

**Register** on September 12, 1995 (60 FR 47317). The comment period was extended until October 31, 1995, and a public hearing was held on October 5, 1995.

The majority of respondents objected to the proposal for reasons of safety and inconvenience to waterway users. Based on the comments received, the Coast Guard denied the request. The Coast Guard offered a counter proposal, but the County did not respond to the counter proposal.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, the Coast Guard is terminating all further rulemaking under docket number CGD11-95-003.

Dated: December 12, 1997.

**J.C. Card,**

*Vice Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard Commander, Eleventh Coast Guard District.*

[FR Doc. 97-34081 Filed 12-30-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### 40 CFR Parts 52 and 81

[CO-001-0006b & CO-001-0021b; FRL-5934-3]

#### Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of PM<sub>10</sub> Implementation Plan for Colorado; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Steamboat Springs

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** EPA proposes to approve the State implementation plan (SIP) submitted by the State of Colorado to achieve attainment and maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers (PM<sub>10</sub>), including among other things, control measures, technical analyses, quantitative milestones and contingency measures. The SIP was submitted by the Governor of Colorado with a letter dated September 16, 1997 to satisfy certain Federal requirements for an approvable SIP for the Steamboat Springs, Colorado moderate PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment area, as designated effective January 20, 1994. In addition, EPA proposes to approve the Steamboat Springs emergency episode plan. EPA also proposes to amend the boundary for the Steamboat Springs nonattainment area to clarify the original description.

In the Final Rules Section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the

State's SIP revisions as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial revision and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for EPA's actions is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated and the direct final rule will become effective. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this document should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by January 30, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on this action should be addressed to Richard R. Long, 8P2-A, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the State's submittal and documents relevant to this proposed rule are available for inspection during normal business hours at the following locations: Air Program, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202-2405; and Colorado Department of Health, Air Pollution Control Division, 4300 Cherry Creek Drive South, Denver, Colorado 80222-1530.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Amy Platt, Air Program, EPA, Region VIII, at (303) 312-6449.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** See the information provided in the Direct Final action which is located in the Rules Section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: November 4, 1997.

**Jack W. McGraw,**

*Acting Regional Administrator.*

[FR Doc. 97-33959 Filed 12-30-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 622

[I.D. 121197E]

RIN 0648-AJ16

#### Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Resubmission of Disapproved and Revised Measure in Amendment 11

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of a revised, previously disapproved measure in an amendment to a fishery management plan; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS announces that the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) has resubmitted a previously disapproved measure, originally contained in Amendment 11 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Reef Fish Resources of the Gulf of Mexico, for review, approval, and implementation by NMFS. The measure would define optimum yield (OY). Written comments are requested from the public.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before March 2, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be mailed to the Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, 9721 Executive Center Drive N., St. Petersburg, FL 33702.

Requests for copies of the Resubmission of the Previously Disapproved Measure, Originally Contained in Amendment 11, which includes an environmental assessment and a regulatory impact review, should be sent to the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3081 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, FL 33619-2266; Phone: 888-883-1844; Fax: 813-225-7015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert Sadler, 813-570-5305.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) requires each regional fishery management council to submit any fishery management plan or amendment to NMFS for review and approval, disapproval, or partial approval. The Magnuson-Stevens Act also requires that NMFS, upon receiving an amendment, immediately publish a document in the **Federal Register**

stating that the amendment is available for public review and comment.

Based on a preliminary evaluation of Amendment 11 in August 1995, the Regional Administrator, Southeast Region, NMFS, disapproved the definition of OY proposed in Amendment 11, because it was determined to be inconsistent with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The disapproved definition of OY would have set OY for each stock based on a SPR level corresponding to  $F_{0.1}$  until an alternative operational definition that optimizes ecological, economic, and social benefits to the Nation has been developed.

The Council's Spawning Potential Ratio (SPR) Strategy Committee considered NMFS' disapproval and recommended a 30- to 40-percent SPR level as a revised OY. SPR is defined as the number of eggs that could be produced by an average female over its lifetime when the stock is fished, divided by the number of eggs that could be produced by an average female over its lifetime when the stock is unfished. The Council's Reef Fish Stock Assessment Panel (RFSAP) recommended that OY be based on a 35-percent SPR level and that the fishing mortality rate at the 35-percent SPR level be used as a surrogate for the

fishing mortality rate that produces maximum sustainable yield (MSY). The Council considered these recommendations, NMFS' prior disapproval, and public comment, and subsequently resubmitted the revised OY definition to NMFS for review under Amendment 11. The revised definition would initially set OY for each reef fish stock managed under the FMP at a yield level that would result in at least a 30-percent SPR for that stock. This measure allows the Council to propose setting OY based on a more conservative (higher) SPR level, if the RFSAP indicates that the biological information supports such action.

Comments from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) indicate that OY should be defined at a more conservative level than 30-percent SPR for those species for which biological information is presently unavailable, and for other species that change sex, may be especially vulnerable to overfishing, and are believed to be less resilient as they mature. The SEFSC recommended that OY be defined as a fishing mortality rate that allows a 40-percent SPR for these 15 species: Red porgy, rock hind, speckled hind, yellowedge grouper, red hind, jewfish, red grouper, misty grouper, warsaw grouper, snowy

grouper, Nassau grouper, yellowmouth grouper, gag, scamp, and yellowfin grouper. The SEFSC concluded that approval of the resubmitted OY definition would risk overfishing, since application of the proposed OY definition to the 15 listed species may not be based on the best available scientific information. The SEFSC also indicated that the proposed definition may be inconsistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act provisions regarding OY and MSY. Comments on these concerns are specifically invited.

If approved, no Federal regulatory action (i.e., no proposed and final rules) will be necessary to implement the revised and resubmitted measure.

In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS is evaluating the resubmitted measure; comments received by March 2, 1998, will be considered in the approval/disapproval decision. All comments received during the comment period will be addressed in a notice of approval or disapproval.

**Authority:** 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Dated: December 23, 1997.

**Gary C. Matlock,**

*Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 97-34077 Filed 12-30-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-F