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Scientific advice on status of stocks is formulated using both fishery-generated data and research vessel survey data. Both sets of information could be utilized as a proxy to determine essential fish habitat (EFH) designations based upon loci of species abundance; however, while fishery-dependent data may identify 'hot-spots' (or preferred habitat), especially as a stock's range contracts because of population decline, the time series of research survey data offers a more systematic approach for identifying and protecting critical habitat necessary for stock rebuilding.

The principle objective in commercial fishing operations is to maximize economic returns. This influences fishing strategy such as gear choice, area fished, and selection of target species. Fishing gear might include various towed nets, such as otter trawls or scallop dredges, or other, more passive capture devices like gill nets or fish pots. Each type of fishing gear differs in its method of deployment and retrieval, and each has its own set of advantages, disadvantages, and logistical constraints with respect to capture of various fish species or size selectivity within a species.

Although scientists may utilize similar gear to sample fish populations, the objectives of standardized surveys are very different from commercial harvesting operations. Research surveys sample both commercial and non-commercial species, a difficult task given the diversity in size and inaccessibility of all the organisms inhabiting dynamic marine communities. Despite the assumptions associated with them, research surveys have proven essential for management of the nation's marine resources and ecosystems, and have assumed greater importance in monitoring the status of depleted resources because of curtailment in commercial effort, and now provide the first characterization of EFH. The following surveys (federal and state) are being used in the EFH designation process for federally managed species based on areas of high concentration and/or absence/presence:

- NMFS Marine Resources Monitoring, Assessment and Prediction Program (MARMAP)
- NMFS Bottom Trawl Survey
- NMFS Sea Scallop Survey
- Hudson-Raritan Survey
- Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries Bottom Trawl Survey
Other sources of information to designate and describe EFH for federally managed species include the food habits database, NOAA's Estuarine Living Marine Resources (ELMR) information, fishing industry input, and the literature review.

Begun in 1963 by what is currently the NEFSC (NMFS) at Woods Hole, the concept behind the original multispecies bottom survey program was to undertake broad-scale, multi-species biological data acquisition, not just on the harvestable portion of the ecosystem, but on other components such as early life history stages of fish (eggs, larvae, and pre-recruits), their food organisms (such as zooplankton, etc.), as well as information on environmental trends, and other biological data (Grosslein 1969; Azarovitz 1981; Despres-Patanjo et al. 1988). Continental shelf-wide surveys are undertaken at set frequencies during the year, or every third year for surf clams and ocean quahogs, using mobile gear such as the scallop dredge, hydraulic clam dredge, bongo nets (the MARMAP survey), and otter trawls. Sometimes, one survey is "piggybacked" on another -- for example, MARMAP sampling is undertaken on trawl surveys. Hydrographic variables are collected on all surveys (usually depth, near-bottom and surface temperature and salinity) to characterize physical conditions of the sample stations. Data and samples are also collected during each trawl survey to characterize biological parameters of each species caught by the survey gear. These data include length frequencies and individual weights, structures to determine age classes (e.g. scales and otoliths), observations or samples to determine the reproductive status (sec and maturity stage), and food habits of each species.

Scientific information required for fisheries assessments and fisheries management depends on the objectives of fishery-independent data collection effort and the degree of acceptable risk or uncertainty (Sissenwine et al. 1983). Because it is impossible to census entirely over a large area (cost / time considerations), only a fraction of potential areas can be sampled. The accuracy of the estimates from surveys is a function of the sampling design, the number of samples (stations) completed, and the behavioral and morphological characteristics of a species. The effort represents a balance between accuracy of the estimates and the costs and need for synoptic coverage within a short time frame.

The efficiency of sampling devices varies and they do not catch all organisms in the area sampled. They measure only the life stages vulnerable to the gear, consequently, sampling does not reveal how many fish were not caught. Also, it must be assumed that neither the environment nor the fish distribution will change very much over the duration of the survey. Spatial and temporal species composition will change by season and area. In addition, major environmental conditions (e.g., gulfstream gyres) may result in temporal and spatial changes in the distribution of ichthyoplankton. The patchy nature of ichthyoplankton assemblages and the wide variation of size, morphology, and behavior patterns of early life history fishes may be problematic during the survey, but over a long-term time series, synoptic surveys standardized to specific calendar periods, will effectively describe trends in the centers of abundance and distribution whether for eggs, larvae, juveniles, or adults of certain species.
Specifically related to the MARMAP, complete taxonomic descriptions of fish eggs and larvae are limited due to the major morphological changes that occur from ichthyoplankton stages to juvenile and adult stages of fishes. For example, classifications of different eggs within the same taxa are limited (i.e. *Urophycis* spp.). Observations of ichthyoplankton population characteristics may be limited or not described thoroughly due to the difficulty of identifying organisms to the lowest possible taxa.

The core survey program is the statistically designed bottom trawl survey of NEFSC (NMFS), now in its 36th year (Survey Working Group 1988). This survey has been duplicated by Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (MDMF) and some other states for determining abundance and distribution of fishes in their territorial waters as well as specific embayments, e.g., the NEFSC Hudson-Raritan survey and MARMAP. A limitation of the latter surveys is that only a portion of a species distribution is covered, increasing variance of abundance indices due to annual changes in availability, particularly for migratory species. However, coastal surveys using small mesh trawls appear to be particularly useful for assessing distribution and abundance of juvenile fish and estimating recruiting year classes.

The basic assumption of the surveys is that species catch (weight or number) per standard tow (or catch per unit effort, CPUE) is proportional to stock density over the area surveyed and that changes in the index of abundance over time are directly proportional to changes in abundance. This is achievable only if there is low annual variability in temporal or spatial distribution of a species, or for NEFSC surveys -- complete coverage in the distribution of species, and the species vulnerability to the sampling gear.

A requirement for successfully monitoring changes in abundance is an objective measure of the precision of the abundance index, i.e., the sampling error of the average catch per tow. The heterogeneous distribution of fish stocks led to the use of the stratified random sampling design which improves precision by removing the among strata variance component and also ensures some trawling in all depth zones of all geographic regions (Cochran 1977; Fogarty 1985). Every towable habitat type is sampled with a probability proportional to specific habitat type within each stratum. This consistent sampling strategy, with some slight variation, is employed for all the surveys contributing information to EFH description, including those for mollusks. Still, sampling intensity may not provide identification of all high density areas in a given year, e.g., scallop beds. The same could be said if there was effort directed to characterize habitat with seabed surveillance equipment over a broad scale. Documenting changes in species distribution is very much related to choosing the appropriate spatial and temporal scaling in sampling.

Catchability is the fraction of a fish population in the path of the gear which is caught and retained by a defined unit of fishing effort. Catchability depends on the size, power, speed of the towing vessel, trawl design, physical factors such as sea state, bottom type, currents, etc, and species. Towing speed and time are standardized. Overall objectives and gear design dictate that a compromise must be made with respect to towing speed since maximum catchability is achieved for demersal species at slow speed and at a higher speed for pelagic species. Most research trawls are towed at 2.5 knots (MDMF) or
3.5 knots (NEFSC). There is also a coefficient of proportionality between CPUE and true abundance. It is assumed to be constant over time, especially lacking information on relative fishing power or changes in species availability; nonetheless, absolute abundance (density) is underestimated by a bottom trawl survey. The main limitation of all survey sampling gear, whether Bongo nets, trawls, or dredges, is that annual changes in species catchability contribute significantly to variance of the survey abundance indices (Byrne et al. 1981; Collie and Sissenwine 1983).

Trawl surveys are subject to two categories of statistical error: variance and bias (Byrne, et al. 1981). Variance around the true abundance index arises out of fluctuations in the spatial or vertical distribution of the species populations, environmental conditions, sample size, variation in gear performance and procedures, and through interactions of these factors. Variance in the measured variables associated with the first two factors could be reduced by additional stratification besides depth (e.g., by bottom type), increasing the intensity of sampling (more stations / sq. n. mi.), and -- with regard to environmental variability -- minimized by conducting seasonal surveys during the same time frame; the latter two methods are routinely followed. The easiest and least costly alternative, which is also practiced as a matter of course, is to maintain high standards for each piece of sampling gear in construction, maintenance, and use. Adherence to uniform catch sampling strategies and measurement methods by the scientists is also routinely followed.

Bias is a systematic error in the abundance estimate related to fishing power of the gear and influences of vessel power, noise, crew, scientists, and adherence to net specifications as noted above, but also arises from availability and selectivity of fish to the gear (Byrne et al. 1981). Although the sampling gear should ideally capture all organisms (of all size ranges) in its path in some known proportion to their absolute numbers, in practice, this is not possible because the net opening extends only a few meters above the substrate whereas fish distribution may extend vertically above and below the net. In addition, species exhibit different swimming speeds, endurance, morphology, and behavior patterns which plays a part in herding and capture success. Generally, gear avoidance is higher during daylight than darkness. The size and type of ground gear and the net mesh size may bias species composition and size (age) structure. Usually, large specimens may more easily avoid the trawl opening and smaller fish may pass through the mesh resulting in size dependent catchability of age groups. For example, the bongo sampling technique of MARMAP selectively collects pelagic eggs and larvae but does not equally collect demersal eggs and larvae (i.e. herring and ocean pout) or egg veils (i.e. monkfish). The choice of sampling gear comes down to pragmatic considerations such as efficiency, ease of operation, maintainability, and gear cost. A constant proportional bias is acceptable (Doubleday 1981), which is why indices are 'relative' measures. Controlling sources of systematic error arising from vessel and gear factors, in particular, is widely recognized and very important relative to ensuring viability and comparability of past survey data to current and future data (Walsh et al. 1993).

Because trawls are less than 100% efficient, catch indices are inaccurate for measuring absolute abundance. They are also imprecise mainly because of the highly contagious
distribution of fish, i.e., high proportion of zero catches. Nonetheless, bottom trawl survey data is very useful for monitoring trends in abundance (Clark 1979). NEFSC scientists have used various statistical methods (Delta distribution and time series analysis) to construct catch/tow data indices which increase survey precision and more closely track populations than does the original series (Pennington 1983; Pennington 1985). Precision of the indices of abundance are highest [lowest Coefficient of Variation (CV's)] for demersal species (Survey Working Group 1988). Flounder species and pelagic fish have higher CV's. The lower precision for flounders relates to diel (day/night) activity changes and the use of roller gear which may pass over individuals in close contact with the substrate. Also, other species besides flounder exhibit diel changes in distribution, such that by moving off bottom at night, they are less vulnerable, but during daylight are more vulnerable by being concentrated near bottom (e.g., squid). Pelagics are normally aggregated in schools (e.g., Atlantic herring) making indices extremely variable, and especially so for those that undertake extensive seasonal migrations, like Atlantic mackerel. Thus, a time series of survey information often provide clearer evidence for trends in abundance than just the results from one survey.

Whether the footrope of the trawl is rigged with large roller gear or small "cookies" influences catchability and efficiency of sampling over certain substrate. Fish associated with complex bathymetry such as ledges or that seek seclusion amongst boulders (e.g., Atlantic cod) or submarine canyons (e.g., tilefish) are not as effectively sampled as fish common to smooth substrate. The result is that geographic gaps in data sometimes exist for certain 'hard bottom' regions. Similarly, the increasing presence of fixed gear (lobster pot trawls, gill nets, conch, scup, and sea bass pots) on trawlable bottom during the last decade has also caused some disruption of sampling in certain habitats both in coastal waters and along the edge of the continental shelf and may create bias. The heightened potential for gear conflicts, as well as other considerations, limits coastal survey operations to daytime only (e.g., the MDMF survey) and may necessitate the federal survey to sample narrow, deep-water strata along continental shelf during daylight to avoid gear conflicts. For the most part, sampling operations conducted by state surveys cannot be undertaken in depths shallower than 3-5 m, therefore, intertidal as well as some shallow subtidal habitats, and shoal banks cannot be sampled.

A subset of fish collected during the NEFSC Bottom Trawl surveys are used to identify fish prey composition through dietary analysis. The food habits sampling is an ongoing program which began in the 1960s. The sampling protocol has undergone several revisions over time, but the data generated serves as a time series for the analysis of predator prey relationships and how they change. The database is currently being used to characterize fish diets for the species requiring EFH designation. The data has some inherent weakness in that certain prey groups may be underrepresented because they may be rapidly digested or not recognizable to the lowest possible taxonomic grouping. Soft bodied animals, such a polychaete worms often may not easily be identified to species because of their state of digestion. Food habits data is generally summarized in one of two ways, either percent weight of the total stomach contents for each prey category or as percent occurrence of fish containing a particular prey. These two methods also have their limits. The percent weight approach will underestimate the importance of rapidly
digested prey and the percent occurrence method may over emphasize the dietary value of small but widely preyed upon animals. Taken together these two indices of dietary habits give a reasonable characterization of a predator’s diet. More detailed dietary analysis, including ontogenetic changes and details of the prey available (not just what is eaten) will further the understanding of the relationship between fish and their habitat.

The NEFSC conducted an extensive review of existing scientific and grey literature to describe the life history characteristics and habitat requirements of managed species. The FMP EFH Source documents are developed from the literature reviews and are being used to develop the text descriptions of EFH. Although these reviews are thorough and comprehensive, other sources of information on particular life history characteristics and habitat associations may be available that support the document with further references. Time and resource constraints have limited the effort available to fully exhaust all potential sources of information.

In summary, survey data can provide indices of relative abundance for many species, and for many age / size groups within a species. These data are also useful for providing information on the spatial and temporal distributions of many species, and can be used to define species assemblages and to monitor changes in them (Gabriel 1992). The primary use of the surveys, however, is for stock assessment and not to identify specific habitat conditions. Inferences made from these assessment data need to be interpreted with caution during EFH designation: the spatial and temporal scales of these inferences are constrained by the resolution power and lack of environmental factors collected during the research survey. Further information on environmental conditions such as high resolution data of surficial sediments, water mass fronts, major and minor currents, nutrient levels, benthic faunal composition, or other parameters may assist in identifying EFH in the New England region. The resolution power and few environmental parameters observed during the research survey is a function of sampling intensity, known sampling gear bias (e.g., size and species selectivity), sampling design (e.g., season of sampling), and low resolution of habitat conditions. Inferences on species assemblages need to be tempered by the fact that variation in catchability by species can bias species composition of survey data.
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ABSTRACT

The Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 mandates that regional fishery management Councils designate essential fish habitat (EFH) for each of the species which are managed, assess the effects of fishing on EFH, and develop conservation measures for EFH where needed. This synthesis of effects of fishing on fish habitat was produced to aid the fishery management councils in assessing the impacts of fishing activities. A wide range of studies were reviewed that reported effects of fishing on habitat (i.e., structural habitat components, community structure, and ecosystem processes) for a diversity of habitats and fishing gear types. Commonalities of all studies included immediate effects on species composition and diversity and a reduction in habitat complexity. Studies of acute effects were found to be a good predictor of chronic effects. Recovery after fishing was more variable, depending on habitat type, life history strategy of component species, and the natural disturbance regime. The ultimate goal of gear impact studies should not be to retrospectively analyze environmental impacts but ultimately to develop the ability to predict outcomes of particular management regimes. Synthesizing the results of these studies into predictive numerical models is not currently possible. However, conceptual models are presented which coalesce the patterns found over the range of observations. Conceptual models can be used to predict effects of gear impacts within the framework of current ecological theory. Initially, it is useful to consider fishes’ use of habitats along a gradient of habitat complexity and environmental variability. A model is presented of gear impacts on a range of seafloor types and is based on changes in the structural habitat values. Disturbance theory provides the framework for predicting effects of habitat change based on spatial patterns of disturbance. Alternative community state models, and type 1-type 2 disturbance patterns, may be used to predict the general outcome of habitat management. Primary data are lacking on the spatial extent of fishing induced disturbance, the effects of specific gear types along a gradient of fishing effort, and the linkages between habitat characteristics and the population dynamics of fishes. Adaptive and precautionary management practices will therefore be required until empirical data becomes available for validating model predictions.

"Habitat alteration by the fishing activities themselves is perhaps the least understood of the important environmental effects of fishing."

Committee on Fisheries, Ocean Studies
Board, National Research Council (1994)
INTRODUCTION

Stationary fishing gear (e.g., traps, gillnets, and longlines) and small scale mobile gear (i.e., beam trawls and shellfish dredges) towed from sailing vessels were used in the nineteenth century to harvest living marine resources. The widespread use of mobile fishing gear beyond near shore regions, and the use of larger vessels for all gear types, became possible only after the development of motorized propulsion and the steam capstan and winch. This widespread and critical change in fishing technology began in England with the launch of the steam trawler BERTA in the late 1800s. Fishing effort, and the range of technologies which support the industry, has increased greatly during the last century. For a wide number of harvested species, catch per unit effort has greatly decreased, and the populations of those species have also declined (FAO 1997). Many species are targeted throughout their geographic range and the wide array of harvesting systems (e.g., traps, gillnets, longlines, trawls, scallop dredges, hydraulic clam dredges) allow fishing to occur over the widest range of habitat types.

A lack of understanding the ecological consequences of the effects of removals of fish, and the direct effects of fishing gear on community and ecosystem functions, has produced questions about the sustainability of current levels of fishing. The number of reviews on this topic which have been produced during the past decade is perhaps the best indicator of this concern (Dayton et al. 1995; Hutchings 1990; ICES 1988, 1992, 1996; Jaspersen 1992; Jennings and Kaiser 1998; Jones 1992; Langton 1994; Messieh et al. 1991; National Research Council 1994, 1995; Roberts 1995). In the United States, the need for information leading to predictive capabilities and precautionary approaches on this topic will only increase as a result of the legal requirement to manage essential fish habitat (Auster et al. 1997a; Langton et al. 1996).

The Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 requires the regional Fishery Management Councils and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to identify and designate essential fish habitat (EFH) for each managed species, identify adverse impacts to EFH (including those caused by fishing activities), and develop actions to conserve and enhance EFH. The Act defines EFH as "those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity." For the purpose of interpreting the definition (and for defining the scope of this report) "waters" is interpreted by NMFS as aquatic areas and their associated physical, chemical, and biological properties that are used by fish, and may include areas historically used by fish where appropriate "substrate" is defined to include sediment, hard bottom, structures, and associated biological communities. These definitions provide substantial flexibility in defining EFH based on our knowledge of the different species, but also allows EFH to be interpreted within a broader ecosystem perspective. Disturbance has been defined as "any discrete event in time that disrupts ecosystem, community, or population structure and changes resources, substrate availability, or the physical environment." (Pickett and White 1985). Disturbance can be caused by many natural processes such as currents, predation, and iceberg scour (Hall, 1994). Human caused disturbance can result from activities such as harbor dredging and fishing with fixed and mobile gear. Disturbance can be gauged by both intensity (as a measure of the force of disturbance) and severity (as a measure of impact on the biotic community). Table 1 summarizes the relative effects of the range of agents which produce disturbances in marine communities. From an ecological perspective, fishing is the most widespread form of direct disturbance in marine systems below depths which are affected by storms (Watling and Norse MS1997).

One of the most difficult aspects of estimating the extent of fishing impacts on habitat is the lack of high resolution data on the distribution of fishing effort. Fishers are often resistant to reporting effort based on locations of individual tows or sets (for the obvious reason of divulging productive locations to competitors and regulators). Effort data in many fisheries are therefore apportioned to particular statistical areas for monitoring purposes. Using this type of data it has been possible to obtain averages of effort, and subsequent extrapolations of area impacted, for larger regions. For eight of the most heavily fished areas in the southern North Sea, for example, Rijnsdorp et al. (1996) estimated that between 1993 and 1996 a mean of 51% of the area was
trawled 1-5 times per year, 33% was trawled less than once per year, and 4% was trawled 10-50 times per year. Trawling effort in the Middle Atlantic Bight off the northeast U.S. was summarized by Churchill (1989). Towed area estimates were extrapolated from fishing effort data in 30' latitude x 30' longitude blocks. The range of effort was quite variable but the percent area impacted in some blocks off southern New England was over 200% with one block reaching 413%. Estimating the spatial impact of fixed gears is even more problematic. For example, during 1996 there were 2,690,856 lobster traps fish in the State of Maine (Maine Department of Marine Resources, unpublished data). These traps were hauled on average every 4.5 days, or 81.4 times year-1. Assuming a 1 m² footprint for each trap, the area impacted was 219 km². If each trap was dragged across an area three times the footprint during set and recovery, the area impacted was 657 km². A lack of data on the extent of the area actually disturbed makes analysis of the impacts of fishing on habitat in those fisheries difficult.

The overall impact of fishing on the North American continental shelf is unknown despite research efforts in the United States spanning nearly 80 years. Alexander et al. (1914) reported that the effect of trawling on the bottom was negligible and stated that "otter trawls do not seriously disturb the bottom over which they are fished nor materially denude it of organisms which directly or indirectly serve as food for commercial fishes". Their conclusion was based on data from the catches, discounting the lack of data on organisms that passed through the trawl meshes. They also attributed shifts in species composition and abundance only to harvesting by the fishery with no connection to changes in habitat structure of the benthic community. This conclusion is not surprising given the state of ecological knowledge at the time (Auster 1988). Many more studies, using a wide range of gear types, have been conducted since that time at locations around the world.

Herein we summarize and interpret the current scientific literature on fishing impacts as they relate to fish habitat. We discuss these studies within three broad subject areas: effects on structural components of habitat, effects on benthic community structure, and effects on ecosystem level processes. The interpretation is based on commonalities and differences between studies. Fishing gear types are discussed as general categories (e.g., trawls, dredges, fixed gear). The necessity for these generalizations is based on two overriding issues: (1) many studies do not specify the exact type and configuration of fishing gear used, and (2) each study reports on a limited range of habitat types. We recognize that individual units of fishing effort with different gears will produce a gradient of results (e.g., a scallop dredge or beam trawl will produce a greater force on the seafloor than a small whiting trawl, tickler chains will produce a different effect than rock-hopper or "street-sweeper" gear on the groundline of a trawl, king crab pots are larger and heavier than pots used for American lobster). However, our interpretation of the wide range of studies is based on the type and direction of impacts, not absolute levels of impacts. We do not address the issues of bycatch (Alverson et al. 1994), mortality of gear escapees (Chopin and Arimoto 1995), or ghost fishing gear (Jennings and Kaiser 1998, p. 11-12 and references therein) as these issues do not directly relate to fish habitat and recent reviews have been published which address these subjects.

EFFECTS ON STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF HABITAT

Interpretation of Results

The environmental characteristics which define species distributions can be found at a variety of spatial and temporal scales (e.g., Langton et al. 1995). At regional scales, the seasonal variations in seawater temperature can explain annual variations in the distribution of fishes (e.g., Murawski 1993). Within regions, temporally stable associations of species have been found and tend to follow isotherms and isobaths (Colvocoresses & Musick 1984, Overholtz & Tyler 1985, Phoel 1986, Gabriel 1992, Gabriel and Tyler 1980). Species groups are sometimes seasonal and may split or show changes in composition that correlate with temperature patterns. Nested within regional scale patterns are small-scale variations in abundance and distribution of demersal fishes
which can be partially attributed to variation in topographic structure. In contrast, habitat associations for coral reef fishes, kelp bed fishes, seagrass fishes, and rock reef fishes are relatively clear (e.g., Ebeling and Hixon 1991, Heck and Orth 1980, Sale 1991). The entire demersal stage of the life history of many species associated with these unique habitats have obligate habitat requirements or demonstrate recruitment bottlenecks. Without the specific structural components of habitat, the populations of fishes with these habitat requirements would not persist. However, a gradient of habitat dependence can be found in the range of demersal fish species globally. For example, early benthic phase Atlantic cod require cobble or similar complex bottom for survival but have a refuge in size, and habitat associations are more facultative as size increases (Gotceitas and Brown 1993, Lough et al. 1989, Tupper and Boutilier 1995). Other species, however, have facultative habitat associations throughout their life (e.g., Able et al. 1995, Auster et al. 1991, 1995, 1997b, Langton et al. 1995, Sogard and Able 1991, Szedlmayer and Howe 1997). These associations may increase survivorship of individuals, and may contribute to wide variations in recruitment, but they are not obligate for the survival of populations (e.g., Lindholm et al. 1998).

Habitat has been defined as "the structural component of the environment that attracts organisms and serves as a center of biological activity" (Peters & Cross 1992). Habitat in this case includes the range of sediment types (i.e., mud through boulders), bed forms (e.g., sand waves and ripples, flat mud) as well as the co-occurring biological structures (e.g., shell, burrows, sponges, seagrass, macroalgae, coral). A review of 22 studies (Table 2) all show measurable impacts of mobile gear on the structural components of habitat (e.g., sand waves, emergent epifauna, sponges, coral), when defining habitat at this spatial scale. Results of each of the studies show similar classes of impacts despite the wide geographic range of the studies (i.e., tropical to boreal). In summary, mobile fishing gear reduced habitat complexity by: (1) directly removing epifauna or damaging epifauna leading to mortality, (2) smoothing sedimentary bedforms and reducing bottom roughness, and (3) removing taxa which produce structure (i.e., taxa which produce burrows and pits). Studies which have addressed both acute and chronic impacts have shown the same types of effects.

Little has been written about the recovery of seafloor habitat from fishing gear effects. Recovery of storm caused sedentary features depends primarily on grain sizes of sediment and depth to which storm generated surge and currents occur. Some features can be reformed after seasonal or annual storm events while others will depend on larger meteorological events which occur on decadal time scales or longer. Recovery of biogenic features will depend on recruitment or immigration, depending on the spatial extent of impacts. Recovery will also depend on whether impacts are short term or chronic. For example, on coral-sponge hard bottom off the coast of Georgia, Van Dolah et al. (1987) found no long-term effects of trawling on the benthic community. After one year the sponge and octocorals that were experimentally trawled recovered with densities reaching or exceeding pretrawling levels at the study site. However, it is important to note that this study did not address chronic effects but a single tow of a roller-rigged trawl.

Few published accounts of the impacts of fixed gears on habitat have been written. Eno et al. (1996) studied the effects of crustacean traps in British and Irish waters. One experiment assessed the effects of setting and hauling pots on emergent epifaunal species (i.e., sea pens) on soft bottom. Both impacts from dragging pots across the bottom, and pots resting for extended periods on sea pens, showed the group was able to mostly recover from such disturbances. Limited qualitative observations of fish traps, longlines, and gillnets dragged across the seafloor during set and recovery showed results similar to mobile gear such that some types of epibenthos was dislodged; especially emergent species such as erect sponge and coral (High 1992, SAFMC 1991). While the area impacted per unit of effort is smaller for fixed gear than with mobile fishing gear, the types of damage to emergent benthos appear to be similar (but not necessarily equivalent per unit effort). Quantitative studies of fixed gear effects, based on acute and chronic impacts, have not been conducted.

The issue of defining pelagic habitats and elucidating effects of fishing is difficult because these habitats are poorly described at the scales that allow for measurements of change.
based on gear use. While pelagic habitat can be defined based on temperature, light intensity, turbidity, oxygen concentration, currents, frontal boundaries, and a host of other oceanographic parameters and patterns, there are few published data that attempt to measure change in any of these types of parameters or conditions concurrently with fishing activity and associations of fishes. Kroger and Guthrie (1972) showed that menhaden (Brevortia patronus and B. tyrannus) were subjected to greater predation pressure, at least from visual predators, in clear versus turbid water, suggesting that turbid habitats were a greater refuge from predation. This same type of pattern was found for menhaden in both naturally turbid waters and in the turbid plumes generated by oyster shell dredging activities (Harper and Hopkins 1976). However, no work has been published that addresses the effects of variation in time and space of the plumes or the effects using turbid water refugia on feeding and growth. There are also examples of small scale aggregations of fishes with biologic structures in the water column and at the surface.

Aggregations of fishes may have two effects on predation patterns by: (1) reducing the probability of predation on individuals within the aggregation, and (2) providing a focal point for the activities of predators (a cue that fishermen use to set gear). For example, small fishes aggregate under mats of Sargassum (e.g., Moser et al. 1998) where high density vessel traffic may dis-aggregate mats. Also, fishes have been observed to co-occur with aggregations of gelatinous zooplankton and pelagic crustaceans (Auster et al. 1992, Brodeur in press). Gelatinous zooplankton are greatly impacted as they pass through the mesh of either mobile or stationary gear (unpublished observations), which may reduce the size and number of aggregations and disperse associated fishes. These changes could reduce the value of aggregating, resulting in increased mortality or reduced feeding efficiency.

Implications for Management

Commonalities in gear impact studies on habitat structure allow for the production of a conceptual model to visualize the patterns in gear impacts across a gradient of habitat types. Auster et al. (1998) developed a hierarchical, categorical, approach for classifying habitats on the cold temperate/boreal continental shelf of the northwest Atlantic. This type of classification scheme has proven very useful in habitat management for freshwater fisheries. The range of habitat types were condensed into eight habitat categories increasing from simple to complex (Table 3). For example, currents form sand wave fields which provide shelter for fish from high current speeds. This reduces the energy needed to maintain position on the bottom and permits ambush predation of drifting demersal zooplankton. Storm currents sort loose sediments and deposit shells and cobbles in the troughs of sand waves; the small crevices providing an ephemeral habitat for small fishes and crustaceans. Cobble bottoms provide interstices for shelter sites but also provide a hard surface for epibenthic organisms such as sponges and bryozoans to attach. These emergent epifauna provide additional cover value. Scattered boulders also provide shelter from currents but boulder piles provide deep crevices for shelter required by some species such as redfish (Sebastes spp.).

Habitat value for each habitat type does not increase linearly. Each category was assigned a numerical score based on its level of physical complexity (note that this model does not include effects of fishing on biodiversity per se). Categories 1 through 5 increase linearly. Staring at category 6, the score of 10 is based on a score of 5 (i.e., the score for cobble) from the previous category plus 5 for dense emergent epifauna which was assumed to double the cover value of small interstices alone. Category 7 is scored for cobble and emergent epifauna (i.e., 10) plus 2 more points for shallow boulder crevices and refuges from current. Finally, category 8 is scored as 15 because of the presence of shallow crevices and current refuges, previously scored as 12, plus deep crevices scored as 3. These scores are therefore the starting points representing unimpacted habitats.

A pictorial representation of the model, shown in Figure 1, indicates the response of the range of seafloor habitat types to increases in fishing effort (Auster MS1997). The range of fishing effort increases from left to right along the x axis with 0 indicating no gear impacts and 4 indicating the maximum effort required to produce the greatest possible change in habitat.
complexity. The numbers at present are dimensionless because better data are needed on the effects of various gear types, at various levels of effort, over specific habitats. The y axis is a comparative index of habitat complexity. Each habitat type starts at the value of the habitat in an unimpacted condition. The habitat categories are representative of the common types found across the northeast U.S. continental shelf and are likely to be found on most other continental shelf areas of the world. The responses to different types of bottom contact fishing gear are assumed to be similar.

This model shows a range of changes in habitat complexity based on gear impacts. It predicts reductions in the complexity provided by bedforms from direct smoothing by the gear. Biogenic structures are reduced by a number of mechanisms such as direct gear impacts as well as removal of organisms which produce structures (e.g. crabs that produce burrows). There are some habitats where the model shows no significant reductions, such as gravel areas with very little epifaunal settlement. While mobile gear would overturn pebbles and cobbles, the actual structural integrity of the habitat would not be reduced (although organisms on the undersides of cobbles are exposed to predation). However, the value of cobble pavements are greatly reduced when epifauna are removed, as biogenic structures provides additional cover. Gear can move boulders and still provide some measure of hydraulic complexity to the bottom by providing shelter from currents. On the other hand, piles of boulders can be dispersed by large trawls and this reduces the cover value for crevice dwellers. The model should be widely applicable as the habitat types are widely distributed worldwide and the impacts are consistent with those described in the literature.

This conceptual model serves two purposes. First, it provides a holistic summary of the range of gear impacts across a range of habitat types. The end points in the model are based on empirical data and observations and should be useful for considering management actions for the conservation of fish habitat. The second purpose for developing the model is to provide a basis for future research. While it is possible to ascribe the endpoints of habitat complexity at both unimpacted and fully impacted states, the slope of the line remains unknown and the level of fishing effort required to produce specific rates of change is also unknown for all gear types. Responses may be linear or non-linear (e.g., logarithmic). Perhaps there are thresholds of disturbance beyond which some habitat types exhibit a response. Regardless, responses will most likely be habitat specific.

The impact model does not have an explicit time component. Here we add such a conceptual framework to the discussion. Cushing’s match-mismatch hypothesis (Cushing 1975) has served as one of several hypotheses which explain annual variation in larval recruitment dynamics and has been the focus of large amounts of research effort for several decades. Here we propose a similar type of match-mismatch paradigm for linking variation in the survivorship of early benthic phase fishes with the abundance epibenthic organisms, particularly those with annual life histories, which may serve as habitat. Figure 2 shows the pattern in percent cover for an idealized benthic species which produces emergent structure (e.g., hydroid stalk, amphipod tube, mussel). This type of species has widespread settlement and occurs at high densities. At the time of settlement, large areas of the seafloor are occupied by this species. Over the course of time, predation and senescence reduce the cover provided by such taxa. The timing of settlement of early benthic phase fish will greatly effect the cover value provided by the benthic taxa. In addition to natural processes, fishing gear impacts further reduce the cover value over time and can narrow the window in which particular patches of epibenthos serve as effective cover for newly settled fishes. The time scale (x-axis) and patterns in the figure were developed to show an annual pattern representative of many taxa with such life history strategies, but this pattern can also be extended in time for longer-lived organisms. Like the conceptual impact model above, the timing and changes in slope of these lines is critical for understanding the dynamics of this interaction.

Ultimately, it will be necessary to develop models which include sensitivity indices for specific habitats, communities, and key taxa based on the effects of specific gear types, levels of effort, and life history patterns (of both fish and taxa which serve a habitat function). MacDonald et al. (1996) has developed such a sensitivity index to quantify the impact of fishing
on particular epifaunal taxa in the North Sea region. The index is a function of recovery time after damage, fragility of the animal and intensity of the impact.

Lack of information on the small scale distribution and timing of fishing make it difficult to ascribe the patterns of impacts observed in field studies to specific levels of fishing effort. Auster et al. (1996) estimated that between 1976 and 1991, Georges Bank was impacted by mobile gear (i.e., otter trawl, roller-rigged trawl, scallop dredge) on average between 200-400% of its area on an annual basis and the Gulf of Maine was impacted 100% annually. Fishing effort was however not homogeneous. Sea sampling data from NMFS observer coverage demonstrated that the distribution of tows was nonrandom (Fig. 3). While these data represent less than 5% of overall fishing effort, they illustrated that the distribution of fishing gear impacts is quite variable.

Recovery of the habitat following trawling is difficult to predict as well. Timing, severity, and frequency of the impacts all interact to mediate processes which lead to recovery (Watling and Norse MS1997). For example, sand waves may not be reformed until storm energy is sufficient to produce bedform transport of coarse sand grains (Valentir and Schmuck 1995) and storms may not be common until a particular time of year or may infrequently reach a particular depth, perhaps only on decadal time scales. Sponges are particularly sensitive to disturbance because they recruit aperiodically and are slow growing in deeper waters (Reiswig 1973, Witman and Sebens 1985, Witman et al. 1993). However, many species such as hydroids and ampelecid amphipods reproduce once or twice annually and their stalks and tubes provide cover for the early benthic stages of many fish species and their prey (e.g., Auster et al. 1996, 1997b). Where fishing effort is constrained within particular fishing grounds, and where data on fishing effort is available, studies which compare similar sites along a gradient of effort, have produced the types of information on effort-impact that will be required for effective habitat management (e.g., Collie et al. 1996, 1997; Thrush et al. in press).

The role these impacts on habitat have on harvested populations is unknown in most cases. However, a growing body of empirical observations and modeling demonstrate that effects can be seen in population responses at particular population levels. For example, Lindholm et al. (1998) have modeled the effects of habitat alteration on the survival of 0-year cohorts of Atlantic cod. The model results indicate that a reduction in habitat complexity has measurable effects on population dynamics when the adult stock is at low levels (i.e., when spawning and larval survivorship does not produce sufficient recruits to saturate available habitats). At high adult population levels, when larval abundance may be high and settling juveniles would greatly exceed habitat availability, predation effects would not be mediated by habitat and no effect in the response of the adult population to habitat change was found.

Empirical studies that most directly link changes due to gear impacts on habitat structure to population responses are being carried out in Australia. Sainsbury (1987,1988, 1991) and Sainsbury et al. (in press) have shown a very tight coupling between a loss of emergent epifauna and fish productivity along the north west continental shelf. In these studies there was a documented decline in the bycatch of invertebrate epifauna in trawl catches, from 500 kg hr$^{-1}$ to only a few kg hr$^{-1}$, and replacement of the most commercially desirable fish associated with the epifaunal communities by less valuable species associated with more open habitat. By restricting fishing the decline in the fish population was reversed. This corresponded to an observed recovery in the epifaunal community, albeit the recovery for the larger epifaunal invertebrates showed a considerable lag time after trawling ceased. This work is based on a management framework which was developed to test hypotheses regarding the habitat dependence of harvested species. The hypotheses, described in Sainsbury (1988, 1991), assessed whether population responses were the result of: (1) independent single-species (intraspecific) responses to fishing and natural variation, (2) interspecific interactions such that as specific populations are reduced by fishing, non-harvested populations experienced a competitive release, (3) interspecific interactions such that as non-harvested species increase from some external process, their population inhibits the population growth rate of the harvested species, and (4) habitat mediation of the carrying capacity for each species, such that gear induced habitat changes alter the carrying capacity of the area. This is a primary example of adaptive management in which
regulations were developed to test hypotheses and were the basis for modifying subsequent management measures. This type of management process exemplifies management of fisheries based primarily on an understanding of ecological relationships.

EFFECTS ON COMMUNITY STRUCTURE

Interpretation of Results

Studies on the effects of fishing on benthic communities have often produced variable results regarding the impact on community structure. The reasons for these differences may include sampling strategies, use of different metrics, different methods of fishing, different functional groups of species which compose the community, and subtle differences in habitat type. Furthermore, studies have often been conducted in areas that have a history of fishing activity and therefore may not have truly undisturbed reference areas for comparison, despite the efforts of the investigator (see Hall et al. 1993, Kaiser MS1997). Changes in benthic community structure also have to be understood against a background of natural disturbance and variability (Thrush et al., in press). Bearing in mind these caveats, the literature on fishing gear impacts can be divided into short term and long term studies that reveal some common characteristics and patterns resulting from fishing on the seafloor.

An immediate reduction in the density of non-target species is often reported following impacts from mobile gear (Table 4). In assessing this effect it is common to compare numbers and densities for each species before and after fishing and/or with an undisturbed reference site. Kaiser and Spencer (1996a), for example, found a reduction in diversity and abundance of some taxa at one location in the Irish Sea where sediments were relatively stable. They reported a 58% decrease in mean abundance and 50% reduction in the mean number of species per sample. In contrast, at a location where the sediments were more mobile the impact of beam trawling was not as substantial. In other European studies, Bergman and Hup (1992) and Santbrink and Bergman (1994) have documented species and size specific differences in macrofaunal abundance and mortality, with densities decreasing for some species, and mortality increasing, after trawling but in other cases there were no observable effects. In a scallop dredging study in New Zealand two experimentally fished sites showed an immediate decrease in macrofaunal densities in comparison to corresponding reference sites (Thrush et al. 1995). In another study of scallop dredging in Australia, Currie and Parry (1994) found that the number of individuals at the dredged sites was always lower than the reference sites despite an overall increase in animal numbers, over the 88 day study, because of amphipod recruitment to both the experimental and reference areas.

Time series data sets that allow for a direct long term comparison of before and after fishing are essentially nonexistent, primarily because the extent to which the worlds oceans are currently fished was not foreseen, or because time series data collection focused on the fish themselves rather than the impact of fishing on the environment. Nevertheless, there are several benthic data sets that allow for an examination of observational or correlative comparisons before and after fishing (Table 5). Perhaps the longest time series comparisons of long-term impact of fishing on benthic community structure are the studies of Reise (1982) and Riesen and Reise (1982) in the Wadden Sea. In reviewing change for 101 species in the benthic community over 100 years Reise (1982) noted no long-term trends in abundance for 42 common species but found 11 of these species showed considerable variation. Sponges, coelenterates and bivalves suffered the greatest losses while polychaetes showed the biggest gains. Subtidally there was a decrease in the most common species from 53 to 44 while intertidally the opposite was observed, an increase from 24 to 38. Riesen and Reise (1982) examined a 55 year data set and documented increases in mussel beds and the associated fauna. They noted a loss of oysters, due to
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overexploitation, and Sabellaria reefs, because they were systematically targeted by trawlers, as well as the loss of seagrass from disease. In another European study, Pearson et al. (1985) compared changes in the Kattegatt following a 73 year hiatus in sampling. In this case, community composition had changed to the extent that there was only a 30% similarity between stations over time, with the primary shift being a decrease in sea urchins and an increase in brittle stars. They observed a general decline in deposit feeders and an increase in suspension feeders and carnivores as well as a decline in animal size. Holme (1983) also made some comparisons from data collected over an 85 year time span in the English Channel and noted changes in the benthic community which he speculated might relate to the queen scallop fishery. The results of these long term studies are consistent with the patterns found in short term studies of habitat and community structure.

Data sets on the order of months to a few years are more typical of the longer term studies on fishing impacts on benthic community structure. The impact of experimental trawling has been monitored over a series of months, for example, in the Bay of Fundy at a high energy sandy site (Brylinsky et al. 1994, Watling et al. MS1997). Trawl door marks were visible for 2 to 7 months but no sustained significant impact on the benthic community was noted. However, Watling et al. (MS1997) measured community level changes caused by scallop dredging at a lower energy muddy sand location in the Gulf of Maine. There was a loss in surficial sediments and lowered food quality of the sediments. The subsequent variable recovery of the benthic community over the following six months correlated with the sedimentary food quality which was measured as microbial populations, abundance of chlorophyll a and enzyme hydrolizable amino acid concentrations. While some taxa recolonized the impacted areas quickly, the abundances of some taxa (i.e., cumaceans, phoxocephalids and photid amphipods, nephtyid polychaetes) did not recover until food quality also recovered.

The most consistent pattern in fishing impact studies at shallow depths is the resilience of the benthic community to fishing. Two studies in the intertidal, harvesting worms and clams using suction and mechanical harvesting gear, demonstrated a substantial immediate effect on the macrofaunal community but from seven months to two years later the study sites had recovered to pre-fished conditions (Beukema 1995, Kaiser and Spencer 1996a). At nearshore subtidal depths, harvesting bay scallops in a North Carolina seagrass bed and razor clams in a Scottish sea loch, Peterson et al. (1987) and Hall et al. (1990) found little long term impact on the benthic community structure except at the most intense level of fishing. After 40 days, the loch showed no effect of fishing and in the lightly harvested seagrass bed, with <25% seagrass biomass removal, recovery occurred within a year. In the seagrass bed where harvesting was most extensive, with 65% of the seagrass biomass removed, recovery was delayed for two years and after four years preharvesting biomass levels were still not obtained. In a South Carolina estuary, Van Dolah et al. (1991) found no long term effects of trawling on the benthic community. The study site was assessed prior to and after the commercial shrimp season and demonstrated variation over time but no trawling effects per se. Other studies of pre and post impacts from mobile gear on sandy to hard bottoms have generally shown similar results (Currie and Parry 1996, Gibbs et al. 1980, MacKenzie 1982) with either no or minimal long term impact detectable.

Other benthic communities show clear effects which can be related to fishing. Collie et al. (1997) has, for example, characterized disturbed and undisturbed sites on Georges Bank, based on fishing records, and found more individuals, a greater biomass and greater species richness and diversity in the undisturbed areas. Engel and Kvitek (MS 1997) also found more fish and epifaunal invertebrates in a lightly trawled area compared to a more heavily trawled site over a three year period off Monterey, California. Perhaps the most convincing cases of fishing related impacts on the benthic community are from studies in Northern Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand. Brown (1989) has reported the demise of the horse mussel community in Strangford Loch with the development of the queen scallop fishery. The horse mussel beds were essentially unchanged from 1857 until 1980 when the trawl fishery for scallops was initiated. Along the northwest Australian shelf Bradstock and Gordon (1983) and Sainsbury (1987, 1988, 1991) and Sainsbury et al. (in press) describe a habitat dependent fishery with fish biomass being
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related to the coral-like byrozoan community. With the demise of this epifaunal community there was a shift in fish species composition to less commercially desirable species. In experimentally closed areas there has been a recovery of fish and an increase in the small benthos but, based on settlement and growth of larger epifaunal animals, it may take 15 years for the system to recover. Finally, sampling of fishing grounds along a gradient of fishing effort in the Hauraki Gulf of New Zealand has shown that 15-20% of the variability in the macrofauna community could be attributed to fishing (Thrush et al. in press). As fishing effort decreased there were increases in the density of large epifauna, long-lived surface dwellers (with a decrease in deposit feeders and small opportunistic species), and in the Shannon-Weiner diversity index. These results validated most predictions made from small scale studies, suggesting that there is value in continuing such work. However, where data are available to determine patterns of fishing effort at the scale of fishing grounds, large scale studies such as this are beneficial for validating predictions from limited experimental work and, most importantly, establishing the range of ecological effects along a gradient of disturbance (i.e., produced by resource extraction and variable intensity of impacts from particular harvesting methods. Ultimately, such data can be used to develop strategies for the sustainable harvest of target species while maintaining ecosystem integrity.

Implications for Management

Clearly the long term effects of fishing on benthic community structure are not easily characterized. The pattern that does appear to be emerging from the available literature is that communities that are subject to variable environments and are dominated by short-lived species are fairly resilient. Depending on the intensity and frequency of fishing, the impact of such activity may well fall within the range of natural perturbations. In communities which are dominated by long-lived species in more stable environments the impact of fishing can be substantial and longer term. In cases such as described for Strangford Loch and the Australian shelf, recovery from trawling will be on the order of decades. In many areas, these patterns correlate with shallow and deep environments. However, water depth is not the single variable that can be used to characterize fishing impacts. There are few studies that describe fishing impacts on shallow mud bottom communities or deep areas at the edge of the continental shelf. Such sites would be expected to be relatively low energy zones, similar to areas in Strangford Loch, and might not recover rapidly from fishing disturbances. Studies in these relatively stable environments are required to pattern fishing impacts over the entire environmental range but, in anticipation of such results, it is suggested here that one should expect a tighter coupling between fish production and benthic community structure in the more stable marine environments.

EFFECTS ON ECOSYSTEM PROCESSES

Interpretation of Results

A number of studies indicate that fishing has measurable effects on ecosystem processes, but it is important to compare these with natural process rates at appropriate scales. Both primary production and nutrient regeneration have been shown to be affected by fishing gear. These studies are small in scope and it is difficult to apply small-scale studies at the level of entire ecosystems. Understanding that processes are affected confirms the need to understand the relative changes in vital rates caused by fishing and the spatial extent of the disturbances.

Disturbance by fishing gear in relatively shallow depths (i.e., 30-40 m depth) can reduce primary production by benthic microalgae. Recent studies in several shallow continental shelf habitats have shown that primary production by a distinct benthic microflora can be a significant portion of overall primary production (i.e., water column plus benthic primary production; Cahoon and Cooke, 1992; Cahoon et al., 1990; 1993). Benthic microalgae production supports a
variety of consumers, including demersal zooplankton (animals that spend part of each day on or in the sediment and migrate regularly into the water; Cahoon and Tronzo, 1992). Demersal zooplankton include harpacticoid copepods, amphipods, mysids, cumaceans, and other animals that are eaten by planktivorous fishes and soft bottom foragers (Thomas and Cahoon, 1993).

The effects of fishing were elucidated at Stellwagen Bank in the northwest Atlantic during 1991 and 1994. Measurements showed that a productive benthic microflora exists on the crest of the Bank (Cahoon et al., 1993; Cahoon et al., unpubl. data) but demersal zooplankton was low in comparison to the other shelf habitats and lower than would be expected given the available food supply (Cahoon et al. 1995). Several explanations can be advanced for this anomalously low abundance. These include competitive or predatory interactions with meiofauna or the holozoooplankton, disturbance by macrobenthos, intense predation by planktivorous fishes, and physical disturbance by mobile fishing gear. Many demersal zooplankters appear to construct and/or inhabit small burrows or capsules made of accreted or agglutinated sand. These formations provide shelter for demersal zooplankters in a habitat otherwise devoid of structure. Many small biogenic structures were observed on the sediment surface and even gentle handling by divers destroyed them easily. Movement by divers and an ROV caused demersal zooplankters to exhibit escape responses. Events that disturb the bottom, particularly such relatively powerful events as storms and towing mobile fishing gear along the sediment surface, must destroy these delicate habitat features. Disturbance of demersal zooplankters may result in increased predation which reduces local populations of zooplankters. Juvenile fish that feed on these taxa may require greater times and longer distances away from benthic shelter sites to forage in the water column in order to capture prey, exposing themselves to greater predation risk (Walters and Juanes 1993).

Recovery rates of populations of benthic primary producers are not well known. Brylinski et al. (1994) showed that trawling had significant effects on benthic diatoms, but recovery occurred at all stations after about 30 days. The experimental sites which were trawled were in the intertidal in the Bay of Fundy. Trawling occurred during high tides and sampling at low tide. It is important to note that light intensity (and spectral composition) in this experiment are much greater than at sites where trawling normally occurs; where seawater constantly overlays the substrate.

Experimental measurements from scallop dredge and otter trawl impacts off coastal Maine showed that dragging can both resuspend and bury labile organic matter (Mayer et al. 1991). Burial shifts the decomposition and availability from aerobic eucaryotic-microbial pathways to anaerobic pathways. Short term effects may include shifts from metazoan communities which support harvested species (e.g., meiofauna-polychaetes-flounders) toward anaerobic microbial respiration. Studies by Watling et al. (MS1997) empirically demonstrate these short term trends. Longer term effects of chronic dragging and burial are difficult to predict.

Reimann and Hoffmann (1991) measured the short term effects of mussel dredging and bottom trawling off Denmark in a shallow coastal marine system. Dredging and trawling increased suspended particulates immediately to 1361% and 960-1000% respectively, above background. Oxygen decreased and nutrients such as ammonia and silicate increased. Dyekjaer et al. (1995) calculated the annual effects of mussel dredging in the same region. The total annual release of suspended particles during dredging is relatively minor when compared with total wind-induced resuspension. Similarly, the release of nutrients is minor when compared with the nutrient loading from land runoff. However, local effects may be significant when near bottom dissolved oxygen concentrations are low and reduced substances are resuspended, depending upon the depth of stratification, water flow rates, and the number of dredges operating simultaneously.

Direct movement of fishing gear over and through the sediment surface can change sediment grain size characteristics, change suspended load, and change the magnitude of sediment transport processes. Churchill (1989) showed that trawling could resuspend sediments on the same magnitude as storms and can be the primary factor regulating sediment transport.
over the outer continental shelf in areas where storm related currents and bottom stresses are weak. Gear induced resuspension of sediments can potentially have important impacts on nutrient cycling (Pilskaln et al. MS1997). Open continental shelf environments typically receive approximately half of their nutrients for primary production from sediment resuspension and pore water exchange. The nutrients are produced from the microbial based decay of organic matter and remineralization within sediments. Changes in rates of resuspension from periodic to steady pulses of nutrients (e.g., nitrate fluxes), caused by gear disturbance to the seafloor, can shift phytoplankton populations from picoplankton towards diatoms which may ultimately be beneficial for production of harvested species, while changes in nutrient ratios may stimulate harmful algal blooms.

Implications for Management

The disturbances caused by fishing to benthic primary production and organic matter dynamics are difficult to predict. Semi-closed systems such as bays, estuaries, and fjords are subject to such effects at relatively small spatial scales. Open coastal and outer continental shelf systems can also experience perturbations in these processes. However, the relative rates of other processes may minimize the effects of such disturbances depending upon the level of fishing effort.

Mayer et al. (1991) discuss the implications of organic matter burial patterns in sediments versus soils. Their results are similar to organic matter patterns found in terrestrial soils. Sediments are essentially part of a burial system while soils are erosional. While gear disturbance can enhance remineralization rates by shifting from surficial fungal dominated communities to subsurface communities with dominant bacterial decomposition processes, burial caused by gear disturbance might also enhance preservation if material is sequestered in anaerobic systems. Given the importance of the carbon cycling in estuaries and on continental shelves to the global carbon budget, understanding the magnitude of effects caused by human disturbances on primary production and organic matter decomposition will require long term studies as have been conducted on land.

DISCUSSION

Direct Alteration of Food Webs

In heavily fished areas of the world it is undeniable that there are ecosystem level effects (Gislason, 1994; Fogarty and Murawski 1998) and that shifts in benthic community structure have occurred. The data to confirm that such shifts have taken place is limited at best (Riesen and Reise, 1982) but the fact that it has been documented at all is highly significant. If the benthic communities change, what are the ecological processes that might bring about such change?

One of these is an enhanced food supply, resulting from trawl damaged animals and discarding both nonharvested species and the offal from fish gutted at sea. The availability of this food source might affect animal behavior and this energy source could influence survival and reproductive success. There are numerous reports of predatory fishes and invertebrate scavengers foraging in trawl tracks after a trawl passes through the area (Medcof and Caddy 1971, Caddy 1973, Kaiser and Spencer 1994, Ramsey et al. 1997a, b). The prey available to scavengers is a function of the ability of animals to survive the capture process, either being discarded as unwanted by-catch or having been passed through or over by the gear (Meyer et al. 1981, Fonds 1994, Rumhor et al. 1994, Santbrink and Bergman 1994, Kaiser and Spencer 1995). Studies in both the Irish and North Sea on the reaction of scavengers to a trawling event, usually involving beam trawling, are the most comprehensive. In the Irish Sea studies focused on the movement of animals over time into an experimentally trawled areas, at locations that range in sediment type from mud to gravel. Results were found to be habitat dependent (Ramsay et al.
1997a,b) and not always consistent (Kaiser and Ramsay 1997) although the general trends are that the rate of movement of scavengers into a trawled area reflects the mobility of the animals, their sensory abilities and their behavior (Kaiser and Spencer 1996b). Fish were usually the first to arrive and slower moving invertebrates like whelks and starfish, which were also attracted to the area, required a longer time to respond to the availability of damaged or dead prey. That the scavengers are feeding has been documented both by direct diver observations and analysis of stomach contents (see Caddy 1973, Rumhor et al. 1994). Stomach contents data demonstrate that fish not only feed on discarded or damaged animals, and often eat more than their conspecifics at control sites, but they also consume animals that were not damaged but simply displaced by the trawling activity, or even those invertebrates that have themselves responded as scavengers (Kaiser and Spencer 1994, Santbrink and Bergman 1994). Hence the biomass available for consumption from discards and offal are not effecting the community equally but selectively providing additional food resources for those taxa which differentially react to the disturbance created by fishing.

It is of interest to note that Kaiser and Spencer (1994) make the comment, as others have before them, that it is common practice for fishermen to re-fish recently fished areas to take advantage of the aggregations of animals attracted to the disturbed benthic community. The long term effect of opportunistic feeding following fishing disturbances is an area of speculation. In the North Sea, for example, the availability of "extra" food, either from discarded bycatch or as a more direct result of trawling induced mortality, has been suggested as one reason why the population of dab, Limanda limanda, has increased. Kaiser and Ramsay (1997) argue that the combination of predator and competitor removal by fishing together with an increased food supply has resulted in the increase in the dab population. Obviously the negative effects on the prey organisms themselves are also important and may have an equal but opposite effect on their density. Faunal changes in the North Sea have been noted with major shifts in the composition of the benthic community that can be correlated with trawling. The general decline in populations of hard bodied animals, such as bivalves and heart urchins, has been suggested to be the direct result of trawl damage with, one might speculate, this food becoming available to scavengers.

Another process that can indirectly alter food webs is alteration of the predator community by removing keystone predators. Removal of herbivorous fishes and invertebrates produced a shift in coral reef communities from coral-invertebrate dominated systems to filamentous and fleshy algae dominated (Roberts 1995 provides a synoptic review). The removal of sea otters from kelp bed communities in the western Pacific has also had cascading effects on urchin populations and the dynamics of kelp (Duggins 1980, Estes 1996). In the northwest Atlantic, Witman and Sebens (1992) showed that onshore-offshore differences in cod and wolffish populations reduced predation pressure on cancriid crabs and other megafauna in deep coastal communities. They suggest that this regional difference in predation pressure is the result of intense harvesting of cod, a keystone predator, with cascading effects on populations of epibenthos (e.g., mussels, barnacles, urchins) which are prey of crabs. American lobsters were also considered a keystone predator by controlling urchin populations, which controlled the distribution of kelp (e.g., Mann and Breen 1972, Mann 1982). Communities shifted from kelp dominated to coralline algae dominated under the influence of intense urchin predation, with concomitant shifts in the mobile species which use such habitats. A hypothesis about this shift in communities focused on the role of lobster removals by fishing, where urchins which are a primary prey of lobsters, had large population increases resulting in greater herbivory on kelp. However, Elner and Vadas (1990) brought the keystone predation hypothesis into question as urchins did not react to lobster predation by forming defensive aggregations and lobster diets were not dominated by urchins. Understanding the ultimate control of such shifts remains elusive but recent harvesting of urchins has coincided with a return of kelp dominated habitats. Other processes (e.g., annual variation in physical processes effecting survivorship of recruits, climate change, El Nino, recruitment variability of component species caused by predator induced mortality) can also result in food web changes and, while it is important to understand the underlying causes of such shifts, precautionary approaches should be considered given the
strong inference of human caused effects in the many cases where studies were focused on identifying causes.

Predicting the Effects of Disturbance

This review of the literature indicates that fishing, using a wide range of gear, produces measurable impacts. However, most studies were conducted at small spatial scales and it is difficult to apply such information at a regional level where predictive capabilities would allow us to manage at an ecosystem scale (Jennings and Kaiser 1998). Studies can be divided into those focused on acute impacts, of a single or a small number of tows, or those which focus on chronic effects. While the former type of study is most common and amenable to experimental manipulation, the latter is the type most directly applicable in the arena of habitat management. Unfortunately, few long term monitoring programs allow for an analysis of all of the appropriate metrics needed to ascertain the effects of fishing on EFH. Additionally, while there are clear effects on local and regional patterns of biodiversity, an obvious metric needed to monitor the effects of ecosystem level management, we do not have a good understanding of how communities respond to large scale disturbances. This level of knowledge is needed to separate the responses of natural versus anthropogenic caused variability.

Our current understanding of ecological processes related to the chronic disturbances caused by fishing make results difficult to predict. Disturbance has been widely demonstrated as a mechanism which shifts communities (Dayton 1971, Pickett and White 1985, Witman 1985, Suchanek 1985). While a full discussion of this area of ecology is beyond the scope of this review, general models produced from such work are useful for understanding fishing as an agent of disturbance in an ecological perspective. Assumptions regarding the role of fishing on the dynamics of marine communities generally assert that the cessation or reduction of fishing will allow populations and communities to recover. That is, recover to a climax community state as is the case in long-lived terrestrial plant communities. Succession of communities implies a predictable progression in species composition and abundance (Connell 1989, Bell et al. 1991). Such knowledge of successional patterns would allow managers to predict future community states and directly manage EFH. While direct successional linkages have been found in some communities, others are less predictable.

Two types of patterns in shifts in community states due to disturbance are illustrated in Figure 4. The first model is the traditional successional model where communities change from type A to B to C and so forth. There are empirical examples of this type of succession in soft substrate benthic communities (e.g., Rhoads et al. 1978). Succession is based on one community of organisms producing a set of local environmental conditions (e.g., enriching the sediments with organic material) which make the environment unsuitable for continued survival and recruitment but are favorable for another community of organisms. Disturbance can move the succession back in single or multiple steps, depending on the type of conditions which prevail after the disturbance. The successional stages are predictable based on the conditions which result from the organisms themselves or from conditions after a perturbation. The second type of model is disturbance mediated and lottery based (based on Horn 1976). Empirical studies of such relationships are generally found in hard substrate communities (e.g., Dayton 1971, Horn 1976, Sebens 1986, Witman 1987). Shifts in community type are produced by competition and disturbance (e.g., predation, grazing, storms, fishing gear) that can result in shifts toward community types which are often unpredictable because they are based on the pool of recruits available in the water column at the time that niche space is available.

The spatial extent of disturbed and undisturbed communities is a concern in designing and interpreting studies (Pickett and White 1985, Barry and Dayton 1991, Thrush et al. 1994). Single, widely spaced disturbances may have little overall effect on habitat integrity and benthic communities, and may show reduced recovery times as a result of immigration of mobile taxa (e.g., polychaetes, gastropods). In the ecological literature, this is a type 1 disturbance, where a small patch is disturbed but surrounded by a large unimpaired area. In contrast, type 2 disturbances are those in which small patches of undisturbed communities are surrounded by
large areas of disturbed communities. Immigration into such patches requires large scale transport of propagules from outside source patches, or significant reproductive output (and high planktonic survival and larval retention) from the small undisturbed patches. Making predictions about the outcome of disturbances even where spatial extent is known is difficult since transport of colonizers (i.e., larvae, juveniles, and adults) depends on oceanographic conditions, larval period, movement rates of juveniles and adults, time of year, and distance from source. However, as an example of disturbance effects given specific sets of conditions, it is possible to illustrate general trends in the response of biogenic habitat structure to type 1 and 2 disturbances and the population responses based on characteristics of obligate and facultative habitat users (Fig. 5). Type 1 disturbances have recovery rates that are generally faster because they are subject to immigration dominated recovery versus the dependence of larval recruitment for recovery of type 2 disturbances. Population responses to such disturbances are also variable. Obligate habitat users have a much greater response to habitat disturbance such that type 1 disturbances would produce substantial small scale effects but overall population responses would be small. Comparatively, it would be difficult to detect responses from populations of facultative habitat users because of large areas of undisturbed habitat. However, type 2 disturbances would produce large responses in obligate habitat users such that a large percentage of required habitat would be effected. Facultative habitat users would have a measurable response at population levels where habitat mediated processes are important.

The dependence of fish communities on particular habitat features is well represented in the literature on coral reef, kelp forest, and seagrass fish communities (e.g., Sale 1991, Ebeling and Hixon 1991, Heck and Orth 1980). Studies at this particular scale are generally lacking for most harvested taxa on outer continental shelves. One problem in interpreting existing studies is that we tend to compartmentalize the processes which structure these communities and not apply our general knowledge of habitat mediated processes to other fish assemblages using other habitats. In reality, fish assemblages occur in a continuum along two gradients; one of habitat complexity and the other of environmental variation (Fig. 6). Only limited numbers of species, and communities, have hard (limited) linkages between parts of the food web where gear impacts on prey communities would have obvious and easily measurable effects. Large temperate and boreal marine ecosystems are characterized by soft (flexible) linkages with most species having flexible prey requirements. Measuring effects which can be linked to changes in prey availability, and ultimately back to effects of fishing gear will be challenging in these situations. New molecular and stable isotope techniques offer the possibility for better tracking of trophic transfer of carbon and labeling of the role of particular prey taxa in secondary and tertiary production. The same can be said for effects of structural habitat change. It is difficult to detect signal changes because variability in populations are the cumulative result of many factors. Small scale field studies producing information on the patterns of survivorship and predator-prey interactions in particular habitats, laboratory tests to determine relative differences in habitat mediated survivorship under constant predator-prey densities, and numerical modeling to link the small scale approaches with population level responses provides the bridge to link small scale studies to large scale patterns.

Further Considerations for Management

Fishing is one of the most widespread human impacts to the marine environment. The removal of fish for human consumption from the world's oceans has effects not only on the target species but also on associated communities. The size specific, and species specific, removal of fish can change the system structure but, fortunately, the regions of the continental shelf which are normally fished appear to be fairly resilient. The difficulty for managers is defining the level of resilience, in the practical sense of time/area closures or mesh regulations or overall effort limits, that will allow for the harvest of selected species without causing human induced alterations of ecosystem structure to the point that recovery is unduly retarded or community and ecosystem support services are shifted to an alternate state (Steele 1996).
Natural variability forms a backdrop against which managers must make such decisions and, unfortunately, natural variability can be both substantial and unpredictable. The above discussion on the impact of fishing on marine communities does not address the role of natural variability directly but it is apparent that in many of the systems studied there is an inherent resistance to biological change. In the very long term one can expect natural variability to generate regime shifts but the challenge for natural resource managers is not to precipitate these shifts prematurely or in unintended directions.

Much of the research described herein is not at a scale that directly relates to effects on fish populations and therefore does not link directly to fishery management decisions. The research on fishing gear impacts does offer an indication of the types and direction of changes in benthic communities over large spatial scales as well as confirmation that benthic communities are dynamic and will ultimately compensate for perturbations. However, as observations show, shifts in communities are not necessarily beneficial to the harvested species. The scale of fishing is a confounding factor in management because systems are being fished to the point where recovery is delayed so long that the economic consequences are devastating. We are currently seeing this pattern in many U.S. fisheries (and many other fisheries worldwide for that matter). Because our knowledge of ecosystem dynamics is still rather rudimentary managers bear the responsibility of adopting a precautionary approach when considering the environmental consequences of fishing rather than assuming that the extraction of fish has no ecological price and therefore no feedback loop to our non-ecologically based economic system.

This review has revealed that primary information is lacking for us to strategically manage fishing impacts on EFH without invoking precautionary measures. A number of areas where primary data are lacking, which would allow better monitoring and improved experimentation ultimately leading to improved predictive capabilities, are:

1. **The spatial extent of fishing induced disturbance.** While many observer programs collect data at the scale of single tows or sets, fisheries reporting systems often lack this level of spatial resolution. The available data makes it difficult to make observations, along a gradient of fishing effort, in order to assess the effects of fishing effort on habitat, community, and ecosystem level processes.

2. **The effects of specific gear types, along a gradient of effort, on specific habitat types.** These data are the first order needs to allow an assessment of how much effort produces a measurable level of change in structural habitat components and associated communities. Second order data should assess the effects of fishing disturbance in a gradient of type 1 and type 2 disturbance treatments.

3. **The role of seafloor habitats on the population dynamics of fishes.** While there is often good time series data on late-juvenile and adult populations, and larval abundance, there is a general lack of empirical information (except perhaps in coral reef, kelp bed, and seagrass fishes) on linkages between habitat and survival, which would allow modeling and experimentation to predict outcomes of various levels of disturbance.

These data and research results should allow managers to better strategically regulate where, when, and how much fishing will be sustainable in regards to EFH. Conservation engineering should play a large role in developing fishing gears which are both economical to operate and minimize impacts to environmental support functions.

The ultimate goal of research on fishing impacts is not to retrospectively evaluate what fishing does to the environment but to predict cause and effect given a particular management
protocol. This requires the application of the conceptual models introduced in this discussion to actual management decisions and, at the same time, increasing our understanding of ecological mechanisms and processes at the level of the fish populations and associated communities. This demands, in particular, an appreciation of the importance of both the intensity and frequency of fishing impacts. Fishing should be conducted with an intensity that does not create isolated patches of communities whose progeny are required to recolonize an impacted area, if the objective is maintenance of habitat integrity. Similarly the habitat requirements of the harvested species must be taken into account to insure that harvesting strategies do not disturb habitats more frequently than is required to balance economic as well as ecological sustainability.
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Table 1. Comparisons of intensity and severity of various sources of physical disturbance to the seafloor (based on Hall 1994, Watling and Norse MS1997). Intensity is a measure of the force of physical disturbance and severity is the impact on the benthic community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABIOTIC Waves</td>
<td>Low during long temporal periods but high during storm events (to 70-80 m depth)</td>
<td>Low over long temporal periods since taxa adapted to these events but high locally depending on storm behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currents</td>
<td>Low since bed shear normally lower than critical velocities for large volume and rapid sediment movement</td>
<td>Low since benthic stages rarely lost due to currents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceberg Scour</td>
<td>High locally since scouring results in significant sediment movement but low regionally</td>
<td>High locally due to high mortality of animals but low regionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOTIC Bioturbation</td>
<td>Low since sediment movement rates are small</td>
<td>Low since infauna have time to repair tubes and burrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predation</td>
<td>Low on a regional scale but high locally due to patchy foraging</td>
<td>Low on a regional scale but high locally due to small spatial scales of high mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN Dredging</td>
<td>Low on a regional scale but high locally due to large volumes of sediment removal</td>
<td>Low on a regional scale but high locally due to high mortality of animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Alteration (Causing silt laden runoff)</td>
<td>Low since sediment laden runoff per se does not exert a strong physical force</td>
<td>Low on a regional scale but high locally where siltation over coarser sediments causes shifts in associated communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>High due to region wide fishing effort</td>
<td>High due to region wide disturbance of most types of habitat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Studies of the impacts of fishing gear on the structural components of fish habitat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Gear Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eelgrass</td>
<td>Scalloped dredge</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Comparison of reference quadrats with treatments of 15 and 30 dredgings in hard sand and soft mud substrates within eelgrass meadows. Eelgrass biomass was significantly greater in hard sand than soft mud sites. Increased dredging resulted in significant reductions in eelgrass biomass and number of shoots.</td>
<td>Fonesca et al. (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eelgrass</td>
<td>Clam rake and “clam kicking”</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Comparison of effect of two fishing methods. Raking and “light” clam kicking treatments, biomass of seagrass was reduced approximately 25% below reference sites but recovered within one year. In “intense” clam kicking treatments, biomass of seagrass declined approximately 65% below reference sites. Recovery did not begin until more than 2 years after impact and biomass was still 35% below the level predicted from controls to show no effect.</td>
<td>Peterson et al. (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eelgrass</td>
<td>Clam rakes (pea digger and bull rake)</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Compared impacts of two clam rake types on removal of seagrass biomass. The bull rake removed 89% of shoots and 83% of roots and rhizomes in a completely raked 1 m² area. The pea digger removed 55% of shoots and 37% of roots and rhizomes.</td>
<td>Peterson et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagrass</td>
<td>Trawl</td>
<td>western Mediterranean</td>
<td>Noted loss of <em>Posidonia</em> meadows due to trawling; 45% of study area. Monitored recovery of the meadows after installing artificial reefs to stop trawling. After 3 years plant density has increased by a factor of 6.</td>
<td>Guillen et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge-coral</td>
<td>Roller-rigged trawl</td>
<td>off Georgia coast</td>
<td>Assessed effect of single tow. Damage to all species of sponge and coral observed; 31.7% of sponges, 30.4% of stony corals, and 3.9% of octocorals. Only density of barrel sponges (<em>Cliona</em> spp.) significantly reduced. Percent of stony coral damage high because of low abundance. Damage to other sponges, octocorals, and hard corals varied but changes in density not significantly different. No significant differences between trawled and reference sites after 12 months.</td>
<td>Van Dolah et al. (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge-coral</td>
<td>roller-frame shrimp trawl</td>
<td>Biscayne Bay,</td>
<td>Damage to approximately 50% of sponges, 80% of stony corals, and 38% of soft corals.</td>
<td>Tilmant (1979) (cited in Van Dolah et al. 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Gear Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various tropical emergent benthos</td>
<td>Trawl</td>
<td>North West Shelf, Australia</td>
<td>Catch rates of all fish and large and small benthos show that in closed areas fish and small benthos abundance increased over 5 years while large benthos (&gt;25 cm) stayed the same or increased slightly. In trawled areas all groups of animals declined. Found that settlement rate and growth to 25 cm was on the order of 15 years for the benthos.</td>
<td>Sainsbury et al. (In press)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel pavement</td>
<td>Scallop dredge</td>
<td>Georges Bank</td>
<td>Assessed cumulative impact of fishing. Undredged sites had significantly higher percent cover of the tube-dwelling polychaete Filograna impexa and other emergent epifauna than dredged sites. Undredged sites had higher numbers of organisms, biomass, species richness, and species diversity than dredged sites. Undredged sites were characterized by bushy epifauna (bryozoans, hydroids, worm tubes) while dredged sites were dominated by hard-shelled molluscs, crabs, and echinoderms.</td>
<td>Collie et al. (1996, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobble-shell</td>
<td>Assumed trawl and scallop dredge</td>
<td>Gulf of Maine</td>
<td>Comparison of fished site and adjacent closed area. Statistically significant reduction in cover provided by emergent epifauna (e.g., hydroids, bryozoans, sponges, serpulid worms) and sea cucumbers.</td>
<td>Auster et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>Beam trawl</td>
<td>Irish Sea</td>
<td>An experimental area was towed 10 times. Density of epifauna (e.g., hydroids; soft corals, Alcyonium digitatum) was decreased approximately 50%.</td>
<td>Kaiser and Spencer (1996a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Gear Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder-Gravel</td>
<td>Roller-rigged trawl</td>
<td>Gulf of Alaska</td>
<td>Comparisons of single low trawled lane with adjacent reference lane. Significant reductions in density of structural components of habitat (two types of large sponges and anthozoans). No significant differences in densities of a small sponge and mobile invertebrate fauna. 20.1% boulders moved or dragged. 25% of ophiuroids (<em>Amphiophiuera ponderosa</em>) in trawled lanes were crushed or damaged compared to 2% in reference lanes.</td>
<td>Freese et al. (In prep.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel over sand</td>
<td>Scallop dredge</td>
<td>Gulf of St. Lawrence</td>
<td>Assessed effects of single tows. Suspended fine sediments and buried gravel below the sediment-water interface. Overturns boulders.</td>
<td>Caddy (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>Gear Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryozoan beds (on sand and cobble)</td>
<td>Otter trawl and roller-rigged trawl</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Qualitative comparison of closed and open areas. Two bryozoans produce &quot;coral-like&quot; forms and provide shelter for fishes and their prey. Comparisons of fished site with reference sites and prior observations from fishes show reduced density and size of colonies.</td>
<td>Bradstock and Gordon (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mussel beds</td>
<td>Otter trawl</td>
<td>Strangford Lough, Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Comparison of characteristics of trawled and untrawled <em>Modiolus modiolus</em> beds as pre and post impacts of a trawl. Trawled areas, confirmed with sidescan sonar, showed mussel beds disconnected with reductions in attached epibenthos. The most impacted sites were characterized by few or no intact clumps, mostly shell debris, and sparse epifauna. Trawling resulted in a gradient of complexity with flattened regions at the extreme. Immigration of <em>Nephrurus</em> into areas previously dominated by <em>Modiolus</em> may result in burial of new recruits due to burrowing activities; precluding a return to a functional mussel bed habitat.</td>
<td>Magorrian (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-mud</td>
<td>Trawl and scallop dredge</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand</td>
<td>Comparisons of 18 sites along a gradient of fishing effort (i.e., heavily fished sites through unfished reference sites). A gradient of increasing large epifaunal cover correlated with decreasing fishing effort.</td>
<td>Thrush et al. (In press)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Gear Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft sediment</td>
<td>Scallop dredge</td>
<td>Port Phillip Bay, Australia</td>
<td>Compared reference and experimentally towed sites in BACI designed experiment. Bedforms consisted of cone shaped callianasid mounds and depressions prior to impact. Depressions often contained detached seagrasses and macroalgae. Only dredged plot changed after dredging. Eight days after dredging the area was flattened; mounds were removed and depressions filled. Most callianasids survived and density did not change in 3 mo following dredging. One month post impact, seafloor remained flat and dredge tracks distinguishable. Six months post impact mounds and depressions were present but only at 11 months did the impacted plot return to control plot conditions.</td>
<td>Currie and Parry (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>Beam trawl</td>
<td>North Sea</td>
<td>Observations of effects of gear. As pertains to habitat, trawl removed high numbers of the hydroid <em>Tubularia</em>.</td>
<td>DeGroot (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel-sand-mud</td>
<td>Trawl</td>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Comparison of heavily trawled (HT) and lightly trawled (LT) sites. The seafloor in the HT area had significantly higher densities of trawl tracks while the LT area had significantly greater densities of rocks &gt;5 cm and mounds. The HT area had shell debris on the surface while the LT area had a cover of flocculent material. Emergent epifauna density was significantly higher for all taxa (anenomes, sea pens, sea whips) in the LT area.</td>
<td>Engel and Kvitek (MS1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Gear Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand-shell</td>
<td>Assumed trawl and scallop dredge</td>
<td>Gulf of Maine</td>
<td>Comparison of fished site and adjacent closed area. Statically significant reduction of habitat complexity based on reduced cover provided by biogenic depressions and sea cucumbers. Observations at another site showed multiple scallop dredge paths resulting in smoothed bedforms. Scallop dredge paths removed cover provided by hydrozoans which reduced local densities of associated shrimp species. Evidence of shell aggregates dispersed by scallop dredge.</td>
<td>Auster et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand-silt to mud</td>
<td>Otter trawl with</td>
<td>Long Island Sound</td>
<td>Diver observations showed doors produced continuous furrows. Chain gear in wing areas disrupted amphipod tube mats and bounced on bottom around mouth of net, leaving small scoured depressions.</td>
<td>Smith et al. 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain sweep and roller gear</td>
<td>In areas with drifting macroalgae, the algae draped over groundgear of net during tows and buffered effects on the seafloor. Roller gear also created scoured depressions. Spacers between discs lessened impacts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Complexity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>flat sand and mud</td>
<td>areas with no vertical structure such as depressions, ripples, or epifauna troughs provide shelter from current; previous observations indicate species such as silver hake station keep on the downcurrent sides of sand waves and ambush drifting demersal zooplankton and shrimp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sand waves</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>biogenic structures</td>
<td>burrows, depressions, cerianthid anemones, hydroid patches; features which are created and/or used by mobile fauna for shelter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>shell aggregates</td>
<td>provide complex interstitial spaces for shelter; as an aside shell aggregates also provide a complex high contrast background which may confuse visual predators</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>pebble-cobble</td>
<td>also provides small interstitial spaces and may be equivalent in shelter value to shell aggregate, however shell is a more ephemeral habitat</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>pebble-cobble with sponge cover</td>
<td>attached fauna such as sponges provide additional spatial complexity for a wider range of size classes of mobile organisms</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>partially buried or dispersed boulders</td>
<td>while not providing small interstitial spaces or deep crevices, partially buried boulders do exhibit high vertical relief; dispersed boulders on cobble pavement provide simple crevices; the shelter value of this type of habitat may be less or greater than previous types based on the size class and behavior of associated species</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>piled boulders</td>
<td>provides deep interstitial spaces of variable sizes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Studies of short-term impacts of fishing on benthic communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>Gear and Sediment Type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infauna</td>
<td>beam trawl;</td>
<td>Irish Sea, U.K.</td>
<td>Assessed at the immediate effects of beam trawling and found a reduction in diversity and abundance of some taxa in the more stable sediments of the northeast sector of their experimental site but could not find similar effects in the more mobile sediments. Out of the top 20 species 19 had lower abundance levels at the fished site and nine showed a statistically significant decrease. Coefficient of variation for numbers and abundance was higher in the fished area of the NW sector supporting the hypothesis that heterogeneity increases with physical disturbance. Measured a 58% decrease in mean abundance and a 50% reduction in the mean number of species per sample in the sector resulting from removal of the most common species. Less dramatic change in the sector where sediments are more mobile.</td>
<td>Kaiser and Spencer (1996a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>megarippl es and flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>substrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starfish</td>
<td>beam trawl;</td>
<td>Irish Sea, U.K.</td>
<td>Evaluated damage to starfish at three sites in the Irish sea that experienced different degrees of trawling intensity. Used ICES data to select sites and used side scan to confirm trawling intensity. Found a significant correlation between starfish damage (arm regeneration) and trawling intensity.</td>
<td>Kaiser (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coarse sand,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gravel and shell,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>muddy sand, mud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse mussels</td>
<td>otter trawl;</td>
<td>Strangeford Lough; N.</td>
<td>Used video/rov, side scan and benthic grabs to characterize the effect of otter trawling and scallop dredging on the benthic community. There was special concern over the impact on <em>Modiolus</em> beds in the Lough. Plotted the known fishing areas and graded impacts based on a subjective 6 point scale; found significant trawl impacts. Side scan supported video observations and showed areas of greatest impact. Found that in otter trawl areas that the otter boards did the most damage. Side scan suggested that sediment characteristics had changed in heavily trawled areas.</td>
<td>Industrial Science Division. (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horse mussel beds,</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benthic fauna</td>
<td>beam trawl;</td>
<td>Irish Sea, U.K.</td>
<td>Sampled trawled areas 24 hours after trawling and 6 months later. On stable sediment found significant difference immediately after</td>
<td>Kaiser et al MS 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxa</td>
<td>Gear and Sediment Type</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivalves, sea scallop, surf clams, ocean quahog</td>
<td>scallop dredge, hydraulic clam dredge; various substrate types</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic Bight, USA</td>
<td>Submersible study of bivalve harvest operations. Scallops harvested on soft sediment (sand or mud) had low dredge induced mortality for uncaught animals (&lt;5%). Culling mortality (discarded bycatch) was low, approx. 10%. Over 90% of the quahogs that were discarded reburrowed and survived whereas 50% of the surf clams died. Predatory crabs, starfish, fish and skates, moved in on the quahogs and clams the predator density 10 tisons control area levels within 8 hours post dredging. Noted numerous &quot;minute&quot; predators feeding in trawl tracks. Non-harvested animals, sand dollars, crustaceans and worms significantly disrupted but sand dollars suffered little apparent mortality.</td>
<td>Murawski and Serchuck (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean quahog</td>
<td>hydraulic clam dredge;</td>
<td>Long Island, N.Y., USA</td>
<td>Evaluated clam dredge efficiency over a transect and changed up to 24 hours later. After dredge fills it creates a &quot;windrow of clams&quot;. Dredge penetrates up to 30 cm and pushes sediment into track shoulders. After 24 hours track looks like a shallow depression. Clams can be cut or crushed by dredge with mortality ranging from 7 to 92 %, being dependent on size and location along dredge path. Smaller clams survive better and are capable of reburrowing in a few minutes. Predators, crabs, starfish and snails, move in rapidly and depart within 24 hours.</td>
<td>Meyer et al. (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrobenthos</td>
<td>scallop dredge; coarse sand</td>
<td>Mercury Bay, New Zealand</td>
<td>Benthic community composed of small short-lived animals at two experimental and adjacent control sites. Sampling before and after dredging and three months later. Dredging caused an immediate decrease in density of common macrofauna. Three months later some populations had not recovered. Immediate post-trawling</td>
<td>Thrush et al. (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallops and associated fauna</td>
<td>Gear and Sediment Type</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scallop dredge; &quot;soft sediment&quot;</td>
<td>Port Phillip Bay, Australia</td>
<td>Sampled twice before dredging and three times afterwards, up to 88 days later. The mean difference in species number increased from 3 to 18 after trawling. The total number of individuals increased over the sampling time on both experimental and control primarily as a result of amphipod recruitment, but the number of individuals at the dredged sites were always lower than the control. Dissimilarity increased significantly, as a result of dredging, because of a decrease in species numbers and abundance.</td>
<td>Currie and Parry (1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Scallops and associated fauna</td>
<td>Otter trawl and scallop dredge; gravel and sand</td>
<td>Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada</td>
<td>Observed physical change to sea floor from otter doors and scallop dredge and lethal and nonlethal damage to the scallops. Noted an increase in the most active predators within the trawl tracks compared to outside; winter flounder, sculpins and rock crabs. No increase in starfish or other sedentary forms within in an hour of dredging.</td>
<td>Caddy (1973)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxa</th>
<th>Gear and Sediment Type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macrofauna</td>
<td>Beam trawl; hard-sandy substrate</td>
<td>North Sea, coast of Holland</td>
<td>Sampling before and after beam trawling (*hrs, 16 hrs and 2 weeks) showed species specific changes in macrofaunal abundance. Decreasing density ranged from 10 to 65% for species of echinoderms (starfish and sea urchins but not brittle stars), tube dwelling polychaetes and molluscs at the two week sampling period. Density of some animals did not change others increased but these were not significant after 2 weeks.</td>
<td>Bergman and Hup (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benthic fauna</td>
<td>Beam trawl and shrimp trawl; hard sandy bottom, shell debris and sandy mud</td>
<td>North Sea, German coast</td>
<td>Preliminary report using video and photographs comparing trawled and untrawled areas. Presence and density of brittle stars, hermit crabs, other &quot;large&quot; crustaceans and flatfish was higher in the controls than the beam trawl site. Difference in sand ripple formation in trawled areas was also noted, looking disturbed not round and well developed. Found a positive correlation with damage to benthic animals and individual animal size. Found less impact with the shrimp trawl, diver observations confirmed low level of impact although the net was &quot;festooned&quot; with worms. Noted large megafauna, mainly crabs, in trawl tracks.</td>
<td>Rumhor et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft bottom macrofauna</td>
<td>beam trawl; very fine sand</td>
<td>North Sea, Dutch Sector</td>
<td>Compared animal densities before and after trawling and looked at fish stomach contents. Found that total mortality due to trawling varied between species and size class of fish, ranging from 4 to 139% of pretrawling values. (values &gt;100% indicate animals moving into the trawled area). Mortality for echinoderms was low, 3 to 19%, undetectable for some molluscs, esp. solid shells or small animals, while larger molluscs had a 12 to 85% mortality. Burrowing crustaceans had low mortality but epifaunal crustaceans approximated 30% but ranged as high as 74%. Annelids were generally unaffected except for Pectinaria, a tube building animal. Generally mortality increased with number of times the area was trawled (once or twice). Dab were found to be the major scavenger, immigrating into the area and eating damaged animals.</td>
<td>Santbrink and Bergman (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemit Crabs</td>
<td>beam trawl</td>
<td>Irish Sea, U.K.</td>
<td>Compared the catch and diet of two species of hermit crab on trawled and control sites. Found significant increases in abundance on the trawl lines two to four days after trawling for both species but also no change for one species on one of two dates. Found a general size shift towards larger animals after trawling. Stomach contents weight was higher post-trawling for one species. Diets of the crabs were similar but proportions differed.</td>
<td>Ramsey et al. (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxa</td>
<td>Gear and Sediment Type</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Reference(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand macrofauna and infauna</td>
<td>scallop dredge</td>
<td>Irish Sea</td>
<td>Compared experimental treatments based frequency of tows (i.e., 2,4,12,25). Bottom topography changes did not change grain size distribution, organic carbon, or chlorophyll content. Bivalve molluscs and peracarid crustaceans did not show significant changes in abundance or biomass. Polychaetes and urchins showed significant declines. Large molluscs, crustaceans and sand eels were also damaged. In general, there was selective elimination of fragile and sedentary components of the infauna as well as large epifaunal taxa.</td>
<td>Eletheriou and Robertson (1992)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Studies of long-term impacts of fishing on benthic communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Type and Taxa Present</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sand; macrobenthos and meiofauna</td>
<td>2-7 months</td>
<td>Bay of Fundy</td>
<td>Experimental trawling in high energy area. Otter trawl doors dug up to 5 cm deep and marks were visible for 2 to 7 months. Initial significant effects on benthic diatoms and nematodes but no significant impact on macrofauna. No significant longterm effects.</td>
<td>Brylinsky et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz sand; benthic infauna</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>South Carolina Estuary</td>
<td>Compared benthic community in two areas, one open to trawling one closed, before and after shrimp season. Found variation with time but no relationship between variations and trawling per se.</td>
<td>Van Dolah et al. (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy; ocean quahogs</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Western Baltic</td>
<td>Observed otter board damage to bivalves, especially ocean quahogs, and found an inverse relation between shell thickness and damage and a positive correlation between shell length and damage.</td>
<td>Rumhor and Krost (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtidal shallows and channel; macrobenthos</td>
<td>100 years</td>
<td>Wadden Sea</td>
<td>Reviewed changes in benthic community documented over 100 years. Considered 101 species. No long term trends in changing abundance for 42 common species, with 11 showing considerable variation. Sponges, coelenterates and bivalves suffered greatest losses while polychaetes showed the largest gains. Decrease subtidally for common species from 53 to 44 and increase intertidally from 24 to 38.</td>
<td>Reise (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertidal sand; lug worms</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Wadden Sea</td>
<td>Studied impact of lugworm harvesting versus control site. Machine digs 40 cm gullies. Immediate impact is a reduction in several benthic species and slow recovery for some the the larger long-lived species like soft shelled clams. With one exception, a polychaete, the shorter-lived macrobenthic animals showed no decline. It took several years for the area to recover to prefishing conditions.</td>
<td>Beukema (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various habitat types; all species</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>North Sea</td>
<td>Review of fishing effects on the North Sea based primarily on ICES North Sea Task Force reports. Starfish, sea urchins and several polychaetes showed a 40 to 60% reduction in density after beam trawling but some less abundant animals showed no change and one polychaete increased. At the scale of the North Sea the effect of trawling on the benthos is unclear.</td>
<td>Gislason (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Type and Taxa Present</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand; macrofauna</td>
<td>73 years</td>
<td>Kattegatt</td>
<td>Compared benthic surveys form 1911-1912 with 1984. Community composition has changed with only approximately 30% similarity between years at most stations. Primary change was a decrease in sea urchins and increase in brittle stars. Animals were also smaller in 1984. Deposit feeders have decreased while suspension feeders and carnivores have increased.</td>
<td>Pearson et al. (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtidal shallows and channels; Macrofauna</td>
<td>55 years</td>
<td>Wadden Sea, Germany</td>
<td>Documented increase in mussel beds and associated species such as polychaetes and barnacles when comparing benthic survey data. Noted loss of oyster banks, Sabellaria reefs and subtidal sea grass beds. Oysters were overexploited and replaced by mussels; Zostera lost to disease. Conclude that major habitat shifts are the result of human influence.</td>
<td>Riesen and Reise (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 stations; Ocean Quahogs</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Southern North Sea, Europe</td>
<td>Arctica valves were collected from 146 stations in 1991 and the scars on the valve surface were dated, using internal growth bands, as an indicator of the frequency of beam trawl damage between 1959 and 1991. Numbers of scars varied regionally and temporally and correlated with fishing.</td>
<td>Witbaard and Klein (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various habitats; Macrofauna</td>
<td>85 years</td>
<td>Western English Channel, UK</td>
<td>Discusses change and causes of change observed in benthic community based on historic records and collections. Discusses effects of fishing gear on dislodging hydroid and bryozoan colonies, and speculates that effects reduce settlement sites for queen scallops.</td>
<td>Holme (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel/sand; Macrofauna</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Central California, USA</td>
<td>Compared heavily trawled area with lightly trawled (closed) area using Smith MacIntyre grab samples and video transect data collected over three years. Trawl tracks and shell debris were more numerous in heavily trawled area, as were amphipod polychaetes and oligochaetes in most years. Rocks, mounds and flocculent material were more numerous at the lightly trawled station. Commercial fish were more common in the lightly trawled area as were epifaunal invertebrates. No significant differences were found between stations in term of biomass of most other invertebrates.</td>
<td>Engel and Kvitik (MS 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Type and Taxa Present</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine sand; razor clam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barrinha, Southern Portugal</td>
<td>Evaluated disturbance lines in shell matrix of the razor clam and found an increase in number of disturbance lines with length and age of the clams. Sand grains were often incorporated into the shell suggestive of a major disturbance, such as trawling damage, and subsequent recovery and repair of the shell.</td>
<td>Gaspar et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine to medium sand; ocean quahogs</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Southern New Jersey, USA</td>
<td>Compared areas unfished, recently fished and currently fished for ocean quahogs using hydraulic dredges. Sampled invertebrates with a Smith MacIntyre grab. Few significant differences in numbers of individuals or species were noted, no pattern suggesting any relationship to dredging.</td>
<td>MacKenzie (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel, shell debris and fine mud; Horse mussel community</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Strangford Lough, Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Review paper of effects of queen scallop fishery on the horse mussel community. Compared benthic survey from the 1975-80 period with work in 1988. Scallop fishery began in 1980. Modiolus community has remained unchanged essentially from 1857 to 1980. The scallop fishery has a large benthic faunal bycatch, including horse mussels. Changes in the horse mussel community are directly related to the initiation of the scallop fishery and there is concern about the extended period it will take for this community to recover.</td>
<td>Brown (1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow muddy sand; scallops</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Maine, USA</td>
<td>Sampled site before, immediately after and up to 6 months after trawling. Loss of surficial sediments and lowered food quality of sediments, measured as microbial populations, enzyme hydrolyzable amino acids and chlorophyll a, was observed. Variable recovery by benthic community. Correlation with returning fauna and food quality of sediment.</td>
<td>Watling et al. (MS 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand and seagrass; hard shelled clams and bay scallops</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>North Carolina, USA</td>
<td>Evaluated effects of clam raking and mechanical harvesting on hard clams, bay scallops, macroinvertebrates and seagrass biomass. In sand, harvesting adults showed no clear pattern of effect. With light harvesting seagrass biomass dropped 25% immediately but recovered in a year. In heavy harvesting seagrass biomass fell 65% and</td>
<td>Peterson et al. (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel pavement; benthic megafauna</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Northern Georges Bank, USA</td>
<td>Used side scan, video and naturalist dredge sampling to characterize disturbed and undisturbed sites based on fishing activity records. Documented a gradient of community structure from deep, undisturbed to shallow disturbed sites. Undisturbed sites had more individual organisms, greater biomass, greater species richness and diversity and were characterized by an abundant bushy epifauna. Disturbed sites were dominated by hard-shelled molluscs, crabs and echinoderms.</td>
<td>Collie et al. (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand; epifauna</td>
<td>3 year</td>
<td>Grand Banks, Canada</td>
<td>Experimentally trawled site 12 times each year within 31 to 34 hours for three years. Total invertebrate bycatch biomass declined over the three year study in trawls. Epibenthic sled samples showed lower biomass, averaging 25%, in trawled areas than reference sites. Scavanging crabs were observed in trawl tracks after first 6 hours and trawl damage to brittle stars and sea urchins was noted. No significant effects of trawling were found for four dominant species of mollusc.</td>
<td>Pena et al. (MS 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand, shrimp and macrobenthos</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>New South Wales, Australia</td>
<td>Sampled macrofauna, pretrawling, after trawling and after commercial shrimp season using Smith McIntyre grab at experimental and control sites. Under water observation of trawl gear were also made. No detectable changes in macrobenthos was found or observed.</td>
<td>Gibbs et al. (1980)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Type and Taxa Present</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soft sediment; scallops and associated fauna</td>
<td>17 months</td>
<td>Port Phillip Bay, Australia</td>
<td>Sampled 3 months before trawling and 14 months after trawling. Most species showed a 20 to 30% decrease in abundance immediately after trawling. Dredging effects generally were not detectable following the next recruitment within 6 months but some animals had not returned to the trawling site 14 months post trawling.</td>
<td>Currie and Parry (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryozoans; fish and associated fauna</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Tasman Bay,</td>
<td>Review of ecology of the coral-like bryozoan community and changes in fishing gear and practices since the 1950s. Points out the interdependence of fish with this benthic</td>
<td>Bradstock and Gordon (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various habitat types; diverse tropical fauna</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>North West Shelf, Australia</td>
<td>Describes a habitat dependent fishery and an adaptive management approach to sustaining the fishery. Catch rates of all fish and large and small benthos show that in closed areas fish and small benthos abundance increased over 5 years while large benthos (&gt;25 cm) stayed the same or increased slightly. In trawled areas all groups of animals declined. Found that settlement rate and growth to 25 cm was on the order of 15 years for the benthos.</td>
<td>Sainsbury et al. (In press)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudflat; commercial clam cultivation and benthos</td>
<td>5+ years, ongoing</td>
<td>South-east England</td>
<td>Sampled benthic community on a commercial clam culture site and control area at the end of a two year growing period, immediately after sampling, and again 7 months later. Infaunal abundance was greatest under the clam culture protective netting but species composition was similar to controls. Harvesting with a suction dredge changed the sediment characteristics and reduced the numbers of individual animals and species. Seven months later the site had essentially returned to the unharvested condition.</td>
<td>Kaiser et al. (1996a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand; razor clam and benthos</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>Loch Gairloch, Scotland</td>
<td>Compared control and experimentally harvested areas using a hydraulic dredge at 1 day and 40 days after dredging. On day one a non-selective reduction in the total numbers of all infaunal species was apparent but no differences were observed after forty days.</td>
<td>Hall et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand and muddy areas; Macrozoobenthos</td>
<td>3 years; ongoing</td>
<td>German Bight, Germany</td>
<td>Investigated macrozoobenthos communities around a sunken ship that had been “closed” to fishing for three years. Compared this site with a heavily fished area. Preliminary results show an increase in polychaetes and the bivalve Tellina in the fished, sandy, area. The data does not yet allow for a firm conclusion regarding the unfished area but there is some (nonsignificant) increase in species numbers and some delicate, sensitive species occurred within the protected zone.</td>
<td>Arntz et al. (1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure Legends

Figure 1. Conceptual fishing gear impact model. The range of fishing effort increases from left to right along the x axis with 0 as a pristine condition and 4 as a maximally impacted state. The y and z axis are based on information in Table 3. The y axis is a comparative index of habitat complexity. The z axis shows the range of habitat categories from simple (bedforms) to complex (piled boulders).

Figure 2. Habitat match-mismatch paradigm which links variation in the survivorship of early benthic phase fishes with abundance of epibenthic organisms. The illustration shows a temporal pattern in percent cover for an “idealized” benthic species with emergent structure (e.g., hydroid, amphipod tubes) under conditions of natural variation (solid line) and when impacted by fishing activities (dotted line). The habitat value of such areas is dependent on the timing of recruitment of fishes in relation to settlement and subsequent mortality of epibenthos from natural and human caused sources. For example, at the time period marked A, settlement into unimpacted benthos provides greater cover for fishes than an area impacted by fishing. However, at the settlement period marked B, recruitment of epibenthos has recently occurred and the cover provided under either state is nearly identical. The settlement period marked C is similar to A, and reflects the dichotomy of natural versus fishing enhanced changes in a dynamic habitat.

Figure 3. Spatial distribution of trawl and scallop dredge tows from NMFS Sea Sampling database for 1989-1994 (April). This illustration represents a total of 14,908 tows. Note that the spatial distribution of effort is not homogeneous but aggregated in productive fishing areas.

Figure 4. Models of alternative community states. Arrows indicate direction of community shifts. A. The successional model which has relatively predictable shifts in community type. B. A lottery based model which has more stochastic, non-linear responses to disturbance.

Figure 5. Comparison of biogenic habitat structure and population responses to type 1 and type 2 forms of habitat disturbance.

Figure 6. Habitat complexity and environmental variability domain of fish assemblages as it relates to obligate and facultative habitat users. Fish assemblages occur in a continuum along the two gradients.
Figure 1. Conceptual fishing gear impact model. The range of fishing effort increases from left to right along the x axis with 0 as a pristine condition and 4 as a maximally impacted state. The y axis is a comparative index of habitat complexity.
Figure 3. Spatial distribution of trawl and scallop dredge tows from NMFS Sea Sampling database for 1989-1994 (April). This represents a total of 14,908 tows. Note that the spatial distribution of effort is not homogeneous but aggregated in productive fishing areas.
Figure 4. Models of alternative community states. Arrows indicate direction of community shifts. A. The successional model which has relatively predictable shifts in community type. B. A lottery based model which has more stochastic, non-linear responses to disturbance.
Comparatively higher rate due to high densities of larval recruits and more rapid immigration from adjacent undisturbed areas.

Comparatively lower rate due to dependence on larval recruitment, lower density of larval recruits, and small pool of immigrants from limited undisturbed patches.

In general, difficult to detect due to comparatively small area of disturbance. Obligate - Small effect if disturbances are a small % of required habitat. Facultative - No detectable effect.

In general, easier to detect due to large area where processes mediated by EFH occur. Obligate - Large effect due to disturbance of many habitat patches. Facultative - Detectable effect at populations where habitat mediated effects are dominant.

Figure 5. Comparison of biogenic habitat structure and population responses to type 1 and type 2 forms of habitat disturbance.
Figure 6. Habitat complexity and environmental variability domain of fish assemblages as it relates to obligate and facultative habitat users. Fish assemblages occur in a continuum along the two gradients.
ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT AMENDMENT

APPENDIX F

Coastal Zone Management Agency Letters
October 6, 1998

Ms. Fran Rudoff  
Maine Coastal Program  
State Planning Office  
State House Station 38  
184 State Street  
Augusta, ME 04333

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Ms. Rudoff:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. Section 6.72 (54) of Maine's Final EIS addresses fisheries resources. Maine's policy is to assure that activity in the coastal wetlands conserve marine fisheries through a permit procedure. Section 6.72 (57) requires Maine to conserve marine resources in coastal waters. Maine's coastal zone management laws and policies mostly address on-shore activity and development. Since the EFH amendment aims to conserve the habitat of fishery resources, as does Maine's policy, no inconsistencies arise.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Mr. David Hartman
New Hampshire Coastal Program
Office of State Planning
2 ½ Beacon Street
Concord, NH 03301

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Mr. Hartman:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. New Hampshire's coastal program policy #7(2) aims to: conserve, manage, maintain, restore, and enhance the fish of the state's waters. Also included in New Hampshire's coastal laws is Section 483-B:2 (VII) which mandates the protection of commercial fishing. The EFH amendment is consistent with the policy and laws of New Hampshire because it aims to conserve the habitat of fishery resources.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard
Executive Director

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Ms. Peg Brady  
Massachusetts Coastal Program  
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs  
100 Cambridge Street, 20th Floor  
Boston, MA 02202  

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination  

Dear Ms. Brady:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. The EFH amendment agrees with the objectives in Massachusetts' 1997 Ocean Resources Policy #1 to minimize adverse impacts upon the coastal and marine environment.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director  

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Mr. Grover Fugate
Rhode Island Coastal Resources Council
Oliver H. Stedman Office Building
4808 Tower Hill Road
Wakefield, RI 02879

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Mr. Fugate:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. Section 300.11 of Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Program is the only part of the policy that directly addresses fisheries. As a section that permits and regulates aquaculture, it does not overlap with the EFH amendment; thus there is not inconsistency.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard
Executive Director

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Mr. Todd Ouellette  
Office of Long Island Sound Programs  
Department of Environmental Protection  
79 Elm Street  
Hartford, CT  06106  

RE:  Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination  

Dear Mr. Ouellette:  

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. The Connecticut's Coastal Zone Management Program objective is to coordinate planning and regulatory activities of public agencies at all levels of government to insure maximum protection of coastal resources while minimizing conflicts and disruptions of economic development (Section 22(a)(9)). This objective is consistent with the EFH amendment, because the FMP aims to conserve the habitat of fishery resources.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Mr. George Stafford
New York Division of Coastal Resources
41 State Street
Albany, NY 12231

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Mr. Stafford:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. Policy 9 of the New York Coastal Zone Management Program calls for efforts to increase use of fish in freshwater and marine areas. Among the considerations it provides are considerations as to whether an action will impede future utilization of the State's recreational fish resources. Policy 10 provides for further development of commercial fish occurring within the context of sound fishery management principles. These measures have consistent goals and intended results as the EFH amendment.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard
Executive Director

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Mr. Lawrence J. Torok  
Division of Coastal Resources  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection  
401 East State Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625  

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Mr. Torok:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director

enclosure
Ms. Sarah J. Cooksey  
Delaware DNREC  
89 Kings Highway  
Dover, DE  19903

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Ms. Cooksey:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. The Coastal Waters Management Policy is Section 5.A.3 of the Delaware Coastal Program Implementation Plan (CPIP). Among the "Specific CMP Policies for Coastal Waters Management," the state maintains and protects beneficial uses of the coastal waters including boating and fishing. Included within this policy is the objective to maintain water quality at a level to support the propagation of fish species. The CPIP also states that the wise use and enjoyment of fish is encouraged. The EFH amendment is consistent with the policy and laws of Delaware because it aims to conserve the habitat of fishery resources.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director

enclosure
Ms. Gwynne Schultz  
Coastal Zone Management Division  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Tawes State Office Building, E-3  
580 Taylor Ave.  
Annapolis, MD 21401  

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Ms. Schultz:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. Maryland does not have a general fish conservation policy in its Coastal Zone Management Program, however the state has aggressive coastal zone regulations to manage fish stocks. The EFH amendment appears consistent with the policy and laws of Maryland because it aims to conserve the habitat of fishery resources.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director

enclosure
Ms. Laura McKay  
Virginia Coastal Resources Management Program  
629 East Main Street  
Richmond, VA  23219  

RE:  Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination  

Dear Ms. McKay:  

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. As stated in Part I of the Coastal Resources Management Program Final EIS, Virginia has implemented its own fisheries management program that is implemented by the Marine Resources Commission and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries. The fishery management policy stresses the conservation and enhancement of fish resources and the promotion of commercial and recreational fisheries to maximize food production . . . particularly for future generations. Included in Part II of the EIS are the goals to minimize damage to the productivity and diversity of the marine environment resulting from the disruption of fish population balances and to improve or maintain fisheries. There appears to be no inconsistencies between Virginia regulations and the EFH amendment.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director  

enclosure
October 6, 1998

Ms. Donna D. Moffitt  
North Carolina Division of Coastal Management  
P.O. Box 27687  
Raleigh, NC  27611  

RE: Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Ms. Moffitt:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. The Coastal Zone Management Program designated fishery management to the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission (Fisheries Commission). Statute 143B-289.51 provides that the Fisheries Commission has the authority to implement law relating to coastal fishing and fisheries. Among its duties, the Fishery Commission must manage, restore, develop, conserve and regulate the marine resources; and implement management measures regarding marine fisheries consistent with authority conferred on North Carolina by the federal government. Statute 113-134.1 further directs the Fishery Commission to exercise regulatory authority over the conservation of marine fisheries. There appears to be no inconsistencies between North Carolina regulations and the EFH amendment.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard  
Executive Director

closure
October 6, 1998

Mr. E. James Tabor
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Coastal Zone Management Program
P.O. Box 8555
Harrisburg, PA  17015

RE:  Essential Fish Habitat FMP Amendment Consistency Determination

Dear Mr. Tabor:

The New England Fishery Management Council is submitting the Essential Fish Habitat Amendment to its fishery management plans (FMPs) to the Secretary of Commerce for approval under Section 304 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. This document serves as Amendment #11 to the Northeast Multispecies FMP, Amendment #9 to the Sea Scallop FMP, Amendment #1 to the Monkfish FMP, Amendment #1 to the Atlantic Salmon FMP, and components of the proposed Atlantic Herring FMP.

Enclosed is a copy of the amendment which designates essential fish habitat (EFH) for eighteen Council-managed species and identifies the major fishing and non-fishing related threats to EFH. The amendment contains Council recommendations regarding conservation and enhancement measures designed to protect EFH, and research and information needs identified to improve the designation and assessment of impacts to EFH. Based on information provided by your office in the past, it appears that the state reserves the responsibility to have its agencies review consistency determinations vis-à-vis the appropriate core laws. By way of this letter and the enclosed documents, we believe that we have fulfilled our obligation under your procedure.

We have reviewed the amendment in light of your coastal zone management plan and applicable regulations. Chapter 57 of Pennsylvania Fishing and Boating Regulations addresses fisheries policy. The general policy of the state is to protect, conserve, and enhance the quality and diversity of the fishery resources. To achieve that objective, the State Fishing and Boating Commissioner is assigned to manage self-sustaining fish populations as a renewable natural resource. Since the EFH amendment aims to conserve the habitat of fishery resources, as does Pennsylvania's policy, no inconsistencies arise.

To the best of our understanding we believe that the amendment will be consistent with your program. We would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible regarding our determination.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Howard
Executive Director

enclosure