

not television stations should be aggregated with the television station revenues in determining whether a concern is small. Our estimate, therefore, likely overstates the number of small entities that might be affected by any changes to the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule, because the revenue figure on which it is based does not include or aggregate revenues from non-television affiliated companies.

65. As set forth in the *NPRM*, as of June 30, 2001, the Commission had licensed 12,392 radio stations. The SBA defines a radio station that has \$5 million or less in annual receipts as a small business. According to Commission staff review of BIA Publications Inc. Master Access Radio Analyzer Database on March 14, 2001, about 10,400 commercial radio stations have revenue of \$5 million or less. We note, however, that many radio stations are affiliated with much larger corporations with much higher revenue. Our estimate, therefore, likely overstates the number of small entities that might be affected by any changes to the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule.

Description of Projected Recording, Recordkeeping, and Other Compliance Requirements

66. We anticipate that none of the proposals presented in the *NPRM* will result in an increase to the reporting and recordkeeping requirements of broadcast stations or newspapers.

Steps Taken To Minimize Significant Economic Impact on Small Entities, and Significant Alternatives Considered

67. The RFA requires an agency to describe any significant, specifically small business, alternatives that it has considered in reaching its proposed approach, which may include the following four alternatives (among others): (1) The establishment of differing compliance or reporting requirements or timetables that take into account the resources available to small entities; (2) the clarification, consolidation, or simplification of compliance or reporting requirements under the rule for small entities; (3) the use of performance, rather than design, standards; and (4) an exemption from coverage of the rule, or any part thereof, for small entities.

68. This *NPRM* invites comment on a number of alternatives to modify or eliminate the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule. The Commission will also consider additional significant alternatives developed in the record.

69. With respect to modification of the rule, the *NPRM* proposes five specific options. First, the Commission might redefine the geographic area in which the rule operates to allow broadcast stations and newspapers to combine if they are in different markets, without regard to whether the station's service contour encompasses the newspaper's city of publications (the current standard). This option might permit more entities, including small newspapers and stations, to combine. In the second option, the "market concentration" standard, the Commission would allow newspapers and stations to combine, provided their combined market share would not exceed a defined limit. Under the third option, the "voice count" standard, the Commission would permit combinations so long as a certain number of independently owned media "voices" would remain in the market. The fourth option would combine the "market concentration" and the "voice count" standards. In each of these several options, the Commission would limit the number and type of combinations in any market to ensure that no market participant attains unconstrained or unrivaled market power or otherwise controls the information sources available. These options would thus permit some smaller businesses to combine to realize economic efficiencies and strengthen their ability to compete, but at the same time ensure that the markets in which they operate do not become too concentrated. Under the fifth option, the Commission would permit newspapers and stations to combine, subject to a structural separations approach. This would permit newspapers and stations to combine and realize economic efficiencies but preserve editorial diversity.

70. In addition to, or as an alternative to, modifying the current rule, the circumstances under which the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule should be waived could be enhanced. In particular, the *NPRM* seeks comment on whether a waiver should be granted if one of the parties to the combination has failed, is failing, or if a new service would result. This would benefit small entities that wish to combine with another in order to save their business, compete more efficiently, or better realize economic efficiencies through economies of scale.

71. As an alternative to modifying the current rule and/or adding to the list of circumstances under which the rule should be waived, the rule could be eliminated entirely. The *NPRM* seeks comment on this alternative. Under this

alternative, entities, including small entities, would be subject only to the antitrust laws and the Commission's general public interest review when granting, renewing or transferring a license.

Federal Rules that May Overlap, or Conflict With the Proposed Rules

72. The rules under consideration in this proceeding do not overlap, duplicate, or conflict with any other rules.

Federal Communications Commission.
Magalie Roman Salas,
Secretary.
 [FR Doc. 01-24950 Filed 10-4-01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6712-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 648

[I.D. 092501C]

Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery

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

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS); request for comments.

SUMMARY: The New England Fishery Management Council (Council) announces its intention to prepare an SEIS in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act for Framework Adjustment 36 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan (FMP). The intent of this action is to reduce regulatory discards in the Gulf of Maine (GOM) cod fishery; address reductions in fishing mortality needed to ensure that the mortality objectives for Georges Bank (GB) cod, GB haddock, GB yellowtail flounder, GOM cod, and Southern New England (SNE) yellowtail flounder are achieved; allow tuna purse seine vessels access to the current closed areas; and expand the current Small Mesh Northern Shrimp Fishery Exemption Area.

DATES: Written comments on the intent to prepare the SEIS must be received on or before 5 p.m., local time, November 5, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to Paul J. Howard, Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council, 50 Water Street,

Mill 2, Newburyport, MA 01950. Comments may also be sent via fax to (978) 465-0492. Comments will not be accepted if submitted via e-mail or Internet.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Howard, Executive Director, New England Fishery Management Council, (978) 465-0492.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Amendment 7 to the FMP (61 FR 27710, May 31, 1996) specifies a procedure for setting annual target total allowable catch (TAC) levels for GB cod, GB haddock, GB yellowtail flounder, GOM cod, SNE yellowtail flounder and an aggregate TAC for the remaining regulated multispecies. This procedure requires that the Council's Multispecies Monitoring Committee (MSMC) annually review the best available scientific information, and recommend annual target TAC levels for these key groundfish stocks, as well as management options to achieve the FMP objectives.

Calculation of the annual TAC levels by the MSMC is based on the biological reference points of F_{max} for GOM cod and $F_{0.1}$ for the remaining stocks of cod, haddock, and yellowtail flounder. The MSMC also intends to estimate the TAC associated with $F_{0.1}$ for GOM cod, since this is considered the more appropriate biological reference point by the MSMC and is expected to be incorporated into Amendment 13, which is currently under development by the Council.

For the 2001 fishing year, the MSMC developed recommendations for target TACs that were consistent with the rebuilding targets specified in Amendment 7. However, the status of GOM cod was not clear due to the difficulty in characterizing discards in the fishery in 1999 and 2000. The MSMC report for the 2001 fishing year noted that better estimates of the fishing mortality rate (F) in 1999 and 2000 for GOM cod would be available once results from the 33rd Stock Assessment Review Committee (SARC 33) were completed in June 2001.

Although the Council did not develop an annual adjustment framework for fishing year 2001, in response to the MSMC report and public comment concerning regulatory discards in the GOM cod fishery, the Council voted to make the January 2001 Council meeting the first framework (Framework 36) meeting for adjustment measures that would decrease regulatory discards of GOM cod.

At its initial framework meeting in January 2001 to address regulatory discards in the GOM cod fishery, the Council voted to maintain the fishing year 2000 management measures for GOM cod for the 2001 fishing year until additional information was available from SARC 33. Results from SARC 33 were presented to the Council at its July 2001 meeting. For the GOM cod fishery, SARC 33 advised that fishing mortality be reduced by approximately 63 percent to meet the Amendment 7 F target of $F_{max}=0.27$. If this F value is achieved for GOM cod in 2002, then the above average 1998 year class will likely experience enhanced spawning potential.

In light of the SAW 33 advice, the Council tasked its Multispecies Oversight Committee to develop management options to reduce regulatory discards and address the fishing mortality reductions needed for the GOM cod fishery. Management measures considered by the Committee thus far include additional GOM closures and/or closure modifications, extension or adjustment to the Western GOM Closed Area, trip limit revisions, mesh-size increases, modifications to the days-at-sea accounting scheme, and equivalent measures to reduce recreational catch. Although the measures discussed to date focus on the GOM cod fishery, the Council also intends that this action be the annual adjustment for the 2002 fishery. Therefore, other management measures may also be developed to ensure that the Amendment 7 F objectives are reached for GB cod, GB haddock, GB yellowtail flounder, and SNE yellowtail flounder if so recommended by the MSMC.

However, given the complexity of this task and the magnitude of the required reductions in F and their associated impacts, the Council and NMFS have determined that significant impacts on the human environment may result, and preparation of an SEIS for this action will be necessary to examine the cumulative effects and consequences of the short-term measures on the human environment. In preparing the SEIS, the Council and NMFS will take into account, in addition to comments received in response to this document, all comments that have already been submitted and all discussions that have occurred in Council meetings before the publication of this document.

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

Dated: October 1, 2001.

Bruce C. Morehead,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.
[FR Doc. 01-25036 Filed 10-4-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 679

[I.D. 091301C]

RIN 00648-AL98

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Revision of Overfishing Definitions for the Salmon Fishery

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

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) has submitted for Secretarial review Amendment 6 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Salmon Fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone off the Coast of Alaska (Salmon FMP). This amendment is necessary to revise the overfishing definitions for the salmon fishery authorized under the Salmon FMP. This action is intended to ensure that conservation and management measures continue to be based on the best scientific information available and to advance the Council's ability to achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from the salmon fisheries under its jurisdiction.

DATES: Comments on the amendments must be submitted on or before December 4, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments on this amendment should be submitted to Sue Salvesson, Assistant Regional Administrator for Sustainable Fisheries, Alaska Region, NMFS, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802-1668, Attn: Lori Gravel, or delivered to the Federal Building, 709 West 9th Street, Juneau, AK. NMFS will not accept comments by e-mail or internet. Copies of Amendment 6 to the Salmon FMP, and the Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the amendment are available from NMFS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Gretchen Harrington, 907-586-7228 or gretchen.harrington@noaa.gov.