



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

4055 FABER PLACE DRIVE, SUITE 201
NORTH CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29405
TEL 843/571-4366 FAX 843/769-4520
Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10
Email: safmc@safmc.net Website: www.safmc.net

George Geiger, Chairman
Duane Harris, Vice Chairman

Robert K. Mahood, Executive Director
Gregg T. Waugh, Deputy Executive Director

OVERVIEW

Joint Meeting of the Ecosystem-Based Management and Habitat and Environmental Protection Committees

September 16, 2008

Charleston Marriott

170 Lockwood Boulevard; Charleston, South Carolina

The Ecosystem-Based Management and Habitat and Environmental Protection Committees needs to: (1) Discuss recommendations from the Joint Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels; (2) Review the Fishery Ecosystem Plan and approve for 2nd round of public hearings; and (3) Review Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1 and approve for 2nd round of public hearings.

The Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels will meet Monday September 15 and their recommendations will be presented to the Committees.

BACKGROUND

FISHERY ECOSYSTEM PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE ECOSYSTEM AMENDMENT 1 DEVELOPMENT

The development of a South Atlantic Council Fishery Ecosystem Plan (FEP) (SAFMC 2007) provides the first regional opportunity to compile and review available habitat, biological, social, and economic fishery and resource information for fisheries in the South Atlantic Bight ecosystem in context. Development of the plan expands and significantly updates the SAFMC Habitat Plan (SAFMC 1998) incorporating comprehensive details of all managed species (SAFMC, South Atlantic States, ASMFC, and NOAA Fisheries Highly Migratory Species and Protected Species) including their biology and food web, and economic and social characteristics of the fisheries prosecuted in those resources. In addition, development of the FEP has initiated coordination and integration of information from other developing regional initiatives including but not limited to the Southeast Coastal Ocean Observing Regional Association (SECOORA) and the Southeast Aquatic Resources Partnership (SARP) under the

National Habitat Action Plan. The FEP development process has provided the Council with the opportunity to build on the existing comprehensive compendium of the habitat, fisheries, and ecosystem information in the South Atlantic Council's Habitat Plan. This effort has resulted in the development of a FEP that describes the South Atlantic Ecosystem and the impact of fisheries on the environment. The FEP also updates available information on designated Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) and EFH-Habitat Areas of Particular Concern, expands descriptions of biology and status of managed species, presents ecosystem considerations for managed species, and describes the social and economic characteristics of the fisheries in the region. In addition, it expands the discussion and description of existing comprehensive habitat research needs to include all biological, social, and economic research needed to fully address ecosystem-based management. This FEP serves as a living source document of biological, economic, and social information for all Fishery Management Plans (FMPs). All future Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements would be developed through subsequent amendments to those FMPs.

Fishery Ecosystem Plan for the South Atlantic Region encompasses the following volume structure:

FEP Volume I	Introduction and Overview of FEP for the South Atlantic Region
FEP Volume II	South Atlantic Habitats and Species
FEP Volume III	South Atlantic Human and Institutional Environment
FEP Volume IV	Threats to South Atlantic Ecosystem and Recommendations
FEP Volume V	South Atlantic Research Programs and Data Needs
FEP Volume VI	References and Appendices

This first Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment (CEA) is being supported by this FEP and updates EFH and EFH-HAPC information and addresses the Final EFH Rule (e.g., GIS presented for all EFH and EFH-HAPCs). Management actions proposed in the CEA include the establishment of deepwater Coral HAPCs to protect what is thought to be the largest continuous distribution (>23,000 square miles) of pristine, untouched, deepwater coral ecosystems in the world.

The CEA development process serves as the vehicle to move the Council to a new era of ecosystem-based management. While this first CEA focuses on deepwater coral ecosystem conservation and EFH related action, future FMP actions will be addressed by having a full review of management needs to initiate preparation of a new CEA to address all FMP amendment needs in the coming year. This effort will not only draw from and build on the biological, economic, and social information presented in the FEP, but will also address possible issues or future management actions identified in the FEP. This process will provide the Council with the opportunity to evaluate needed actions across multiple fisheries, evaluate the impacts of management, and facilitate development of FMP amendments or measures that could apply across FMPs.

While this iteration of the CEA has been focused on addressing immediate needs for deepwater coral conservation, the Council acknowledges the combined development of the FEP and CEA establishes a process to facilitate the transition from single species to ecosystem-based management.

FEP and CEA 1 Completion Schedule

Two rounds of public hearings are being held for the FEP and CEA to refine proposed actions intended to protect deepwater coral ecosystems and highlight the Council’s move to ecosystem-based management. The first public hearings were held May 7-15, 2008 to provide public input on the proposals and additional input from advisors from the golden crab and royal red shrimp fisheries. The Council selected preferred management alternatives in June 2008 for completion of a revised draft CEA including a Draft Environmental Impact Statement during the September 2008 meeting. The FEP and CEA 1 will be brought to a second set of public hearings October 27 – November 3, 2008. The Council is scheduled to approve the FEP and CEA for Secretarial review at the December 2008 Council meeting.

<p><u>October 27, 2008</u> Key Largo Grande 97000 South Overseas Highway Key Largo, Florida 33037 Phone: 305-852-5553</p>	<p><u>October 28, 2008</u> Double Tree Hotel 2080 N. Atlantic Avenue Cocoa Beach, Florida 32931 Phone: 321-783-9222</p>
<p><u>October 29, 2008</u> Bridge Pointe Hotel 101 Howell Road New Bern, North Carolina 28582 Phone: 252-636-3637</p>	<p><u>October 30, 2008</u> Hilton Garden Inn 5265 International Blvd. N. Charleston, South Carolina 29418 Phone: 843-308-9331</p>
<p><u>November 3, 2008</u> Mighty Eighth Air Force Museum 175 Bourne Avenue Pooler, Georgia 31322 Phone: 912-748-8888</p>	

The Council’s Advisory Panels will review the FEP and CEA 1 as follows:

Advisory Panel	Scheduled 2008 Meeting Date/Location
Golden Crab	September 15, 2008 in Charleston, SC
Deepwater Shrimp	September 15, 2008 in Charleston, SC
Joint Habitat and Coral	November 17-19, 2008 in Charleston, SC

COMMITTEE ACTION

1. Discuss Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel Recommendations

Roger Pugliese will review recommendations developed at the Joint meeting of Golden Crab and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels held Monday September 15.

REQUIRED COMMITTEE ACTION: Discuss the recommendations and take action as necessary.

2. Review Fishery Ecosystem Plan (Attachment 2)

Roger Pugliese will provide an overview of the 2nd round public hearing draft of the FEP.

REQUIRED COMMITTEE ACTION: Discuss the FEP Volumes and Approve for 2nd round of public hearings.

3. Review Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1 (Attachment 3)

Roger Pugliese will review 2nd round public hearing draft of Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1.

REQUIRED COMMITTEE ACTION: Discuss Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1 and Approve document for 2nd round of public hearings.

Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment 1

Description of the Alternatives Being Considered

These alternatives were identified and developed over a number of years, with input from numerous sources, and through multiple processes, including the scoping process conducted for the Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment and meetings of the Council, the Council's Habitat and Ecosystem Committees, Habitat and Environmental Protection Advisory Panel, Coral Advisory Panel, Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel, Golden Crab Advisory Panel, and Scientific and Statistical Committee.

Each alternative retained for analysis is designed to accomplish the following:

- Establish deepwater Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern.

Description of Alternatives

ACTION 1: Amend the Coral, Coral Reefs and Live/Hard Bottom Habitat FMP to Establish Deepwater Coral HAPCs

In October 2004, at a joint meeting of the Council's Habitat and Environmental Protection and Coral Advisory Panels six areas were proposed as new deepwater coral HAPCs. Subsequently the Council, at their December 2004 meeting, approved establishing the new deepwater coral HAPCs through the developing Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment. At their joint meeting in Miami in June 2006, the Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels received updated reports on recent research on the status and distribution of deepwater coral systems in the region. Based on this new information, the Panels proposed to consolidate and expand the six original areas into four. The Council subsequently voted to adopt the Panel's proposal and take action to establish the four new deepwater coral HAPCs through this Comprehensive Ecosystem Amendment. At their November 2007 meeting, the Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels recommended an additional Methane Seep Coral HAPC. In December 2007 the Council approved adding consideration of a fifth Coral HAPC the Blake Ridge Diapir (methane seep).

Alternative 1. No Action. Do not establish deepwater Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern.

Discussion

This alternative would not provide regulations to protect additional extensive deepwater coral ecosystems, however, regulations established through amendments to the Coral FMP, the Shrimp FMP and Snapper Grouper FMP, established to protect the *Oculina* HAPC, would remain in effect.

Preferred Alternative 2. Establish Deepwater Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern:

Sub-Alternative 2a. Cape Lookout Lophelia Banks HAPC;

Sub-Alternative 2b. Cape Fear Lophelia Banks HAPC;

Sub-Alternative 2c. Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace HAPC;

Sub-Alternative 2d. Pourtales Terrace HAPC; and

Sub-Alternative 2e. The Blake Ridge Diapir Methane Seep HAPC.

Discussion

In the deepwater coral HAPCs (Figure 2-1, CEA 1), no person may:

1. Use a bottom longline, trawls (mid-water and bottom), dredge, pot or trap.
2. If aboard a fishing vessel, anchor, use an anchor and chain, or use a grapple and chain.
3. Possess any species regulated by the coral FMP.
4. Fish for golden crab in designated areas without an approved VMS.

This alternative is based on the latest recommendation of the Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels supported by information presented in both the 2004 and 2006 reports (Appendix C and Appendix D, CEA 1) to the South Atlantic Council on deepwater coral habitat distribution in the South Atlantic Region. The Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels expanded their rationale and provided additional justification for these Coral HAPCs at their November 2007 meeting (Appendix B, CEA1). In addition, John Reed provided updated deepwater habitat distribution information that was reviewed in relationship to Deepwater Shrimp and Golden Crab Advisory Panel proposals presented at the March 2008 meeting.

ACTION 2: Amend the Coral, Coral Reefs and Live/Hard Bottom Habitat FMP to Create “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas” within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries

Alternative 1. No Action.

Preferred Alternative 2. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area”:

Sub-Alternative 2a. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area” in the Northern Golden Crab Fishing Zone within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries;

Sub-Alternative 2b. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area” in the Middle Golden Crab Fishing Zone within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries; and

Sub-Alternative 2c. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area” in the Southern Golden Crab Fishing Zone within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries.

Alternative 3. Move the western boundary of the proposed Northern and Middle Zone Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas west to include the proposed Shrimp Fishery Access Areas.

Discussion

The Golden Crab Advisory Panel met formally and informally between January and March 2008 to develop proposals for Council consideration that would allow the fishery to continue to operate while avoiding damaging deepwater coral habitat. The Council approved bringing the alternatives developed by the Advisory Panel to public hearing to collect additional information and input on the proposals. The Advisory Panel chairman clarified at the March 2008 Council meeting that the Panel was recommending the establishment of allowable gear areas for golden crab fishing which lie within the deepwater CHAPC versus moving the boundaries. The Council requested comment on the industry proposal to establish fishing areas where the traditional fishery has operated and can continue to operate without impacting deepwater coral habitat. The Advisory Panel provided a revised recommendation at public hearing (see Appendix K, CEA 1). Panel members collaborated with Council staff to further refine those proposals to focus operation areas on traditional fishing grounds and areas which would not impact deepwater coral habitat. In order to maximize the likelihood of success, a requirement for electronic monitoring of permitted golden crab fishing vessels (e.g., require Vessel Monitoring System) is proposed as a provision to be allowed to fish in the allowable golden crab fishing areas. The Council adopted these alternatives as preferred. The Council also, at the request of industry, added a non-preferred alternative for public hearings (Alternative 3) which is a consideration of allowing fishing for golden crab in the Shrimp Fishery Access Areas.

ACTION 3: Amend the Coral FMP to Create a “Shrimp Fishery Access Area” (SFAA) within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC boundaries.

Alternative 1. No Action. Do not create “Shrimp Fishery Access Areas” (SFAAs) within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace boundaries.

Preferred Alternative 2. Create a “Shrimp Fishery Access Area” (SFAA) (Figures 2-2, 2-3 and 2-4, CEA 1) within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC boundaries, where fishing with a shrimp trawl and/or shrimp possession is allowed by any vessel holding a rock shrimp limited access endorsement and equipped with an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS).

Alternative 3. Move the west boundary of the proposed C-HAPC 6 nautical miles to the east between the following points: (a) 30 degrees 16 minutes 35.354 seconds N and (b) 26 degrees 12 minutes 56.273 seconds

Discussion

Comments provided at public hearing were reviewed by Council and evaluated the proposals developed. The Council subsequently recommended moving alternatives proposing the movement of the CHAPC boundary to the Considered but Rejected Appendix K (CEA 1). The Council reviewed and adopted an alternative developed as a follow-up to an industry recommendation provided at public hearing. The alternative, developed through cooperation with industry and representatives of the Habitat and Coral Advisory Panels, was developed to both address fishery operation concerns and the fact that a small portion of historic traditional grounds based on VMS points and industry provided royal red shrimp trawl tracks, occurred close to the western edge of the Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms and Miami Terrace CHAPC. Alternative 2 was adopted as a preferred alternative.

ACTION 4: Amend the Golden Crab Fishery Management Plan to Require Vessel Monitoring

Alternative 1. No action. Do not require the use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any vessel with a limited access golden crab permit.

Alternative 2. Require use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any vessel with a limited access golden crab permit and approved crustacean traps fishing for golden crab within Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas within the proposed Stetson-Miami Terrace HAPC and Pourtales Terrace HAPC where fishing has occurred historically and does not impact deepwater coral habitats.

Alternative 3. Require use of an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS) by any vessel fishing with a limited access golden crab permit in the South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction.

For a person aboard a fishing vessel with a limited access golden crab permit to fish for golden crab in the EEZ in South Atlantic Council's area of jurisdiction, possess golden crab in or from the South Atlantic Council's EEZ, off-load golden crab from the South Atlantic Council's EEZ, or sell golden crab in or from the South Atlantic Council's EEZ, an approved vessel monitoring system must be on board the vessel, be in operational condition, and be turned on.

SUMMARY/COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Action 1: Amend the Coral, Coral Reefs and Live/Hard Bottom Habitat FMP to Establish Deepwater Coral HAPCs

Alternative 1 (No-action) would not meet the objectives of the amendment and have adverse biological effects. In addition, it would not prevent fisheries that may use gear that would have long-term negative impacts from developing. Alternative 2 would result in long-term positive biological effects. Of all the alternatives considered, Alternative 2 would be expected to produce the most long-term beneficial direct effects on the socioeconomic environment.

Table 2-2. Summary and comparison of alternatives for Action 1.

Action 1. Amend the Coral FMP to establish deepwater Coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern.	Biological Effects	Economic, Social, and Administrative Effects
Alternative 1. No Action. Do not establish deepwater coral Habitat Areas of Particular Concern.	Would not provide long-term protection to pristine deepwater ecosystem.	Unprotected deepwater habitats
<p>Preferred Alternative 2. Establish Deepwater Coral HAPCs</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2a. Cape Lookout Lophelia Banks HAPC;</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2b. Cape Fear Lophelia Banks HAPC;</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2c. Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace HAPC;</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2d. Pourtales Terrace HAPC; and</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2e. The Blake Ridge Diapir Methane Seep HAPC.</p>	<p>Would protect the Cape Lookout Lophelia Banks.</p> <p>Would protect the Cape Fear Lophelia Banks.</p> <p>Protection of deepwater coral habitat from the Stetson Reefs through the Miami Terrace.</p> <p>Would protect deepwater coral habitat on the Pourtales Terrace.</p> <p>Would protect unique benthic deepwater habitat</p>	<p>No impact on the rock shrimp fishery which operates shallower than proposed CHAPCs. The Wreckfish fishery does not use bottom tending gear and would be able to proceed un-impacted. There would be a minimal impact on the royal red shrimp fishery. Analyses provided by NMFS SEFSC of VMS data indicates that less than 1 % of all VMS points collected between 2003 and 2007 occurred inside of the proposed Stetson-Miami Terrace CHAPC. Industry provided vessel tracks, however, show some overlap in the area just north of the Miami Terrace, and because of fishing the edge of the 400 meter line, normal operations outside the CHAPC could be problematic. Virtually all of the impact will be eliminated with the proposed establishment of Shrimp Fishery Access Areas as proposed in Action 3. Impact on the golden crab fishery would be reduced if allowable gear areas are also established as proposed in Action 2.</p>

Action 2: Amend the Coral, Coral Reefs and Live/Hard Bottom Habitat FMP to Create “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas” within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries

Alternative 1 (No-action) while meeting the objective of the amendment to protect deepwater coral ecosystems would have a significant impact on the golden crab fishery by eliminating major operation areas in the Northern and more importantly the Middle Zone where the majority of production in the fishery occurs. Alternative 2 would meet the intent of the Council to create a regulatory structure that would allow traditional fisheries that are managed as not to impact deepwater habitat to continue. Therefore, the cooperative development of Alternative 2 would result in long-term positive biological effects as well as socio-economic benefits.

Table 2-3. Summary and comparison of alternatives under consideration for Action 2.

Action 2. Amend the Coral FMP to Establish Allowable Gear Areas for the Golden Crab Fishery in the proposed C-HAPCs.	Biological Effects	Economic, Social, and Administrative Effects
<p>Alternative 1. No Action.</p> <p>Preferred Alternative 2 Create Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas within the proposed CHAPCs:</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2a. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area” in the Northern Golden Crab Fishing Zone within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries;</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2b. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area” in the Middle Golden Crab Fishing Zone within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries; and</p> <p>Sub-Alternative 2c. Create an “Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Area” in the Southern Golden Crab Fishing Zone within the proposed Coral HAPC boundaries.</p>	<p>Would not constrain the fishery to areas of the Northern, Middle or Southern Golden Crab Fishing Zones where it would not impact deepwater coral habitat.</p> <p>The refined proposal significantly reduces the potential for impact of the Golden Crab Fishery operating in the Northern Zone.</p> <p>The refined proposal significantly reduces the potential for impact of the Golden Crab Fishery operating impact in the Middle Zone.</p> <p>The refined proposal significantly reduces the potential for impact of the Golden Crab Fishery operating impact in the Southern Zone.</p>	<p>No impact, fishery would continue to operate in area.</p> <p>Eliminate impact to fishery because measure tracks virtually all of traditional fishing operation in Northern Zone.</p> <p>Eliminate impact to fishery because measure tracks virtually all traditional fishing operation in Middle Zone. Fishermen indicate this is the most important fishing area.</p> <p>Eliminate impact to fishery because measure tracks vast majority of traditional fishing operation in Southern Zone. Virtually all the fishing occurs to the northeast and southwest of the proposed Pourtales Terrace CHAPC.</p>

Action 3: Amend the Coral FMP to Create a “Shrimp Fishery Access Area” (SFAA) within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC boundaries.

Alternative 1 (No-action) would not meet the objectives of the Amendment and have adverse biological effects. Of all the alternatives considered, Alternative 2 would be expected to produce the most beneficial direct effects on the socioeconomic environment by providing for traditional fishing operations given the knife-edge characteristics of the fishery along the west of the proposed Stetson-Miami CHAPC. Alternative 3 was one of four proposed by the deepwater Advisory Panel and brought to Public Hearings in May 2008. It was rejected as not meeting the objective of the amendment because it overlaps significant known and highly probable low and high relief deepwater coral habitats, allows the fishery to expand into non-traditional fishing grounds and would create gear conflict by allowing trawling within the major golden crab fishing area in the Middle Zone.

Table 2-4. Summary and comparison of alternatives under consideration for Action 3.

Action 3. Amend the Coral FMP to Create a Shrimp Fishery Access Area within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC	Biological Effects	Economic, Social, and Administrative Effects
<p>Alternative 1. No Action.</p> <p>Preferred Alternative 2. Create a Shrimp Fishery Access Area within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC boundaries where fishing with a shrimp trawl and/or shrimp possession is allowed by any vessel with a rock shrimp limited access endorsement and equipped with an approved vessel monitoring system (VMS).</p> <p>Alternative 3. Move the west boundary of the Stetson-Miami proposed C-HAPC 6 nautical miles to the east between the following points: (a) 30 degrees 16 minutes 35.354 seconds N and (b) 26 degrees 12 minutes 56.273 seconds N.</p>	<p>Would not prevent fishing on both high and low profile deepwater coral habitat.</p> <p>Would prevent fishing on both high and low profile deepwater coral habitat associated with Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC boundaries.</p> <p>Would allow the fishery to expand and operate in areas of both high and low profile deepwater coral habitat.</p>	<p>Would not impact fishery but would allow trawling on deepwater habitat potentially impacting other regulated (e.g., wreckfish) deepwater fish stocks.</p> <p>Would eliminate the minimal impact to the fishery. Analyses provided by NMFS SEFSC of VMS data indicates that monitoring between 2003 and 2007 shows less than 1% of all individual points occurred inside the boundaries of the proposed Stetson-Miami Terrace CHAPC.</p> <p>Would eliminate the minimal impact to the fishery but would allow fishing on known high and low profile deepwater coral habitat.</p>

Action 4: Amend the Golden Crab FMP to Require Vessel Monitoring

Alternative 1 (No-action) would not meet the objectives of the amendment or the intent that allowing fishing for golden crab in specified areas of the CHAPC is contingent upon monitoring of those vessels as was recommended by the Habitat, Coral and Golden Crab Advisors.

Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would have similar administrative and economic impacts and would result in long-term positive biological effects and socio-economic benefits.

Table 2-5. Summary of alternatives under consideration for Action 4.

Action 4: Amend the Golden Crab FMP to Require Vessel Monitoring	Biological Effects	Economic, Social, and Administrative Effects
Alternative 1. No Action. Do not require monitoring of golden crab vessels.	Would not facilitate enforcement of CHAPC and constrain golden crab fishing to areas which did not impact habitat.	If allowable gear areas for golden crab are established there would be no way to monitor the golden crab fishery.
Alternative 2. Require the use of an approved vessel Monitoring System (VMS) by any vessel with a limited access golden crab permit and approved crustacean traps fishing for golden crab within Allowable Golden Crab Fishing Areas within the proposed Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC and Pourtales CHAPC where fishing has occurred historically and does not impact deepwater coral habitat.	Would protect low and high relief deepwater coral habitat by facilitating enforcement of the Stetson Reefs, Savannah and East Florida Lithoherms, and Miami Terrace CHAPC and Pourtales CHAPC and limitation of golden crab fishing to traditional areas which did not impact habitat.	Would establish a system to monitor the golden crab fishery and verify vessels fishing in the Miami-Stetson and Pourtales Terrace CHAPCs, are fishing in allowable fishing areas to ensure they are not impacting deepwater coral habitat.
Alternative 3. Require use of an approved VMS by any vessel fishing with a limited access golden crab permit.	Would protect low and high relief deepwater coral habitat by facilitating enforcement of CHAPC and limitation of golden crab fishing to traditional areas and areas which did not impact habitat.	Would establish a system to monitor all golden crab vessels to ensure they are fishing in their zone and not impacting deepwater coral habitat.