

## Fishery Conservation and Management

## § 600.905

of conservation and enhancement measures for EFH.

(10) *Review and revision of EFH components of FMPs.* Councils and NMFS should periodically review the EFH provisions of FMPs and revise or amend EFH provisions as warranted based on available information. FMPs should outline the procedures the Council will follow to review and update EFH information. The review of information should include, but not be limited to, evaluating published scientific literature and unpublished scientific reports; soliciting information from interested parties; and searching for previously unavailable or inaccessible data. Councils should report on their review of EFH information as part of the annual Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) report prepared pursuant to §600.315(e). A complete review of all EFH information should be conducted as recommended by the Secretary, but at least once every 5 years.

(b) *Development of EFH recommendations for Councils.* After reviewing the best available scientific information, as well as other appropriate information, and in consultation with the Councils, participants in the fishery, interstate commissions, Federal agencies, state agencies, and other interested parties, NMFS will develop written recommendations to assist each Council in the identification of EFH, adverse impacts to EFH, and actions that should be considered to ensure the conservation and enhancement of EFH for each FMP. NMFS will provide such recommendations for the initial incorporation of EFH information into an FMP and for any subsequent modification of the EFH components of an FMP. The NMFS EFH recommendations may be provided either before the Council's development of a draft EFH document or later as a review of a draft EFH document developed by a Council, as appropriate.

(c) *Relationship to other fishery management authorities.* Councils are encouraged to coordinate with state and interstate fishery management agencies where Federal fisheries affect state and interstate managed fisheries or where state or interstate fishery regulations affect the management of

Federal fisheries. Where a state or interstate fishing activity adversely affects EFH, NMFS will consider that action to be an adverse effect on EFH pursuant to paragraph (a)(3) of this section and will provide EFH Conservation Recommendations to the appropriate state or interstate fishery management agency on that activity.

### Subpart K—EFH Coordination, Consultation, and Recommendations

SOURCE: 67 FR 2376, Jan. 17, 2002, unless otherwise noted.

#### § 600.905 Purpose, scope, and NMFS/Council cooperation.

(a) *Purpose.* These procedures address the coordination, consultation, and recommendation requirements of sections 305(b)(1)(D) and 305(b)(2–4) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. The purpose of these procedures is to promote the protection of EFH in the review of Federal and state actions that may adversely affect EFH.

(b) *Scope.* Section 305(b)(1)(D) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires the Secretary to coordinate with, and provide information to, other Federal agencies regarding the conservation and enhancement of EFH. Section 305(b)(2) requires all Federal agencies to consult with the Secretary on all actions or proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect EFH. Sections 305(b)(3) and (4) direct the Secretary and the Councils to provide comments and EFH Conservation Recommendations to Federal or state agencies on actions that affect EFH. Such recommendations may include measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or otherwise offset adverse effects on EFH resulting from actions or proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by that agency. Section 305(b)(4)(B) requires Federal agencies to respond in writing to such comments. The following procedures for coordination, consultation, and recommendations allow all parties involved to understand and implement the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

## § 600.910

(c) *Cooperation between Councils and NMFS.* The Councils and NMFS should cooperate closely to identify actions that may adversely affect EFH, to develop comments and EFH Conservation Recommendations to Federal and state agencies, and to provide EFH information to Federal and state agencies. NMFS will work with each Council to share information and to coordinate Council and NMFS comments and recommendations on actions that may adversely affect EFH. However, NMFS and the Councils also have the authority to act independently.

### § 600.910 Definitions and word usage.

(a) *Definitions.* In addition to the definitions in the Magnuson-Stevens Act and § 600.10, the terms in this subpart have the following meanings:

*Adverse effect* means any impact that reduces quality and/or quantity of EFH. Adverse effects may include direct or indirect physical, chemical, or biological alterations of the waters or substrate and loss of, or injury to, benthic organisms, prey species and their habitat, and other ecosystem components, if such modifications reduce the quality and/or quantity of EFH. Adverse effects to EFH may result from actions occurring within EFH or outside of EFH and may include site-specific or habitat-wide impacts, including individual, cumulative, or synergistic consequences of actions.

*Anadromous fishery resource under Council authority* means an anadromous species managed under an FMP.

*Federal action* means any action authorized, funded, or undertaken, or proposed to be authorized, funded, or undertaken by a Federal agency.

*Habitat areas of particular concern* means those areas of EFH identified pursuant to § 600.815(a)(8).

*State action* means any action authorized, funded, or undertaken, or proposed to be authorized, funded, or undertaken by a state agency.

(b) *Word usage.* The terms “must”, “shall”, “should”, “may”, “may not”, “will”, “could”, and “can” are used in the same manner as in § 600.305(c).

## 50 CFR Ch. VI (10–1–15 Edition)

### § 600.915 Coordination for the conservation and enhancement of EFH.

To further the conservation and enhancement of EFH in accordance with section 305(b)(1)(D) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS will compile and make available to other Federal and state agencies, and the general public, information on the locations of EFH, including maps and/or narrative descriptions. NMFS will also provide information on ways to improve ongoing Federal operations to promote the conservation and enhancement of EFH. Federal and state agencies empowered to authorize, fund, or undertake actions that may adversely affect EFH are encouraged to contact NMFS and the Councils to become familiar with areas designated as EFH, potential threats to EFH, and opportunities to promote the conservation and enhancement of EFH.

### § 600.920 Federal agency consultation with the Secretary.

(a) *Consultation generally—(1) Actions requiring consultation.* Pursuant to section 305(b)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Federal agencies must consult with NMFS regarding any of their actions authorized, funded, or undertaken, or proposed to be authorized, funded, or undertaken that may adversely affect EFH. EFH consultation is not required for actions that were completed prior to the approval of EFH designations by the Secretary, e.g., issued permits. Consultation is required for renewals, reviews, or substantial revisions of actions if the renewal, review, or revision may adversely affect EFH. Consultation on Federal programs delegated to non-Federal entities is required at the time of delegation, review, and renewal of the delegation. EFH consultation is required for any Federal funding of actions that may adversely affect EFH. NMFS and Federal agencies responsible for funding actions that may adversely affect EFH should consult on a programmatic level under paragraph (j) of this section, if appropriate, with respect to these actions. Consultation is required for emergency Federal actions that may adversely affect EFH, such as hazardous material clean-up, response

to natural disasters, or actions to protect public safety. Federal agencies should contact NMFS early in emergency response planning, but may consult after-the-fact if consultation on an expedited basis is not practicable before taking the action.

(2) *Approaches for conducting consultation.* Federal agencies may use one of the five approaches described in paragraphs (f) through (j) of this section to fulfill the EFH consultation requirements. The selection of a particular approach for handling EFH consultation depends on the nature and scope of the actions that may adversely affect EFH. Federal agencies should use the most efficient approach for EFH consultation that is appropriate for a given action or actions. The five approaches are: use of existing environmental review procedures, General Concurrence, abbreviated consultation, expanded consultation, and programmatic consultation.

(3) *Early notification and coordination.* The Federal agency should notify NMFS in writing as early as practicable regarding actions that may adversely affect EFH. Notification will facilitate discussion of measures to conserve EFH. Such early coordination should occur during pre-application planning for projects subject to a Federal permit or license and during preliminary planning for projects to be funded or undertaken directly by a Federal agency.

(b) *Designation of lead agency.* If more than one Federal agency is responsible for a Federal action, the consultation requirements of sections 305(b)(2) through (4) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act may be fulfilled through a lead agency. The lead agency should notify NMFS in writing that it is representing one or more additional agencies. Alternatively, if one Federal agency has completed an EFH consultation for an action and another Federal agency acts separately to authorize, fund, or undertake the same activity (such as issuing a permit for an activity that was funded via a separate Federal action), the completed EFH consultation may suffice for both Federal actions if it adequately addresses the adverse effects of the actions on EFH. Federal agencies may

need to consult with NMFS separately if, for example, only one of the agencies has the authority to implement measures necessary to minimize adverse effects on EFH and that agency does not act as the lead agency.

(c) *Designation of non-Federal representative.* A Federal agency may designate a non-Federal representative to conduct an EFH consultation by giving written notice of such designation to NMFS. If a non-Federal representative is used, the Federal action agency remains ultimately responsible for compliance with sections 305(b)(2) and 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(d) *Best available information.* The Federal agency and NMFS must use the best scientific information available regarding the effects of the action on EFH and the measures that can be taken to avoid, minimize, or offset such effects. Other appropriate sources of information may also be considered.

(e) *EFH Assessments—(1) Preparation requirement.* For any Federal action that may adversely affect EFH, Federal agencies must provide NMFS with a written assessment of the effects of that action on EFH. For actions covered by a General Concurrence under paragraph (g) of this section, an EFH Assessment should be completed during the development of the General Concurrence and is not required for the individual actions. For actions addressed by a programmatic consultation under paragraph (j) of this section, an EFH Assessment should be completed during the programmatic consultation and is not required for individual actions implemented under the program, except in those instances identified by NMFS in the programmatic consultation as requiring separate EFH consultation. Federal agencies are not required to provide NMFS with assessments regarding actions that they have determined would not adversely affect EFH. Federal agencies may incorporate an EFH Assessment into documents prepared for other purposes such as Endangered Species Act (ESA) Biological Assessments pursuant to 50 CFR part 402 or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and public notices pursuant to 40 CFR part 1500. If

an EFH Assessment is contained in another document, it must include all of the information required in paragraph (e)(3) of this section and be clearly identified as an EFH Assessment. The procedure for combining an EFH consultation with other environmental reviews is set forth in paragraph (f) of this section.

(2) *Level of detail.* The level of detail in an EFH Assessment should be commensurate with the complexity and magnitude of the potential adverse effects of the action. For example, for relatively simple actions involving minor adverse effects on EFH, the assessment may be very brief. Actions that may pose a more serious threat to EFH warrant a correspondingly more detailed EFH Assessment.

(3) *Mandatory contents.* The assessment must contain:

- (i) A description of the action.
- (ii) An analysis of the potential adverse effects of the action on EFH and the managed species.
- (iii) The Federal agency's conclusions regarding the effects of the action on EFH.
- (iv) Proposed mitigation, if applicable.

(4) *Additional information.* If appropriate, the assessment should also include:

(i) The results of an on-site inspection to evaluate the habitat and the site-specific effects of the project.

(ii) The views of recognized experts on the habitat or species that may be affected.

(iii) A review of pertinent literature and related information.

(iv) An analysis of alternatives to the action. Such analysis should include alternatives that could avoid or minimize adverse effects on EFH.

(v) Other relevant information.

(5) *Incorporation by reference.* The assessment may incorporate by reference a completed EFH Assessment prepared for a similar action, supplemented with any relevant new project specific information, provided the proposed action involves similar impacts to EFH in the same geographic area or a similar ecological setting. It may also incorporate by reference other relevant environmental assessment documents. These

documents must be provided to NMFS with the EFH Assessment.

(f) *Use of existing environmental review procedures—(1) Purpose and criteria.* Consultation and commenting under sections 305(b)(2) and 305(b)(4) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act should be consolidated, where appropriate, with interagency consultation, coordination, and environmental review procedures required by other statutes, such as NEPA, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Clean Water Act, ESA, and Federal Power Act. The requirements of sections 305(b)(2) and 305(b)(4) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, including consultations that would be considered to be abbreviated or expanded consultations under paragraphs (h) and (i) of this section, can be combined with existing procedures required by other statutes if such processes meet, or are modified to meet, the following criteria:

(i) The existing process must provide NMFS with timely notification of actions that may adversely affect EFH. The Federal agency should notify NMFS according to the same timeframes for notification (or for public comment) as in the existing process. Whenever possible, NMFS should have at least 60 days notice prior to a final decision on an action, or at least 90 days if the action would result in substantial adverse impacts. NMFS and the action agency may agree to use shorter timeframes provided that they allow sufficient time for NMFS to develop EFH Conservation Recommendations.

(ii) Notification must include an assessment of the impacts of the action on EFH that meets the requirements for EFH Assessments contained in paragraph (e) of this section. If the EFH Assessment is contained in another document, the Federal agency must identify that section of the document as the EFH Assessment.

(iii) NMFS must have made a finding pursuant to paragraph (f)(3) of this section that the existing process can be used to satisfy the requirements of sections 305(b)(2) and 305(b)(4) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(2) *NMFS response to Federal agency.* If an existing environmental review process is used to fulfill the EFH consultation requirements, the comment deadline for that process should apply to the submittal of NMFS EFH Conservation Recommendations under section 305(b)(4)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, unless NMFS and the Federal agency agree to a different deadline. If NMFS EFH Conservation Recommendations are combined with other NMFS or NOAA comments on a Federal action, such as NOAA comments on a draft Environmental Impact Statement, the EFH Conservation Recommendations will be clearly identified as such (e.g., a section in the comment letter entitled “EFH Conservation Recommendations”) and a Federal agency response pursuant to section 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act is required for only the identified portion of the comments.

(3) *NMFS finding.* A Federal agency with an existing environmental review process should contact NMFS at the appropriate level (regional offices for regional processes, headquarters office for national processes) to discuss how to combine the EFH consultation requirements with the existing process, with or without modifications. If, at the conclusion of these discussions, NMFS determines that the existing or modified process meets the criteria of paragraph (f)(1) of this section, NMFS will make a finding that the process can be used to satisfy the EFH consultation requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. If NMFS does not make such a finding, or if there are no existing consultation processes relevant to the Federal agency’s actions, the agency and NMFS should follow one of the approaches for consultation discussed in the following sections.

(g) *General Concurrence—(1) Purpose.* A General Concurrence identifies specific types of Federal actions that may adversely affect EFH, but for which no further consultation is generally required because NMFS has determined, through an analysis of that type of action, that it will likely result in no more than minimal adverse effects individually and cumulatively. General Concurrences may be national or regional in scope.

(2) *Criteria.* (i) For Federal actions to qualify for General Concurrence, NMFS must determine that the actions meet all of the following criteria:

(A) The actions must be similar in nature and similar in their impact on EFH.

(B) The actions must not cause greater than minimal adverse effects on EFH when implemented individually.

(C) The actions must not cause greater than minimal cumulative adverse effects on EFH.

(ii) Actions qualifying for General Concurrence must be tracked to ensure that their cumulative effects are no more than minimal. In most cases, tracking actions covered by a General Concurrence will be the responsibility of the Federal agency. However, NMFS may agree to track such actions. Tracking should include numbers of actions and the amount and type of habitat adversely affected, and should specify the baseline against which the actions will be tracked. The agency responsible for tracking such actions should make the information available to NMFS, the applicable Council(s), and to the public on an annual basis.

(iii) Categories of Federal actions may also qualify for General Concurrence if they are modified by appropriate conditions that ensure the actions will meet the criteria in paragraph (g)(2)(i) of this section. For example, NMFS may provide General Concurrence for additional actions contingent upon project size limitations, seasonal restrictions, or other conditions.

(iv) If a General Concurrence is proposed for actions that may adversely affect habitat areas of particular concern, the General Concurrence should be subject to a higher level of scrutiny than a General Concurrence not involving a habitat area of particular concern.

(3) *General Concurrence development.* A Federal agency may request a General Concurrence for a category of its actions by providing NMFS with an EFH Assessment containing a description of the nature and approximate number of the actions, an analysis of the effects of the actions on EFH, including cumulative effects, and the Federal agency’s conclusions regarding the magnitude of

such effects. If NMFS agrees that the actions fit the criteria in paragraph (g)(2)(i) of this section, NMFS will provide the Federal agency with a written statement of General Concurrence that further consultation is not required. If NMFS does not agree that the actions fit the criteria in paragraph (g)(2)(i) of this section, NMFS will notify the Federal agency that a General Concurrence will not be issued and that another type of consultation will be required. If NMFS identifies specific types of Federal actions that may meet the requirements for a General Concurrence, NMFS may initiate and complete a General Concurrence.

(4) *Further consultation.* NMFS may request notification for actions covered under a General Concurrence if NMFS concludes there are circumstances under which such actions could result in more than a minimal impact on EFH, or if it determines that there is no process in place to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of actions covered under the General Concurrence. NMFS may request further consultation for these actions on a case-by-case basis. Each General Concurrence should establish specific procedures for further consultation, if appropriate.

(5) *Notification.* After completing a General Concurrence, NMFS will provide a copy to the appropriate Council(s) and will make the General Concurrence available to the public by posting the document on the internet or through other appropriate means.

(6) *Revisions.* NMFS will periodically review and revise its General Concurrences, as appropriate.

(h) *Abbreviated consultation procedures—(1) Purpose and criteria.* Abbreviated consultation allows NMFS to determine quickly whether, and to what degree, a Federal action may adversely affect EFH. Federal actions that may adversely affect EFH should be addressed through the abbreviated consultation procedures when those actions do not qualify for a General Concurrence, but do not have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on EFH. For example, the abbreviated consultation procedures should be used when the adverse effect(s) of an action

could be alleviated through minor modifications.

(2) *Notification by agency and submittal of EFH Assessment.* Abbreviated consultation begins when NMFS receives from the Federal agency an EFH Assessment in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section and a written request for consultation.

(3) *NMFS response to Federal agency.* If NMFS determines, contrary to the Federal agency's assessment, that an action would not adversely affect EFH, or if NMFS determines that no EFH Conservation Recommendations are needed, NMFS will notify the Federal agency either informally or in writing of its determination. If NMFS believes that the action may result in substantial adverse effects on EFH, or that additional analysis is needed to assess the effects of the action, NMFS will request in writing that the Federal agency initiate expanded consultation. Such request will explain why NMFS believes expanded consultation is needed and will specify any new information needed. If expanded consultation is not necessary, NMFS will provide EFH Conservation Recommendations, if appropriate, pursuant to section 305(b)(4)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(4) *Timing.* The Federal agency must submit its EFH Assessment to NMFS as soon as practicable, but at least 60 days prior to a final decision on the action. NMFS must respond in writing within 30 days. NMFS and the Federal agency may agree to use a compressed schedule in cases where regulatory approvals or emergency situations cannot accommodate 30 days for consultation, or to conduct consultation earlier in the planning cycle for actions with lengthy approval processes.

(1) *Expanded consultation procedures—*

(1) *Purpose and criteria.* Expanded consultation allows maximum opportunity for NMFS and the Federal agency to work together to review the action's impacts on EFH and to develop EFH Conservation Recommendations. Expanded consultation procedures must be used for Federal actions that would result in substantial adverse effects to EFH. Federal agencies are encouraged to contact NMFS at the earliest opportunity to discuss whether the adverse

effects of an action make expanded consultation appropriate.

(2) *Notification by agency and submittal of EFH Assessment.* Expanded consultation begins when NMFS receives from the Federal agency an EFH Assessment in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section and a written request for expanded consultation. Federal agencies are encouraged to provide in the EFH Assessment the additional information identified under paragraph (e)(4) of this section to facilitate review of the effects of the action on EFH.

(3) *NMFS response to Federal agency.* NMFS will:

(i) Review the EFH Assessment, any additional information furnished by the Federal agency, and other relevant information.

(ii) Conduct a site visit, if appropriate, to assess the quality of the habitat and to clarify the impacts of the Federal agency action. Such a site visit should be coordinated with the Federal agency and appropriate Council(s), if feasible.

(iii) Coordinate its review of the action with the appropriate Council(s).

(iv) Discuss EFH Conservation Recommendations with the Federal agency and provide such recommendations to the Federal agency, pursuant to section 305(b)(4)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(4) *Timing.* The Federal agency must submit its EFH Assessment to NMFS as soon as practicable, but at least 90 days prior to a final decision on the action. NMFS must respond within 60 days of submittal of a complete EFH Assessment unless consultation is extended by agreement between NMFS and the Federal agency. NMFS and Federal agencies may agree to use a compressed schedule in cases where regulatory approvals or emergency situations cannot accommodate 60 days for consultation, or to conduct consultation earlier in the planning cycle for actions with lengthy approval processes.

(5) *Extension of consultation.* If NMFS determines that additional data or analysis would provide better information for development of EFH Conservation Recommendations, NMFS may request additional time for expanded

consultation. If NMFS and the Federal agency agree to an extension, the Federal agency should provide the additional information to NMFS, to the extent practicable. If NMFS and the Federal agency do not agree to extend consultation, NMFS must provide EFH Conservation Recommendations to the Federal agency using the best scientific information available to NMFS.

(j) *Programmatic consultation—(1) Purpose.* Programmatic consultation provides a means for NMFS and a Federal agency to consult regarding a potentially large number of individual actions that may adversely affect EFH. Programmatic consultation will generally be the most appropriate option to address funding programs, large-scale planning efforts, and other instances where sufficient information is available to address all reasonably foreseeable adverse effects on EFH of an entire program, parts of a program, or a number of similar individual actions occurring within a given geographic area.

(2) *Process.* A Federal agency may request programmatic consultation by providing NMFS with an EFH Assessment in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section. The description of the proposed action in the EFH Assessment should describe the program and the nature and approximate number (annually or by some other appropriate time frame) of the actions. NMFS may also initiate programmatic consultation by requesting pertinent information from a Federal agency.

(3) *NMFS response to Federal agency.* NMFS will respond to the Federal agency with programmatic EFH Conservation Recommendations and, if applicable, will identify any potential adverse effects that could not be addressed programmatically and require project-specific consultation. NMFS may also determine that programmatic consultation is not appropriate, in which case all EFH Conservation Recommendations will be deferred to project-specific consultations. If appropriate, NMFS' response may include a General Concurrence for activities that qualify under paragraph (g) of this section.

(k) *Responsibilities of Federal agency following receipt of EFH Conservation*

## § 600.925

*Recommendations*—(1) *Federal agency response.* As required by section 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the Federal agency must provide a detailed response in writing to NMFS and to any Council commenting on the action under section 305(b)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act within 30 days after receiving an EFH Conservation Recommendation from NMFS. Such a response must be provided at least 10 days prior to final approval of the action if the response is inconsistent with any of NMFS' EFH Conservation Recommendations, unless NMFS and the Federal agency have agreed to use alternative time frames for the Federal agency response. The response must include a description of measures proposed by the agency for avoiding, mitigating, or offsetting the impact of the activity on EFH. In the case of a response that is inconsistent with NMFS Conservation Recommendations, the Federal agency must explain its reasons for not following the recommendations, including the scientific justification for any disagreements with NMFS over the anticipated effects of the action and the measures needed to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or offset such effects.

(2) *Further review of decisions inconsistent with NMFS or Council recommendations.* If a Federal agency decision is inconsistent with a NMFS EFH Conservation Recommendation, the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries may request a meeting with the head of the Federal agency, as well as with any other agencies involved, to discuss the action and opportunities for resolving any disagreements. If a Federal agency decision is also inconsistent with a Council recommendation made pursuant to section 305(b)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, the Council may request that the Assistant Administrator initiate further review of the Federal agency's decision and involve the Council in any interagency discussion to resolve disagreements with the Federal agency. The Assistant Administrator will make every effort to accommodate such a request. NMFS may develop written procedures to further define such review processes.

(1) *Supplemental consultation.* A Federal agency must reinitiate consulta-

tion with NMFS if the agency substantially revises its plans for an action in a manner that may adversely affect EFH or if new information becomes available that affects the basis for NMFS EFH Conservation Recommendations.

## § 600.925 NMFS EFH Conservation Recommendations to Federal and state agencies.

(a) *General.* Under section 305(b)(4)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS is required to provide EFH Conservation Recommendations to Federal and state agencies for actions that would adversely affect EFH. NMFS will not recommend that state or Federal agencies take actions beyond their statutory authority.

(b) *Recommendations to Federal agencies.* For Federal actions, EFH Conservation Recommendations will be provided to Federal agencies as part of EFH consultations conducted pursuant to § 600.920. If NMFS becomes aware of a Federal action that would adversely affect EFH, but for which a Federal agency has not initiated an EFH consultation, NMFS may request that the Federal agency initiate EFH consultation, or NMFS will provide EFH Conservation Recommendations based on the information available.

(c) *Recommendations to state agencies*—  
(1) *Establishment of procedures.* The Magnuson-Stevens Act does not require state agencies to consult with the Secretary regarding EFH. NMFS will use existing coordination procedures or establish new procedures to identify state actions that may adversely affect EFH, and to determine the most appropriate method for providing EFH Conservation Recommendations to state agencies.

(2) *Coordination with states on recommendations to Federal agencies.* When an action that would adversely affect EFH is authorized, funded, or undertaken by both Federal and state agencies, NMFS will provide the appropriate state agencies with copies of EFH Conservation Recommendations developed as part of the Federal consultation procedures in § 600.920. NMFS will also seek agreements on sharing information and copies of recommendations with Federal or state agencies

## 50 CFR Ch. VI (10–1–15 Edition)



## Fishery Conservation and Management

§ 600.1000

conducting similar consultation and recommendation processes to ensure coordination of such efforts.

(d) *Coordination with Councils.* NMFS will coordinate with each Council to identify the types of actions on which Councils intend to comment pursuant to section 305(b)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. For such actions NMFS will share pertinent information with the Council, including copies of NMFS' EFH Conservation Recommendations.

### § 600.930 Council comments and recommendations to Federal and state agencies.

Under section 305(b)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Councils may comment on and make recommendations to the Secretary and any Federal or state agency concerning any activity or proposed activity authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that, in the view of the Council, may affect the habitat, including EFH, of a fishery resource under its authority. Councils must provide such comments and recommendations concerning any activity that, in the view of the Council, is likely to substantially affect the habitat, including EFH, of an anadromous fishery resource under Council authority.

(a) *Establishment of procedures.* Each Council should establish procedures for reviewing Federal or state actions that may adversely affect the habitat, including EFH, of a species under its authority. Each Council may receive information on actions of concern by methods such as directing Council staff to track proposed actions, recommending that the Council's habitat committee identify actions of concern, or entering into an agreement with NMFS to have the appropriate Regional Administrator notify the Council of actions of concern that would adversely affect EFH. Federal and state actions often follow specific timetables which may not coincide with Council meetings. Therefore, Councils should consider establishing abbreviated procedures for the development of Council recommendations.

(b) *Early involvement.* Councils should provide comments and recommendations on proposed state and Federal actions of concern as early as practicable in project planning to ensure thorough

consideration of Council concerns by the action agency. Each Council should provide NMFS with copies of its comments and recommendations to state and Federal agencies.

### Subpart L—Fishing Capacity Reduction Framework

AUTHORITY: 16 U.S.C. 1861a(b)–(e).

SOURCE: 65 FR 31443, May 18, 2000, unless otherwise noted.

### § 600.1000 Definitions.

In addition to the definitions in the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and in § 600.10 of this title, the terms used in this subpart have the following meanings:

*Address of Record* means the business address of a person, partnership, or corporation. Addresses listed on permits or other NMFS records are presumed to be business addresses, unless clearly indicated otherwise.

*Bid* means the price a vessel owner or reduction fishery permit holder requests for reduction of his/her fishing capacity. It is an irrevocable offer in response to the invitation to bid in § 600.1009.

*Borrower* means, individually and collectively, each post-reduction fishing permit holder and/or fishing vessel owner fishing in the reduction fishery.

*Business plan* means the document containing the information specified in § 600.1003(n) and required to be submitted with a request for a financed program.

*Business week* means a 7-day period, Saturday through Friday.

*Controlling fishery management plan or program (CFMP)* means either any fishery management plan or any state fishery management plan or program, including amendments to the plan or program, pursuant to which a fishery is managed.

*Delivery value* means:

(1) For unprocessed fish, all compensation that a fish buyer pays to a fish seller in exchange for fee fish; and

(2) For processed fish, all compensation that a fish buyer would have paid to a fish seller in exchange for fee fish