



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

ONE SOUTHPARK CIRCLE, SUITE 306

CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29407-4699

TEL 843/571-4366 or
Toll Free 1-866/SAFMC-10

FAX 843/769-4520
E-mail: safmc@safmc.net

Web site: www.safmc.net

Louis Daniel, Chairman
George Geiger, Vice-Chairman

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

(MARCH 2003)

POLICIES FOR THE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION OF ESSENTIAL FISH HABITATS FROM ENERGY EXPLORATION, DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION

Policy Context

This document establishes the policies of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council (SAFMC) regarding protection of the essential fish habitats (EFH) and habitat areas of particular concern (EFH-HAPCs) associated with energy exploration, development and transportation. The policies are designed to be consistent with the overall habitat protection policies of the SAFMC as formulated and adopted in the Habitat Plan (SAFMC 1998a), the Comprehensive EFH Amendment (SAFMC 1998b) and the various FMPs of the Council.

The findings presented below assess the threats to EFH potentially posed by activities related to the energy development in offshore, coastal ocean and adjacent habitats, and the processes whereby those resources are placed at risk. The policies established in this document are designed to avoid, minimize and offset damage caused by these activities, in accordance with the general habitat policies of the SAFMC as mandated by law.

EFH At Risk from Energy Exploration, Development and Transportation Activities

The SAFMC finds:

- 1) That oil or gas drilling for exploration or development on or closely associated with Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) including Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live Hardbottom Habitat or Essential Fish Habitat - Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (EFH-HAPCs), or other special biological resources essential to commercial and recreational fisheries under Council jurisdiction, be prohibited.
- 2) That all facilities associated with oil and gas exploration, development, and transportation be designed to avoid impacts on coastal wetlands and sand sharing systems.
- 3) That adequate spill containment and cleanup equipment be maintained for all development and transportation facilities and, that the equipment be available on site within the trajectory time to land, and have industry post a bond to assure labor or other needed reserves.
- 4) That exploration and development activities should be scheduled to avoid northern right whales in coastal waters off Georgia and Florida as well as migrations of that species and other marine mammals off South Atlantic States.

- 5) That the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for any Lease Sale address impacts from activities specifically related to natural gas production, safety precautions which must be developed in the event of a discovery of a “sour gas” or hydrogen sulfide reserve and the potential for southerly transport of hydrocarbons to nearshore and inshore estuarine habitats resulting from the cross-shelf transport by Gulf Stream spin-off eddies. The EIS should also address the development of contingency plans to be implemented if problems arise due to the very dynamic oceanographic conditions and the extremely rugged bottom, the need for and availability of onshore support facilities in coastal North and South Carolina, and an analysis of existing facilities and community services in light of existing major coastal developments.

Energy development activities have the potential to cause impacts to a variety of habitats across the shelf, including:

- a) waters and benthic habitats near the drilling sites,
 - b) waters between drilling sites,
 - c) waters and benthic habitats in or near the sites, and
 - d) waters and benthic habitats potentially affected as sediments move subsequent to deposition in fill areas.
- 6) Certain nearshore and offshore habitats are particularly important to the long-term viability of commercial and recreational fisheries under SAFMC management and potentially threatened by oil and gas and other energy exploration, development, and transportation:
- a) coral, coral reef and live bottom habitat,
 - b) estuarine wetlands, and
 - c) submerged aquatic vegetation.
- 7) Sections of South Atlantic waters potentially affected by these projects, both individually and collectively, have been identified as EFH or EFH-HAPC by the SAFMC. Potentially affected species and their EFH under Federal management include (SAFMC 1998b):
- a) summer flounder (various nearshore waters, including the surf zone and inlets; certain offshore waters),
 - b) bluefish (various nearshore waters, including the surf zone and inlets),
 - c) red drum (ocean high-salinity surf zones and unconsolidated bottoms in the nearshore),
 - d) many snapper and grouper species (live hardbottom from shore to 600 feet, and – for estuarine-dependent species (e.g., gag grouper and gray snapper) – unconsolidated bottoms and live hardbottoms to the 100 foot contour),
 - e) black sea bass (various nearshore waters, including unconsolidated bottom and live hardbottom to 100 feet, and hardbottoms to 600 feet),
 - f) penaeid shrimp (offshore habitats used for spawning and growth to maturity, and waters connecting to inshore nursery areas, including the surf zone and inlets),
 - g) coastal migratory pelagics (e.g., king mackerel, Spanish mackerel) (sandy shoals of capes and bars, barrier island ocean-side waters from the surf zone to the shelf break inshore of the Gulf Stream; all coastal inlets),
 - h) corals of various types (hard substrates and muddy, silt bottoms from the subtidal to the shelf break), and
 - i) areas identified as EFH for Highly Migratory Species managed by the Secretary of Commerce (e.g., sharks: inlets and nearshore waters, including pupping and nursery grounds).

- 8) Many of the habitats potentially affected by these activities have been identified as EFH-HAPCs by the SAFMC. The general activity and specific fishery management plan is provided:
- a) all nearshore hardbottom areas - transportation and development (SAFMC snapper grouper),
 - b) all coastal inlets - transportation (SAFMC penaeid shrimp, red drum, and snapper grouper),
 - c) nearshore spawning sites transportation and development (SAFMC penaeid shrimps and red drum),
 - d) benthic *Sargassum* (SAFMC snapper grouper),
 - e) from shore to the ends of the sandy shoals of Cape Lookout, Cape Fear, and Cape Hatteras, North Carolina; Hurl Rocks, South Carolina; and *Phragmatopoma* (worm reefs) reefs off the central coast of Florida and near shore hardbottom south of Cape Canaveral (SAFMC coastal migratory pelagics),
 - f) Atlantic coast estuaries with high numbers of Spanish mackerel and cobia from ELMR, to include Bogue Sound, New River, North Carolina; Broad River, South Carolina (SAFMC coastal migratory pelagics),
 - g) Florida Bay, Biscayne Bay, Card Sound, and coral hardbottom habitat from Jupiter Inlet through the Dry Tortugas, Florida (SAFMC spiny lobster),
 - h) Hurl Rocks (South Carolina); The *Phragmatopoma* (worm reefs) off central east coast of Florida; nearshore (0-4 meters; 0-12 feet) hardbottom off the east coast of Florida from Cape Canaveral top Broward County); offshore (5-30 meters; 15-90 feet) hardbottom off the east coast of Florida from Palm Beach County to Fowey Rocks; Biscayne Bay, Florida; Biscayne National Park, Florida; and the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (SAFMC Coral, Coral Reefs and Live Hardbottom Habitat), and
 - i) EFH-HAPCs designated for HMS species (e.g., sharks) in the South Atlantic region (NMFS Highly Migratory Species).
- 9) Habitats likely to be affected by oil and gas exploration, development and transportation include many recognized in State level fishery management plans. Examples of these habitats include Critical Habitat Areas (CHAs) established by the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission, either in FMPs or in Coastal Habitat Protection Plans.
- 10) Recent work by scientists in east Florida has documented exceptionally important habitat values for nearshore, hardbottom used by over 500 species of fishes and invertebrates, including juveniles of many reef fishes. Equivalent scientific work is just beginning in other South Atlantic States, but life histories suggest that similar habitat use patterns will be found.

Threats to Marine and Estuarine Resources from Energy Exploration, Development and Transportation Activities

The SAFMC finds that energy exploration, development and transportation activities threaten or potentially threaten EFH through the following mechanisms:

- 1) Direct mortality and displacement of organisms at and near drilling sites,
- 2) Elevated turbidity and deposition of fine sediments down-current from drilling sites,
- 3) Elevated turbidity in and near drilling sites,
- 4) Direct mortality occurring from oil spills from pipelines or from a vessel in transit near or close to inlet areas, of larvae, post-larvae, juveniles and adults of marine and estuarine organisms, and
- 5) Alteration of long-term shoreline migration patterns (inducing further ecological cascades with consequences that are difficult to predict).

In addition, the interactions between cumulative and direct (sub-lethal) effects among the above factors certainly trigger non-linear impacts that are completely unstudied.

SAFMC Policies for Energy Exploration, Development and Transportation Activities

The SAFMC establishes the following general policies related to energy exploration, development and transportation activities and related projects, to clarify and augment the general policies already adopted in the Habitat Plan and Comprehensive Habitat Amendment (SAFMC 1998a, SAFMC 1998b):

- 1) Projects should avoid, minimize and where possible offset damage to EFH and EFH-HAPCs.
- 2) Projects requiring expanded EFH consultation should provide detailed analyses of possible impacts to each type of EFH, with careful and detailed analyses of possible impacts to EFH-HAPCs and state CHAs, including short and long-term, and population and ecosystem scale effects. Agencies with oversight authority should require expanded EFH consultation.
- 3) Projects requiring expanded EFH consultation should provide a full range of alternatives, along with assessments of the relative impacts of each on each type of EFH, HAPC and CHAs.
- 4) Projects should avoid impacts on EFH, HAPCs and CHAs that are shown to be avoidable through the alternatives analysis and minimize impacts that are not.
- 5) Projects should include assessments of potential unavoidable damage to EFH and other marine resources using conservative assumptions.
- 6) Projects should be conditioned on the avoidance of avoidable impacts, and should include compensatory mitigation for all reasonably predictable impacts to EFH, taking into account uncertainty about these effects. Mitigation should be local, up-front and in-kind, and should be adequately monitored, wherever possible.
- 7) Projects should include baseline and project-related monitoring adequate to document pre-project conditions and impacts of the projects on EFH.
- 8) All assessments should be based upon the best available science and be appropriately conservative follow precautionary principles as developed for various Federal and State policies.
- 9) All assessments should take into account the cumulative impacts associated with other energy exploration, development and transportation projects that are geographically and ecologically related.

- 10) Support application of existing standards and requirements regulating domestic and international transportation of energy products including regulated waste disposal and emissions which are intended to minimize negative impacts on and preserve environmental quality of the marine environment.

The SAFMC recommends the following concerns and issues be addressed by the MMS prior to approval of any application for a permit to drill any exploratory wells in any Lease Sales in the South Atlantic and that these concerns and issues also be included in a new EIS for any future Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Leasing Plan:

- 1) Identification of the on-site fisheries resources, including both pelagic and benthic communities, that inhabit, spawn, or migrate through the lease sites with special focus on those specific lease blocks where industry has expressed specific interest in the pre-lease phases of the leasing process. Particular attention should be given to critical life history stages. Eggs and larvae are most sensitive to oil spills, and seismic exploration has been documented to cause mortality of eggs and larvae in close proximity.
- 2) Identification of on-site species designated as endangered, threatened, or of special concern, such as shortnose sturgeon, striped bass, blueback herring, American shad, sea turtles, marine mammals, pelagic birds, and all species regulated under federal fishery management plans.
- 3) Determination of impacts of all exploratory and development activities on the fisheries resources prior to MMS approval of any applications for permits to drill in the Exploratory Unit area, including effects of seismic survey signals on fish behavior, eggs and larvae; temporary preclusion from fishing grounds by exploratory drilling, and permanent preclusion from fishing grounds by production and transportation.
- 4) Identification of commercial and recreational fishing activities in the vicinity of the lease or Exploratory Unit area, their season of occurrence and intensity.
- 5) Determination of the physical oceanography of the area through field studies by MMS or the applicant, including on-site direction and velocity of currents and tides, sea states, temperature, salinity, water quality, wind storms frequencies, and intensities and icing conditions. Such studies must be required prior to approval of any exploration plan submitted in order to have an adequate informational database upon which to base subsequent decision making on site-specific proposed activities.
- 6) Description of required existing and planned monitoring activities intended to measure environmental conditions, and provide data and information on the impacts of exploration activities in the lease area or the Exploratory Unit area.
- 7) Identification of the quantity, composition, and method of disposal of solid and liquid wastes and pollutants likely to be generated by offshore, onshore, and transportation operations associated with oil and gas exploration development and transportation.
- 8) Development of an oil spill contingency plan which includes oil spill trajectory analyses specific to the area of operations, dispersant-use plan including a summary of toxicity data for each dispersant, identification of response equipment and strategies, establishment of procedures for early detection and timely notification of an oil spill including a current list of persons and regulatory agencies to be notified when an oil spill is discovered, and well defined and specific actions to be taken after discovery of an oil spill.
- 9) Studies should include detailing seasonal surface currents and likely spill trajectories.
- 10) Mapping of environmentally sensitive areas (e.g., spawning aggregations of snappers and groupers); coral resources and other significant benthic habitats (e.g., tilefish mudflats) along the edge of the continental shelf (including the upper slope); the calico scallop, royal red shrimp, and other productive

benthic fishing grounds; other special biological resources; and northern right whale calving grounds and migratory routes, and subsequent deletion from inclusion in the respective lease block(s).

- 11) Planning for oil and gas product transport should be done to determine methods of transport, pipeline corridors, and onshore facilities. Siting and design of these facilities as well as onshore receiving, holding, and transport facilities could have impacts on wetlands and endangered species habitats if they are not properly located.
- 12) Develop understanding of community dynamics, pathways, and flows of energy to ascertain accumulation of toxins and impacts on community by first order toxicity.
- 13) Determine shelf-edge down-slope dynamics and resource assessments to determine fates of contaminants due to the critical nature of canyons and steep relief to important fisheries (e.g., swordfish, billfish, and tuna).
- 14) Discussion of the potential adverse impacts upon fisheries resources of the discharges of all drill cuttings that may result from activities in, and all drilling muds that may be approved for use in the lease area or the Exploration Unit area including: physical and chemical effects upon pelagic and benthic species and communities including their spawning behaviors and effects on eggs and larval stages; effects upon sight feeding species of fish; and analysis of methods and assumptions underlying the model used to predict the dispersion and discharged muds and cuttings from exploration activities.
- 15) Discussion of secondary impacts affecting fishery resources associated with onshore oil and gas related development such as storage and processing facilities, dredging and dredged material disposal, roads and rail lines, fuel and electrical transmission line routes, waste disposal, and others.

SAFMC Policy and Position on Previous Oil and Gas Exploration Proposals

The SAFMC urged the Secretary of Commerce to uphold the 1988 coastal zone inconsistency determination of the State of Florida for the respective plans of exploration filed with Minerals Management Service (MMS) by Mobil Exploration and Producing North America, Inc. for Lease OCS-G6520 (Pulley Ridge Block 799) and by Union Oil Company of California for Lease OCS-G6491/6492 (Pulley Ridge Blocks 629 & 630). Both plans of exploration involved lease blocks lying within the lease area comprising the offshore area encompassed by Part 2 of Lease Sale 116, and south of 26° North latitude. The Council's objection to the proposed exploration activities was based on the potential degradation or loss of extensive live bottom and other habitat essential to fisheries under Council jurisdiction.

The SAFMC also supported North Carolina's determination that the plans of exploration filed with MMS by Mobil Exploration and Producing North America, Inc. for Lease OCS Manteo Unit are not consistent with North Carolina's Coastal Zone Management program.

The Council has expressed concern to the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing and Development Task Force about the proposed area and recommended that no further exploration or production activity be allowed in the areas subject to Presidential Task Force Review (the section of Sale 116 south of 26° N latitude).

The following section addresses the recommendations, concerns and issues expressed by the South Atlantic Council (Source: Memorandum to Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia from Regional Director, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region dated October 27, 1995):

"The MMS, North Carolina, and Mobil entered into an innovative Memorandum of Understanding on July 12, 1990, in which the MMS agreed to prepare an Environmental Report (ER) on proposed drilling offshore North Carolina. The scope of the ER prepared by the MMS was more comprehensive than an EIS would be. The normal scoping process used in preparation of a NEPA-type document would not only

'identify significant environmental issues deserving of study' but also 'de-emphasize insignificant issues, narrowing the scope' (40 CFR 1500.4) by scoping out issues not ripe for decisions.

Of particular interest to North Carolina are not the transient effects of exploration, but rather the downstream and potentially broader, long-term effects of production and development. The potential effects associated with production and development would normally be "scoped out" of the (EIS-type) document and would be the subject of extensive NEPA analysis only after the exploration phase proves successful, and the submittal of a full-scale production and development program has been received for review and analysis. The ER addressed three alternatives: the proposed Mobil plan to drill a single exploratory well, the no-action alternative and the alternative that the MMS approve the Mobil plan with specific restrictions (monitoring programs and restrictions on discharges). The ER also analyzes possible future activities, such as development and production, and the long-term environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with such activities. The MMS assured North Carolina that all of the State's comments and concerns would be addressed in the Final ER (MMS 1990).

The MMS also funded a Literature Synthesis study (USDOJ MMS 1993a) and a Physical Oceanography study (USDOJ MMS 1994), both recommended by the Physical Oceanography Panel and the Environmental Sciences Review Panel (ESRP). Mobil also submitted a draft report to the MMS titled *Characterization of Currents at Manteo Block 467 off Cape Hatteras, North Carolina*. The MMS also had a Cooperative Agreement with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science to fund a study titled *Seafloor Survey in the Vicinity of the Manteo Prospect Offshore North Carolina* (USDOJ MMS 1993b). The MMS had a Cooperative Agreement with East Carolina University to conduct a study titled *Coastal North Carolina Socioeconomic Study* (USDOJ MMS 1993c). The above-mentioned studies were responsive to the ESRP's recommendations as well as those of the SAFMC and the State of North Carolina."

Copies of these studies can be acquired from the address below:
Minerals Management Service, Technical Communication Services
MS 4530 381 Elden Street
Herndon, VA 22070-4897 (703) 787-1080

References

- SAFMC. 1998a. Final Habitat Plan for the South Atlantic region: Essential Fish Habitat requirements for fishery management plans of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 1 Southpark Cir., Ste 306, Charleston, SC 29407-4699. 457 pp. plus appendices.
- SAFMC. 1998b. Final Comprehensive Amendment Addressing Essential Fish Habitat in Fishery Management Plans of the South Atlantic Region. Including a Final Environmental Impact Statement /Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis, Regulatory Impact Review, and Social Impact Assessment/Fishery Impact Statement. South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 1 Southpark Cir., Ste 306, Charleston, SC 29407-4699. 136pp.
- USDOJ, MMS. 1990. Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf, Final Environmental Report on Proposed Exploratory Drilling Offshore North Carolina, Vols. I-III.
- USDOJ, MMS. 1993a. North Carolina Physical Oceanography Literature Study. Contract No. 14-35-0001-30594.
- USDOJ, MMS. 1993b. Benthic Study of the Continental Slope Off Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. Vols. I-III. MMS 93-0014, -0015, -0016.
- USDOJ, MMS. 1993c. Coastal North Carolina Socioeconomic Study. Vols. I-V. MMS 93-0052, -0053, -0054, -0055, and -0056.
- USDOJ, MMS. 1994. North Carolina Physical Oceanographic Field Study. MMS 94-0047.