# **Chapter 5 Environmental Management Issues**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter summarizes an analysis of certain environmental management issues required by NEPA and CEQ guidelines. These issues include effective use or conservation of some types of resources, consistency with other planning efforts, and mitigation of unavoidable impacts. These issues are very broad in scope and in some cases not relevant to the alternative actions considered in this EIS.

## 5.2 Short-term Uses Versus Long-term Productivity

*Short-term uses* are generally those that determine the present quality of life for the public. The quality of life for future generations depends on *long-term productivity*; i.e., the capability of the environment to provide resources on a sustainable basis. It is known that fisheries have the potential to reduce long-term productivity of pelagic fish and non-fish resources if management standards are not met. Monitoring determines whether fishery control measures are effective and are being correctly applied to achieve management objectives.

None of the alternatives for seabird deterrent use or squid management would be expected to cause long-term loss of productivity of fish resources harvested by fisheries managed under the Pelagics FMP or the HSFCA.

Despite the intention of implementing additional or more effective deterrent methods to reduce the seabird interactions in the Hawaii-based longline fishery, none of the alternatives are likely to prevent long-term loss of productivity of North Pacific seabird populations if interactions in other Pacific demersal and pelagic longline fisheries are not also reduced.

The alternatives considered for squid fishery management, with the exception of Alternative SQB.2, which would result in the phase out of U.S. high seas squid fishing, would not alter the catch or effort in that fishery. The alternatives that include enhanced monitoring and reporting (all alternatives except SQA.1, SQB.1 and SQB.2) however, would improve the potential for long-term sustain ability of the resource through better understanding of catch and effort relationships and the effects of environmental variability on stocks.

#### 5.3 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

*Irreversible commitments* of resources are actions which disturb either a non-renewable resource or a renewable resource to the point that it can only be renewed over a long period of time (decades). Loss of biodiversity may be an irreversible resource commitment. For example, extinction of an endangered species, such as the short-tailed albatross, would constitute an irreversible loss. An *irretrievable commitment* is the loss of opportunities for production or use of a renewable resource for a short to medium period of time (years).

The intent of the seabird deterrent measure alternatives is to further minimize interactions of seabirds with the Hawaii-based longline fishery. Although there has never been observed or reported a fatal interaction between this fishery and the endangered short-tailed albatross, additional or more effective deterrent methods would further reduce this possibility and decrease fatal interactions with the Laysan and black footed albatrosses, which although not threatened or endangered, are declining in numbers.

The alternatives for squid fishery management do not involve the commitment of natural resources. Initiation of a new management regime, regional, national or international, would involve an expenditure of capital and human labor.

# 5.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Potential of the Alternatives

The use of fossil fuels for fishing vessel operation and government surveillance and enforcement activities is an irreversible resource commitment. The seabird deterrent measure alternatives are expected to have insignificant direct or indirect impacts on energy requirements. Fishing effort, and hence vessel fuel consumption, would not be altered. Depending on the alternative and option selected, there would be minor energy expenditures for constructing hardware such as a setting chute.

Likewise, the squid management alternatives, with the exception of Alternative SQB.2, would not affect effort in that fishery. Although Alternative SQB.2 would phase out U.S. pelagic squid jigging, this alternative might have the highest energy requirement because the affected vessels would likely be refitted for service in other fisheries.

## 5.5 Urban Quality, Historic Resources and Design of the Built Environment, Including Re-use and Conservation Potential of the Alternatives

Neither the seabird deterrent measure or squid management alternatives would directly affect urban quality, historic resources or design of the built environment. Squid Alternative SQB.2 could indirectly result in re-use of displaced vessels.

## 5.6 Cultural Resources and Conservation Potential of the Alternatives

Neither the seabird deterrent measure or squid management alternatives would directly or indirectly affect cultural resources.

## 5.7 Possible Conflicts Between the Alternatives and Other Plans.

The seabird deterrent measure alternatives are supportive of the Recovery Plan for the shorttailed albatross and the National Plan of Action for seabirds. Squid management Alternative SQA.4, development of a new squid FMP, could potentially conflict with the proposed ecosystem-based pelagics FMP for the region. It's likely however, that any such ecosystem plan would supercede and subsume a squid FMP.

## 5.8 Adverse Effects that Cannot be Avoided

None of the seabird deterrent measure or squid management alternatives would result in significant negative direct or indirect effects that cannot be avoided. The seabird mitigation method alternatives are in fact mitigation of an existing adverse effect of the Hawaii-based longline fishery.

#### 5.9 Possible Mitigation Methods for Unavoidable Adverse Effects

The seabird mitigation alternatives are themselves mitigation measures for interactions with longline fishing gear. The squid alternatives have no significant adverse effects.