

evaluation is available for review in the Docket.

**B. Impact on Small Entities.**

Based on limited information concerning the size and nature of entities likely affected, I certify that this notice will not, as promulgated, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criterial of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

**List of Subjects**

49 CFR Part 171

Hazardous materials transportation, Incorporation by reference.

49 CFR Part 175

Hazardous materials transportation, Air carriers.

In consideration of the foregoing, 49 CFR Parts 171 and 175 would be amended as follows:

**PART 171—GENERAL INFORMATION, REGULATIONS AND DEFINITIONS**

1. The authority citation for Part 171 would be revised to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1803, 1804, 1805, 1808; 49 CFR Part 1.

2. In § 171.7, paragraph (d)(27) would be revised to read:

**§ 171.1 Matter incorporated by reference.**

(b) \* \* \* (27) International Civil Aviation Organization Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air, DOC 9284-AN/905 ( ICAO Technical Instructions), 1987 edition.

**PART 175—CARRIAGE BY AIRCRAFT**

3. The authority citation for Part 175 would be revised to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1803, 1804, 1805, 1808, 49 CFR Part 1.

4. In § 175.10, the introductory text to paragraph (a)(4) would be revised, and paragraph (a)(15) would be revised to read as follows:

**§ 175.10 Exceptions**

(a) \* \* \* (4) Non-radioactive medicinal and toilet articles carried by a crewmember of passenger in checked or carry-on baggage, and aerosols, with no subsidiary risk, for sporting or home use when carried in checked baggage only, when:

(15) Alcoholic beverages, perfumes, colognes, and liquefied gas lighters that have been examined by the Bureau of

Explosives (B of E) and approved by the Director, Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation, carried aboard a passenger-carrying aircraft by the operator for use or sale on the aircraft.

5. In § 175.30, paragraph (e)(1)(iii) would be added to read as follows:

**§ 175.30 Accepting and inspecting shipments.**

(e) \* \* \* (1) \* \* \* (iii) Not more than one package is overpacked.

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 12, 1986.

Sherwood C. Chu, Deputy Director, Office of Hazardous Materials Transportation. [FR Doc. 86-18595 Filed 8-15-86; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

**49 CFR Part 192**

[Docket No. PS-84; Notice 3]

**Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipeline; Confirmation or Revision of Maximum Allowable Operating Pressure Near Certain Occupied Buildings and Outside Areas**

**AGENCY:** Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** RSPA proposes to change the standard classification pipelines located near certain buildings and outside areas that are occupied infrequently. The existing classification has proven to be unreasonably burdensome in applying requirements for confirmation or revision of maximum allowable operating pressure (MOPA) where a change in classification has occurred because of the construction of such a building or outside area.

**DATE:** Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on this proposal before November 17, 1986. Late filed comments will be considered as far as is practicable. Interested persons should submit as part of their written comments all the material that is considered relevant to any statement of fact or argument made.

**ADDRESS:** Comments should be sent to the Dockets Branch, DHM-53, Research and Special Programs Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590. Please identify the docket and notice numbers. All comments and

docket materials will be available in Room 8426 for inspection and copying between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. each working day. Non-Federal employee visitors are admitted to the DOT headquarters building through the southwest quadrant at Seventh and E Streets.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Robert F. Langley, (202) 366-4562, regarding the contents of this notice, or the Dockets Branch, (202) 366-4453, regarding copies of the notice or other information in the docket.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

Under § 192.611, the MAOP of gas pipelines must be confirmed or revised according to maximum hoop stress levels that correspond to population densities. In general, as the population near a gas pipeline increases (to levels set by a classification scheme in § 192.5), the maximum hoop stress level decreases (varying from 72 percent of specified minimum yield strength (SMYS) in remote Class 1 areas to 40 percent in densely populated Class 4 areas) and the pipeline's MAOP must be confirmed or decreased accordingly. In an area of increased population, an operator who wishes to maintain the MAOP of a pipeline operating at a high hoop stress relative to SMYS usually must replace the pipeline, using either a higher strength material or the same material with a greater wall thickness. Replacement can be costly, depending on the length of line section involved. Section 192.611 does, however, allow pipelines that have experienced a single jump in class location (e.g., Class 1 to Class 2) to maintain their existing MAOP if they were previously pressure tested to 90 percent of SMYS for at least 8 hours or are tested in accordance with Subpart J after the class change occurs.

The purpose of re-evaluating the operating hoop stress level of gas pipelines on a population basis is to combat their susceptibility to long-running fractures. Fracture propagation of this type, which is caused by the high energy levels of compressed gas, can be catastrophic in highly populated areas. Under the theory of the gas regulations, the risk of such an event is reduced by increasing, in relation to population density, the margin between the operating hoop stress and the stress at which yield would occur. The larger the margin, the larger the fault or the accidental overloading a pipeline can withstand before failure, thus reducing the chance that a long-running fracture will occur.

Under § 192.5(d)(2) a Class 3 location is an area where the pipeline lies within 100 yards of any of the following:

(i) A building that is occupied by 20 or more persons during normal use.

(ii) A small, well-defined outside area that is occupied by 20 or more persons during normal use, such as a playground, recreation area, outdoor theater, or other place of public assembly.

Developments of the type characterized by § 192.5(d)(2) run the gamut from rural churches used a few hours a week or hunting lodges used seasonally to nursing homes or schools. They often are constructed in the vicinity of existing pipelines, with little, if any, notice to the operator. Such unanticipated developments, which raise the class location of the affected pipeline segments to Class 3, can have major cost impacts under § 192.611. The impact is greatest on pipelines which had been designed and constructed to rural Class 1 standards—in the millions of dollars when considering the costs of replacements and gas lost.

Because of the high costs of meeting § 192.611, several operators in § 192.5(d)(2) situations have requested relief from either § 192.5(d)(2) or § 192.611 for pipeline segments no more than 600-feet long. Besides the high costs of replacing short segments, the reasons for their requests centered on the small number of building occupants or the infrequency of occupancy, such as once or twice a week, or a combination of the two. The requests were not granted, however, because change in local conditions is the intended trigger for § 192.611 and the operators were unable to clearly demonstrate that public safety would not be adversely affected if the MAOP of the pipeline segment involved were not confirmed or revised as required by § 192.611.

Nevertheless, RSPA has remained sympathetic to the plight of these and similarly situated operators who are faced with high compliance costs to achieve uncertain safety benefits. The potential benefits are uncertain because even assuming the existence of a defect in a pipeline, the likelihood that a long-running fracture will occur at all in a gas pipeline is remote, even for pipelines operating at 72 percent of SMYS. In addition to the small likelihood of a long-running fracture occurring, the potential benefits of applying § 192.611 in § 192.5(d)(2) areas are further reduced when the number of people exposed to risk is small on the length of their exposure is brief, or both. For example, the risk to a hunting lodge used seasonally on weekends is much less than to an equally populated nursing

home where people are constantly in attendance. Yet, the cost to meet § 192.611 could be the same.

This analysis leads to the conclusion that § 192.5(d)(2) may be more conservative in application under § 192.611 than called for by the needs for safety. In the absence of data to further define the need for or benefits of meeting § 192.611 in areas defined by § 192.5(d)(2), RSPA published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) (50 FR 36116), seeking more information. Public comment was invited on the issue of whether it is necessary for safety to confirm or revise the MAOP of gas pipelines in the vicinity of isolated buildings or outdoor places of assembly where 20 or more people gather during normal use. At the request of the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA), the comment period on the proposed rule was extended to January 3, 1986, by Notice 2 (50 FR 45845), which resulted in interested parties having a total of 4 months for comment.

A total of 41 commenters responded to the ANPRM. Basically, the comments came from gas transmission pipeline operators, but some comments came from State regulatory agencies and a few pipeline trade associations. The comments have been helpful in enabling RSPA to arrive at the course to follow for this NPRM, since the majority of the commenters responded to the alternative solutions and to the questions asked in the ANPRM. Especially helpful have been the responses to the request in the ANPRM for actual costs involved in complying with the confirmation or revision rule for pipelines in areas defined by § 192.5(d)(2).

#### Discussion of Comments on the Questions and the Alternatives

*1. Are the requirements of § 192.611 needed for the safety of pipelines in general? If so, are they needed for pipelines in Class 3 areas defined by § 192.5(d)(2)?*

Of the respondents to this question, 64 percent believed that some sort of regulation was needed to provide extra protection for the areas defined. However, several of the commenters felt that the goal could be accomplished by adopting the latest amendment to American Society of Mechanical Engineers' (ASME) B31.8. This amendment to B31.8 substitutes the word "infrequently" for the term "normal use."

*2. If the requirements of § 192.611 are needed for safety in general or in § 192.5(d)(2) areas, what safety problem does compliance with § 192.611 help to resolve, and are there any alternative less costly solutions to that problem?*

The commenters that answered this question in a direct manner believed that present regulations led to reduced stress on the pipeline. The RSPA continues to believe that reducing the maximum allowable operating pressure to reduce the hoop stress offers increased protection to the public. To date, however, after reviewing all comments, we question whether this protection is justified in § 192.5(d)(2) situations. Four commenters stated that: "The requirements of § 192.611 cause an operator to verify the integrity of a pipeline and to provide for increased surveillance of the pipeline in the area involved. The increased surveillance would reduce the possibility of damage to the pipeline from outside activities, the major cause of pipeline incidents." Continuing surveillance is required under Part 192 by § 192.613, not § 192.611. As far as external damage caused by construction activity, § 192.614, "Damage prevention program," was designed to help prevent that from occurring.

*3. If the rules were modified under any alternative above, should other safety requirements be proposed to maintain safety in the vicinity of the isolated building or outside area as defined in § 192.5(d)(2)? If so, what should they be and why? If not, why not?*

Fifty percent of the commenters, in answering this, felt that it would not be necessary to set forth other rules if the present rules were modified as discussed in the ANPRM. They felt that a modification could be found to relieve the present burden and still continue to maintain a high level of safety.

*4. What data can be provided from experience or studies about degree of risks associated with a pipeline in proximity to the § 192.5(d)(2) types locations? In this regard, is an isolated pocket of population within 100 yards of a pipeline a factor in the occurrence of a pipeline accident? What data can you provide about such adjacent population density in relationship to the severity of (or hazardous results from) a pipeline accident?*

To expand on the statement made in the discussion to question number 2, 100 percent of the persons replying to this question, representing 34 percent of the commenters, did not provide any data showing that any accidents had

occurred at these isolated locations and if they had, had caused any damage. (However, two accidents were reported in answer to question 7.)

*5. Is "20 or more persons" the appropriate size group on which to base this class location criteria? Cite any research, experience, or safety studies.*

Forty-four percent of the commenters answered this question. All of the commenters said that 20 was too small a number. (Refer to the discussion of comments to Alternative No. 2). The reason given for increasing the number was that Class 2 allows for a greater number of occupants per mile, as indicated by the Bureau of Census figures quoted in the ANPRM. It is difficult, however, to compare the risk exposure in Class 2 areas, possibly spread over a mile long segment 440 yards wider, to that in isolated buildings or outdoor areas with no upper limit on occupants and very near to the pipeline.

*6. Can a better criteria be developed from research, study, or risk analysis upon which to base possible exposure of the public to hazard than "normal use?" What is it and what is the basis for your recommendation?*

Thirty-six of the commenters responded to this question, and they felt that a better criteria could be developed for "normal use" with the majority offering "frequent" or "frequently." (See also the discussion under Alternative No 3.)

*7. What data are available from research or experience concerning any relationship between the stress level in a gas pipeline and the cause of a pipeline accident or the magnitude of accident consequences? Do accidents on higher stress level pipelines normally result in greater damages than lower stress level pipelines, given the same population density and mixture?*

This question is related to question number 4 and the discussion of question number 2. Thirty-seven percent of the commenters replied to this question. With the exception of two of these, all answered that they could not supply any data. The two that could supply data stated that several years ago they had incidents caused by outside force damage near § 192.5(d)(2) locations. The only damages, however, were to the pipeline.

*8. If change is not provided in the regulation from the effects of the*

*criteria in § 192.5(d)(2) on the MAOP resulting from such class location changes, what are the estimated costs to comply for an operator's impacted pipelines? For upgrading? Moving the pipeline? Reducing MAOP. Give estimated number of locations with size and length of each.*

Ten of the commenters provided excellent detailed data of the breakdowns of costs, including locations, lengths and diameters of pipeline involved, and whether or not the costs involved replacement of the pipeline, relocation of the pipeline, or the encroachment involved, or the losses caused by reducing pressure. Individual costs per location ranged from \$4,000 to \$500,000. One major pipeline has spent over \$7.5 million and another over \$8 million in compliance.

Docket No. PS-84's ANPRM offered six alternatives for the commenters. The alternatives and the responses follow:

*1. Continue present rules §§ 192.5(d)(2) and 192.611 unchanged.*

Negative responses to this alternative indicated that 85 percent favored some sort of amendment. The Department of Public Service of the State of New York favored continuing with waivers rather than change the rule. RSPA feels, however, that the potential problems are too widespread to continue to deal with on a waiver basis.

*2. Modify § 192.5(d)(2) by changing number of persons to some number greater than 20, possibly the range of numbers in the other Class 3 location using Census data.*

There were 65 percent of the responses that did not believe that changing the number from 20 to some other number would help. The other 35 percent offered numbers ranging from 50 to 100. One commenter favored adopting the revised version of the ASME's Gas Distribution and Transmission System Piping Code (B31.8a) which states "no fewer than 20." The comments presented no basis, however, for increasing the occupancy level above 20.

*3. Quantify the term "normal use." This could be on the basis of days of use per year or percentage of time used.*

Although less than 50 percent of the commenters responded to this alternative, 75 percent of those that responded in favor of a change suggested that the word "frequently" be substituted for "normal use." This, no doubt, was derived from the revised version of ASME B31.8 which states in 840.3(b) "If the facility is used

infrequently the requirements of (b) below need not be applied . . ." Adopting the concept of frequent use would alleviate some costs of § 192.611 associated with the apparently low risk facilities like buildings occupied once a week. However, quantification is needed for clarity of the rule.

*4. Place the criteria presently in § 192.5(d)(2) under § 192.5(c), thus making such a location a Class 2 location.*

A total of 51 percent of the commenters responded to this proposal and 52 percent of those discussing the proposal were in favor of it. This proposal, if adopted, would have a broad effect throughout Part 192 whenever Class 3 is mentioned. Some of the comments perceived and discussed these effects. The effect may be more than needed to resolve the immediate problem.

*5. Revise § 192.611 to increase the MAOP allowed for those pipelines impacted by the criteria of § 192.5(d)(2) to that allowed for pipelines in Class 2 locations.*

Forty-four percent discussed this alternative but 89 percent of those favored this solution. Pacific Gas and Electric Company suggested, in agreeing with Alternative No. 5, that there should still be some requirement that the operator evaluate each individual situation. Also, this commenter said the operator should be required to verify that an adequate level of cathodic protection is being maintained on the segment of pipe, and to install additional markers and conduct additional surveillance for construction activity.

The INGAA, an association of interstate operators, stated its preference for Alternative No. 5. Basically, Alternative No. 5 is a narrow version of Alternative No. 4, with the class location shift limited to § 192.611. The commenters favoring this alternative did not satisfactorily explain why there would be no loss in safety from this broad change to § 192.611. The commenters did indicate, however, some concern about the safety impact.

*6. Except the § 192.5(d)(2) defined Class 3 locations from § 192.611.*

The final alternative presented for comment received comments from 43 percent of the commenters. Thirty-three percent of these favored this type of change whereas 67 percent did not favor it. The INGAA, representing gas transmission pipeline operators, was

one of the dissenters on this alternative. Their reasons for rejecting Alternative No. 6 was that if § 192.611 were changed for pipelines coming under the criteria of § 192.5(d)(2), there would be "the possibility of placing a high number of persons at risk." RSPA agrees with INGAA. Adoption of Alternative No. 6 would have a sweeping effect without any indication that there would be no adverse safety impact.

At the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee meeting held December 10, 1985, the Committee discussed the alternatives and questions presented in the ANPRM. Although the Committee did not vote officially on any one of the alternatives, the Committee's official report on the meeting stated:

There was no clear sense of the committee based on the discussion, in fact comments ran the full spectrum from support for the current regulations to concern over whether the current regulation in 192.611 causes more of a hazard than it protects against one. Certainly, reliable data to indicate whether the existing regulations increase safety, by how much, and at what cost would assist the committee and the DOT staff in developing an opinion.

The needs for safety and the costs of attaining it were brought forth by the ANPRM. The great majority of commenters favored some sort of change for either § 192.5(d)(2) or § 192.611 but recognized that § 192.5(d)(2) represents places of added risk in otherwise low risk areas. In considering the comments, it became obvious that total elimination or exception of § 192.5(d)(2) as it now applies under § 192.611 (Alternative No. 6) would significantly detract from the protection of the public by the rule. Further, there appeared to be no safety basis to support changing § 192.5(d)(2) from Class 3 to Class 2 either overall (Alternative No. 4) or just in § 192.611 (Alternative No. 5).

Of the remaining alternatives, RSPA believes the best balance between safety and cost would be achieved by Alternative No. 3, modify the term "normal use" in § 192.5(d)(2). Many commenters favored the use of "frequently," derived from the ASME B31.8 Code, Amendment C, instead of the term "normal use." In an interpretation of § 192.5(d)(2), RSPA has stated "the frequency of normal use is a factor to consider in determining whether the use of a building or outside area creates a risk . . . to warrant application of Class 3 standards." While the concept of frequent use to trigger Class 3 is useful, for enforceability RSPA is proposing to adopt a specific use rate instead of "frequently" as a substitute for "normal use." There is

precedent for quantifying terms within § 192.5, since the entire class location scheme is based on house counts within specific measured areas. This quantified approach has proved to be easily enforceable and uniformly understood.

The frequency of use that RSPA believes appropriate for § 192.5(d)(2) is use throughout the week for a substantial part of the year, and not just on weekends or isolated periods during the year. This is the use received, for example, by an office, school, store or factory. One commenter suggested a 150 day minimum use limit, to exclude from Class 3, pipelines near buildings or places infrequently used, such as those used only on weekends. This commenter also suggested a 4-hour minimum use during each of the 150 days to include in Class 3, buildings with half-day use, as may be associated with nursery schools or other such facilities. Other frequencies suggested were as low as 1 day a week throughout the year or daily for 12 weeks a year to cover the summer season. However, such infrequent use would not appreciably change the burdensome effect of the existing rule.

The frequency RSPA proposes is used "at least five days a week during at least 26 weeks a year". Neither the days nor weeks would have to run consecutively. We believe this frequency would continue to maintain an acceptable level of safety for schools, hospitals, restaurants, etc., in § 191.5(d)(2) situations throughout Part 192 and including § 192.611. At the same time, it would eliminate the burden of the occasional county fair, church, and hunting lodge that § 192.5(d)(2) presents under § 192.611. An hourly use rate, as suggested by one commenter, was considered too impractical to apply and not needed to achieve the purpose of the proposed rule change. Interested persons are particularly urged to comment on the proposed number of weeks and number of days per week, and on the benefit or the burden of any alternative frequencies they may suggest.

#### Costs

Some costs to relocate pipelines were discussed in the ANPRM. In the June 1984 issue of "Pipeline Digest," average current construction costs for typical pipe sizes (12 inch through 30 inch O.D.) and for the average length of the pipeline operators to comply with pipeline safety regulations because of the criteria of § 192.5(d)(2). This figure appears now to be on the conservative side. In question number 8 (discussed above) that appeared in the ANPRM, costs to pipeline operators caused by the criteria of § 192.5(d)(2) were asked

for. Costs to only two operators were in excess of \$15 million with many more listing costs of a million dollars or more. The net result of such high replacement costs for pipelines could lead to increases in gas prices or a reduced gas supply. However, in some situations, operators would have to incur some of these costs at a later date when and if the area becomes more densely populated.

#### Classification

This proposed amendment constitutes a reduction in burden on the regulated industry by modifying a regulation in a manner that serves public safety and reduces costs. It is considered to be nonmajor under Executive Order 12291 and nonsignificant under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). The net economic impact has been found to be a reduction in costs since at least a \$24 million average annual savings to the industry and consumers, based on responses to the question on costs in the ANPRM, will result.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) requires a review of certain rules proposed after January 1, 1981, for their effects on small businesses, organizations, and governmental bodies. Based on the facts available concerning the impact of this rulemaking action, I certify that the action will not, if adopted as final, have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

#### List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 192

Pipeline safety, Natural gas, Class locations, Maximum allowable operating pressure.

#### PART 192—[AMENDED]

In view of the foregoing, RSPA proposes to amend 49 CFR Part 192 as follows:

1. The authority citation for Part 192 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 1672; U.S.C. 1804; 49 CFR 1.53, and Appendix A of Part 1.

2. In § 192.5, paragraphs (d)(2)(i) and (d)(2)(ii) would be revised as follows:

#### § 192.5 Class locations.

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) \* \* \*

(2) \* \* \*

(i) A building that is occupied by 20 or more persons on at least 5 days a week during at least 26 weeks a year.

(ii) A small, well-defined outside area that is occupied by 20 or more persons on at least 5 days a week during at least 26 weeks a year, such as a playground,

recreation area, outdoor theater, or other place of public assembly.

\* \* \* \* \*

Issued in Washington, DC, on August 13, 1986, under authority delegated by 49 CFR Part 106, Appendix A.

James C. Thomas,

*Acting Director, Office of Pipeline Safety.*

[FR Doc. 86-18600 Filed 8-15-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-60-M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 661 and 663

#### Ocean Salmon Fisheries off the Coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California, and Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), NOAA, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public hearings and request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** The Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold hearings to receive public comments on (1) an amendment to the fishery management plan for the commercial and recreational salmon fisheries off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California; and (2) an amendment to the

Pacific coast groundfish plan. The amendment documents will be available at the hearing locations and the Council office. These hearings are being held in accordance with section 302(h)(3) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

**DATE:** See "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION" for dates and locations of the hearings. All hearings will begin at 7:00 p.m. Written comments are invited through September 9, 1986.

**ADDRESSES:** See "SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION" for locations of the hearings. Written comments should be sent to the Pacific Fishery Management Council, Metro Center, Suite 420, 2000 SW. First Avenue, Portland, OR 97201. Copies of both salmon and groundfish amendments will be available at this address beginning August 15, 1986.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Joseph C. Greenley, Executive Director, Pacific Fishery Management Council, 503-221-6352.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The amendment to the salmon fishery management plan consists of three issues: (1) Oregon coastal natural coho escapement goal, (2) in season management actions and procedures, and (3) allocation of allowable ocean harvest of coho south of Cape Falcon.

The amendment to the groundfish fishery management plan addresses four issues: (1) Provision for shoreside sorting of prohibited species in the midwater trawl fishery for Pacific whiting, (2) deleting the sablefish optimum yield in the Monterey Bay subarea, (3) gear regulation flexibility, and (4) marking requirements for setnets and commercial hook-and-line gear.

The hearings are scheduled as follows:

August 27, 1986—

Sheraton-Renton Inn, Cedar/Spruce/Fir Rooms, 800 Ranier, South, Renton, WA 98055

Thunderbird Motor Inn, North and South Umpqua Rooms, 1313 North Bayshore Drive, Coos Bay, OR 97420

State Office Building, Auditorium, Room 1194, 350 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

August 28, 1986—

Astoria Middle School, Cafeteria, 1100 Klaskanine Avenue, Astoria, OR 97103

Red Lion Inn, Redwood Ballroom, 1929 Fourth Street, Eureka, CA 95501

Dated: August 13, 1986.

Richard B. Roe,

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

[FR Doc. 86-18563 Filed 8-15-86; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-M