

State and county	Location and case No.	Dates and name of newspaper where notice was published	Chief executive officer of community	Effective date of modification	Community No.
California: San Diego.	City of Oceanside (00-09-332P).	June 15, 2001, June 22, 2001, <i>North County Times</i> .	The Honorable Terry Johnson, Mayor, City of Oceanside, 300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside, California 92054.	May 31, 2001	060294
California: Sonoma	City of Cloverdale (01-09-122P).	June 13, 2001, June 20, 2001, <i>Cloverdale Revueille</i> .	The Honorable Robert Jehn, Mayor, City of Cloverdale, City Hall, P.O. Box 217, Cloverdale, California 95425-0217.	May 23, 2001	060376
California: Shasta	City of Redding (01-09-218P).	July 13, 2001, July 20, 2001, <i>Redding Record Searchlight</i> .	The Honorable Dave McGeorge, Mayor, City of Redding, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, California 96001.	October 18, 2001	060360
Colorado: Douglas	Town of Parker (01-08-180P).	July 11, 2001, July 18, 2001, <i>Douglas County News</i> .	The Honorable Gary Lasater, Mayor, Town of Parker, 20120 East Main Street, Parker, Colorado 80138.	June 22, 2001	080310
Colorado: Douglas	Unincorporated Areas (01-08-180P).	July 11, 2001, July 18, 2001, <i>Douglas County News</i> .	The Honorable Melanie Worley, Chairperson, Douglas County, Board of Commissioners, 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, Colorado 80104.	June 22, 2001	080049
Kansas: Butler	City of Andover (00-07-552P).	July 5, 2001, July 12, 2001, <i>Andover Journal Advocate</i> .	The Honorable Dennis L. Bush, Mayor, City of Andover, P.O. Box 295, Andover, Kansas 67002-0295.	June 19, 2001	200383
North Carolina: Wake.	City of Raleigh (01-04-061P).	June 7, 2001, June 14, 2001, <i>News and Observer</i> .	The Honorable Paul Coble, Mayor, City of Raleigh, City Hall, P.O. Box 590, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602.	May 30, 2001	370243
Nevada: Clark	City of Mesquite (01-09-170P).	May 24, 2001, May 31, 2001, <i>Las Vegas Review-Journal</i> .	The Honorable Charles Home, Mayor, City of Mesquite, 10 East Mesquite Boulevard, Mesquite, Nevada 89027.	August 29, 2001 ..	320035
Nevada: Clark	Unincorporated Areas (00-09-828P).	June 15, 2001, June 22, 2001, <i>Las Vegas Review-Journal</i> .	The Honorable Dario Herrera, Chairman, Clark County, Board of Commissioners, 500 Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89155.	September 20, 2001.	320003
Oklahoma: Oklahoma.	City of Oklahoma City (00-06-879P).	July 6, 2001, July 13, 2001, <i>Daily Oklahoman</i> .	The Honorable Kirk Humphreys, Mayor, City of Oklahoma City, 200 North Walker, Suite 302, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102.	June 20, 2001	405378
Texas: Collin	City of Plano (01-06-359P).	July 13, 2001, July 20, 2001, <i>Plano Star Courier</i> .	The Honorable Jeran Akers, Mayor, City of Plano, P.O. Box 860358, Plano, Texas 75086-0358.	June 20, 2001	480140
Texas: Fort Bend	City of Missouri City (00-06-727P).	April 19, 2001, April 26, 2001, <i>Southwest Sun</i> .	The Honorable Allen Owen, Mayor, City of Missouri City, P.O. Box 666, Missouri City, Texas 77459.	March 23, 2001	480304
Texas: Fort Bend	Unincorporated Areas (00-06-727P).	April 19, 2001, April 26, 2001, <i>Southwest Sun</i> .	The Honorable James Adolphus, Fort Bend County Judge, 301 Jackson Street, Suite 719, Richmond, Texas 77469.	March 23, 2001	480228

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.100, "Flood Insurance")

Dated: August 21, 2001.

Robert F. Shea, Jr.,

Acting Administrator, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration.

[FR Doc. 01-21589 Filed 8-24-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-04-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

46 CFR Part 1

[USCG 2001-8894]

RIN 2115-AG11

Right To Appeal; Director, Great Lakes Pilotage

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Direct final rule; confirmation of effective date.

SUMMARY: On June 13, 2001, we published a direct final rule (66 FR 31842). The direct final rule notified the

public of the Coast Guard's intent to amend its appellate procedures to provide explicit authority for appeal of decisions or actions taken by the Director, Great Lakes Pilotage. We have not received an adverse comment, or notice of intent to submit an adverse comment, on this rule. Therefore, this rule will go into effect as scheduled.

DATES: The effective date of the direct final rule is confirmed as September 11, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: If you have questions on this rule, call Mr. John Bennett, Coast Guard, telephone 202-267-2856. If you have questions on viewing the docket, call Ms. Dorothy Beard, Chief, Dockets, Department of

Transportation, telephone 202-366-5149.

Dated: August 20, 2001.

Paul J. Pluta,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety and Environmental Protection.

[FR Doc. 01-21563 Filed 8-24-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-U

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 660

[Docket No. 010105005-1206-02; I.D. 120600A]

RIN 0648-AO64

Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery; Amendment 9

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

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NMFS issues this final rule to implement Amendment 9 to the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan (FMP), which was submitted by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) for review and approval by the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) and which was approved on March 22, 2001. Amendment 9 was prepared to provide for documentation of bycatch in the coastal pelagic species fishery (CPS), to ensure that a standardized reporting methodology to assess the amount and type of bycatch is in place, to put in place any necessary conservation and management measures to minimize bycatch, and to ensure that Indian fishing rights are implemented according to treaties between the U.S. and the tribes. The final rule implements Amendment 9 with respect to Indian fishing rights and codifies a provision in the FMP that authorizes the Regional Administrator, Southwest Region, to require observers on fishing vessels for scientific purposes should such observers be necessary. The intent of this final rule is to implement Amendment 9 and to codify the authorization to require observers.

DATES: Effective September 26, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Copies of Amendment 9, which includes an environmental assessment/regulatory impact review, may be obtained from Donald O. McIssac, Executive Director, Pacific

Fishery Management Council, 2130 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 224, Portland, Oregon, 97201.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Morgan, Sustainable Fisheries Division, NMFS, at 562-980-4036.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Council submitted Amendment 9 for Secretarial review on November 21, 2000. NMFS published a notice of availability for Amendment 9 in the **Federal Register** on December 21, 2000 (65 FR 80411), announcing a 60-day public comment period, which ended on February 20, 2001. The Secretary approved Amendment 9 on March 22, 2001. The proposed rule implementing Amendment 9 was published in the **Federal Register** on March 30, 2001 (66 FR 17395). The comment period ended on May 14, 2001. No comments were received. The regulatory text remains the same as that in the proposed rule.

On June 10, 1999, Amendment 8 to the Northern Anchovy Fishery Management Plan was partially approved by the Secretary. The portions of Amendment 8 approved by the Secretary added four species to the plan, implemented limited entry to prevent overcapitalization, and changed the name of the plan to the Coastal Pelagic Species Fishery Management Plan. Other provisions were not approved. The optimum yield (OY) for squid and the bycatch provisions in Amendment 8 were not approved because they did not conform to National Standards 1 and 9, respectively, of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). Amendment 8, contrary to the requirements of National Standard 9, failed to include a standardized reporting methodology to assess the amount and type of bycatch in the CPS fishery and did not explain whether additional management measures to minimize bycatch and the mortality of unavoidable bycatch were practicable. Also, Amendment 8 failed to provide an estimate of maximum sustainable yield (MSY) for squid, which is necessary in order to determine OY.

Background on the preparation and review of Amendment 9 was summarized in the preamble to the proposed rule and is not repeated here. Based on testimony concerning MSY for squid, the Council decided to include in Amendment 9 only the bycatch provision and a provision establishing a framework to ensure that Indian fishing rights are implemented according to treaties between the U.S. and the specific tribes. Since implementation of the FMP, the CPS fishery has expanded to Oregon and Washington. As a result,

the FMP must discuss Indian fishing rights in these areas.

A stock assessment workshop on squid was held at the Southwest Fisheries Science Center on May 14-16, 2001, to review the research being conducted in California. Based on the results of this workshop, the Council will prepare an amendment that will address OY and MSY for squid.

Classification

The Administrator, Southwest Region, NMFS, determined that Amendment 9 is necessary for the conservation and management of the coastal pelagic species fishery and that it is consistent with the national standards of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and other applicable laws.

This rule only implements provisions of Amendment 9 that relate to Indian fishing rights and codifies existing elements of the FMP requiring observers. The other provisions of Amendment 9 do not require regulatory text.

This rule does not contain policies with tribal impacts within the meaning of Executive Order 13175.

This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

The Chief Counsel for Regulation of the Department of Commerce certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration when this rule was proposed that it would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. No comments were received on the economic impacts of this rule on small entities, and the basis for this certification has not changed. Accordingly, a regulatory flexibility analysis was not prepared.

NMFS initiated an informal consultation with the Protected Resources Division, Southwest Region, on January 12, 1999, with regard to the effects of Amendment 8 on endangered and threatened marine mammals and salmon under NMFS' jurisdiction. On June 3, 1999, NMFS determined that Amendment 8 would not likely adversely affect listed species under NMFS jurisdiction.

On June 8, 1999, NMFS provided the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) with background information on the harvest strategies in Amendment 8 and their potential impact on other species. NMFS requested that FWS concur with NMFS' determination that Amendment 8 would not likely adversely affect any threatened or endangered birds under FWS' jurisdiction. On June 10, 1999, FWS stated that Amendment 8 would