§ 600.335 National Standard 6—Variations and Contingencies.

(a) Standard 6. Conservation and management measures shall take into account and allow for variations among, and contingencies in, fisheries, fishery resources, and catches.

(b) Conservation and management. Each fishery exhibits unique uncertainties. The phrase “conservation and management” implies the wise use of fishery resources through a management regime that includes some protection against these uncertainties. The particular regime chosen must be flexible enough to allow timely response to resource, industry, and other national and regional needs. Continual data acquisition and analysis will help the development of management measures to compensate for variations and to reduce the need for substantial buffers. Flexibility in the management regime and the regulatory process will aid in responding to contingencies.

(c) Variations. (1) In fishery management terms, variations arise from biological, social, and economic occurrences, as well as from fishing practices. Biological uncertainties and lack of knowledge can hamper attempts to estimate stock size and strength, stock location in time and space, environmental/habitat changes, and ecological interactions. Economic uncertainty may involve changes in foreign or domestic market conditions, changes in operating costs, drifts toward overcapitalization, and economic perturbations caused by changed fishing patterns. Changes in fishing practices, such as the introduction of new gear, rapid increases or decreases in harvest effort, new fishing strategies, and the effects of new management techniques, may also create uncertainties. Social changes could involve increases or decreases in recreational fishing, or the movement of people into or out of fishing activities due to such factors as age or educational opportunities.

(2) Every effort should be made to develop FMPs that discuss and take into account these vicissitudes. To the extent practicable, FMPs should provide a suitable buffer in favor of conservation. Allowances for uncertainties should be factored into the various elements of an FMP. Examples are:

Stevens Act, except for fees allowed under section 304(d)(2).

(2) Factors to consider. The Magnuson-Stevens Act ties the use of limited access to the achievement of OY. An FMP that proposes a limited access system must consider the factors listed in section 303(b)(6) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and in § 600.325(c)(3). In addition, it should consider the criteria for qualifying for a permit, the nature of the interest created, whether to make the permit transferable, and the Magnuson-Stevens Act’s limitations on returning economic rent to the public under section 304(d). The FMP should also discuss the costs of achieving an appropriate distribution of fishing privileges.

(d) Analysis. An FMP should discuss the extent to which overcapitalization, congestion, economic waste, and inefficient techniques in the fishery reduce the net benefits derived from the management unit and prevent the attainment and appropriate allocation of OY. It should also explain, in terms of the FMP’s objectives, any restriction placed on the use of efficient techniques of harvesting, processing, or marketing. If, during FMP development, the Council considered imposing a limited-entry system, the FMP should analyze the Council’s decision to recommend or reject limited access as a technique to achieve efficient utilization of the resources of the fishing industry.

(e) Economic allocation. This standard prohibits only those measures that distribute fishery resources among fishermen on the basis of economic factors alone, and that have economic allocation as their only purpose. Where conservation and management measures are recommended and management measures that would change the economic structure of the industry or the economic conditions under which the industry operates, the need for such measures must be justified in light of the biological, ecological, and social objectives of the FMP, as well as the economic objectives.
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(i) Reduce OY. Lack of scientific knowledge about the condition of a stock(s) could be reason to reduce OY.

(ii) Establish a reserve. Creation of a reserve may compensate for uncertainties in estimating domestic harvest, stock conditions, or environmental factors.

(iii) Adjust management techniques. In the absence of adequate data to predict the effect of a new regime, and to avoid creating unwanted variations, a Council could guard against producing drastic changes in fishing patterns, allocations, or practices.

(iv) Highlight habitat conditions. FMPs may address the impact of pollution and the effects of wetland and estuarine degradation on the stocks of fish; identify causes of pollution and habitat degradation and the authorities having jurisdiction to regulate or influence such activities; propose recommendations that the Secretary will convey to those authorities to alleviate such problems; and state the views of the Council on unresolved or anticipated issues.

(d) Contingencies. Unpredictable events—such as unexpected resource surges or failures, fishing effort greater than anticipated, disruptive gear conflicts, climatic conditions, or environmental catastrophes—are best handled by establishing a flexible management regime that contains a range of management options through which it is possible to act quickly without amending the FMP or even its regulations.

(3) Amendment of a flexible FMP would be necessary when circumstances in the fishery change substantially, or when a Council adopts a different management philosophy and objectives.

§ 600.340 National Standard 7—Costs and Benefits.

(a) Standard 7. Conservation and management measures shall, where practicable, minimize costs and avoid unnecessary duplication.

(b) Necessity of Federal management—

(1) General. The principle that not every fishery needs regulation is implicit in this standard. The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires Councils to prepare FMPs only for overfished fisheries and for other fisheries where regulation would serve some useful purpose and where the present or future benefits of regulation would justify the costs. For example, the need to collect data about a fishery is not, by itself, adequate justification for preparation of an FMP, since there are less costly ways to gather the data (see §600.320(d)(2). In some cases, the FMP preparation process itself, even if it does not culminate in a document approved by the Secretary, can be useful in supplying a basis for management by one or more coastal states.

(2) Criteria. In deciding whether a fishery needs management through regulations implementing an FMP, the following general factors should be considered, among others:

(i) The importance of the fishery to the Nation and to the regional economy.

(ii) The condition of the stock or stocks of fish and whether an FMP can improve or maintain that condition.

(iii) The extent to which the fishery could be or is already adequately managed by states, by state/Federal programs, by Federal regulations pursuant to FMPs or international commissions, or by industry self-regulation, consistent with the policies and standards of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

(iv) The need to resolve competing interests and conflicts among user groups and whether an FMP can further that resolution.