UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Finding of No Significant Impact
Issuance of Scientific Research Permit No. 15552

Background

In October 2010, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) received an application for a permit (File No. 15552) from NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) to conduct research on sea turtles incidentally captured in commercial fisheries as part of the Southeast Fisheries Observer Program. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, NMFS has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) analyzing the impacts on the human environment associated with permit issuance (*Environmental Assessment on the Effects of the Issuance of a Scientific Research Permit File No. 15552 for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Observer Program to Conduct Sea Turtle Research from Specimens Taken in Commercial Fisheries*; June 2011). In addition, a Biological Opinion was prepared under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (June 8, 2011) summarizing the results of an intra-agency consultation. The analyses in the EA, as informed by the Biological Opinion, support the below findings and determination.

Analysis

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Administrative Order 216-6 (May 20, 1999) contains criteria for determining the significance of the impacts of a proposed action. In addition, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 C.F.R. 1508.27 state that the significance of an action should be analyzed both in terms of "context" and "intensity." Each criterion listed below is relevant to making a finding of no significant impact and has been considered individually, as well as in combination with the others. The significance of this action is analyzed based on the NAO 216-6 criteria and CEQ's context and intensity criteria. These include:

1) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to cause substantial damage to the ocean and coastal habitats and/or essential fish habitat (EFH) as defined under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and identified in Fishery Management Plans?

Response: The permit would only authorize the measuring and sampling of sea turtles already legally captured under another authority. This permit would not authorize in-water activities. Therefore no impacts to the physical environment, including ocean and coastal habitats, and EFH would be expected from the proposed research.

2) Can the proposed action be expected to have a substantial impact on biodiversity and/or ecosystem function within the affected area (e.g., benthic productivity, predator-prey relationships, etc.)?

Response: The effects of the action on ESA-listed species and their habitat, EFH, marine sanctuaries, and marine mammals were all considered. The research would not affect

Printed on Recycled Paper

predator-prey relationships, other species, or habitat. The research would cause short-term effects to sea turtles; however they would be returned alive to the water. No substantial impact on biodiversity and ecosystem function within the affected areas would be expected.

3) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to have a substantial adverse impact on public health or safety?

Response: The proposed action involves basic research (e.g., handling, measuring, and sampling) of sea turtles and does not involve hazardous methods, toxic agents or pathogens, or other materials that would have a substantial adverse impact on public health and safety.

4) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect endangered or threatened species, their critical habitat, marine mammals, or other non-target species?

Response: As determined in the associated biological opinion, the proposed action would adversely affect individual sea turtles during the research. However, the biological opinion concluded that the effects of the proposed action would be short-term in nature. The proposed action would not likely jeopardize the continued existence of ESA-listed species and would not likely destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. The action would not have an adverse impact on any marine mammals or their critical habitat. No non-target species would be captured, handled, or affected by this research.

In addition, Permit No. 15552 would contain mitigation measures to minimize the effects of the research on target sea turtles.

5) Are significant social or economic impacts interrelated with natural or physical environmental effects?

Response: There would be no significant social or economic impacts interrelated with natural or physical environmental effects.

6) Are the effects on the quality of the human environment likely to be highly controversial?

Response: A *Federal Register* notice (76 FR 4635) was published to provide the public the opportunity to review and comment on the action. No substantive public comments were received; therefore NMFS does not expect the issuance of the proposed permit to have highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment. The same type of research has been conducted previously with no public controversy.

7) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in substantial impacts to unique areas, such as historic or cultural resources, park land, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, essential fish habitat, or ecologically critical areas?

Response: See Response #1. The proposed action would only affect the target sea turtles that have been legally captured under another authority. Because the action does not involve vessel operations or placing gear in the water column, the action would not affect unique areas or any other portions of the physical environment. .

8) Are the effects on the human environment likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks?

Response: The proposed research activities are not new or unique. The same type of research has been conducted previously with no significant impacts to the environment. NMFS believes that the effects on the human environment would not be highly uncertain and the risks would be minimal and known.

9) Is the proposed action related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant impacts?

Response: The proposed action is not related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant impacts. The short-term stresses (separately and cumulatively when added to other stresses the turtles face in the environment) resulting from the research activities would be expected to be minimal. The permit would contain conditions to mitigate adverse impacts to turtles from these activities.

Overall, the proposed action would be expected to have no more than short-term effects on endangered and threatened sea turtles. The incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions discussed in the environmental assessment would be minimal and not significant.

10) Is the proposed action likely to adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources?

Response: See response to Question 1. No impacts to the physical environment are expected. The action would not take place in any of these areas nor affect them indirectly, thus none would be impacted.

11) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in the introduction or spread of a non-indigenous species?

Response: The action would not be removing nor introducing any species in the marine environment. The action would only affect the target sea turtles species that would be authorized for research. The action would not authorize vessel movements as they are covered under another authority; therefore, it would not result in the introduction or spread of a non-indigenous species.

12) Is the proposed action likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration?

Response: The decision to issue this permit would not be precedent setting and would not affect any future decisions. Issuing a permit to a specific individual or organization for a given activity does not in any way guarantee or imply that NMFS will authorize other individuals or organizations to conduct the same or similar activity.

13) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment?

Response: The action would not result in any violation of Federal state or local laws for environmental protection. The applicant is required to obtain any state and local permits necessary to carry out the action, and takes for scientific purposes would only be authorized on sea turtles that were legally captured under other authority during commercial fishing operations.

14) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in cumulative adverse effects that could have a substantial effect on the target species or non-target species?

Response: The action is not expected to result in any cumulative adverse effects to the species that are the subject of the proposed research. The proposed action would not be expected to have more than short-term effects on the target species (sea turtles). No adverse effects on non-target species, regardless of ESA-listing status, are expected. No cumulative adverse effects that could have a substantial effect on any species would be expected.

DETERMINATION

In view of the information presented in this document, and the analyses contained in the EA and Biological Opinion prepared for issuance of Permit No. 15552, it is hereby determined that permit issuance will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. In addition, all beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action have been addressed to reach the conclusion of no significant impacts. Accordingly, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for this action is not necessary.

James H. Lecky
Director, Office of Protected Resources

JUL 21 2011
Date