

NORTHEAST REGIONAL MARINE FISH HABITAT ASSESSMENT

WORKPLAN

July 1, 2019 – June 31, 2022

6/24/2019

Draft reviewed: March 29, 2019

Final approved: June 24, 2019

Assessment Steering Committee:

Atlantic Coast Fish Habitat Partnership: Lisa Havel

Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission: Patrick Campfield

Duke University, Marine Spatial Ecology: Patrick Halpin

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council: Christopher Moore

Monmouth University, Urban Coast Institute: Tony McDonald

National Fish Habitat Partnership, Science and Data Committee: Gary Whelan

New England Fishery Management Council: Thomas Nies

NOAA Fisheries Offices of Habitat Conservation: Kara Meckley, Lou Chiarella

NOAA NCCOS Marine Spatial Ecology Division: Mark Monaco

NOAA Fisheries Offices of Science and Technology: Peg Brady, Tony Marshak

NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center: Thomas Noji

The Nature Conservancy: Kate Wilke

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document was prepared by Northeast Regional Marine Fish Habitat Assessment - Workplan Development Teams for the Assessment Steering Committee. Four actions were identified as necessary to describe and characterize estuarine, coastal, and offshore fish habitat distribution, abundance, and quality in the Northeast. These actions will address: 1) Abundance and trends in habitat types in the inshore area, 2) Habitat vulnerability, 3) Spatial descriptions of species habitat use in the offshore area and 4) provide a Habitat Data Visualization and Decision Support Tool. The work to support these actions is proposed for July 2019 - July 2022. Action team leads and the majority of the action team members have been identified as of June 2019. Following approval of the workplan, action teams will need to be finalized. The teams will be responsible for completing the actions as described in the workplan and providing deliverables to the Steering Committee.

2.0 FREQUENTLY USED TERMS

ACFHP	Atlantic Coast Fish Habitat Partnership
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
GARFO	Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
GB	Georges Bank
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOM	Gulf of Maine
HAPC	Habitat Area of Particular Concern
HCVA	Habitat Climate Vulnerability Assessment
MAFMC	Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
NFHP	National Fish Habitat Partnership
NEFMC	New England Fishery Management Council
NEFSC	Northeast Fisheries Science Center
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
TNC	The Nature Conservancy

3.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
2.0 FREQUENTLY USED TERMS	2
3.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
4.0 INTRODUCTION	3
5.0 WORKPLAN	4
6.0 FOLLOW ON ACTIONS	14
7.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	15

4.0 INTRODUCTION

In late 2017, a Steering Committee, comprised of leadership from the major habitat conservation, restoration, and science organizations in the region, met and agreed to identify ways to improve fish habitat science within the region. They concluded that a Northeast Regional Marine Fish Habitat Assessment was needed to describe and characterize estuarine, coastal, and offshore fish habitat distribution, abundance, and quality in the Northeast. The project will align habitat science goals and priorities with human and financial resources to develop habitat science products that support an assessment.

The Steering Committee wanted an assessment that:

- Serves as a decision support tool for multiple audiences – for both inshore and offshore habitats, to assess habitat distribution, abundance, quality, species habitat use, and how it is changing in response to changes in climate.
- Provides foundational information to support the designation of essential fish habitat (EFH) for Councils and supports federal EFH assessments and EFH consultations (i.e., better data, better synthesis, more specific habitat information, finer scale information).
- Identifies what habitat areas are rare, sensitive, especially vulnerable to degradation, or are uniquely important to ecosystem function, to help prioritize consultations and conservation.
- Compiles information to support a regional National Fish Habitat Partnership (NFHP)¹ assessment, to identify areas that could be considered for habitat conservation or restoration.
- Addresses NOAA’s Habitat Assessment Improvement Plan (HAIP)² priorities.
- Characterizes habitats, their services, and vulnerabilities to better inform permitting agencies and industries in decision making with respect to multiple ocean uses (e.g. aquaculture, wild-caught fisheries, energy issues, etc.).
- Supports incorporation of ecosystem principles into fisheries management.

To meet these objectives, the Steering Committee supported the development of a detailed workplan to identify specific products and delivery dates, the associated financial commitments, and responsible parties to complete a regional assessment. The Steering Committee leadership specifically identified staff habitat scientists to participate on workplan development teams (see Section 7.0), to support the development of the workplan during July 2018 - December 2018. Once the workplan is finalized, action teams will be finalized to conduct work on each of the actions described. There will likely be substantial overlap in membership between those who developed the workplan and those conducting the work, but the teams will not be identical.


¹ National Fish Habitat Partnership’s (<http://www.fishhabitat.org/about/>) mission is to protect, restore and enhance the nation's fish and aquatic communities through partnerships that foster fish habitat conservation and improve the quality of life for the American people.

² Habitat Assessment Improvement Plan: <https://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/ecosystems/habitat/publications/haip/index>.

5.0 WORKPLAN

Geographic Scope

The workplan covers the Northeast U.S. Shelf, and extends from the North Carolina/South Carolina boundary to the western end of the Scotian Shelf and includes the Mid-Atlantic Bight, Southern New England, Georges Bank, and the Gulf of Maine. The geographic scope of this workplan includes all waters extending from the inshore tidal boundary³ in state waters to the eastern-most boundary of the EEZ (200 miles offshore) and extends from the Canadian/US Border southwards to the North Carolina/South Carolina border. Inshore assessment actions will generally focus on habitat from the inshore tidal boundary to the eastern state waters boundary (3 miles). The offshore assessment actions will generally focus on habitat from the coastal bays to the eastern boundary of the EEZ, although data available to support work will likely only extend to the offshore canyon areas at its furthest extent. The area between the coastal bays and 3 miles is noted as an area of overlap for the actions. While important habitat for some species may occur outside the geographic scope for the actions, it is not practical to identify and assess this habitat in a transboundary way at this time.



Map 1. Geographic scope for the Northeast Regional Marine Fish Habitat Assessment.

Focus Species

The Steering Committee identified 65+ focus fish species for this habitat assessment (Table 1). All species are highly important to fisheries management organizations within the region.

³ The inshore tidal boundary could be defined several ways. The use of the term is generalized here, but could include mean high water or head of tide, or be inclusive of tidal marsh edge. Workplan development teams recommended that tidal marsh edge be included in the assessment (Supplement 1).

Table 1. Focus fish species identified by the Steering Committee.

MAFMC	NEFMC	ASMFC (not noted in column 1 or 2)	Highly Migratory (with HAPC designations)
Atlantic mackerel	Acadian redfish	American eel	Sandbar shark
Atlantic surfclam	American plaice	American lobster	Dusky shark
Black sea bass*	Atlantic halibut	Atlantic croaker	
Bluefish*	Atlantic herring*	Atlantic menhaden	
Blueline tilefish	Atlantic salmon	Atlantic striped bass	
Butterfish	Atlantic wolffish	Atlantic sturgeon	
Chub mackerel (potentially added)	Barndoor skate	Black drum	
Golden tilefish	Clearnose skate	Coastal sharks	
Longfin squid	Atlantic cod	Cobia	
Ocean quahog	Cusk***	Horseshoe crab	
Scup*	Haddock	Jonah crab	
Shortfin (<i>Illex</i>) squid	Little Skate	Northern shrimp	
Spiny dogfish**, *	Monkfish**	Red drum	
Summer flounder*	Ocean pout	Shad and river herring	
	Offshore hake	Spanish mackerel	
	Pollock	Spot	
	Red crab	Spotted seatrout	
	Red hake	Tautog	
	Rosette skate	Weakfish	
	Sea scallop		
	Silver hake		
	Smooth skate		
	Thorny skate		
	White hake		
	Windowpane flounder		
	Winter flounder*		
	Winter skate		
	Witch flounder		
	Yellowtail flounder		

* Also managed by ASMFC.

**Jointly managed between MAFMC and NEFMC.

*** Not a NEFMC managed species but occurring in the New England region

Actions and Timelines

There are four core actions identified to complete the habitat assessment within 3-years (July 2019-July 2022). They are summarized as follows with more detailed action descriptions provided in Tables 2-6:

1) Abundance and trends in habitat types in the inshore area (during months 1-36). This action will map the location and extent of habitat types utilized by the focus species and quantify the areal coverage, status and trends of these habitats. It will also compile metrics that may inform an assessment of habitat quality. Key outcomes from this action include:

- A. **Location and extent of habitat types** as maps (Geographic Information System (GIS) framework; to finest scale practical).
- B. **Quantity** of habitat types in the entire region, sub or ecoregions, estuaries, mainstems/tributaries, to finest scale (1 km sq polygons or smaller, where possible).
- C. **Status and trend** of habitat types with 1) relative proportion of habitat types to one another, 2) a baseline to track each habitat type, 3) trends in habitat quantity relative to baseline if possible, and 4) development of habitat quality metrics, if possible.
- D. **Written inventory and database** of habitats and habitat use for inshore focus species.

2) Habitat vulnerability (during months 1-36). This action will involve Council and Commission staff coordination with, and participation in, the NOAA Habitat Climate Vulnerability Assessment (HCVA). That assessment will use habitat experts to examine fish habitat vulnerability to climate and non-climate stressors. Key outcomes from this action include:

- A. **Qualitative evaluation** of the vulnerability of specific habitat types to non-climate and climate related stressors based on expert judgement.
- B. **Recommendations** from HCVA and staff leads if additional areas for future work are identified through this process.

3) Spatial descriptions of species habitat use in the offshore area (during months 1-36). This action will use model-based and empirical approaches to identify, predict, and map habitat use for each of the focus species and track and quantify changes in habitat use over time (e.g. seasonal, annual, and future predicted use). Key outcomes from this action include:

- A. **Location and extent of habitat use** (spatially depicted) by individual focus species (and, if possible, species groups), including annual, seasonal, and predicted future use.
- B. **Quantify and track changes in habitat use** for focus species throughout the region, and for each Ecological Production Unit (EPU): Mid-Atlantic Bight, Georges Bank, Gulf of Maine.
- C. **Identification of most important factors** (covariates) driving focus species distribution.

4) Habitat data visualization and decision support tool (during months 24-36). Habitat information will be incorporated into a publicly accessible decision support tool, making this information available to partners to visualize habitat location, extent, and use throughout the region, and providing access to relevant data and habitat metrics developed by the assessment.

Table 2. Inventory of Key Habitat Types in the Inshore Area under Action 1.

Project Phase	Actions Needed	Timeline	Current efforts to be applied	Existing and New Resources Needed
Data identification and prioritization	Identify, inventory, and describe all inshore habitat types across and within the defined subregions with a focus on SAV, tidal river bottom, shellfish beds, tidal vegetation, hard bottom and shorelines that are utilized by the focus species in the inshore environment by life stage. This could include both natural and anthropogenic habitats (see Supplement 1). Additional metrics of habitat quality will be collected while the data is compiled (e.g. oysters per m ² ., SAV shoots density, etc.).	Months 1-12	1. Existing EFH Source documents (through about 2003); 2. ELMR living marine resources documents; 3) Updated recent literature review completed by MAFMC/GARFO; 4) ACFHP Species/Habitat Matrix; 5) <u>HAPWG Report</u> ; and 6) Detailed state agency habitat data (e.g. MD, RI, MA all have saltmarsh, SAV, and shellfish location and extent, including some current and historic data; 7) Northeast and Mid-Atlantic data portal artificial reef data, etc.; 8) Other resources as appropriate. Some early consideration should be given to SAV, shoreline marsh edge habitat, etc.	Staff members from ACFHP/ASMFC, state agencies (rep from each agency with regional habitat expertise), both Councils, NMFS HCD and NEFSC, and others as needed with inshore habitat expertise; ^a Resources to meet as a group in person (meeting space and travel) and via webinar will be needed. Some in person meetings may be needed to complete the tasks below. This will depend on location, but it is estimated that about \$5,600 (4 x 2 x \$700) may be needed for federal travel, and an additional \$8,400 for non-federal travel (6 x 2 x \$700), for 2-in person meetings.
Data compilation	Establish classification scheme for all identified and inventoried habitats in action 1. Evaluate and choose a habitat classification scheme to serve as an organizing framework across the subregions (e.g., CMECS - https://iocm.noaa.gov/cmecs/ ; Cowardian system) and determine how to best include restored or manmade habitat, if appropriate.	Months 13-18	Ensure classification includes those habitat types (class and subclass) that are identified through the NOAA Climate Habitat Vulnerability Assessment. Work with NOAA CMECS leads to obtain a briefing and more information on how the classification system might be used to support this assessment work.	Funds are needed to support a GIS contractor to develop the geodatabase, synthesize information, and develop final spatial products; up to 2 years additional funding may be needed estimated at \$230,000 (1 year of funds already applied). Coordination should occur between this effort and complementary assessments by ACFHP and the Chesapeake Bay Program. The Chesapeake will be hiring a contractor in spring 2019 to begin compiling estuarine habitat, biological and stressor data.
Geodatabase development	Develop geodatabase(s) with agreed upon classification scheme for all inshore habitats. In addition, specific decisions on how to organize the data including establishing inshore boundaries, mapping scale, and potential subdivision of the region to smaller inshore "sub regional" units should be made (see Supplement 1).	Months 19-24	See Supplement 1 for more detail on methods that could be used to set inshore boundaries, mapping scale, and possible inshore regional units. It is recommended as a starting point for consideration that: 1) the inshore/inland boundary include the shoreline/tidal marsh edge and be the same across the entire region, 2) data be mapped at the finest scale possible by estuary using a gridded system, 3) estuaries be aggregated using the NFHP coastal assessments biogeographic regions (or a variation on that for this assessment), and 4) consideration be given to using 3 salinity zones within estuaries.	See above (GIS contractor)

Synthesis and analysis	Utilize geodatabase(s) to determine for which habitat types location and extent can be determined based on available data, and map location and extent of habitats with available data at the finest possible scale.	Months 25-30	NA	See above (GIS contractor)
Development of habitat quantity metrics	Analyze and synthesize quantity, status and trends for all habitats in the geodatabase as available data allows.	Months 25-30	NA	See potential experts listed above plus those noted under footnote a.
Development of habitat quality metrics	Plan and hold a Workshop, using a predetermined structured decision process (e.g. Analytical Hierarchy Process), to identify and develop habitat quality metrics based on the available data from the quantitative analysis. This group will prioritize characteristics of habitat types (natural and restored) that support fish production and identify specific metrics to be used based on the data available. These findings will be compiled in a final report and mapped with the location and extent data for habitat where possible.	Months 31-34	An examination of metrics used by state-agencies and others for their habitat management may be a relevant starting point.	Resources to hold a workshop in person (\$20,000; meeting space and travel). This will depend on location, but it is estimated that about \$8,400 (12x\$700) may be needed for federal travel, \$8,400 (12x\$700) for non-federal travel, plus \$3,200 for other associated meeting costs.
Early review and feedback on maps for location and extent and habitat quantity metrics	1) Review methods and products with a pilot group of regional experts (e.g., NMFS habitat leads, Council and ASMFC staff habitat leads); and 2) Review Products with the Steering Committee.	Months 31-34	NA	This can be done with existing staff resource commitments, if participating entities are willing to provide staff support in the form of work and travel. However, this may not require in-person meetings and could use web-based meetings to complete.
Application and final product development	Make necessary adjustments to final products and incorporate into final database and GIS visualization/Support Tool (see Action 5)	Months 35-36	NA	GIS contractor. Information access when products are complete will link to Action 5 to develop a visualization/Support Tool.
Final review	Present information to the assessment steering committee and finalize products	After Complete	NA	Convene steering committee in person, once for all actions. Overall costs estimated as \$9,800 (14x\$700).

^a Possible participants include: Michelle Bachman (NEFMC), Steve Faulkner (USGS), NOAA NCCOS (AK Leight and Moe Nelson), Mark Rosseau (MA-DMF), Eric Schneider (RI-DFW), Dawn McReynolds (NYDEC), TBD (ME-DMF, CT-DEP, NJ-FWS, DE-DNREC, MD-DNR, VA-VMRC, NC-DMF), Bryan DeAngelis (TNC), Julie Devers (US-FWS), TBD (ACFHP), Bruce Vogt (NFMS-Ches. Bay), Emily Shumchenia (Northeast Data Portal), and other NMFS/NEFSC experts (TBD).

Table 3. Habitat Vulnerability under Action 2.

Project Phase	Actions Needed	Timeline	Current efforts to be applied	Existing and New Resources Needed
Participation in HCVA Process	Habitat staff from ASMFC, MAFMC, and NEFMC will coordinate directly with the NOAA Northeast HCVA. This initially will involve support during "pilot assessment" work to finalize the methods for conducting the assessment including selection of priority climate and non climate stressors. This will later involve participation as subject matter experts to review the information at the in-person HCVA workshop to conduct the full assessment.	Months 1-12. Pilot assessment early 2019, with full assessment to follow later 2019.	NOAA Habitat Climate Vulnerability Assessment that is already underway. NOAA Habitat Climate Vulnerability Assessment that is already underway. The HCVA will develop a method to assess habitat vulnerability to a changing climate that can be applied directly to fisheries management. The trait-based assessment will score the sensitivity of specific habitat attributes to climate change for habitats ranging from riverine to oceanic. The result will be a ranked list of vulnerable habitats. The HCVA will be developed as a regional tool (e.g. northeast large marine ecosystem) that can be applied nationally.	Jessica Coakley (MAFMC), Michelle Bachman (NEFMC), and Lisa Havel (ASMFC/ACFHP) will participate directly in aspects of the HCVA, including pilot work to develop and improve aspects of the process. Commitments from NEFMC, MAFMC, and ASMFC to cover their staff travel to participate in any in-person meetings. This will include several coordination calls or remote meetings.
Future Work	Habitat staff from ASMFC, MAFMC, and NEFMC and the NOAA HCVA will discuss lessons learned from the HCVA process and identify any areas for future work on this subject that would be beneficial to the Northeast region and fishery management agencies (Councils and Commission).	6-12 months after HCVA completion	NA	NA
Reports Provided	Provide the final report to the Steering Committee.	After report completed	NA	NA

Table 4. Spatial Descriptions of Species Habitat Use in the Offshore Area under Action 3.

Project Phase	Actions Needed	Timeline	Current efforts to be applied	Existing and New Resources Needed
Identification of Best Modeling Approaches	Assemble scientists from NOS, OAR, and NMFS laboratories, and others, to compare and contrast methods and approaches in the use of species habitat or niche models. Discussion will focus on fitting procedures and model construction, visualization and interpretation of results, and the range of applications with these data that can be used to describe and quantify habitat use. This should include a discussion of the best and most appropriate tests for model validation and performance measurements.	Months 1-12	NART Project: "Progress in habitat modelling to inform fisheries and ecosystem management" (Leads: Kevin Friedland and Scott Large (NOAA/NEFSC/READ/EDAB), Mark Monaco and Beth Turner (NOAA/NOS/NCCOS), Kimberly Hyde (NOAA/NEFSC/READ/EDAB); Existing models and approaches have been developed within NMFS-NEFSC and other institutions that could be applied or inform these approaches. NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office science: NCBO is funding four projects assessing in shore offshore habitat connectivity for black sea bass and summer flounder. Habitat suitability models and climate change impacts will be developed with products expected in 2020 (Bruce Vogt and Sara Coleman are POCs who can coordinate with researchers to contribute approaches and information to this project).	Travel funds are available for 8-10 federal participants through this 2019 project. An additional \$6,500 is needed for up to 8 non-federal travel participants (8 x \$700) and misc. meeting needs. ^b
Model Diagnostic Criteria Survey	A priori input from focus species stock assessment scientists on the most important variables driving their species distribution and habitat use, and how those would be ranked based on their expertise. This information can be used to prioritize information for modeling efforts or serve as an additional diagnostic external to the models, to be compared to model-preferred explanatory variables. It is noted that factors driving the productivity of the focus species may be different (or the same) as those driving the distribution of the focus species.	Months 1-12	NA	This will utilize existing focus species stock assessment expertise.
Information Prioritization	Assemble data available to describe habitat use by the focus species spatially and temporally (juveniles and adults, and if possible other life stages such as eggs/larvae) in the offshore environment. Much of this has already been done by the	Months 1-12	A number of data resources are available. Fishery independent data: State/federal fish survey data, MARMAP/EcoMon (egg/larvae), and clam or scallop survey data is accessible. Other information on primary productivity, etc. could be considered. Fishery-dependent data: commercial landings,	This can be done with existing staff resource commitments, since these data already exist. However, this may require some web-based meetings to complete.

	various modeling groups. Therefore, this should focus on supplementing the work already done by identifying missing data needs or data improvements that are needed. This should include fisheries independent and dependent data.		observer or study fleet data could be used to verify model results. Application of data provided from the NEFSC food habits database. Characterizing habitat types, making special note of any difference found by region. Habitat types differ by species and to climate change.	
Model and Data Application	1) Identify the best modeling approaches for each focus species based on the tools and data available and using the performance diagnostics criteria identified. 2) Based on the best approaches for each species, describe those factors that are most important in driving changes in distribution based on the covariates used (e.g., temperature, substrate type, rugosity, primary production, etc.). Variable selection should be based upon species ecology and incorporate the input from the stock assessment experts. ^a	Months 12-24	Using the NART project work described above, a core modeling team will be formed to address this step.	Funds are needed to support a contractor working on modeling approaches (GAM/MaxENT/RegTree models at NEFSC; approximately 2 years additional funding: \$230,000 - (1 year of funds already applied; Additional funds may be needed to support travel for modeling team members to meet in-person. This will depend on location, but it is estimated that about \$8,400 (6 x 2 x \$700) may be needed for federal travel, and an additional \$5,600 for non-federal travel (4 x 2 x \$700).
Habitat Metrics and Indicators	Based on the modeling products, identify specific metrics to track changes in habitat use for the focus species. The use of smaller organizing units (based on ecology or fisheries distributions) should be used to organize information at a regional scale in a way that would support management entity decision capability. This could include examining trends in use of available (past, present, and future predicted habitats). These outputs should be linked to other regional indicators of ecosystem change of possible. This component will require additional input be provided to the modeling leads from staff at the Councils (NEFMC and MAFMC) and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC), as well as input from NMFS Habitat Conservation Division staff. As a starting point, the Ecological Production Units (EPUs) developed by the NEFSC based on	Months 18-30	Ongoing work at the NMFS/NEFSC to develop ecological indicators throughout the region and by EPU can be directly linked to this work and enhance decision capability. This can be directly linked to management entity EBM and EAFM approaches.	This can be done with existing staff resource commitments, if participating entities are willing to provide staff support in the form of work and travel. However, this may require some in-person or web-based meetings to complete.

	ecological/oceanographic breaks in the region should be considered.			
Synthesis and analysis	The outputs from the modeling work and development of ecological indicators will be compiled in a report, documenting methods and results, as well as GIS files that can be utilized to spatially understand changes in habitat use. Efforts will be made to make this information available via an online visualization/Support Tool (see other action).	Months 18-30	Utilize and build off existing online GIS services to make the information accessible to partners and end users.	Information access when products are complete will link to a separate action to develop a visualization/Support Tool.
Early Review and Feedback	1) Review methods and early products with a pilot group of regional experts (e.g., NMFS habitat leads, Council and ASMFC staff habitat leads); and 2) Review Products with the Steering Committee.	Months 31-33	NA	This can be done with existing staff resource commitments, if participating entities are willing to provide staff support in the form of work and travel. However, this may not require in-person meetings and could use web-based meetings to complete.
Application and Final Product Development	Make any necessary adjustments to final products.	Months 34-36	NA	NA
Final Review and Approval	Present information to the Steering Committee and finalize products.	After Complete	NA	Convene Steering Committee in person, once for all actions.

^a A number of themes should be considered as relevant to understanding distribution shifts, such as temperature, assemblages, predator-prey dynamics, and other species interactions. A selection of an ecosystem based approach applied to multiple species may be necessary for an explanation of all-inclusive factors driving habitat use. Species groups based upon similar life history traits and interactions of multiple species could be useful for modeling and understanding of habitat use. Additional methods to explore: pelagic eggs and larvae of the focus species (as a modeling group), and (if time permits) include the probable prey variable, its abundance, distribution and impacts upon the movement of juvenile and adult focus species. Additional variables such as: primary productivity, ichthyoplankton, food habit data, depth, and fishing influence could be of value to the models. In addition, fishery dependent data could be used to validate outputs. This could also involve examining changes in seasonal use where possible.

^b Possible attendees: Arliss Winship (NOS), Matthew Poti (NOS), Elliott Hazen (NMFS), Vince Guida (NMFS), Christopher Rooper (NMFS), Paul Conn (NMFS), James Thorson (NMFS), Edward Rutherford (OAR); Victoria Kentner (NMFS); Donna Johnson (NMFS), Charles Perretti (NMFS), Rich Bell (TNC), Kathy Mills (GMRI), Vince Saba (GFDL), Heather Welch (NMFS); Jessica Coakley (MAFMC); Michelle Bachman (NEFMC).

Table 5. Habitat Data Visualization and Decision Support under Action 4.

Project Phase	Actions Needed	Timeline	Current efforts to be applied	Existing and New Resources Needed
Determine type of services needed	Based on the products being developed from Actions 1-3, determine the kind on online mapping application needed to share the products with end users and the public.	Months 18-24	NA	This can be done with existing staff resource commitments. However, this may require some conference calls or web-based meetings to complete.
Examine existing mapping/visualization services available and integrate data into a visualization/Support Tool	Habitat staff from ASMFC, MAFMC, NEFMC and NOAA HCD, will discuss how to maintain and refresh the assessment data and models at least every 5 years. Some of the mapping platforms that are currently available could be considered to maintain and house the information. Consideration will be given to whether this information should be housed on a NOAA site (which requires extensive clearances) or a non-federal site. Recommendations will be taken to the steering committee for input on approach to be taken.	Months 25-36	This could include existing services such as the Northeast or Mid-Atlantic Ocean Data Portals (which could display fish habitat data with other kinds of regional data), NMFS Habitat Data Geodatabase (which has geoprocessing, mapping, and spatial analysis/modeling services that allow data to be queried and accessed, as well as mapped), or other kinds of existing sites and services internal or external to NOAA.	Funds are available to complete this work (\$70,000 available through MAFMC).
Finalize products	When final products become available, the information will be integrated into an appropriate visualization/Support tool and shared.	After complete	NA	Convene Steering Committee in person, once for all actions.

6.0 FOLLOW ON ACTIONS

Follow On Actions

The assessment will be used several ways. These actions were identified by the workplan development teams as important next steps after the assessment actions have been completed.

- 1) EFH Review/Redo: High resolution habitat maps that include both static and dynamic aspects of habitat should be used to improve essential fish habitat designations and descriptions.
- 2) Integration of habitat science into EAFM and broader IEA approaches: Information from the habitat assessment should be pulled into summary reports for the region and for individual species, including maps and metrics to track how much habitat we have (if known) and how that habitat is changing (in the inshore or offshore, annually, seasonal, and projected to change).
- 3) Habitat and stock assessments: High resolution habitat maps that include both static and dynamic aspects of habitat combined with geospatial statistical models have the potential to improve the indices of abundance that go into stock assessments as well as improve survey design. Methods to explicitly link habitat information with stock assessments should be explored.

7.0 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all those that contributed as members of workplan development teams. Action team leads and members are identified in a separate document.

Inshore Assessment Workplan Development Team

Soren Dahl, New York DEC, soren.dahl@dec.ny.gov
Bryan DeAngelis, TNC, bdeangelis@tnc.org,
Julie Devers, USFWS, julie_devers@fws.gov
AK Leight, NOAA-NOS-NCCOS, ak.leight@noaa.gov
Tony Marshak, NMFS S&T, tony.marshak@noaa.gov
Moe Nelson, NOAA-NOS-NCCOS, david.moe.nelson@noaa.gov
David O'Brien, GARFO, david.l.o'brien@noaa.gov
Dave Packer, NEFSC, dave.packer@noaa.gov
Jeff Pessutti, NEFSC, jeffrey.pessutti@noaa.gov
Mark Rousseau, Massachusetts DMF, mark.rousseau@state.ma.us
Eric Schneider, Rhode Island DFW, eric.schneider@dem.ri.gov
Alison Verkade, GARFO, alison.verkade@noaa.gov
Bruce Vogt (Chair), NOAA Ches. Bay Program, bruce.vogt@noaa.gov

Offshore Assessment Workplan Development Team

Jessica Coakley (Chair), MAFMC, jcoakley@mafmc.org
Vincent, Guida, NEFSC, vincent.guida@noaa.gov
Donna Johnson, NEFSC, donna.johnson@noaa.gov
Tori Kentner, NEFSC, victoria.kentner@noaa.gov
Andy Lipsky, NEFSC, andrew.lipsky@noaa.gov
Chris Melrose, NEFSC, chris.melrose@noaa.gov
Marta Ribera, TNC, marta.ribera@tnc.org
David Stevenson, GARFO, david.stevenson@noaa.gov

Fish Habitat Footprint Workplan Development Team

Rich Bell, TNC, rich.bell@tnc.org
Jessica Coakley, MAFMC, jcoakley@mafmc.org
Karen Greene, GARFO, karen.greene@noaa.gov
Scott Large (Chair), NEFSC, scott.large@noaa.gov
Chris Melrose, NEFSC, chris.melrose@noaa.gov
Kathy Mills, Gulf of Maine Research Institute, kmills@gmri.org
Dave Packer, NEFSC, dave.packer@noaa.gov
David Stevenson, GARFO, david.stevenson@noaa.gov
Marek Topolski, Maryland DNR, marek.topolski@maryland.gov