1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

1.1 Introduction

Management of the federal fisheries located off Alaska in the 3- to 200-nautical mile (nm) U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) is conducted under five federal fishery management plans (FMPs) approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Protocol Amending the Convention Between Canada and the United States of America for the Preservation of the Halibut Fishery of the Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea (EBS). The FMPs include *The Fishery Management Plan for the Groundfish Fishery of the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Area* (North Pacific Fishery Management Council [Council] 2000a) (Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands [BSAI] Groundfish FMP), *The Fishery Management Plan for Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska* (Council 2000b) (Gulf of Alaska [GOA] Groundfish FMP), *The Fishery Management Plan for Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Commercial King and Tanner Crabs* (Council 1998b) (BSAI Crab FMP), *The Fishery Management Plan for the Scallop Fishery off Alaska* (Council 1996) (Scallop FMP), and *The Fishery Management Plan for the Salmon Fisheries in the EEZ off the Coast of Alaska* (Council 1990) (Salmon FMP).

These FMPs and their amendments are developed under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and other applicable federal laws and executive orders (EOs). These FMPs were prepared by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) for approval and implementation by the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) through the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

All federal actions, including amendments to the FMPs and changes to federal fishing regulations, must comply with applicable federal laws and EOs. The federal laws most applicable to fisheries management actions include the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA). EOs most applicable to fisheries management actions include EO 12866 because of its relevance to regulatory planning and review, EO 12898 because of its pertinence to environmental justice, EO 13084 because it requires consultation and coordination with Indian Tribes and Tribal Governments, EO 13186 because it relates to migratory birds, and EO 13132 because of its link to federalism. The decision-making process for FMPs, FMP amendments, and regulatory amendments includes determining compliance of the various alternatives with federal laws and EOs.

The 1996 amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Act require NMFS and regional Fishery Management Councils (Councils) to describe and identify essential fish habitat (EFH) within FMPs based on guidelines established by the Secretary, minimize to the extent practicable adverse effects on EFH caused by fishing, and identify other actions to encourage the conservation and enhancement of EFH. EFH is defined in the Magnuson-Stevens Act as "those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity."

As required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS developed guidelines, (located at 50 CFR part 600, Subpart J), to assist the Councils in the description and identification of EFH and in the consideration of actions to ensure the conservation and enhancement of EFH. The EFH regulations also include guidelines for identifying adverse impacts from both fishing and non-fishing activities and considering the practicability of actions for minimizing adverse effects on EFH from fishing. In addition, the implementing regulations identify eight other activities that either should or must be included when amending the FMPs.

These activities consist of the following:

1. Describe the habitat requirements by life stage for species covered by the FMP.
2. Describe fishing activities that may adversely affect EFH.
3. Describe options for managing adverse effects from fishing.
4. Identify non-fishing related activities that may adversely affect EFH.
5. Conduct a cumulative impacts analysis.
6. Describe options for the conservation and enhancement of EFH.
7. Identify prey species and their habitat..
8. Identify research and information needs.

The regulations at Section 600.815(a)(8) provide guidance to Councils in identifying habitat areas of particular concern (HAPCs). HAPCs are those areas within EFH that are of particular ecological importance to the long-term sustainability of managed species, are of a rare type, or are especially susceptible to degradation or development. HAPCs are meant to provide for greater focus of conservation and enhancement efforts. In this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), alternative approaches to identify HAPCs are considered. Specific identification of HAPC sites (or types) will be addressed in a separate environmental assessment (EA). The Council found it necessary to draft a separate EA for HAPCs concurrent with this EFH EIS to meet the court-ordered timeline for the latter. The separate EA is not an attempt to segment the issue or avoid taking a hard look at the environmental consequences of potential actions. Reasonably foreseeable actions (including the potential new HAPCs and fishery restrictions) are presented in the cumulative effects section of this EFH EIS.

1.2 Purpose and Need for Action

1.2.1 Purpose of Action

The purpose of this action is to determine whether and how to amend the Council FMPs pursuant to Section 303(a)(7) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which requires NMFS and the Council to (1) describe and identify EFH for the fishery, (2) minimize to the extent practicable the adverse effects of fishing on EFH, and (3) identify other actions to encourage the conservation and enhancement of EFH. Depending on the preferred alternatives identified in this EIS, one or more of the Council's FMPs could be amended. The analysis contained in this document is based upon the best scientific information available and the guidelines articulated in the Final Rule to implement the EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (see 50 CFR Part 600, Subpart J).

1.2.2 Need for Action

In the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Congress recognized that one of the greatest long-term threats to the viability of commercial and recreational fisheries is the continuing loss of marine, estuarine, and other aquatic habitats. To ensure that habitat considerations would receive increased attention, the amended Magnuson-Stevens Act included new EFH requirements.

In June 1998, the Council adopted Amendments 55/55/8/5/5 to the BSAI Groundfish FMP, the GOA Groundfish FMP, the BSAI Crab FMP, the Scallop FMP, and the Salmon FMP, respectively, and submitted them for review by the Secretary. The Secretary approved these amendments on January 20, 1999 (64 FR 20216; April 26, 1999), in accordance with Section 304(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

In 1999, a coalition of several environmental groups brought suit challenging the agency's approval of the EFH FMP amendments prepared by the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean, New England, North Pacific, and

Pacific Fishery Management Councils (*American Oceans Campaign et al. v. Daley et al.*, Civil Action No. 99-982(GK) (D.D.C. September 14, 2000). The court found that the agency's decisions on the EFH amendments were in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, but held that the EAs on the amendments were in violation of NEPA and ordered NMFS to complete new, more thorough, NEPA analyses for each EFH amendment in question.

Consequently, NMFS entered into a Joint Stipulation with the plaintiffs that called for each affected Council to complete EISs to examine alternatives for minimizing the adverse effects of fishing on EFH to the extent practicable. See *AOC v. Evans*, Civil No. 99-982 GK (D.D.C. December 17, 2001). Because the court did not limit its criticism of the EAs to efforts to minimize adverse fishing effects on EFH, however, NMFS decided that the scope of these EISs should address all required EFH components of Section 303(a)(7) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Further, NMFS determined that the agency's prior actions regarding EFH should not predetermine any conclusions in the EIS; therefore, this EIS analyzes alternatives for the EFH FMP amendments, including the alternative that the Council adopted and NMFS approved in 1999, as well as other alternatives.

In December 2002, the Council adopted a draft problem statement to guide this analysis. It is presented below:

> The productivity of the North Pacific ecosystem is acknowledged to be among the highest in the world. The Council intends to ensure the continued sustainability of FMP species by considering additional, precautionary and reasonable management measures. Recognizing that in the North Pacific, potential changes in productivity may be caused by fluctuations in natural oceanographic conditions, fisheries, and other, non-fishing activities, the Council intends to take action in compliance with the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act to protect the productivity of FMP species by considering additional measures to reduce adverse effects of fishing activities on habitat essential to managed species. To accomplish this task, the Council will undertake an EIS analysis to:
>
> - Identify and designate EFH,
> - Develop designation criteria for identification of HAPC, and
> - Consider implementation of additional management measures to minimize, to the extent practicable, adverse effects of fishing on EFH. The intent of the Council is for those FMP species where data are available, habitat measures should be applied to minimize the effects of fishing on habitat essential to continued productivity of the managed species.

1.3 NEPA Analysis and Fishery Management Plan Actions

NEPA provides a mechanism for identifying and evaluating the full spectrum of environmental issues associated with federal actions and for considering a reasonable range of alternatives to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts. NMFS and the Council will consider any new information and alternatives discussed in the EIS to determine whether changes to the EFH provisions of the FMPs previously approved by NMFS are warranted. As noted in the court's decision in *AOC v. Daley*, the alternatives that NMFS must consider under NEPA are not restricted to the options originally presented in the FMP amendments submitted by the Council. This EIS, therefore, considers status quo and no-action alternatives separately. The no-action alternatives describe a scenario in which no action would be taken to comply with the EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The status quo alternatives constitute the current state of the management regime regarding EFH. Because the Council did not adopt any new measures in the 1999 EFH amendments for minimizing adverse effects of fishing on EFH, the

no-action and status quo conditions for minimizing the effects of fishing on EFH are the same in both the 1999 analysis and this EIS.

The original EISs for the BSAI and GOA groundfish FMPs were completed in 1981 and 1979, respectively. NMFS issued a Supplemental EIS (SEIS) on methods of setting total allowable catch in December 1998; that document analyzed the impacts of groundfish fishing over a range of total allowable catch (TAC) levels (five alternatives) (NMFS 1998a). In addition, NMFS has released the Alaska Groundfish Fisheries Revised Draft Programmatic SEIS for public review and comment. This document evaluates both the BSAI and GOA groundfish FMPs in their entirety (NMFS 2003a). The revised draft programmatic groundfish SEIS is a broad, holistic environmental evaluation that examines the fishery management program on a policy level scale. It provides the agency and the public with insights as to what environmental effects would result from other management regimes within an analytical framework. Findings of that analysis could result in FMP amendments that could lead to rulemaking and implementation of changes to the current management policy governing the groundfish fisheries off Alaska.

In addition to these EIS analyses, several draft and final EAs have been prepared to describe the impacts of implementing similar suites of fishery management measures to protect EFH. These EAs, which are incorporated into this analysis by reference, include the following:

- The EA for EFH Amendments 55/55/8/5/5, which identified and described EFH in text and maps and identified HAPC habitat types (Council 1999).
- The Draft EA for Habitat Areas of Particular Concern, which considered additional HAPC types and areas, as well as two measures to protect HAPCs from fishing effects (HAPC as a prohibited species and no fishing areas in gorgonian coral aggregations) (Council 2000c). [Note that this action was considered by the Council, but was not implemented.]
- The EA for HAPC Amendment 65, which would have added corals and sponges to the list of prohibited species to prevent a directed fishery from developing (Council 2000d). [Note that this action moved through the Council process, but was not implemented.]

Each of the EAs expanded the analysis, incorporating new information and new alternatives as they became relevant. These documents initially served to inform the Council regarding the possible environmental and economic consequences of various alternatives designed to identify and describe EFH and HAPC and to minimize impacts of fishing on EFH to the extent practicable.

1.4 Notice of Intent and Scoping Process

NMFS published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS for the EFH components of the BSAI Groundfish, GOA Groundfish, BSAI Crab, Alaska Scallop, and Salmon Fishery Management Plan(s) on June 6, 2001 (66 FR 30396). The public comment period was open until July 21, 2001. NMFS solicited public comment to identify a range of alternatives for identifying and describing EFH and HAPCs and requested information on adverse effects of fishing activity on EFH and HAPCs. As indicated earlier, NMFS intends to address identification of specific types or locations of HAPCs in separate NEPA analyses. NMFS also solicited public comment on EFH management measures and alternatives to minimize, to the extent practicable, any adverse effects of fishing on EFH. NMFS held public scoping meetings in Unalaska on June 8, Anchorage on June 11, Seattle on June 19, Juneau on June 20, and Sitka on June 21. NMFS considered all public comments received before and during the formal scoping period and used them to identify the key environmental issues to be addressed. A summary of the public comments and primary issues raised during the meetings is in the Scoping Report (Appendix A).

In addition to the formal comment period set forth in the NOI, there were numerous other opportunities for public input and participation in the process. Public testimony is taken at all Council meetings and at the meetings of the Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee and Advisory Panel. At the April 2001 Council meeting, the Council notified the public that additional participation would be solicited through establishment of a Council EFH Committee. The Committee's objective was to develop a recommendation for the Council on a suite of alternative management measures that would meet the mandates of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other applicable laws. Nominations were submitted and the Council Chairman appointed 10 members in May 2001. The EFH Committee included members of the fishing community, the conservation community, NMFS, and state agencies. Notifications of the Council's EFH Committee meetings were published in the *Federal Register*, in the Council newsletter, and on the Council's web page. EFH Committee meetings (and work group meetings) were held in Anchorage, Juneau, Kodiak, Sitka, and Seattle. The Committee met several times in 2001, including May 30; August 13 and 14; and November 5 through 9 (which continued via teleconference on November 27 and 29). The Committee also met numerous times in 2002, including January 29 and 30; March 27 (in conjunction with the NMFS EFH workshop March 25 and 26); May 15 through 17; August 27; September 16 through 18; October 2; October 22 and 23 (work group); October 28 and 29 (work group); and November 4 through 6. The EFH Committee also met in 2003 on January 26 and May 5 and 6. All of these meetings provided additional opportunity for public comment and recommendations, as members of the public were offered an opportunity to present comments to the Committee during each Committee meeting. Several of the preparers of this analysis were staff to the Council's EFH Committee. All discussions at EFH Committee meetings were used to define the scope of analytical issues examined in this analysis.

During scoping, several issues and areas of concern, with respect to the effects of the fishery management measures and non-fishery measures, were identified as important aspects of the human environment that should be analyzed in detail. Therefore, this analysis will pay special attention to the following significant issues:

- Alternatives for identifying and describing EFH
- Data used to analyze and develop EFH descriptions
- Effects of EFH descriptions on non-fishing interests
- Alternative ideas for salmon EFH as marine waters only
- Effects of fishing on EFH and mitigation measures
- Alternatives for identifying and describing HAPCs
- Scientific information, research, and uncertainty
- Impacts on marine mammals and other non-targeted marine species
- Economic/socioeconomic impacts
- Regulatory compliance

1.5 Project Area

The project area includes virtually all of the North Pacific EEZ off Alaska and adjacent waters of the United States. The area affected by the fisheries includes state waters and international waters adjacent to the EEZ, as well as all freshwater areas used by salmon for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity.

1.5.1 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands Groundfish

The action area for the federally managed BSAI groundfish fisheries effectively covers all of the Eastern Bering Sea under U.S. jurisdiction, extending southward to include the waters south of the Aleutian Islands west of long. 170° W, to the border of the U.S. EEZ. The northern boundary of the EBS is the Bering Strait, defined as a straight line from Cape Prince of Whales to Cape Dezhneva. The BSAI area is further divided into 2 sub-areas (eastern Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands) and 19 reporting areas.

The BSAI groundfish FMP and its management regime governs all stocks of finfish and marine invertebrates, except salmonids, shrimps, scallops, snails, king crab, Tanner crab, Dungeness crab, corals, surf clams, horsehair crab, lyre crab, Pacific halibut, and Pacific herring. The FMP separates the species into five categories: prohibited species (e.g., crab, halibut, herring, salmon), target species (e.g., pollock, cod), other species (e.g., sharks, skates, sculpins, and octopus), forage fish species (e.g., smelts, euphausiids), and nonspecified species (e.g., eelpouts, lampreys).

The EFH regulations require that EFH be identified and described for all species in an FMP's fishery management unit (defined as a fishery identified in an FMP relevant to the FMP's management objectives). A review by NOAA GC (Smoker 1997) found that although the fishery management unit for the BSAI groundfish FMP is not specifically defined in the FMP, it is apparent from past and current management objectives and practices that the fishery management unit does not include prohibited species and nonspecified species. Thus, EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act apply to groundfish species, and not to prohibited and nonspecified species (unless these species are included in the fishery management unit of another FMP; e.g., BSAI crab species).

1.5.2 Gulf of Alaska Groundfish

The GOA Groundfish FMP and its management regime apply to the U.S. EEZ of the North Pacific Ocean, exclusive of the EBS, between the eastern Aleutian Islands at long. 170° W and Dixon Entrance at long. 132°40' W, and includes the Western, Central, and Eastern regulatory areas.

The GOA groundfish FMP and its management regime govern all stocks of finfish (including squid and octopus), except salmon, steelhead, halibut, herring, and tuna. The GOA groundfish FMP separates the species into four categories: prohibited species (e.g., crab, halibut, herring, salmon), target species (e.g., pollock, cod), other species (e.g., sharks, sculpins), and forage fish species (e.g., smelts, euphausiids). As with the BSAI groundfish FMP, EFH provisions of the Magnuson-Stevens Act apply only to groundfish species, and not to prohibited species and nonspecified species (unless these species are included in the fishery management unit of another FMP; e.g., BSAI crab species).

1.5.3 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crab

The BSAI King and Tanner Crab FMP includes those waters of the EEZ lying south of Point Hope (68°21' N), east of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. convention line of 1988, and extending south of the Aleutian Islands for 200 miles between the convention line and Scotch Cap Light (long. 164°44'36" W). The King and Tanner Crab FMP applies to commercial fisheries for red king crab *Paralithodes camtschaticus*, blue king crab *P. platypus*, golden (or brown) king crab *Lithodes aequispinus*, scarlet (or deep sea) king crab *Lithodes couesi*, Tanner crab *Chionoecetes bairdi*, snow (or queen) crab *C. opilio*, grooved Tanner crab *C. tanneri*, and triangle Tanner crab *C. angulatus* in the BSAI area.

1.5.4 Alaska Scallops

The management areas covered under the Scallop FMP include all federal waters of the GOA and the BSAI area. The GOA is defined as the U.S. EEZ of the North Pacific Ocean, between the eastern Aleutian Islands at long. 170° W and Dixon Entrance at long. 132°40' W. The BSAI is defined as the U.S. EEZ south of the Bering Strait to the Alaska Peninsula and Aleutian Islands and extending south of the Aleutian Islands west of long. 170° W. The Scallop FMP measures apply to fisheries for weathervane scallops *(Patinopectin caurinus*), primary species, and *Chlamys behringiana*, *Ch. albida*, *Ch. rubida*, *Ch. hastata*, and *Crassadoma gigantea*, secondary species.

1.5.5 Salmon Fisheries in the EEZ off the Coast of Alaska

The management unit of the Salmon FMP consists of all of the EEZ off the coast of Alaska (including parts of the GOA, EBS, Chukchi Sea, and Arctic Ocean) and the salmon fisheries that occur there. Two management areas are established within the fishery management unit, with the border between the two at the longitude of Cape Suckling (143º53'36" W). As long as the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean remains in effect (or is replaced by an equivalent convention), the Council leaves the management of the salmon fisheries west of long. 175º E under the control of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission (or equivalent organization). Otherwise, this plan will govern the salmon fisheries in the EEZ west of long. 175º E as an integral part of the West Area.

The West Area is the area of the EEZ off the coast of Alaska west of the longitude of Cape Suckling (143º53'36" W). It includes the EEZ in the Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort seas, as well as the EEZ in the North Pacific Ocean west of Cape Suckling. The East Area is the area of the EEZ off the coast of Alaska east of the longitude of Cape Suckling.

The salmon FMP includes all five species of Pacific salmon, including pink salmon *Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*, sockeye salmon *O. nerka*, coho salmon *O. kisutch*, chum salmon *O. keta*, and chinook salmon *O. tshawytscha*.

1.6 Decisions and Proposed Schedule

On December 5, 2001, the Department of Justice filed a signed settlement agreement in the case of *AOC v. Daley* with the U.S. District Court. The stipulation filed with the court set forth a schedule for completion of the EISs, a determination as to the need for any FMP amendments, a process for FMP amendment submission and approval, and action by NMFS if the Council fails to submit a necessary FMP amendment. The stipulation also specified that the plaintiffs dismiss their Magnuson-Stevens Act appeal and that the injunction from enforcing the EFH amendments be dissolved. The schedule for the EIS for the North Pacific Council fisheries was subsequently amended in a separate joint stipulation approved as an order of the court on May 21, 2003. The schedule required that NMFS provide a preliminary Draft EIS (DEIS) for review by the Council no later than September 15, 2003. NMFS must publish the DEIS for public comment by no later than January 16, 2004, and provide a comment period no later than January 16 through April 15, 2004. NMFS must issue a Final EIS no later than June 1, 2005, and a Record of Decision (ROD) no later than August 13, 2005. If NMFS determines that an FMP amendment and implementing regulations, or other regulations issued pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Act, are necessary, it must approve those actions no later than August 13, 2006. Additionally, NMFS must work with the Council to develop a process for the evaluation and possible identification of HAPCs and the implementation of any associated management measures. NMFS must promulgate any resulting final regulations, supported by appropriate NEPA analysis, no later than August 13, 2006.

1.7 Organization of the EIS

Based in part on the issues identified during scoping, the EIS discusses a range of alternatives for identifying and describing EFH (Action 1). The alternatives include several methods that would result in different areas being identified and described as EFH. The EIS evaluates the environmental consequences of the EFH identification that would result from each alternative. The EIS also evaluates alternative approaches for identifying HAPCs within EFH (Action 2). The EIS evaluates the consequences of each different approach and the types of HAPCs the Council might identify. The EIS includes an evaluation of the effects of fishing on EFH and an analysis of alternatives to minimize to the extent practicable the adverse effects of fishing on EFH, including measures such as fishing gear restrictions, time area closures, and harvest limits (Action 3).

The analysis considers the no-action alternative, along with a range of other reasonable alternatives. Information from the 1998 EA is reflected in this analysis; however, additional information and the selection of alternatives come from a review of the best scientific information available, including new information made available since the FMP amendments were originally completed.

Chapter 2 describes the alternatives for each of the three actions analyzed in the EIS. The chapter discusses significant issues associated with each alternative, including those identified during scoping. For each EFH identification alternative, the EIS describes the methodology and discusses the geographic range and habitat types included as EFH. A summary and comparison are provided for each alternative. For HAPCs, the EIS discusses a range of alternative approaches for future HAPC designations. The discussion of each alternative for minimizing the effects of fishing on EFH describes associated fishery management measures that would be taken. Chapter 2 includes background information on previous actions taken to protect habitat. Chapter 2 concludes with a discussion and explanation of alternatives that were considered, but that were not carried forward for further analysis.

Chapter 3 of the EIS describes the environment affected by the alternative courses of action. The chapter's description of the affected environment details the physical and biological resources affected by the alternatives, including the fishery resources, threatened and endangered species and marine mammals, EFH for other fisheries, and any other relevant biological resources.

Similarly, Chapter 3 characterizes the socioeconomic environment by describing the geographic extent of the fishery and discussing the number of vessels and gear types used. Chapter 3 also contains an analysis of the effects of fishing on fish habitat. This analysis includes an overview of national and international literature on fishing impacts to fish habitat and a more focused analysis of region- and fishery-specific impacts. The discussion describes how NMFS and the Council manage the fishery under the existing FMP and how the EFH FMP amendments will affect, and be incorporated into, the management of this fishery.

Chapter 4 details the environmental consequences of each alternative for designating EFH and HAPCs and minimizing the effects of fishing on EFH. The chapter contains an analysis of the direct and indirect environmental and socioeconomic effects of each alternative. For each alternative for designating EFH and HAPC, the chapter describes the specific environmental consequences in relation to effects on the fishery and other fisheries, protected resources, and non-fishing activities. For each alternative for minimizing adverse effects of fishing on EFH, the chapter describes the practicability of the associated fishery management measures and evaluates the environmental consequences in relation to effects on EFH, the fishery, other fisheries, and protected resources. The discussion of potential impacts resulting from each alternative is presented in comparative form that clearly distinguishes the environmental

consequences of each alternative. The discussion in Chapter 4 includes a description of the conservation benefits and the adverse impacts of the alternatives.

Chapter 5 provides a list of the preparers of the EIS. Chapter 6 lists the agencies, organizations, and individuals consulted. Chapter 7 provides an index of topics addressed in the EIS. Chapter 8 lists the literature cited, and Chapter 9 contains all figures and tables. The appendices include documentation of the scoping process, a Regulatory Impact Review analysis, maps depicting EFH identification alternatives, and other pertinent information.