

workloads. Each agency action must analyze the impacts of the proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole on all EFH in the affected area. If adverse effects are identified, an EFH consultation must be conducted at the appropriate level of detail.

For those fishery management actions that have been submitted to NMFS by a Council, the regional Sustainable Fisheries Division (SF) should review the proposed action and assess whether the proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole may have an adverse impact on EFH. If SF determines there will not be an adverse impact, then a separate determination to that effect must appear in the decision memorandum, or information memo if a decision memo is not required, submitted to Headquarters. The basis for such a determination must be written and included in the administrative record. If SF determines that the proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole may have an adverse impact on EFH, then a separate determination to that effect must appear in the decision memo, or information memo if a decision memo is not required, and SF must initiate an EFH consultation with the regional Habitat Conservation Division (HC). Evidence of compliance with all EFH consultation requirements must appear in the administrative record and must be referenced in the decision memorandum, or information memorandum if a decision memorandum is not required, for the action.

The analysis of adverse impacts on EFH must consider the impacts of the proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole, on EFH identified for any species in the area affected by the action, whether EFH has been identified under the FMP authorizing the action or another FMP.

II. Objective

The following EFH determinations provide guidance to achieve a consistent approach to complying with the EFH requirements for fishery management actions.

III. Guidance on EFH Language for Classification Sections and Decision Memorandum Determinations Sections

Classification Sections of Proposed and Final Rules

The MSA and the EFH regulations do not require a statement on EFH to appear in the classification sections of proposed and final rules. Therefore, no classification language is needed.

Determinations Section of a Decision Memorandum

Option 1 – No adverse impact on EFH: The area affected by the proposed action in the [insert name] fishery has been identified as EFH for [list all of the FMP(s) or the managed species, as appropriate, including those in other management units]. The proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole will not have an adverse impact on EFH; therefore, an EFH consultation is not required. {Describe with succinct specificity the basis for this determination either here or in a memorandum included in the administrative record. If a separate memorandum is used, insert the following here: “The basis for this determination is

described in a memorandum dated [insert date].” The memorandum should be submitted as part of a complete package for Secretarial review.}

Option 2 – Abbreviated Consultation: The area affected by the proposed action in the [insert name] fishery has been identified as EFH for [list all of the FMP(s) or the managed species, as appropriate, including those in other management units]. The proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole may have an adverse impact on EFH. Because the potential adverse impact on EFH is not substantial, NMFS conducted an abbreviated EFH consultation pursuant to 50 CFR 600.920(h) and prepared an EFH Assessment that incorporates all of the information required in 50 CFR 600.920(g)(2). [If NMFS or the Council prepared the EFH Assessment as part of a NEPA or other document, identify that document here.] In a memorandum dated [insert date], the responsible NMFS regional Habitat Conservation Division provided recommendations on the proposed action that would conserve EFH. The NMFS regional Sustainable Fisheries Division responded to these recommendations in a memorandum dated [insert date]. [These memoranda should be submitted as part of a complete package for Secretarial review.] [NOTE – If the Councils are designated as official representatives of NMFS, a Council could be the one to respond if action has not yet been submitted.]

Option 3 – Expanded Consultation: The area affected by the proposed action in the [insert name] fishery has been identified as EFH for [list all of the FMP(s) or the managed species, as appropriate, including those in other management units]. The proposed action in the context of the fishery as a whole may have a substantial adverse impact on EFH. As a result, NMFS conducted an expanded EFH consultation pursuant to 50 CFR 600.920(i) and prepared an EFH Assessment that incorporates all of the information required in 50 CFR 600.920(g)(2). [If the EFH Assessment was prepared as part of a NEPA or other document, identify that document here.] In a memorandum dated [insert date], the responsible NMFS regional Habitat Conservation Division provided recommendations on the proposed action that would conserve EFH. The NMFS regional Sustainable Fisheries Division responded to these recommendations in a memorandum dated [insert date]. These memoranda should be submitted as part of a complete package for Secretarial review. [NOTE – The Council could be the one to respond if action has not yet been submitted.]

Option 4 – General Concurrence: The area affected by the proposed action in the [insert name] fishery has been identified as EFH for [list all of the FMP(s) or the managed species, as appropriate, including those in other management units]. This action falls within the scope of the General Concurrence issued on [insert date] for [insert type of fishery actions]. As a result, no further EFH consultation is required.

Option 5 – Programmatic Consultation: The area affected by the proposed action in the [insert name] fishery has been identified as EFH for [list all of the FMP(s) or the managed species, as appropriate, including those in other management units]. This action falls within the scope of the Programmatic Consultation for the [insert the name of the program] conducted on [insert date]. NMFS has followed the recommendations in the Programmatic Consultation. No further EFH consultation is required.