

APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY BODIES, STANDING COMMITTEES,
AND OTHER FORUMS, AND CHANGES TO COUNCIL OPERATING PROCEDURES
(COP) AS NEEDED

Advisory Body Appointments

In view of her promotion and new responsibilities, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), has requested that Ms. Susan Ashcraft be replaced on the Groundfish Management Team (GMT) by Ms. Joanna Grebel (Closed Session A.1.a, Attachment 1).

In view of her promotion and new responsibilities within Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Ms. Michele Culver has submitted her resignation from the WDFW position on the Highly Migratory Species Management Team (HMSMT) (Closed Session A.1.a, Attachment 2). The naming of a replacement awaits the filling of Ms. Culver's previous position within WDFW and any reassignment of her former responsibilities.

The following advisory body vacancies remain:

- HMSMT – WDFW Position
- SSC – Idaho Department of Fish and Game Position
- Ad Hoc Groundfish Trawl Individual Quota Committee – Community Representative

Committee Membership and Process for Essential Fish Habitat Considerations

In September 2006, the Council established the Groundfish Essential Fish Habitat Oversight Committee (EFHOC) as an Ad Hoc Committee to be appointed by the Council Chair and to include appropriate representatives from the Groundfish Advisory Subpanel, GMT, and Scientific and Statistical Committee. To date, no action has occurred to identify the committee members or a COP guiding its function. The Council may wish to consider any final guidance to the chair and staff on committee membership and process, based on the expected need and appropriate timing, especially considering the up coming groundfish biennial regulatory process and other pertinent workload issues.

Attachment 1 contains excerpts from the current Groundfish Fishery Management Plan (FMP) which describe the process for changes to essential fish habitat (EFH) and habitat areas of particular concern (HAPC). The Council must review its EFH and HAPC identification at least once every 5 years (due no later than May 2011).

Council Action:

- 1. Confirm CDFG Appointment to the GMT.**
- 2. Consider guidance on EFHOC membership and Process.**

Reference Materials:

1. Agenda Item C.4.a, Attachment 1: Excerpts from Current Groundfish FMP Regarding Changes to EFH.

Agenda Order:

- a. Agenda Item Overview
- b. Reports and Comments of Advisory Bodies
- c. Public Comment
- d. **Council Action:** Consider Changes to COP and Appoint new Advisory Body Members as Needed

John Coon

PFMC
03/20/07

Excerpts from Current Groundfish FMP Regarding Changes to EFH:

...

7.6 Review and Revision of Essential Fish Habitat Descriptions and Identification

The Council will review the EFH description and identification, HAPC designations, and information on fishing impacts and nonfishing impacts included in this FMP at least every five years. New information may be included in the annual SAFE document or similar document and, if necessary, the FMP may be amended. The Council may schedule more frequent reviews in response to recommendation by the Secretary or for other reasons.

...

6.2.4 The Habitat Conservation Framework

In order to protect EFH from the adverse effects of fishing, the Council has identified areas that are closed to bottom trawling (see sections 6.8 and 7.4). These areas are described in Federal regulations and may be modified through the full rulemaking process as described under Section 6.2 D. The Council shall establish an EFH Oversight Committee (OC). At the request of the Council, the EFH OC would review the areas currently closed to bottom trawling and recommend to the Council the elimination of existing areas or the addition of new areas, or modification of the extent and location of existing areas. In making its recommendation to the Council, the committee should consider, but is not limited to considering, the best available scientific information about:

1. The importance of habitat types to any groundfish FMU species for their spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity.
2. The presence and location of important habitat (as defined immediately above).
3. The presence and location of habitat that is vulnerable to the effects of bottom trawl fishing.
4. The presence and location of unique, rare, or threatened habitat.
5. The socioeconomic and management-related effects of closures, including changes in the location and intensity of bottom trawl fishing effort, the displacement or loss of revenue from fishing, and social and economic effects to fishing communities attributable to the location and extent of closed areas.

When making its recommendation to the Council, the committee may also include in its recommendations proposed changes in the designation of habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs) consistent with the proposed modification of the location and extent of areas closed to

bottom trawling. For example, if a current closed area, which is also identified as a HAPC, is recommended for elimination, the committee may recommend whether or not to retain the HAPC designation. Any such recommendation with respect to a HAPC would trigger the process for the modification of HAPCs (by FMP amendment) described in Section 7.3.2. Upon receipt of a recommendation from the committee, the Council will decide whether to begin the rulemaking process described in Section 6.2 D for establishing, adjusting, or removing discretionary management measures intended to have a permanent effect.

...

7.3.2 Process for Modifying Existing or Designating New HAPCs

Recognizing that new scientific information could reveal other important habitat areas that should be designated HAPCs or call into question the criteria for existing HAPCs, the Council may designate a new HAPC or modify or eliminate an existing HAPC through the process described below. This process allows organizations and individuals to petition the Council at any time to consider a new designation, or modify or eliminate an existing designation, and ensures, provided they submit the required information described below, their proposal will be considered by the Council. The process includes the following elements, which may be described in more detail in Council Operating Procedures:

1. A petitioner submits a proposal to eliminate or modify an existing HAPC, or designate a new HAPC, by letter to the Chairman and Executive Director of the Council. Proposals must include a description of: (a) for a new HAPC, the location of the HAPC, defined by specified geographic characteristics such as coordinates, depth contours, or distinct biogeographic characteristics; (b) for a new HAPC, how the HAPC meets the criteria specified in regulations at 50 CFR 600.815 (a)(8), or for changes to an existing HAPC, how such a change would better meet these criteria; and (c) a preliminary assessment of potential biological and socioeconomic effects of the proposed change or new designation.
2. Council/NMFS staffs determine whether the proposal contains the mandatory components outlined in step one. If this technical review determines that the proposal is inadequate, staff return it to the petitioner for revision and resubmission. If it is determined adequate, staff forward it to the Council for full consideration over three Council meetings as described below.
3. At the first meeting, the Council establishes a timeline for consideration, including merit review by the EFH OC and the SSC.
4. At the second meeting, the EFH OC and SSC provide their merit review to the Council. Depending on the results of this review, the Council directs staff to begin developing any documentation necessary for implementation. The proposal is also be forwarded to other advisory bodies for additional review.

5. At the third meeting the Council receives advisory body reports, reviews implementing documentation, and decides whether to approve an FMP amendment for Secretarial review.

...

6.2

...

D. Full Rulemaking For Actions Normally Requiring at Least Two Council Meetings and Two Federal Register Rules (Regulatory Amendment)

These include any proposed management measure that is highly controversial or any measure that directly allocates the resource. These also include management measures that are intended to have permanent effect and are discretionary, and for which the impacts have not been previously analyzed. Full rulemakings will normally use a two-Council-meeting process, although additional meetings may be required to fully develop the Council's recommendations on a full rulemaking issue. Regulatory measures to implement an FMP amendment will be developed through the full rulemaking process. The Secretary will publish a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* with an appropriate period for public comment followed by publication of a final rule in the *Federal Register*.

Council-recommended management measures addressing a resource conservation issue must be based upon the identification of a point of concern through that decision-making framework, consistent with the specific procedures and criteria listed in Section 6.2.2.

Council-recommended management measures addressing social or economic issues must be consistent with the specific procedures and criteria described in Section 6.2.3.

Council-recommended changes to habitat protection measures must be consistent with the specific procedures and criteria described in Section 6.2.4.

...

PFMC
03/20/07