

**EFH COMMITTEE MINUTES**

For the January 26, 2003, EFH Steering Committee Meeting

Committee Members present: Stosh Anderson (vice-chair), Heather McCarty, Scott Smiley, Ben Enticknap, John Gauvin, Earl Krygier, Glenn Reed, Michelle Ridgway, Gordon Blue, Jon Kurland

Agency Staff present: Cathy Coon (NPFMC), David Witherell (NPFMC), Cindy Hartmann (NMFS-HCD), John Olson (NMFS-HCD), John Lepore (NOAA-GC), Scott Miller (NMFS - Analysis Team), Lew Queirolo (NMFS, Alaska Region, Economist), Kenneth Hansen (NMFS-Enforcement), Phil Thorne (Coast Guard).

Public: Al Burch, Joe Childers, Ron Clarke, Steve Copps, Kevin Kennedy, Terry Leitzell, Paul MacGregor, Brent Paine, Whit Sheard, Geoff Shester, Thorn Smith and Arnie Thomson.

The EFH Committee met on January 26, 2003 in Seattle, WA. The intent of the meeting was to receive staff reports on existing mitigation measures with respect to the Gulf of Alaska (GOA), Bering Sea (BS) and Aleutian Islands (AI) area boundaries, receive staff reports on new mitigation alternatives (Alternative 5b and 6), discussion criteria for the trawl gear modification, and discuss the pre status quo baseline for the EIS analysis. Additional discussions planned were the HAPC process and definition of terms. A draft agenda was distributed prior to the meeting.

**Additions/Corrections to agenda**

Jon Kurland will give an overview of EIS process before item three on the agenda. In addition, the draft EFH research closure plan will be presented by Cindy Hartmann, after agenda item five.

**Overview of EFH Process and Schedule Extension Request**

NMFS is now requesting a 12-month extension on the EIS process. The extension has not been approved yet, but the effort to extend the schedule has been started. The complexity of the alternatives has been increased, both in numbers and the details of each alternative. So, there are costs to having more complicated alternatives and we may have to change the original schedule to deal with this level of complexity.

Heather McCarty asked about what the schedule would look like with the extension. Jon Kurland replied that everything would be moved out exactly one year, so that the DEIS would be out by August 2004. A preliminary analysis of the alternatives would be presented to the Council in April, 2004, and the pre-analysis and analysis would take place in the interim.

Stosh Anderson reminded everyone that we need to stay on the same schedule until the extension is approved.

John Gauvin asked if the 12-month period was what Jon Kurland really thought was adequate. Jon said yes, if the alternatives would be "locked down" at this meeting.

**Progress Report**

Presented by Cindy Hartmann

Alternatives to minimize the effects of fishing are still in progress. Phil Thorne and Ken have been working with the staff on enforcement issues in the GOA. Chapters 1 and 2 are drafted as well as a "cut and paste" version of Chapter 3. Pre-analysis studies need to be done, and these studies would take 6-9 months once the alternatives are finalized. The effects analysis (Chapter 4) cannot begin until the pre-analysis database work is done.

EFH would be accurately defined for each species that we have information on. Cindy Hartmann estimates that this is about 90 species, with a different description for each of six alternatives, and then different descriptions for each life stage as information is available.

## **Existing Mitigation Alternatives**

Presented by Cathy Coon and John Olson

**Status Quo** no additional actions – no explanation needed.

### **Alternative 2 – Rockfish Only**

The number of areas designated for protection has been reduced from thirteen to eleven to provide more effective enforcement boundaries. Boundaries are defined to the degree and minute.

Protected area boundaries for the GOA are the same for Alternatives 2 and 3. The difference is in what types of fishing are excluded.

### **Alternative 3 – All Groundfish**

John Gauvin mentioned that the area closed to all groundfish under Alternative 3 should be changed to reflect exactly what the Committee recommended and the Council has approved (the maps reflect that the rockfish only areas are now included in the all groundfish alternative).

All areas were approved by Council at the last meeting with a request to work with the Coast Guard and NMFS on enforceability.

### **Alternative 4 for the Bering Sea – Prohibit Fishing Except for Designated Open Areas**

The rotational closures under Alternative 4 have been drawn along lines of longitude for ease of mapping and enforcement.

Members and staff discussed the need for closure areas to include a variety of depths and to encompass the continental shelf break. There was also a request for bathymetry and fishing effort data to be included on the rotational closure map. The four-year rotational closure cycle length was discussed. Members decided that the rotational cycle length should be closely tied to biological information and the length of time needed to recover community structure. Adaptive management should be used to determine the optimum cycle length.

**Alternative 5, Aleutian Islands (AI)** - areas selected for closure are listed in the handout. The areas were selected from ADFG statistical areas.

**Sub option for Alt. 5 for the AI (Alternative 5b)** was developed from Oceana draft method presented to the Council on December 6, 2002. The purpose of the sub option was to close areas to bottom trawling that had high levels of corals and sponges and low CPUE.

John Olson discussed his work on this sub option to Alternative 5. John Olson discussed information provided for one management area. He looked at coral, sponge, and bryozoan bycatch in the AI for 5 km blocks. He looked at bycatch related to CPUE of catch. A ratio of these numbers was created. These ratios were plotted, and natural breaks were used to define categories. High coral catch were the areas of interest. John mapped the tons of catch and the trawl intensity from Rose and noted that there was little overlap of areas with high catch and areas of high coral and sponge bycatch.

He wanted to then set up areas that were open to fishing. Areas that have not been fished would be closed to fishing. When all of the trawl effort was shown as one color, it was not possible. He looked at number of trawls in each area over the past 11 years. He based this on number of “hits” in each category. He then tried to draw

blocks over the areas of higher bottom trawl effort. To get square blocks, he had to include some areas in the open area that had not been fished, but also included some areas that had been fished in the closed areas.

John Olson stated that the option includes 100% observer coverage and 100% VMS (vessel monitoring system).

Phil Thorne stated that the Coast Guard will work with the Council on whatever boundaries are drawn. But, he provided information on what would be the easiest shapes to enforce. Many small areas are very difficult to enforce.

### **Alternative 6**

John Olson discussed Alternative 6. The task was to close 20% of the fishable waters to all bottom tending gear based on habitat, structure, invertebrate concentrations, disturbance, and existing closures. Habitat information is limited.

About 20% of total fishable areas between 0 m to 1000 m was selected for closure. In the Bering Sea, the selection was based on substrate habitat. If the area was too large, staff used fishing intensity to cut the total area down. The area was divided into regions – west, central, and east within the GOA.

Ben Enticknap clarified that the fishing intensity data used to delineate this alternative was only trawling fishing effort data, and did not include fishing intensity for other bottom tending gears (longline and pot).

Stosh Anderson asked for a definition of bottom tending gear. Bottom tending gear was defined at pots, long lines, bottom trawls, scallop fishing, but did not include jigging, for example.

### **Information on Draft Gear Definition**

Presented by Cathy Coon

Cathy Coon read the gear definition hand out regarding sweeps, bobbins, and footropes.

Ben Enticknap did not see benefits to habitat from a three inch clearance over the sea floor. Others voiced similar concerns. Members discussed the effectiveness of these types of gear limitations. Members wanted monitoring to be applied if this action were to be implemented to evaluate recovery time effectiveness.

Ben Enticknap noted that originally the gear modification was intended for the BS and now it is for all three areas, BS, AI and GOA. He wanted to clarify if it was intended for all areas or just for the Bering Sea. John Gauvin agreed with Ben that the original discussion was just for the BS. John does not think that anyone in the AI is using unprotected footropes. In the BS, most people also use protected footropes, and that there would be little additional costs to implement. He would like this to stay in as part of the analysis.

### **Proposed Research Closure Areas**

Presented by Cindy Hartmann

Cindy Hartmann presented Dr. Jeff Fujioka's *Draft EFH Research Closure Plan* dated January 24, 2003. This is an initial stab at research closures done by NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center scientists. Methods for the selection of areas were described in a handout provided to the members.

The closures would be described as a Sub Option under Alternative 1, Status Quo. This would be an additional alternative sub option. The sub option was designed to look at fished areas and non-fished areas. The long-term goal of the research is to understand the long-term effects of fishing on habitat.

There were questions about the effectiveness of the research closure areas and about the ability to compare data between the Bering Sea and the GOA based on the location of closures in areas that had been historically fished or not fished.

Cindy Hartmann stated that the proposed closures would be total closures to fishing, year-around. Glenn Reed wanted to know the total time period for the closures. The description at this point is several years or decades. The closure would not be time certain at this point. Cindy Hartmann stated that since EFH would be evaluated every 5 years, that these closures may also be evaluated on that time frame.

Stosh Anderson commented that, with respect to the other alternatives, a comparison of these closures with the other closures identified under other alternatives would be helpful. He noted that many of these closures would overlap with those in the other alternatives.

### **Public Testimony**

#### **Arni Thomson – Representing Alaska Crab Coalition (A.C.C.)**

The ACC has registered an estimate of the “foot print” for the pot fishery in the BSAI. The estimate is that less than 1 square mile is currently affected. Even under increased production, he estimates that only 2 sq. mi. would be affected. The pot fishery runs for 21 days right now, and the cod pot fishery is a six week time period.

Under Alt. 6, crab production would be heavily affected. A large portion of the primary harvest area would be closed to fishing in Bristol Bay. If you close areas of heavy production, the duration of fisheries is extended and there will be more impacts on benthic habitat. In the Pribilofs, there are areas proposed for closure that represent high production areas for many types of crabs. The visual depiction of the closures is helpful. In the AI, there are also proposed closed areas that are high production areas for king crab. The proposed closure areas in 541 and 542 are high production areas for brown crab.

Gordon Blue asked if Arni had looked at the St. Matthews Area for blue king crab. Arni concurred that those proposed closed areas were high production areas for blue king crab. Gordon Blue listed several species of crab that would be affected in the AI by the closures. He estimated the impact at 60% or more. Other areas were also discussed with reference to Bairdi crab production, east of the Pribilof Islands.

Ben Enticknap asked what recommendations Arni had for the alternatives – to have the crab fishery left out? Or to have certain fisheries targeted? Arni just wanted to underline the problems that these closures would cause for the industry. Arni expressed that he did not want to point fingers at specific fisheries.

Michelle Ridgway asked about the consideration of benefits to crab habitats from the closures, i.e. whether there would be long-term benefits to crab productivity. Arni stated that extensive areas in Bristol Bay are already closed for fishing, as well as areas in the Pribilofs. Arni’s concern is that the groundfish and crab industry have been involved for a long time in developing negotiated protection areas. To separate open and closed areas, based on gear types, in this forum will exacerbate this process. Arni does not represent the Brown Crab Coalition, but there are some brown crabbers in the A.C.C.

#### **Thorn Smith - Representing the North Pacific Longline Association (NPLA)**

Thorn is concerned about affects on longliners from Alternative 6. He has not seen the Alternative 6 before and questions whether scoping was done on this alternative. He does not see that they have had the same opportunity as the trawlers to provide comments on the alternatives. He thinks there may be NEPA concerns on this.

Impacts on the longliners were presented by Thorn. Winter fishing occurs in Cod Alley and in the fall is forced to the north. The closures around Port Moller and in 516 would seriously affect the fishery. Other areas would be affected as well. There are 32 longliners in his group, and each needs 350 to 400 sq. miles to fish effectively. Fishable area can also be covered by ice pack or other fishing gears, which decreases the area available to longliners. Longliners are spread out and are unlikely to have large effects on benthic habitat. The longliners

give up areas to the trawlers after January 20 each year when the trawlers force them out and to the north. Thus the northern closures would have the largest effect on the longliners, as they are pushed farther north by other fisheries.

He suggests selecting HAPC areas within the fished areas of longliners instead of EFH closures, due to the low level of impacts of longlining. He does not believe that longlining belongs in the 20% closure alternatives. Heather McCarty asked if he was requesting a separate alternative. Thorn just restated that he does not believe longliners belong in the 20% closure.

### **Geoff Shester – Representing Oceana**

Geoff would like to thank NMFS for the work on Alternative 5b, the sub option. It looks good so far, but they will need time to comment. He noticed that this data intensive approach was not really in the other alternatives, and wanted to analyze the issues of coral and sponge bycatch. The approach used in AI 5b could also be applied to the BS and the GOA. Geoff showed pictures of what this would look like. Using the limited data available to Oceana, he showed examples that were analogous to John Olson's presentation. He showed areas of high fishing intensity, and high coral, byzoan and sponge bycatch and then identified mitigation areas that have high bycatch and low fishing effort. This approach is different than either reserves or rotations that are currently used in the other alternatives. Geoff feels that this approach could be applied in about a week for the BS and the GOA using a similar methodology.

Heather McCarty wanted to clarify what would be regulated, and Geoff stated that it would be trawling. The closures would be intended to prevent the expansion of fisheries to undisturbed areas. Geoff feels that this is a science-based approach and would be subject to change under adaptive management. The sub-option would include the research to evaluate the effectiveness of the closures. Heather McCarty asked whether this research would be funded by Oceana as well as NMFS. Geoff said that Oceana has and will continue to work hard to seek funding for habitat research from funding sources.

Heather McCarty also asked if Oceana supported the one year time extension. Geoff said yes if it [the EIS/analysis] can be done right.

Ben Enticknap asked if trawl closures applied to bottom trawls as well as pelagic trawls? Geoff has been told that pelagic trawls impact the bottom 75% of the time fished, as per the Craig Rose paper that notes that in the BS the highest effects occurred from pelagic trawls. If the pelagic trawls hit the bottom, this approach should be applied for analysis to the pelagic trawl fishery. What type of bycatch? Geoff looked at coral and sponge bycatch, but would be interested in bycatch all habitat species, with a preference for longer-lived species.

Scott Smiley asked about how open areas would deal with regime shifts in the GOA. Geoff suggested looking at a longer-term data set for historical movements of fish. He also noted that, with the research component, that this alternative is meant to change over time and is relatively flexible.

John Gauvin wanted to compare Geoff's proposal to the committee's proposal. John discussed how the committee used the top third of the CPUE data over the last 30 or so years. He wondered whether in Geoff's model, with more data, that the open area would be larger or smaller. Geoff would like to use a data set in which all areas that are important to the fishery are identified. He just used what he had, which did not include pelagic trawl data, only bottom trawl data.

Jon Kurland mentioned the scheduling issue occurs with adding new alternatives. Jon Kurland asked Geoff what was involved in the one-week estimate. John Olson replied that he could put the data together in a week, but the time required to review the alternative by the Coast Guard, and NMFS was not included. Jon Kurland stated that there would be additional workload for NMFS with the expansion of this alternative. Geoff felt that on first glance, the work done to date on Alternative 5b appeared to meet the Council's intent.

Cindy Hartmann mentioned that the addition of new alternatives would mean alternatives would then probably not be finalized until after the April Council meeting necessitating a longer than one year extension. The analysis would also be complicated by additional alternatives. Geoff feels that the additional year would provide enough time if NMFS looks at all science-based reasonable alternatives..

Scott Smiley asked whether Alternative 6 went out to stakeholders for comment, with respect to Cindy's comment that any additional alternative would have to go out for stakeholder review. Cindy Hartmann stated that Alternative 6 was introduced in this public meeting and will have public review during this Council meeting.

#### **Whit Sheard – Representing The Ocean Conservancy (TOC)**

Whit feels that we are much closer to a good range of alternatives. He feels that the way the alternatives are presented does not encompass all scientific tools recommended by the NRC in all areas and that the repetition of approaches blurs the costs, benefits, and trade offs of different approaches. He felt that Alternative 5b is very different from Alternative 5 and should be a separate alternative. He is concerned that the closed area approach in the GOA, which is based upon 13 areas identified by fisherman as having minimal fishing effort is repeated as the only approach in the GOA throughout several alternatives. The map of the Bering Sea has changed a bit from the original map that was approved. The lines are different in terms of area that is open.

Heather McCarty asked if there has been an adequate amount of time to consider the concept of a 20% closure in Alternative 6. Whit said yes, that he has been discussing this for over a year, and that, since the Draft EIS has not even been released, that they are well within the bounds of the process. He would welcome comments from the specific fisheries and communities. Heather asked whether Whit thinks that the 20% identified here is a good starting point, but that the 20% could change based on new scientific information. He said yes, because he wants to make sure that small fisheries and communities are not put out of business.

The HAPC process needs to be done by the April Council meeting according to meet the Council's due date. Whit feels that the EFH process must encompass the HAPC process because HAPC are the most essential fish habitat. He does not feel that example HAPCs are acceptable because the proposed action must be an actual action, not a theoretical review of example actions. Action should be specifically taken as part of EFH.

Whit commented on the timeline, that it was a negotiated schedule between the parties and not court imposed, as suggested by Jon Kurland. Whit wondered whether the Council will be allowed to mix and match measures, as in the Programmatic EIS. He wants the Council to be able to protect habitat based on the analysis and what scientists say the best approach to EFH is.

#### **Kevin Kennedy – Representing the Tribal Government of St. Paul, and TDX, St. Paul**

Kevin felt that EFH, especially under Alternative 6, has taken away all of the St George Halibut fishery, 85% of the St. Paul halibut fishery, all of the Korean Har Crab (*Erimacrus*) fishery and many other crab fisheries as well. They would likely have to relocate. He wants to know the coordinates of all of the areas of closures. Areas 4 and 5 would have a huge impact. They have lost the majority of their halibut production in Area 4c. In area 4d, they are still catching halibut, but there are few fish in area 4c. He thinks that the areas depicted are just like moving a movable fence that never gives the fishers a chance to access the fish under Alternative 6. He states that local village fisheries would be heavily affected.

John Gauvin asked if the east-west closure strips west of the Pribilofs would allow better access to the fishery. Kevin said yes. He would like to see a no-trawl zone for May, June, July and August in the area. Stosh Anderson asked about NE to SW lines, so that they would be perpendicular to the edge of the bay. Kevin said that those lines would be even better. Gordon Blue pointed out an area in the SW that is closed which would have significant effects on communities there.

Kevin Kennedy summarized that he would like to see for the Bering Sea: a no-drag zone that starts where it starts now and goes due west until you get to the canyons. This area would be closed to bottom trawling at a minimum and would be closed for June, July and August.

#### **Terry Leitzell – Representing Icicle Seafoods**

Terry is concerned about the analysis for Sub option 5b--that the areas closed under this alternative would be the ones that are most used by small boats in the Aleutians. Other current closures include some AFA trawlers, as well as other closures for northern rockfish. He also wants to know why 518 and 519 are included under AI and not in the BS analysis area.

Terry wants to see the fishing effort superimposed over the closures identified under sub option 5b to understand the productivity in the closure areas. He feels that receiving the charts today is too late to adequately comment on the alternative proposals. He feels that there needs to be more opportunity to comment on Alternative 6 and Sub option 5b for the public.

Michelle Ridgway wanted to know about projected expansion of the fleet that delivers to Icicle in Adak. Terry mentioned that they would be using both pot and trawls. Michelle Ridgway wondered if there was a projected increase in cod biomass that would support this expansion. Terry mentioned that they expect some new boats into the fishery, but did not have numbers on the biomass portions in the Aleutians .

John Gauvin asked for suggestions on how to approach the analysis and still get additional stakeholder input. Terry stated that the specificity of the areas is the issue, and that there needs to be input from the stakeholders who know and fish those areas.

Gordon Blue was looking at Alts 6 and 5b and does not see closures in areas set aside for use by small boats. Terry noted that small boats fish outside of the areas set aside for small boats, and that his plant in Adak also uses fish from larger boats.

#### **Paul MacGregor – At-Sea Processors**

Paul finds it's hard to comment on the new alternatives presented today (Alternatives 5b and 6) as the rationale for the sites selected are not provided and the people responsible for designing the alternatives are not present to describe the rationality used in designing the alternatives. The amount of production from the areas that would be closed would be very useful to him. He thinks that the fisherman have a lot of information that would be useful to the committee, but they did not have a chance to review the proposals. Bycatch information and the consequences of moving fisheries from one area to another are examples of information that would inform the process. For example, when the pollock industry moved operations to protect chum salmon, they encountered higher bycatch of rockfish. The bycatch limits for rockfish are very small, and it is easy to get into trouble as a result of even small increases in rockfish bycatch rates. Voluntary closures can be used to protect areas and prevent bycatch problems from occurring.

Heather McCarty asked for process recommendations. Paul noted that even with the extension, the approval of alternatives still would have to occur by the next meeting. Paul stated that this does not allow for stakeholder input into the process, if the alternatives have already been picked and the analysis has already begun. He would like to see more time devoted to the alternative development process.

#### **End of Public Testimony.**

#### **John Lepore (NOAA General Counsel) – NEPA Process**

The group is currently working on the scoping process for NEPA to collect information from the public and other agencies to define the scope of the analysis for the proposed action, the range of alternatives, and the effects of all of those alternatives. He says that the scoping of the analysis would end when the Draft EIS is released. He notes that they are under time constraints, and acknowledges the concerns of the public to

comment on alternatives. He notes that the draft EIS would allow the public to comment on the alternatives and the analysis for those alternatives. The job now is to come up with an *adequate range of reasonable alternatives*. He does not believe that the committee is circumventing the process.

Jon Kurland noted that the transition from scoping to analysis is a moving one, but that the alternatives need to be clearly defined well before a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) is released in order to do the analysis. He said that changing the alternatives would change the analysis, and that would take more time and effort. If there is consensus that additional time is needed, the extension could be lengthened beyond the 12 months that have been asked for. He does not want to draw out the process, but wants to have enough time to address the issues.

Stosh Anderson wanted to determine where the limit was for the period needed to define the alternatives. Jon Kurland said that the 12-month schedule is aggressive with the current range of alternatives – if additional alternatives are added, that time period would be longer. If Alternatives had been finalized in October 2002, the DEIS would have been out by Aug 2003. Stosh Anderson noted that, based on the previous schedule, 10 months from the finalization of Alternatives, the DEIS would be available.

Cindy Hartmann noted that the original schedule was put together without knowing what the alternatives were along with assumptions on when the alternatives would be finalized and ready for analysis. They took into consideration dates based on when the Council would be able to take action. The Council has since made it clear that a cost-benefit analysis needs to be done. This request can only be performed by a few key people looking at the available data sets. Relative to the number and complexity of the current range of mitigation alternatives and the Council's intent, the previous schedule was under scoped. The 12-month request is a minimum that would be needed to do an adequate quantitative analysis.

The role of Foster Wheeler Environmental was also discussed by members.

### **Baseline Analysis (pre Status Quo)**

Presented by David Witherell

The baseline is defined as the status quo without any habitat protection measures. The baseline addresses the question: What has been the cost to get to where we are now as far as current habitat protection? This would help the public understand where we have come from in terms of habitat protection. These measures include gear restrictions, closures, and many other measures that have had a benefit to habitat.

He suggests including this section under Chapter 2 as it is part of the existing conditions that provide some benefit to habitat, even as a secondary effect, such as limiting a fishery to pelagic gear or, incidental effect, such as a vessel moratorium. All previously adopted measures would be included in one table.

The baseline would provide a comparison point for all of the alternatives, including status quo. It would allow a relative comparison of the protection provided under EFH to all the habitat protection provided in the last 25 years. He does not feel that cost can accurately be captured, but perhaps amount of area protected in the past 25 years, as compared to that provided under each alternative.

Scott Smiley said that taking a stab at the economic effects could be done from numbers taken from the past. He states that this estimate would give a range of magnitude of the consequences that would be illuminating.

Dave would include in the table the cost of implementing the measures at the time of implementation, but the costs would not be additive. They would be used as a relative indicator.

Ben states that the baseline does not represent a real point in time. There was never a time that there were no protection measures. There were also actions that had negative impacts in history. He also wanted the actions with negative effects on habitat, such as repealing the Bristol Bay Pot Sanctuary, to be included in the analysis.

## EFH Committee RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

### *Motion*

John Gauvin moves to tell the Council that the Draft gear modification document summarizes the issue. The committee wants to clarify that the original intent of the idea was that it should only apply to the Bering Sea, and not to other areas, as it most suits the habitat of the Bering Sea. The committee would like to provide this as information to the Council. *Amendment* –The evaluation of gear modification practices should be included under a standard monitoring program with tangible effectiveness monitoring of the specific habitat impacts. The parameters for measuring effects would be reduced footprint and height off of the sea floor. *Motion Carries*

### *Motion*

Change “Gear Definition” to “Gear Experiment” *Motion Fails*

### *Motion*

John Gauvin moves that the staff write up of Alternative 5 be amended to remove the areas that the Council had previously designated as “rockfish only” from the groundfish prohibition. *Motion carries.*

### *Motion*

Ben Enticknap moves to inform the Council that the area north of St. Matthews should be closed and not included as an open area for Alternatives 4 and 5. There was some uncertainty as to whether the map reflects the original EFH Committee motion. *Two abstentions. Motion carries*

### *Motion*

Ben Enticknap moves that the cross sectional lines that divide the rotating open areas be realigned so that each encompasses the shelf break. The original intent of the divisions was to include the ecological diversity of the shelf break as well as a range of depths for fishing. *Amendment:* Committee Designation: John Gauvin, Ben, and Heather are designated to work together on designing the lines. Cathy Coon will help as staff. Earl Krygier would like the information to be presented as informational to the Council. A draft would be presented to the committee. *Motion Carries.*

### *Motion*

John Gauvin recommends to the Council that they use a stakeholder process similar to the one used in Alternatives 4 and 5 to evaluate the staff’s work up of Alternatives 5b and 6. *Motion carries 8 to 1. One abstention.*

### *Motion*

Heather McCarty moves that the committee voice their support to the Council for a NMFS request for a time extension for the development of the EFH EIS. *Motion Tabled Indefinitely.*

### *Motion*

Gordon moves to table the previous motion indefinitely. *Motion Carries.*

**Meeting adjourned at 3:46 pm.**