for limited access scallop vessels</i>	60
5.3.11	<i>Allocate individual quotas to vessels fishing in the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas... ..</i>	60
5.3.12	<i>Allow consolidation of fishing rights through transferability or stacking of permits or day-at-sea allocations, or through buybacks.....</i>	60
5.3.13	<i>Require sea sampling by observers on a minimum proportion of trips for scallop fishing in all areas</i>	61
5.3.14	<i>Require closed seasons or other types of measures to reduce encounters with sea turtles</i>	61
5.3.15	<i>Require experimental determination of MSY and OY by a date certain</i>	62
6.0	APPLICABLE LAW	63

6.1	MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT (MSFCMA) – CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL STANDARDS AND OTHER REQUIRED PROVISIONS.....	63
6.1.1	<i>National Standard 1 – Optimum Yield</i>	63
6.1.2	<i>National Standard 2 – Scientific Information</i>	64
6.1.3	<i>National Standard 3 – Management Units</i>	64
6.1.4	<i>National Standard 4 – Allocations</i>	65
6.1.5	<i>National Standard 5 – Efficiency</i>	65
6.1.6	<i>National Standard 6 – Variations and Contingencies</i>	66
6.1.7	<i>National Standard 7 – Costs and Benefits</i>	66
6.1.8	<i>National Standard 8 – Communities</i>	66
6.1.9	<i>National Standard 9 – Bycatch</i>	67
6.1.10	<i>National Standard 10 – Safety of Life at Sea</i>	68
6.2	MAGNUSON-STEVENS ACT REQUIRED PROVISIONS FOR FMPS	69
6.3	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)...	75
6.3.1	<i>Purpose and Need</i>	75
6.3.2	<i>Description of Management Action</i>	75
6.3.3	<i>Affected Environment</i>	75
6.3.3.1	Biological Environment.....	75
6.3.3.1.1	Sea scallop life history, habitat, and the physical environment.....	75
6.3.3.1.2	Status of the Resource.....	75
6.3.3.1.3	Status and management of the scallop resource in Canada.....	77
6.3.3.2	Estimates of total finfish bycatch from area access program observer data.....	78
6.3.3.3	Habitat.....	85
6.3.3.4	Endangered and Other Protected Species.....	85
6.3.3.4.1	Threatened and Endangered Species of Particular Concern	86
6.3.3.4.2	Other Species of Concern.....	88
6.3.3.5	Human Environment.....	89
6.3.3.5.1	Scallop landings and fishing fleet.....	89
6.3.3.5.2	Economic activity	89
6.3.3.5.3	Social factors.....	89
6.3.4	<i>Environmental Consequences - Analysis of Impacts</i>	90
6.3.4.1	Biological Impacts	90
6.3.4.1.1	Projection results.....	90
6.3.4.1.2	Total allowable catch (TAC), set-asides, and trip allocations	98
6.3.4.1.3	Observed trips and funding	105
6.3.4.1.4	Day-at-sea projections	107
6.3.4.1.5	Day-at-sea tradeoffs	112
6.3.4.1.6	Incidental catch estimates	112
6.3.4.1.7	Impacts from the day-at-sea tradeoff exemption	123
6.3.4.1.8	Methods	123
6.3.4.2	Habitat Impacts.....	124
6.3.4.2.1	Overview of Habitat Impacts of Scallop Fishing.....	124
6.3.4.2.2	Habitat Impacts of Previous Scallop Management Measures.....	129
6.3.4.2.3	Habitat Impacts of Proposed Measures	130
6.3.4.2.4	EFH Assessment.....	137
6.3.4.3	Impacts of Management Measures on Threatened and Endangered Species	138
6.3.4.3.1	Conclusion	146
6.3.4.4	Economic Impacts	147
6.3.4.4.1	Introduction.....	147
6.3.4.4.2	Overview of economic impacts.....	148
6.3.4.4.3	Assumptions and methodology: Economic Model.....	152

6.3.4.4.4	Landings and effort projections	159
6.3.4.4.5	Ex-vessel price and revenue projections	160
6.3.4.4.6	Variable cost projections	163
6.3.4.4.7	Producer and consumer surpluses, net national benefits and employment in the short term (2003)	164
6.3.4.4.8	Short-term versus long-term economic benefits	166
6.3.4.4.9	Trip Limit Analysis	170
6.3.4.4.10	The impacts of the proposed alternatives on small business entities and on an average vessel.....	173
6.3.4.4.11	General category vessels.....	177
6.3.4.4.12	Enforcement costs.....	177
6.3.4.4.13	Sources of uncertainty in the analysis	178
6.3.4.5	Social Impacts	179
6.3.4.5.1	Annual das allocations for limited access scallop vessels.	179
6.3.4.5.2	Controlled access for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas.....	181
6.3.4.6	Cumulative Impacts	185
6.3.5	<i>Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)</i>	186
6.4	REGULATORY IMPACT REVIEW (RIR; EXECUTIVE ORDER 12866)	192
6.4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	192
6.4.2	<i>Executive Order 12866</i>	192
6.4.3	<i>Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis</i>	193
6.4.3.1	Introduction.....	193
6.4.3.2	Determination of Significant Economic Impact on a Substantial Number of Small Entities 194	
6.5	ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (ESA).....	197
6.6	MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT (MMPA)	197
6.7	COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT (CZMA)	197
6.8	PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT (PRA).....	197
7.0	GLOSSARY	198
8.0	LITERATURE CITED.....	200
9.0	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS; AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED.....	205
10.0	COMMENTS.....	206
10.1	COUNCIL MEETINGS WHERE FRAMEWORK ADJUSTMENT 15 WAS THE PRIMARY FOCUS.....	206
10.2	ORAL COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND RESPONSE TO ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMENTS.....	206
10.3	WRITTEN COMMENTS.....	214

1.1 List of Tables

Table 1.	Annual day-at-sea allocations and reported day-at-sea use by limited access scallop vessels.	3
Table 2.	Trends in landings, biomass, and fishing mortality for the Georges Bank scallop stock (NMFS 2001a and NMFS 2001b).	6
Table 3.	Trends in landings, biomass, and fishing mortality for the Mid-Atlantic scallop stock (NMFS 2001a and NMFS 2001b).	7
Table 4.	Comparison of changes in benefits and costs, relative to status quo, with temporal changes in total exploitable biomass and in landings per day-at-sea in currently open fishing areas. Projections	

are based on stock status during the 2001 resource survey, assuming catches derived from predicted day-at-sea use and LPUE during 2002.....	11
Table 5. Comparison of projected changes in biomass and LPUE over 1 and 4 years. Projections are based on stock status during the 2001 resource survey, assuming catches derived from predicted day-at-sea use and LPUE during 2002.	12
Table 6. Summary and comparison of the benefits of a 100 or 120 day-at-sea allocation in Framework Adjustment 15.....	13
Table 7. Boundaries of the “Hudson Canyon South Closed Area” and the “Virginia Beach Closed Area”.....	21
Table 8. Allocations of trips for the Mid-Atlantic area access program in 2003 and the estimated number of trips for each area that can be taken if all vessels participate, assuming full participation in the Hudson Canyon Area and 50 percent participation in the VA/NC Area. The trip allocations are combined for both areas and are shown in the last column. Estimates exclude a one percent set-aside to fund research and another one-percent set-aside to fund the observer program.	27
Table 9. Trip allocation schedule for limited access vessels	28
Table 10. Summary of TACs and limits for scallop access in the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas during the 2003 fishing year, with a five percent TAC set aside for General Category scallop vessels.	30
Table 11. Number of eligible vessels with full-time, part-time, and occasional scallop limited access permits issued during the 2001 fishing year.....	33
Table 12. Rotation management TAC alternative (Section 4.1.2.2.1): Net conservation effect of the day-at-sea tradeoff in 2003 on the estimated number of scallops caught compared to the number of scallops caught by the status quo (120 day-at-sea allocation, Amendment 7 TAC target, and 18,000 lb. scallop possession limit).....	36
Table 13. Rotation management TAC target: Gross value of 2003 TAC set aside (assuming an average price of \$3.25 per pound) and observer costs (assuming that the daily observer cost is \$595 and the average trip duration is six days for limited access vessels).	42
Table 14. Allocations of trips for the Mid-Atlantic area access program in 2003 and the estimated number of trips for each area that can be taken if all vessels participate, assuming full participation in the Hudson Canyon Area and 50 percent participation in the VA/NC Area. The preferred alternative is indicated by the light shading (yellow if printed in color) associated with a 21,000 pound scallop possession limit. The trip allocations are combined for both areas and are shown in the last column. Estimates exclude a one percent set-aside to fund research and another one-percent set-aside to fund the observer program.	49
Table 15. Trip allocation schedule for limited access vessels	49
Table 16. Summary of TACs and possession limits for limited access scallop vessels fishing in the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas during the 2003 fishing year.	51
Table 17. Comparison of updated fishing mortality estimates to the last assessment for 1998 (NMFS 1999 and NMFS 2001).....	76
Table 18. Annual biological projections of Framework Adjustment 15 management alternatives, based on 2001 R/V Albatross survey data.	92
Table 19. Fishing mortality and exploitable biomass projections by stock area for combinations of alternative day-at-sea allocations and area access program TACs.....	94
Table 20. Rotation management TAC target: Biomass estimates for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas from the 2001 and 2002 R/V Albatross scallop survey. Projected biomass for 2003 was estimated by the method described in Section 5.3.4.1.9 for abundance estimates from the experimental fishery and in the methods described for the Albatross biological projections (Section 5.3.4.1.1).	99
Table 21. Amendment 7 TAC target: 2003 Biomass estimates for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas from the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery and the 2000 R/V Albatross scallop survey. Projected biomass for 2003 was estimated by the method described in Section 5.3.2.2 for abundance estimates	

from the experimental fishery and in the methods described for the Albatross biological projections (Section 5.3.4.1.1).	100
Table 22. Amendment 7 TAC target (F=0.2): Average 2001 and 2002 biomass estimates and calculation of 2001 scallop TACs for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas.....	101
Table 23. Rotation management area TAC target (F=0.32): Average 2001 and 2002 biomass estimates and calculation of 2001 scallop TACs for the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas.....	101
Table 24. Rotation management area TAC target alternative possession limit analysis for 2003: Assumed vessel participation and maximum scallop possession limits for various trip allocation choices. The TACs and set-asides are shown in Table 23.	102
Table 25. Amendment 7 TAC target possession limit analysis for 2003: Assumed vessel participation and maximum scallop possession limits for various trip allocation choices. The TACs and set-asides are shown in Table 22.	103
Table 26. Number of trips during the 1999 fishing year that landed to 400 pounds of scallop meats by vessels with General Category permits. Source: Fisheries Statistics Office, NERO, NMFS, Gloucester, MA.....	104
Table 27. Number of vessels by state with General Category permits landing 1 – 400 pounds of scallop meats on one or more trips in fishing year 1999. Source: Fisheries Statistics Office, NERO, NMFS, Gloucester, MA.....	104
Table 28. Number of vessels, trips, and landings of scallops and other species for trips by vessels with General Category permits that landed one or more trips with scallop landings between 200 – 400 pounds during fishing year 1999. The total for all permit categories includes only trips when the vessel landed 200 – 400 pounds of scallop meats. Source: Fisheries Statistics Office, NERO, NMFS, Gloucester, MA.....	104
Table 29. Rotation management TAC target for 2003: Potential funds and costs for observers, assuming a scallop price of \$5.00 per pound, a cost of \$700 per observer day, a six-day trip length for limited access vessels and a one-day trip length for General Category vessels.....	107
Table 30. Amendment 7 TAC target for 2003: Potential funds and costs for observers, assuming a scallop price of \$5.00 per pound, a cost of \$700 per observer day, a six-day trip length for limited access vessels and a one-day trip length for General Category vessels.....	107
Table 31. Summary of permits, 2001 day-at-sea use, and expected day-at-sea use in 2003 for vessels with active limited access scallop permits, assuming no day-at-sea tradeoff or area access program is in effect.	109
Table 32. Summary of permits, 2001 day-at-sea use, and expected day-at-sea use in 2003 for vessels with active limited access scallop permits, based on the effect of the day-at-sea tradeoff to reduce total days used in 2001.	110
Table 33. Example full-time limited access day-at-sea use projections, with various 2001 fishing levels and 2003 day-at-sea allocations.	111
Table 34. Day-at-sea capacity held in Confirmation of Permit History status for limited access scallop vessels. Source: Northeast Regional Office, NMFS.....	112
Table 35. Mean number per tow in the Hudson Canyon Area during the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery. Data and analysis provided by Dr. William DuPaul, VIMS.....	114
Table 36. Mean number per tow in the VA/NC Area during the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery. Data and analysis provided by Dr. William DuPaul, VIMS.	115
Table 37. Minimum Sizes of Incidental Catch / Potential Bycatch Species (total length).....	118
Table 38. Catch (number) per tow in the R/V Albatross scallop survey for important groundfish species, 1998 – 2000.	122
Table 39. 2000-1 Groundfish Closed Area Fishery Bycatch summary (Catch in lbs live wt.).....	83
Table 40. 2000-1 groundfish closed area fishery – bycatch ratio (Bycatch live weight / scallops landed [meat weight]).....	83
Table 41. 2001 Mid-Atlantic Access Area Bycatch Estimates Catch in pounds live weight (except sea scallops)	84

Table 42. Skate biomass estimates, including only areas surveyed by the NMFS scallop survey.....	85
Table 43. Selected published information of the effects of the New Bedford type scallop dredge on sand substrates.....	125
Table 44. Selected published information of the effects of the New Bedford type scallop dredge on mixed sediment substrates.....	126
Table 45. Summary of the estimated qualitative effects of the proposed actions on habitat relative to status quo and the No Action alternative.	137
Table 46. Marine turtle takes and observer effort in the scallop dredge fishery by year and area during 1996-2000. Traditional observer coverage in “Open Areas” during 1996-2000 was typically at 1% of trips or less.....	144
Table 47. Short-term impacts and economic benefits: 2003.....	150
Table 48. Long-term costs and benefits net of status quo levels.....	150
Table 49. Landings, Imports, Prices and Meat Count.....	153
Table 50. Composition of sea scallop landings by count category.....	156
Table 51. Landings and effort.....	160
Table 52. Average Meat count, Ex-vessel prices and Fleet Revenues (in 1996 real prices).....	160
Table 53. Variable cost projections (in 1996 real prices).....	163
Table 54. Short-term economic benefits and employment: 2003.....	164
Table 55. Long-term costs and benefits net of no action levels, 2003-2012.....	166
Table 56. Mean and standard deviation of the projected landings (Average of values from 2003 to 2012).....	169
Table 57. Trip limit analysis at 10-days-at-sea trade-off for the Hudson Canyon (HC) and VA/NC areas.	171
Table 58. Economic impacts on vessels for 2003 fishing year.....	176
Table 59. Stratified comparison of year-to-year changes in actual DAS usage, 1995 to 1999.....	181
Table 60. Landing Information by Homeport (percentages based on kept pounds, 1999 fishing year), logbook and permit data.....	183
Table 61. Port of Origin Information by Major Ports of Landing (percentages based on kept pounds, 1999 fishing year), logbook and permit data.....	183
Table 62. Catch distribution by kept pounds scallops, general category boats only.	184
Table 63. Scallops landed, in pounds, by Gear and Permit category, fishing year 1999 (logbook and permit data).....	185
Table 64. Port Distribution, scallops landed by Net boats, 1999 fishing year.....	185
Table 65. Total number of scallop permits issued by fishing year and permit category. Values of 2002 are preliminary, through March 2002.	196

1.2 List of Figures

Figure 1. Relative impact on number of scallop days accumulated in 2001 with a 100 day-at-sea allocation, including the effects of day-at-sea carryovers.....	14
Figure 2. Preliminary (unaudited) scallop size frequency distribution for survey tows in the Hudson Canyon Area during late July 2002.	15
Figure 3. Preliminary (unaudited) scallop size frequency distribution for survey tows in the Mid-Atlantic (excluding the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas) during late July 2002.	15
Figure 4. Projected landings from 2002 to 2012 for alternatives in Framework Adjustment 15, based on 2001 scallop survey results.....	96
Figure 5. Projected Mid-Atlantic exploitable biomass from 2002 to 2012 for alternatives in Framework Adjustment 15, based on 2001 scallop survey results.	96

Figure 6. Projected Georges Bank exploitable biomass from 2002 to 2012 for alternatives in Framework Adjustment 15, based on 2001 scallop survey results.	97
Figure 7. Projected landings per day-at-sea from 2002 to 2012 for alternatives in Framework Adjustment 15, based on 2001 scallop survey results.	97
Figure 8. Projected total area swept from 2002 to 2012 for alternatives in Framework Adjustment 15, based on 2001 scallop survey results. Total area swept is calculated based on total projected day-at-sea use and the proportion between the estimated catch and crew-limited shucking capacity. The totals are estimated as if the tows were contiguous, laid end to end and side by side, without accounting for overlap or geographic distribution of fishing effort.	98
Figure 9. Projected day-at-sea use and total accumulated days for vessels with limited access scallop permits in 2003.	108
Figure 10. Size-frequency distribution of monkfish catch by a scallop dredge in the Hudson Canyon Area during the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery. Data and analysis provided by Mr. David Rudders, VIMS.	116
Figure 11. Size-frequency distribution of fourspot flounder catch by a scallop dredge in the Hudson Canyon Area during the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery. Data and analysis provided by Mr. David Rudders, VIMS.	116
Figure 12. Size-frequency distribution of witch flounder catch by a scallop dredge in the Hudson Canyon Area during the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery. Data and analysis provided by Mr. David Rudders, VIMS.	117
Figure 13. Size-frequency distribution of windowpane flounder catch by a scallop dredge in the Hudson Canyon Area during the 2000 VIMS experimental fishery. Data and analysis provided by Mr. David Rudders, VIMS.	117
Figure 14. Comparison of relative finfish incidental catch for important groundfish species, all areas. .	119
Figure 15. Comparison of relative finfish incidental catch for important groundfish species, Georges Bank scallop stock areas.	120
Figure 16. Comparison of relative finfish incidental catch for important groundfish species, Mid-Atlantic scallop stock areas.	120
Figure 17. Comparison of relative finfish incidental catch for important groundfish species, Hudson Canyon Area.	121
Figure 18. Comparison of relative finfish incidental catch for important groundfish species, VA/NC Area.	121
Figure 19 – Ex-vessel and average price of scallops (in 1996 constant dollars).	154
Figure 20 – Sea scallop landings and imports (pounds).	155
Figure 21 – Price premium: Average monthly price of scallops by count	156
Figure 22 - Ex-vessel price estimates for 2003-2012.	162
Figure 23 – Revenue estimates for 2003-2012	162

1.3 List of Maps

Map 1. Size and configuration of the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas, controlled access areas in the Mid-Atlantic. These areas, totaling 1934 nm ² , are compared with the 1982-2000 sea scallop survey distribution for tows greater than 500 g of scallop meats per tow. The 50 and 100 fathom contours are shown as a reference.	22
Map 2. January to March sea turtle distribution from standard aerial and ship surveys during 1967 to 1997.	142
Map 3. April to June sea turtle distribution from standard aerial and ship surveys during 1967 to 1997.	142

Map 4. July to September sea turtle distribution from standard aerial and ship surveys during 1967 to 1997. 142

Map 5. October to December sea turtle distribution from standard aerial and ship surveys during 1967 to 1997. 142

Map 6. Distribution of loggerhead sea turtles during 1967 to 1997, corrected for sampling effort (Shoop and Kenney 1992). 143