

1.1 List of Appendices & Addendums

Appendix I	NMFS Workshop on the Effects of Fishing Gear on Marine Habitats Off the Northeastern United States
Appendix II	EFH Scoping Comments Summary and Response
Appendix III	Maps and Coordinates for the Habitat Closed Area Alternatives
Appendix IV	Methods of Analysis for Assessment of Environmental Consequences
Appendix V	Detailed Data of Habitat Metric Analysis for the Habitat Closed Area Alternatives Combined with the No Action Alternative
Appendix VI	Gear Descriptions of Gears Used in the Northeast United States
Appendix VII	Amendment 10 Scoping Comments Summary
Appendix VIII	A Proposal for Harvest Cooperatives in the Sea Scallop Fishery
Appendix IX	Controlled Access Area Bycatch Estimates And Scallop and Finfish Bycatch Estimates from Vessel Trip Reports by Quarter and Rotation Management Area, Pooled Over Years
Appendix X	Written comments received by the Council on Draft Amendment 10 and the DSEIS
Appendix XI	Public Hearing Summary of Comments on Draft Amendment 10 and the DSEIS
Addendum I	Description, Rationale, and Preliminary Habitat Analysis for One of the Preferred Habitat Alternatives (Joint Advisory Recommendations 1 - 9)

1.2 List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Amendment 10 alternatives and rationale for decision. Alternatives included in the proposed action are boldfaced.	2-4
Table 2. Annual full-time day-at-sea allocation schedules, active permits, landings, and landings per day-at-sea	3-3
Table 3. Annual day-at-sea allocations	3-10
Table 4. Example of time-averaged fishing mortality overfishing definition with a three-year closure, followed by a three-year period of re-opened management status.....	3-18
Table 5. Example of time-averaged fishing mortality overfishing definition with a two-year closure, followed by a three-year period of re-opened management status.....	3-19
Table 6. Open area target fishing mortality for determining optimum yield.	3-22
Table 7. Revised specifications (values) for overfishing definition targets and thresholds by stock.	5-3
Table 8. Initial allocations of area-specific days-at-sea and trips by management area for 2004-2005 and estimated DAS to achieve fishing mortality target in 2006. The allocations for individual areas represent the maximum number of trips and days that can be taken in each area by a limited access	

vessel, unless authorized to do so through an approved trip/day-at-sea exchange with another limited access vessel. Controlled access DAS allocations and charges assume a 12 DAS/18,000 lb. tradeoff.	5-10
Table 9. Example one-to-one exchange of controlled access trips, showing the application of day-at-sea allocations and charges. This example assumes a 12 DAS tradeoff.	5-12
Table 10. Schedule of day-at-sea charges for trips terminated early by limited access scallop making controlled access trips. This is an example day-at-sea charge schedule if the scallop possession limit is 18,000 pounds and the re-opened area day-at-sea tradeoff is 12 days.	5-14
Table 11. General management structure for area rotation management.	5-16
Table 12. Example of ramped fishing mortality targets for re-opened areas, compared to mortality targets with no rotation and simple rotation with constant fishing mortality targets when re-opened. See Sections 8.2.1 and for analysis of impacts.	5-17
Table 13. Management policies and fishing mortality targets for rotation areas.	5-18
Table 14. Boundaries of “Elephant Trunk” closed rotation area.	5-25
Table 16. Characterization and summary of positive impacts of Amendment 10 management measures on EFH.	5-35
Table 17. Long-term non-rotation projections of scallop biomass, yield, and area swept, 3.5 inch vs. 4 inch dredge rings.	5-40
Table 18. Example controlled access possession limit and open area DAS adjustments needed to fully compensate for the cost of the observer. This example does not take into account the vessel’s lay system or the costs for the extra time and effort needed to process the scallops.	5-43
Table 19. Controlled access TAC set-aside for observers.	5-44
Table 20. Open area DAS set-aside for observers.	5-45
Table 21. Controlled access TAC set-aside for scallop and scallop-related habitat research.	5-49
Table 22. Open area DAS set-aside for scallop and scallop-related habitat research.	5-50
Table 23. General management structure for area rotation management.	5-58
Table 24. Example of ramped fishing mortality targets for re-opened areas, compared to mortality targets with no rotation and simple rotation with constant fishing mortality targets when re-opened. See Sections 8.2.1 and for analysis of impacts.	5-60
Table 25. Management policies and fishing mortality targets for rotation areas.	5-60
Table 26. Rotation management rules for adaptive closures, with fixed duration and fixed boundaries...	5-67
Table 27. Rotation management rules for adaptive closures and re-openings, with fixed boundaries...	5-69
Table 28. Summary of short term effects of area access alternatives.	5-85
Table 29. Summary of short-term economic effects of proposed area access alternatives.	5-86
Table 30. Constant annual fishing mortality targets for recently re-opened rotation areas and time averaged fishing mortality targets with different closure and recent re-open durations. Calculations assume that the stock-wide target equals 0.20.	5-93
Table 31. Ramped annual fishing mortality targets for recently re-opened rotation areas and time-averaged fishing mortality targets, after a three-year closure. The example ramping strategy begins with 80% and ends with 120% of the time-averaged target, assuming that the stock-wide target equals 0.20.	5-93
Table 32. Comparison of Framework Adjustment process and Annual Specifications for a fishing year starting on March 1 (status quo) versus August 1 (proposed)	5-149
Table 33. Schedule of day-at-sea charges for trips terminated early by limited access scallop vessels for trips in the Hudson Canyon and VA/NC Areas. This is an example day-at-sea charge schedule if the scallop possession limit is 15,000 or 24,000 pounds and the re-opened area day-at-sea tradeoff is 10 or 14 days.	5-151
Table 34. Data sources used in Amendment 10 to analyze impacts from proposed management alternatives or to describe the affected environment.	6-6
Table 35. Vessel Characteristics by Category, 1994-2001. Source: NE Permit Data.	7-3

Table 36. Length and Tonnage of limited access vessels, 1994-2001. Source: NE Permit Data.....	7-3
Table 37. Length and Tonnage of general category vessels, 1994-2001. Source: NE Permit Data	7-3
Table 38. Average and Total DAS used by Limited Access Vessels, by Gear and DAS category. Source: NE Permit and Enforcement Data.....	7-4
Table 39. DAS use in Fishing Years 2000 and 2001 by DAS and Gear Category of Limited Access Vessels. Source: NE Permit and Enforcement Data.....	7-4
Table 40. Summary of trips by permit category that landed less than or equal to 400 pounds of sea scallops, March 2000 through February 2001.	7-8
Table 41. Summary of trips by permit category that landed 400 pounds or less of sea scallops from March 1, 2001 through February 28, 2002.	7-9
Table 42. Summary of trips by permit category that landed 400 pounds or less of sea scallops from March 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002, preliminary.	7-10
Table 43. Summary of trips by gear category that landed less than or equal to 400 pounds of sea scallops, March 2000 through February 2001.	7-11
Table 44. Summary of trips by gear category that landed 400 pounds or less of sea scallops from March 1, 2001 through February 28, 2002.	7-12
Table 45. Summary of trips by gear category that landed 400 pounds or less of sea scallops from March 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002.	7-13
Table 46. Summary of trips that landed less than or equal to 400 pounds of sea scallops, March 2000 through February 2001 for limited access and open access scallop permits.	7-14
Table 47. Summary table for all categories and gear types for trips landing 400 pounds or less of sea scallops from March 1, 2001 through February 28, 2002.	7-15
Table 48. Summary table for all categories and gear types for trips landing 400 pounds or less of sea scallops from March 1, 2001 through December 31, 2002.	7-16
Table 49. List of other species included in the general category landings summary tables above.	7-17
Table 50. Landings and Effort from Scallop Vessels, 1997-2000. Source: logbooks	7-20
Table 51. Average trip characteristics by size of crew and permit category, fishing years 1997-2000.	7-23
Table 52. 2001 permits* held by scallop vessels, by category. Source: NE Permit Data	7-24
Table 53. Most common 2001 plan combinations by permit and gear category.	7-24
Table 54. Number of dealers and processors by state*.....	7-25
Table 55. Dealer dependence on scallops	7-25
Table 56. Limited Access Permits by Homeport State, with average length and tonnage, 1994-2001. .	7-27
Table 57. General Category Permits by Homeport State, with average length and tonnage, 1994-2001. .	7-27
Table 58. Limited Access Vessels by Homeport and County (1994-2001), in order of 2001 homeport county vessels.	7-28
Table 59. General category vessels by homeport and county (1994-2001), in order of 2001 homeport county vessels.	7-29
Table 60. Distribution of Landed Value of Scallops by County and State of Landing (1994-2001).....	7-33
Table 61. Distribution of Landed Value of Scallops by Port of Landing (1994-2001).....	7-33
Table 62. Distribution of Dealer-Reported Landed Value of Scallops by Associated Homeport County (1994-2001)	7-35
Table 63. Distribution of Landed Value of Scallops by Associated Homeport (1994-2001)	7-36
Table 64. Number of vessels catching at least half of their annual scallop catch in one statistical area, Fishing years 1995-2000. Source: 1994-2001 logbooks	7-39
Table 65. Fishing characteristics* by statistical area, fishing years 1995 - 2000. Source: 1994-2001 logbooks.	7-39
Table 66. Average Distance traveled from fishing grounds to port of landing, and Average Scallops Landed, stratified by plan, vessel length, and calendar year. Source: logbooks.....	7-40
Table 67. Summary of amendments and Secretarial actions for the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan.	7-45

Table 68. Summary of annual and in-season framework adjustments for the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan.....	7-46
Table 69. Annual day-at-sea allocations and reported day-at-sea use by limited access scallop vessels. .	7-48
Table 70. Trends in landings, biomass, and fishing mortality for the Georges Bank scallop stock (NMFS 2001a and NMFS 2001b).....	7-50
Table 71. Trends in landings, biomass, and fishing mortality for the Mid-Atlantic scallop stock (NMFS 2001a and NMFS 2001b).....	7-50
Table 72. Comparison of updated fishing mortality estimates to the last assessment for 1998 (NMFS 1999 and NMFS 2001), with updates for 2002 and projections for 2003 (Section 8.2.1).....	7-55
Table 73. Estimated total finfish catches made by the scallop fleet during the 2000 fishing year area access program for the Georges Bank closed areas.....	7-58
Table 74. Frequency of occurrence and total hail weight on observed tows on scallop dredge trips, 1991-2000, Sea Sampling Observer Program. Source: NMFS, April 2002. Rows with groundfish and other species of concern are shaded.	7-59
Table 75. Gulf of Maine benthic assemblages as identified by Watling (1998). Geographical distribution of assemblages is shown in Map 29.	7-63
Table 76. Comparison of demersal fish assemblages of Georges Bank and Gulf of Maine identified by Overholtz and Tyler (1985) and Gabriel (1992).	7-65
Table 77. Ten dominant species and mean abundance/tow ⁻¹ from each cluster species group and its associated substrate type as determined by reflectance value, from Stellwagen Bank, Gulf of Maine (Auster et al. 2001).	7-66
Table 78. Sedimentary provinces of Georges Bank, as defined by Valentine <i>et al.</i> (1993) and Valentine and Lough (1991) with additional comments by Valentine (personal communication) and Benthic Assemblages assigned from Theroux and Grosslein (1987). See text for further discussion on benthic assemblages.	7-68
Table 79. Mid-Atlantic habitat types as described by Pratt (1973) and Boesch (1979) with characteristic macrofauna as identified in Boesch 1979.	7-74
Table 80. Major Recurrent Demersal Finfish Assemblages of the Mid-Atlantic Bight During Spring and Fall as Determined by Colvocoresses and Musik (1983).....	7-77
Table 81. Mid-Atlantic Reef Types, Location, and Representative Flora and Fauna, as Described in Steimle and Zetlin (2000).....	7-78
Table 82. Faunal zones of the continental slope of Georges Bank and southern New England (from Hecker 1990)	7-79
Table 83. Habitat Types for the Canyons of Georges Bank Described by Geologic Attributes and Characteristic Fauna (from Cooper <i>et al.</i> 1987).	7-81
Table 84. EFH Designation of Estuaries and Embayments -Atlantic sea scallops (<i>Placopecten magellanicus</i>).....	7-85
Table 85. Percent of scallop EFH (juvenile) that is designated in various sediment types as modified from Poppe et al. 1989.	7-88
Table 86. Effects of Otter Trawls on Mud Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-110
Table 87. Effects of Otter Trawls on Sand Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies.....	7-115
Table 88. Effects of Otter Trawls on Gravel/Rock Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-122
Table 89. Effects of Otter Trawls on Mixed Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies.....	7-123
Table 90. Effects of New Bedford Scallop Dredges on Sand Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-124
Table 91. Effects of New Bedford Scallop Dredges on Mixed Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies.....	7-125
Table 92. Effects of Hydraulic Clam Dredges on Sand Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-127
Table 93. Effects of Hydraulic Clam Dredges on Mixed Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-129

Table 94. Effects of Multiple Gears on Sand Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-129
Table 95. Effects of Multiple Gear Types on Gravel/Rocky Substrate: Summary of Published Studies ...	7-131
Table 96. Effects of Multiple Gears on Mixed Substrate Habitat: Summary of Published Studies	7-132
Table 97. American Plaice EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-136
Table 98. Atlantic Cod EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-137
Table 99. Atlantic Halibut EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-138
Table 100. Atlantic Herring EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-139
Table 101. Atlantic Salmon EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-140
Table 102. Atlantic Sea Scallop EFH - Vulnerability to Benthic Fishing Gear Effects	7-141
Table 103. Haddock EFH - Vulnerability to Effect of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-143
Table 104. Monkfish EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-144
Table 105. Ocean Pout EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-145
Table 106. Offshore Hake EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-146
Table 107. Pollock EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-147
Table 108. Red Hake EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-148
Table 109. Redfish EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-149
Table 110. White Hake EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-150
Table 111. Silver Hake EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-151
Table 112. Windowpane Flounder EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-152
Table 113. Winter Flounder EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-153
Table 114. Witch Flounder EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-154
Table 115. Yellowtail Flounder EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-155
Table 116. Red Crab EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-156
Table 117. Atlantic Mackerel EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-157
Table 118. Black Sea Bass EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-158
Table 119. Bluefish EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-159
Table 120. Butterfish EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-160
Table 121. Illex Squid EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-161
Table 122. Loligo Squid EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-161
Table 123. Ocean Quahog EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-162
Table 124. Atlantic Surfclam EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-163
Table 125. Scup EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-164
Table 126. Spiny Dogfish EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-165
Table 127. Summer Flounder EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-166
Table 128. Tilefish EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-167
Table 129. Barndoor Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-168
Table 130. Clearnose Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-168
Table 131. Little Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-169
Table 132. Rosette Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-170
Table 133. Smooth Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear.....	7-171
Table 134. Thorny Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-172
Table 135. Winter Skate EFH - Vulnerability to Effects of Benthic Fishing Gear	7-173
Table 136. Summary of the criteria used to identify the EFH vulnerability determinations.....	7-176
Table 137. EFH Vulnerability Matrix Analysis	7-177
Table 138. Summary species and life stage's EFH adversely impacted by otter trawling and scallop dredging (gears that adversely impact EFH used in the Scallop fishery).	7-180
Table 139. Effects and Recovery Times of Bottom Otter Trawls on Mud Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Eight Gear Effect Studies.....	7-185
Table 140. Effects and Recovery Times of Bottom Otter Trawls on Sand Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Twelve Gear Effect Studies.....	7-185

Table 141. Effects and Recovery Times of Bottom Otter Trawls on Gravel and Rock Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Three Gear Effect Studies.....	7-186
Table 142. Effects and Recovery Times of Chain Sweep Scallop Dredges on Sand Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Three Gear Effect Studies.....	7-186
Table 143. Comparison of percent of area in NAAA and percent of effort for historic baselines and rotation management area projections	7-188
Table 144. Fishing gears used in estuaries and bays, coastal waters, and offshore waters of the EEZ, from Maine to North Carolina.	7-193
Table 145. Non-Fishing Related Threats to EFH and Activities and Sources Contributing the Threats (<i>Source: Habitat Omnibus Am. (1998)</i>).....	196
Table 146. Essential Fish Habitat Research Needs (Identified by the EFH Steering Committee).....	7-198
Table 147. Summary of meeting days in which the public was able to provide input and comment on Amendment 10 alternatives.....	8-2
Table 148. Plan Development Team and Habitat Technical Team members that performed analyses, contributed material to the document, and/or provided critical review of scientific advice and analysis.....	8-3
Table 149. NEFMC technical review committee members that provided critical review of scientific advice and analysis.	8-3
Table 150. Advisory committee members that provided expert advice and recommendations to the Council.	8-4
Table 151. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Sea Scallop Resource under US jurisdiction. Impacts on the scallop resource generally occur through changes in the fishing mortality rate and the fishery's size selection. Generally management measures that reduce mortality or select larger scallops benefit the scallop resource.	8-8
Table 152. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Scallop fishing fleet and infrastructure (suppliers, maintenance facilities, processors). Fishery impacts generally occur through the amount of revenue derived from fishing and the costs of fishing. Generally management measures that improve yield or reduce fishing costs have positive effects on the fishing industry.	8-12
Table 153. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Vulnerable Finfish Resources Caught as Bycatch in the Scallop Fishery. Bycatch impacts generally occur through the selectivity of the fishery, where fishing occurs relative to the distribution of finfish species, and when fishing occurs. Generally management measures that reduce the overlap between the target fishery and species that are vulnerable to capture during scallop fishing have positive effects on bycatch.....	8-18
Table 154. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). EFH impacts generally occur through contact with the seabed by bottom tending gear that removes, disturbs, or buries benthic epifauna. The quality and quantity of adverse impacts are related to the amount and distribution of fishing activity, as well as the type of gear in use. Generally management measures that reduce fishing time, focus fishing in less sensitive areas, or modify gear so that it has less contact with the bottom have positive effects on EFH.	8-22
Table 155. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Protected Species. Protected species impacts generally occur because of where fishing occurs relative to the distribution of protected species, and when fishing occurs. Generally management measures that reduce the overlap between the target fishery and protected species have positive effects.....	8-33
Table 156. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Human Safety at Sea. Safety is affected by how and when the fishery operates and any regulatory limits that affect it. Generally management measures that allow flexibility for fishermen to determine where and when to fish have positive effects on safety.....	8-37
Table 157. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Fishing Dependent Communities. Community impacts generally occur through the amount of revenue derived from fishing and related employment. Generally management measures that improve yield and fishery activity have positive effects on fishing communities.....	8-41

Table 158. Summary of cumulative effects: VEC = Marine Fisheries Law Enforcement and Administration. Impacts on law enforcement and administration generally occur the complexity of regulations. Generally management measures that simplify regulations or improve compliance have positive effects.....	8-45
Table 159. Steady state (long-term) simulation results.....	8-60
Table 160. Groundfish closure area access options.....	8-62
Table 161. Summary of final projection scenarios and overfishing definitions used to evaluate final alternative options and future events. The “proposed” overfishing definition in the DSEIS was disapproved in favor of continuing the use of the status quo overfishing definition.	8-77
Table 162. Comparison of overfishing definition performance with and without area rotation and Georges Bank area access, using 3½-inch ring assumptions and a 9-day, 21,000 lb. tradeoff.	8-80
Table 163. Comparison of overfishing definition performance with and without area rotation and Georges Bank area access, using 4-inch ring assumptions and a 12-day/ 18,000 lb. tradeoff, compared to baseline conditions without area rotation or access using 3½-inch rings.	8-81
Table 164. Comparison of long-term projected total scallop biomass by management area for various scallop management alternatives. The final alternative is the status quo overfishing definition, with rotation and 4” rings (“Yes – 4”)......	8-99
Table 165. Comparison of long-term projected total scallop landings [mt (top) and million lbs. (bottom)] by management area for various scallop management alternatives. The final alternative is the status quo overfishing definition, with rotation and 4” rings (“Yes – 4”)......	8-106
Table 166. Allowable open area DAS use to achieve the resource-wide target fishing mortality rates (F = 0.2), without and with access to Framework 13 parts of the Georges Bank closed areas.....	8-114
Table 167. Maximum number of limited access trips by controlled access area and number of allocated trips and DAS by permit category, assuming approval of Framework Adjustment 16/39 to allow access to the Georges Bank groundfish closed areas.....	8-119
Table 168. Video survey based TAC estimates with a 0.2 fishing mortality target.	8-123
Table 169. Video survey based TAC estimates with a 0.4 fishing mortality target.	8-124
Table 170. Biomass and TAC estimates by area and year for various fishing mortality targets. TACs for fishing mortality targets above 0.4, assumed that the area was fished at 0.4 in the previous years of the projection.	8-127
Table 171. Projected biomasses and catches in controlled access areas by year.	8-128
Table 172. Total allowable catches (TAC) and estimated average catch per DAS (LPUE) for 2004-2007 based on 2002 survey data within the proposed controlled access areas.....	8-129
Table 173. Trip and DAS allocations in 2004 with controlled access trip lengths ranging from 8 to 15 DAS.....	8-136
Table 174. Trip and DAS allocations in 2005 with controlled access trip lengths ranging from 8 to 15 DAS.....	8-137
Table 175. Trip and DAS allocations in 2006 with controlled access trip lengths ranging from 8 to 15 DAS.....	8-138
Table 176. Trip and DAS allocations in 2006 with controlled access trip lengths ranging from 8 to 15 DAS.....	8-139
Table 177. Number and proportion of observed trips in controlled access areas in 2004 vs. daily scallop possession limit allowance. The “probable” estimate assumes that 75% of allocated trips are taken during the fishing year and that 50% of vessels carrying observers land more than the 18,000 lb. scallop possession limit to defray the costs of the observer.....	8-142
Table 178. Number and proportion of observed trips in controlled access areas in 2005 vs. daily scallop possession limit allowance. The “probable” estimate assumes that 75% of allocated trips are taken during the fishing year and that 50% of vessels carrying observers land more than the 18,000 lb. scallop possession limit to defray the costs of the observer.....	8-142
Table 179. Number and proportion of observed trips in controlled access areas in 2006 vs. daily scallop possession limit allowance. The “probable” estimate assumes that 75% of allocated trips are taken	

during the fishing year and that 50% of vessels carrying observers land more than the 18,000 lb. scallop possession limit to defray the costs of the observer..... 8-142

Table 180. Number and proportion of observed trips in controlled access areas in 2007 vs. daily scallop possession limit allowance. The “probable” estimate assumes that 75% of allocated trips are taken during the fishing year and that 50% of vessels carrying observers land more than the 18,000 lb. scallop possession limit to defray the costs of the observer..... 8-142

Table 181. Estimated sampling frequency (proportion of observed trips) vs. DAS adjustment factor for vessels carrying an observer on open area trips..... 8-143

Table 182. Comparison of scallops greater than 115 mm caught by 3.5” rings and 4.0”rings. Paired t-test analyzes the set of tow-by-tow differences in total catch of scallops by each dredge (Goff 2002)... 8-153

Table 183. Comparison of scallops less than 115 mm caught by 3.5” rings and 4.0”rings. Paired t-test analyzes the set of tow-by-tow differences in total catch of scallops by each dredge (Goff 2002)... 8-153

Table 184. Comparison of harvest by 4.0” and 3.5” rings in terms of meat weight (sampled tows only). Meat weights estimated using shell-height:meat-weight models specific to each closed area. These meat weights are only from scallops retained by the crew for processing, not those discarded (Goff 2002)..... 8-154

Table 185. Comparison of volume of trash (invertebrates and debris, in baskets) retained by 4.0” and 3.5” rings. Data from the Nantucket Lightship trip is excluded due to low sample size (data available for only four tows) (Goff 2002). 8-155

Table 186. Number of finfish bycatch relative to weight of sea scallops harvested from comparative gear research inside Closed Area I. Trips were conducted 10/2/00 through 10/5/00 and 10/12/00 through 10/16/00. 8-156

Table 187. Number of finfish bycatch relative to weight of sea scallops harvested from comparative gear research inside Closed Area II. Trips were conducted 7/11/00 through 7/19/00, 9/7/00 through 9/10/00 and 6/20/01 through 6/25/01. 8-156

Table 188. Number of finfish bycatch relative to weight of sea scallops harvested from comparative gear research inside the Nantucket Lightship Closed Area. A trip was conducted 8/21/01 through 8/23/01. 8-157

Table 189. Example comparison of 15 and 13 foot dredges assuming equal day-at-sea allocation. When catches exceed shucking capacity, fishing time per day increases to compensate for the lower catch rate of a 13-foot dredge. Otherwise, increases in tow speed can compensate for the narrower dredge width. 8-162

Table 190. Example comparison of 15 and 13 foot dredges assuming equal day-at-sea allocation. When catches exceed shucking capacity, fishing time per day increases to compensate for the lower catch rate of a 13-foot dredge. Otherwise, increases in tow duration and decreases in gear handling time can compensate for the narrower dredge width. 8-163

Table 191. Example comparison of 15 and 13 foot dredges assuming equal day-at-sea allocation. When catches exceed shucking capacity, fishing time per day increases to compensate for the lower catch rate of a 13-foot dredge. Otherwise, increases in trip duration or decreases in steam time can compensate for the narrower dredge width. 8-164

Table 192. Example comparison of 15 and 13 foot dredges assuming equal day-at-sea allocation. When catches exceed shucking capacity, fishing time per day increases to compensate for the lower catch rate of a 13-foot dredge. Otherwise, modest changes in a variety of fishing strategies can compensate for the narrower dredge width. 8-165

Table 193. Percent of revenue from species caught on trips by vessels with general category permits landing sea scallops. Data are from VTRs for trips by vessels with general category permits in 2001. 8-168

Table 194. Average scallop landings per trip and per day absent versus trip length and percent of trip revenue from scallop landings (0 –49 percent, 50-99 percent, and 100 percent). Top portion of table

are for vessels using scallop dredges and the bottom part of the panel are for vessels using nets.

Source: Summaries from VTRs from vessels having a general category scallop permit and landing scallops during 2001. 8-169

Table 195. Results of twine top experiments between the standard 6 inch diamond twine top and a 9.5 inch diamond mesh hung on the diagonal which resulted in opening of the mesh. Data was acquired from 66 comparative tows aboard the <i>F/V Carolina Breeze</i> during March of 1998 along the Mid-Atlantic Bight. Values represent numbers of summer flounder (<i>Paralichthys dentatus</i>) captured by each twine top configuration. Significance was determined by a two sample Student's t-test ($\alpha=0.05$).	8-178
Table 196. Species included in geographic and seasonal distribution analysis of discards and non-target species landings on observed trips aboard vessels using scallop dredges during 1991-2000.	8-181
Table 197. Occurrence of catches finfish per day-at-sea, per day fished, and per pound of landed scallop in the top 10 th percentile for a species on observed trips by region, rotational management area and quarter, averaged over 1991 – 2000. Numbered areas are waters outside of the candidate rotation management areas, summed into a one-degree block (latitude/longitude).	8-182
Table 198. Occurrence of catches finfish per day-at-sea, per day fished, and per pound of landed scallop in the top 10 th percentile for a species on observed trips by rotational management area, management status, and quarter, averaged over 1991 – 2000. Numbered areas are waters outside of the candidate rotation management areas, summed into a one-degree block (latitude/longitude).	8-184
Table 199. Biomass trend adjustments to haul weight observations for sea sampled scallop dredge trips, by year and species. Data from various SARC documents and SAFE Reports showing trends in mid-year biomass, spawning stock biomass, or survey catch per tow.	8-186
Table 200 - Area of each habitat closed area alternative in square nautical miles, as well as the percent of the total Northwest Atlantic Analysis Area closed under each option.	8-211
Table 201. Total and percent of total sediment type contained inside each closed area alternative, as compared to the total Northwest Atlantic Analysis Area.	8-214
Table 202. Sediment composition of each closed area alternative (Note: percents of each sediment type add up to approximately 100% for each alternative).	8-215
Table 203. Total and percent of total EFH area for species with EFH identified as vulnerable to bottom-tending mobile gear. (Note the total EFH value for the entire species is provided as well in column 1). <i>**Values are NOT scaled for area.</i>	217
Table 204. Total and percent-of-total biomass for each guild within each closed area scenarios.	8-220
Table 205 - Guild composition of each closure alternative.	8-221
Table 206 - Total and percent-of-total biomass for each assemblage within each closed area alternative.	8-222
Table 207 – Species Assemblage composition of each closure alternative.	8-222
Table 208 - Total and Percentage of total biomass for each species within each closed area alternative.	8-223
Table 209 – Percent composition of each species within each closed area alternative.	8-223
Table 210 - Species and life stages with EFH that is moderately or highly vulnerable to mobile, bottom-tending gears.	8-225
Table 211 – Relative Effectiveness of Habitat Closed Area Alternatives in Protecting EFH for Two Categories of Species and Life Stages.	8-226
Table 212 – Summary of those species managed by the New England Fishery Management Council with EFH deemed highly vulnerable to mobile bottom tending gears.	8-226
Table 213 – Summary of overfished species in the Northeast region with EFH that is highly vulnerable to mobile bottom tending gears.	8-227
Table 214 - Relative Effectiveness of Habitat Closed Area Alternatives in Protecting EFH for Two Categories of Species and Life Stages.	8-227
Table 215 – Summary of habitat and ecological characteristics of species/lifestages with EFH that is highly vulnerable to mobile, bottom-tending gear.	8-228
Table 216 – Percent composition of sediment types associated with species with highly vulnerable EFH within each closed area.	8-229

Table 217 – Percent composition of trophic guilds associated with species with highly vulnerable EFH within each closed area	8-229
Table 218 – Percent composition of species assemblages associated with species with highly vulnerable EFH within each closed area.....	8-230
Table 219. Potential habitat impacts of non-area closure alternatives	8-230
Table 220. Distribution of sediment type within the two scallop closures in the Mid-Atlantic region	8-232
Table 221 Characterization and summary of potential impacts of Amendment 10 management measures on EFH. 8-232	
Table 222. Long-term projections of scalloping impacts, 3.5 inch vs. 4 inch dredge rings.....	8-240
Table 223. Proportion of total productivity effected by various habitat alternatives, assuming no displacement. Scallop productivity estimated from recruitment distributions and long-term potential yield estimates; groundfish and monkfish productivity estimated from adult abundance distributions over the survey time series.....	8-245
Table 224. Approximate proportion of current rotation management area biomass that would be available for fishing under various habitat alternatives. Shaded table cells represent the rotation management areas whose predicted yield were reduced to account for the inaccessibility of scallops within proposed habitat area closure boundaries.	8-246
Table 225. Projected 2004 total landings and allowable limited access day-at-sea use with interim area rotation closures and Georges Bank area access options. PDT Option 1 would set a target 2004 TAC at F=0.4 for the Nantucket Lightship Area and Closed Area I and a target 2005-2006 TAC at F=0.2 for the Closed Area II South. PDT Option 2 would set a target 2004-2006 TAC at F=0.2 for Closed Area II South only.....	8-251
Table 226. Projected 2004 total landings and allowable limited access day-at-sea use with interim area rotation closures and Georges Bank area access options. PDT Option 3 would set a target 2004 TAC at F=0.2 for portions of the Nantucket Lightship Area, Closed Area I and Closed Area II South that were open to fishing in 2000. PDT Option 4 would set a target 2004-2006 TAC at F=0.2 for all of the Groundfish closed areas that were not otherwise closed to protect sensitive habitat.....	8-252
Table 227. Projected 2004 total landings and allowable limited access day-at-sea use without area rotation or habitat closures comparing Georges Bank area access options.	8-252
Table 228. Summary of VMS sea scallop fishing time estimates by year, region, and habitat alternative.8-263	
Table 229. Percent of total VMS sea scallop fishing time estimates by year (1998-2000), bottom substrate (Poppe et al. 1989), and habitat alternative, classified by one nm ²	8-264
Table 230. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by permit type in 1995-2001, assuming that habitat alternative 3a would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-269
Table 231. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by calendar quarter in 1995-2001, assuming that habitat alternative 3a would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-270
Table 232. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by state of landing in 1995-2001, assuming that habitat alternative 3a would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-271
Table 233. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by gear type in 1995-2001, assuming that habitat alternative 3a would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-272
Table 234. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by alternative in 1995-1996, assuming they had been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-273

Table 235. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by alternative in 1997-1998, assuming they had been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-274
Table 236. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by alternative in 1998-1999, assuming they had been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-275
Table 237. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by alternative in 2001, assuming they had been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-276
Table 238. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings (lbs.) by alternative in 1995-2001, assuming that they alternatives had been implemented at that time. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total revenue by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-277
Table 239. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop revenue by alternative in 1995-2001, assuming that they alternatives had been implemented at that time. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total revenue by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-279
Table 240. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop and incidental finfish landings in 1995-2001, assuming the various habitat alternatives would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-282
Table 241. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop and incidental finfish landings in 1995-2001, assuming the various habitat alternatives would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-286
Table 242. Backcast swept area calculations based on DAS utilized from 1990-1999.	8-293
Table 243. Description of four primary analytical components used to determine practicability.	8-296
Table 245. Percent of Retrospective Effort potentially impacted by each of the habitat closed area alternatives, assuming that the alternatives had been implemented at that time.	8-297
Table 246. Percent of Retrospective Landings potentially impacted by each of the habitat closed area alternatives, assuming that the alternatives had been implemented at that time.	8-298
Table 247. Percent of Retrospective Revenues potentially impacted by each of the habitat closed area alternatives, assuming that the alternatives had been implemented at that time.	8-299
Table 248. Summary of economic benefits and costs associated with closure alternatives.	8-301
Table 249. Summary of social benefits and costs associated with each closure alternative.	8-303
Table 250. Percent of total EFH area inside each alternative for species with EFH moderately and highly vulnerable to bottom tending gear, and species with EFH highly vulnerable to bottom tending gear.	8-304
Table 251. Relative Effectiveness of Habitat Closed Area Alternatives in Protecting EFH for Two Categories of Species and Life Stages.	8-305
Table 252. Percent composition of total biomass (summed mean wt/tow by ten minute squares of latitude and longitude) within each proposed habitat closed area for three trophic guilds and two species assemblages during 1995-2001.	8-306
Table 253. Assessment of non-closed area habitat alternatives based on habitat benefits and social and economic costs of the measures.	8-306
Table 254. Projected Swept Area, DAS and Landings under the No Action Alternative.	8-317
Table 255. VTR data (1995 – 2001) for otter trawl gear inside the scallop closed areas.	8-318
Table 256. VTR data (1995 – 2001) for clam dredge gear inside the scallop closed areas.	8-319
Table 257. Projected Swept Area, DAS and Landings under the Status Quo.	8-321

Table 258. Percent of one nautical mile blocks classified by whether it had more than 50 hours of fishing time derived from VMS pollings and whether it fell within the boundaries of rotation management areas used for analysis and projections.	8-327
Table 259. Summary of projected effects on habitat impacts, measured by changes in overlap of sediment and EFH designation habitat metrics.	8-328
Table 260. Sediment distribution in the total Northwest Atlantic Analysis Area (NAAA), total scallop effort distribution, scallop effort distribution for intensely fished nautical mile blocks, and scallop effort distribution inside rotation management areas (RMAs).	8-328
Table 261. Sediment distribution in the 2004 projected scallop effort areas, 2005-2007 projected scallop effort areas, and the long term projected scallop effort areas with access to Georges Bank. The projected change in sediment distribution from the historic (1998-2000) scallop effort within rotation management areas is presented as well.	8-330
Table 262 - Description of general locations of rotation management areas used to project effects of area rotation. See Map 7.	8-335
Table 263 – Comparison of percent of area in NAAA and percent of effort for historic baselines and rotation management area projections.	8-337
Table 264. Total area and distribution of each sediment type contained within each of the rotational management areas (in percent and square nautical miles).	8-344
Table 265. Percent of EFH contained within each rotational management area in the Mid-Atlantic region as compared to the entire Northwest Atlantic Analysis Area (for species that have been identified as having EFH vulnerable to bottom tending gear).	8-344
Table 266. Percent of EFH contained within each of the (1 through 10) rotational management areas in the Georges Bank region as compared to the entire Northwest Atlantic Analysis Area (for species that have been identified as having EFH vulnerable to bottom tending gear).	8-346
Table 267. Percent of EFH contained within each of the (11 through 15) rotational management areas in the Georges Bank region as compared to the entire Northwest Atlantic Analysis Area (for species that have been identified as having EFH vulnerable to bottom tending gear).	8-347
Table 268. VTR data (1995 – 2001) for otter trawl trips reported inside the RMA’s, Days Absent per square nautical mile.	8-349
Table 269. VTR data (1995 – 2001) for surf clam/ocean quahog trips reported inside the RMA’s, Days Absent per square nautical mile.	8-352
Table 270. VMS data (1998 – 2000) for scallop trips reported inside the RMA’s, Average FishDays per square nautical mile. FishDays defined as FishTime (measured in hours) divided by 19.5.	8-354
Table 271. Summary table of Otter trawl (VTR), clam dredge (VTR) and scallop (VMS) trips inside and outside of the RMA’s	8-354
Table 272. Projections based on this alternative reveal a significant decrease in swept area relative to the Status Quo.	8-355
Table 273. Projected impacts of fishing inside current groundfish closed areas.	8-356
Table 274. Effects and Recovery Times of Bottom Otter Trawls on Mud Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Eight Gear Effect Studies.	8-362
Table 275. Effects and Recovery Times of Bottom Otter Trawls on Sand Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Twelve Gear Effect Studies.	8-362
Table 276. Effects and Recovery Times of Bottom Otter Trawls on Gravel and Rock Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Three Gear Effect Studies.	8-363
Table 277. Effects and Recovery Times of Chain Sweep Scallop Dredges on Sand Substrate in the Northeast Region as Noted By Authors of Three Gear Effect Studies.	8-363
Table 278. Summary species and life stage’s EFH adversely impacted by otter trawling and scallop dredging (gears that adversely impact EFH used in the Scallop fishery).	8-364
Table 279. Characterization and summary of potential impacts of Amendment 10 management measures on EFH.	8-366
Table 280.	8-369

Table 281. Economic impacts with status quo overfishing definition, with and without access to groundfish areas. (Dollar values are expressed in 1996 constant prices.).....	8-373
Table 282. DAS-used, LPUE and employment with status quo overfishing definition, 4 inch rings, no habitat closures and with and without access to Georges Bank groundfish areas.	8-374
Table 283. Impacts of controlled area possession limits (Economic values are expressed in terms of 1996 constant prices).	8-377
Table 284. Controlled area access by full-time vessels during 1999-2002 fishing years (all vessels fished in the open areas).	8-379
Table 285. Fishing activity of the active full-time vessels in the controlled access areas by region of principal port (Group II vessels that participated in the scallop fishery in 2002 and in some or all of the years during 1999-2001).	8-380
Table 286. Controlled area access by part-time vessels during 1999-2002 fishing years.....	8-382
Table 287. Limited access and general category permits in the sea scallop fishery.....	8-383
Table 288. Limited access vessel by permit category and principal port (2002 fishing year).....	8-383
Table 289. Revenues and characteristics of active limited access vessels.	8-383
Table 290. Annual scallop revenues of the full-time vessels in fishing years 2001 and 2002 by tonnage group.	8-384
Table 291. Characteristics of full-time vessels classified by annual scallop revenue	8-384
Table 292. DAS-used, LPUE and impacts on vessel revenues and costs from fishing in the controlled access and open areas (assuming % 100 TAC is landed from the controlled area trips).....	8-385
Table 293. Impacts on crew shares and gross profits from fishing in the controlled access and open areas (assuming % 100 TAC is landed from the controlled area trips).....	8-387
Table 294. Estimated gross revenues from controlled access and open areas.....	8-388
Table 295. Limited access vessels and revenues from general category trips by permit category in fishing year 2002.	8-390
Table 296. General category revenues by the scallop limited access fleet as a proportion of total fleet revenues (2002 fishing year).	8-391
Table 297. Revenues of limited access vessels from general category and DAS trips (2002 fishing year).	8-391
Table 298: Impacts on landings – No Access to Georges Bank Closed Areas.....	8-395
Table 299 – Impacts on Landings – With Access to Georges Bank Closed Areas.....	8-396
Table 300 – Predicted ex-vessel prices (\$ per pound in inflation adjusted 1996 constant dollars).....	8-397
Table 301. Impacts on Net Economic Benefits (Net of status quo benefits).....	8-398
Table 302 – Impacts on Consumer and Producer Benefits Net of Status Quo	8-405
Table 303 . Summary of Impacts: Landings, Variability and Net Economic Benefits.....	8-410
Table 304 . Biological variables, price and revenue.....	8-411
Table 305. Landings, Price and Revenue (2003-2012)	8-412
Table 306. Economic Benefits and Employment (2003-2012).....	8-413
Table 307. Economic Benefits Net of Status Quo (2003-2012).....	8-414
Table 308. Biological Results, Price and Revenue in the Long-term (2013-2030).....	8-415
Table 309. Landing, price and revenue in the long-term (2013-2030)	8-416
Table 310. Economic Benefits and Employment (2013-2030).....	8-417
Table 311. Economic Benefits and Employment net of Status Quo in the Long-term (2013-2030) ...	8-418
Table 312. Landings, prices, revenues and economic benefits with no access to groundfish areas and no habitat closures	8-425
Table 313. Impacts of area access alternative 1 with and without habitat closures	8-425
Table 314. Economic impacts relative to <i>no action</i> with no access to groundfish areas and no habitat closures	8-426
Table 315. Impacts of area access alternative 1 (preferred option) relative to <i>no action</i> with and without habitat closures	8-426

Table 316. Economic impacts of area access alternative 1 with ma default rotation relative to <i>status quo</i>	8-427
Table 317. Economic impacts of the habitat alternatives relative to the no habitat closures with ma default rotation and area access alternative 1	8-428
Table 318. Economic impacts of overfishing definition alternatives with no rotation and no area access.	8-430
Table 319. Economic impacts of overfishing definition alternatives with no rotation and with access to Georges Bank groundfish areas	8-431
Table 320. Economic impacts of overfishing definition alternatives with area rotation and with access to Georges Bank groundfish areas	8-432
Table 321. MA default rotation scenario with area option 1	8-432
Table 322. Catch per day-at-sea used and total DAS-used with status quo and proposed overfishing definitions.	8-433
Table 323. Impacts on full-time vessels with no access to groundfish areas and no habitat closures.	8-436
Table 324. Economic impacts of area access alternative 1 on full-time vessels with ma default rotation.	8-437
Table 325. Economic impacts on vessels, percentage change relative to ' <i>no action</i> ' values with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish areas.	8-437
Table 326. Economic impacts on vessels, percentage change relative to ' <i>no action</i> ' values with area access alternatives.	8-438
Table 327. Comparative revenues and costs from fishing in the open versus controlled access area from a 10-day trip and with no possession limits – MA default rotational management combined with area access alternative 1 and no habitat closures.	8-440
Table 328. Equivalent trip limits and gross and gross profits per day-at-sea for a 21,000 lb. trip limit.	8-441
Table 329. Differential impacts of trip limits on high- and low-productivity vessels: An example. The scallop possession limit is assumed to be 21,000 lbs. and the number of allocated trips will be 4. Also, the analysis assumes a 120 annual day-at-sea allocation, in which the vessels uses all days to target sea scallops.	8-442
Table 330. Projected annual average landings (million lbs.; average of 2004-2007).	8-448
Table 331. Total cumulative discounted value of producer surplus with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish areas (\$ million in 1996 constant prices).	8-449
Table 332. Total cumulative discounted value of producer surplus (total of 2004 to 2007; \$ million in 1996 constant prices).	8-449
Table 333. Total cumulative discounted value of consumer surplus with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish areas (\$ million in 1996 constant prices).	8-449
Table 334. Total cumulative discounted value of consumer surplus (total of 2004 to 2007, (\$ million in 1996 constant prices).	8-450
Table 335. Cumulative discounted value of the total benefits with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish areas. (\$ million in 1996 constant prices).	8-450
Table 336. Cumulative discounted value of the total benefits (\$ million in 1996 constant prices).	8-450
Table 337. Total fleet DAS-used with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish area.	8-451
Table 338. Total fleet DAS-used with area access Alternatives	8-451
Table 339. Estimated ex-vessel prices with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish areas.	8-451
Table 340. Annual average ex-vessel prices for period 2004-2007 with area access alternatives.	8-452
Table 341. Average annual fleet revenue with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish areas.	8-452
Table 342. Annual average fleet revenue for period 2004-2007 with area access alternatives (\$ million, in 1996 constant prices).	8-452

Table 343. Average LPUE for 2004-2007 with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish Areas.....	8-453
Table 344. Annual average LPUE for period 2004-2007 with area access alternatives.....	8-453
Table 345. Impacts on employment as measured by Crew*DAS with no additional habitat closures and no access to groundfish Areas	8-453
Table 346. Impacts on employment as measured by Crew*DAS, percentage increase relative to no action values for period 2004-2007 with area access alternatives	8-454
Table 347. Average DAS-used per vessel for period 2004 - 2007 with no area access and no habitat closures	8-454
Table 348. Average DAS-used per vessel for period 2004 - 2007 with area access and habitat alternatives	8-454
Table 349. Annual average revenues per vessel for period 2004-2007 with area access and habitat alternatives	8-455
Table 350. Annual average gross profits per vessel for period 2004-2007 with area access and habitat alternatives	8-455
Table 351. Fishing activity in the draft rotational areas by port of landing for calendar years 1997-2001.	8-457
Table 352. Fishing activity in the draft rotational areas by homeport for calendar years 1997-2001. .	8-457
Table 353. Fishing activity in the draft rotational areas by vessel size class for calendar years 1997-2001.	8-458
Table 354. Predicted Catch Distribution and Closures for Draft Rotational Areas, 2002-2007.	8-458
Table 355. Catch Variability: a comparison of 1D to the status quo.	8-461
Table 356. Use of 4' ring size by trip, calendar year 2000.	8-462
Table 357. Use of 4' ring size by port, calendar year 2000.....	8-463
Table 358. Trawl vessel scallop catch by port.....	8-463
Table 359. Fishing activity in the draft EFH areas (Sections 5.3.4.3 to 5.3.4.9) by vessel size class for calendar years 1997-2001.....	8-464
Table 360. Fishing activity in the draft EFH areas (4A-D) by homeport for calendar years 1997-2001... 8-464	
Table 361. Fishing activity in the draft EFH areas (4A-D) by port of landing for calendar years 1997-2001.	8-465
Table 362. Dredge size use by trip, fishing year 2000.	8-465
Table 363. Dredge size use by port of landing, fishing year 2000.	8-465
Table 364. Summary of the disparity of impacts by port, estimated by the coefficient of variation of the percent of 1995-2001 landings impacted by the proposed closure alternatives. Alternatives are ranked from most even impact (low CV) to most uneven impact (high CV). The most uneven impact, for example, may have the lowest total impact on historic landings but the impacts are concentrated in few ports.	8-467
Table 365. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by port of landing in 1995-2001, assuming that habitat alternative 3a would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-468
Table 366. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by port of landing in 1995-2001, assuming that habitat alternative 5a would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.	8-473
Table 367. Summary of the retrospective impact on total scallop landings by port of landing in 1995-2001, assuming that groundfish mortality alternative 1 would have been implemented. Data are from vessel trip reports with valid latitude and longitude positions, raised to total landings by port group, gear, and month of landing.....	8-478

Table 368. Proportion of reported landings by various scallop permit categories, 1997-2003 fishing years.
Source: 1997-2003 logbooks. 8-486

Table 369. List of Indirectly Affected Industry Sectors..... 9-12