Implementation Plan (SIP) as submitted by the Oregon State Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) on October 15, 1986. These revisions include minor modifications to: (1) OAR 340-24-330 (Light Duty Motor Vehicle Emission Control Cutpoints or Standard) which standardizes the inspection and maintenance (I/M) testing cutpoints for 1972 through 1974 model years and (2) OAR 340-24-335 (Heavy Duty Gasoline Motor Vehicle Emission Control Emission Standards) which establishes I/M testing for heavy duty vehicles which are manufactured with catalytic converters. EPA is approving these amendments because those changes will improve the operation and efficiency of the vehicle emission testing program in Portland and Medford.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action will be effective on May 12, 1987, unless notice is received before April 13, 1987, that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments. If such notice is received, EPA will open a formal 30-day comment period on this action.

ADDRESSES: Copies of material submitted to EPA may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations:

Public Information Reference Unit, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460

Air Programs Branch (10A-86-8), Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101

Department of Environmental Quality, Yeon Building, 811 SW., 6th Street, Portland OR 97204

Comments should be addressed to: Laurie M. Kra, Air Programs Branch, M/S 532, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Laurie M. Kral, Air Programs Branch, M/S 532, Environmental Protection Agency, 1200 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98101, Telephone: (206) 442-0180, FTS: 399-0180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 24, 1980, EPA published in the **Federal Register** (45 FR 42265) final rulemaking on Part D revisions to the Oregon SIP. As part of that action, EPA approved the ongoing Portland Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) progeam on the condition that ODEQ submit adequate operating rules for this program by July 5, 1980. ODEQ responded on July 26, 1980, by submitting a SIP revision which included regulations OAR 340-24-300 through 340-24-350. On January, 2, 1981 EPA approved this revision (46 FR35).

On October 15, 1986, ODEQ submitted two amendments to this vehicle inspection program operating rules. These revisions are: OAR 340-24-330 (Light Duty Motor Vehicle Emission Control Cutpoints or Standards) simplifies the inspection and maintenance idle test standards for 1972 through 1974 model years by eliminating emission limits specific to the vehicle's make and model substituting uniform limits. The second revision, OAR 340-24-335 (Heavy Duty Gasoline Motor Vehicle Emission Control Emission Standards), establishes a new inspection and maintenance idle test standard for heavy duty gasoline vehicles which are manufactured with catalytic converters. Since these changes will improve the operational procedures and will not affect the program's effectiveness, EPA is initiating action today to approve these amendments.

Administrative Review

The public should be advised that this action will be effective 60 days from the date of this **Federal Register** notice. However, if notice is received within 30 days that someone wishes to submit adverse or critical comments on any or all of the revisions approved herein, the action on these revisions will be withdrawn and two subsequent notices will be published before the effective date. One notice will withdraw the final action on those revisions and another will begin a new rulemaking by announcing a proposal of the action on these revisions and establish a comment period.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

Under 5 U.S.C. section 605(b), I certify that this revision will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (see 46 FR 8709).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by May 12, 1987. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see 307(b)(2)).

List of Subjects 40 CFR Part 52

Air pollution control, Ozone, Sulfur oxides, Nitrogen dioxide, Lead, Particulate matter, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Reporting and Recording requirements, Incorporation by Reference.

Dated: March 9, 1987.

Lee M. Thomas,

Administrator.

Note.—Incorporation by reference of the Implementation Plan for the State of Oregon was approved by the Director of the Office of Federal Register on July 1, 1982.

PART 52—[AMENDED]

Title 40, Part 52 of the Code of Federal Regulations in amended as follows:

Subpart MM—Oregon

1. The authority citation for Part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

2. Section 52.1970 is amended by adding paragraph (c) (79) as follows:

§ 52.1970 Identification of Plan

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(79) Revisions to the Oregon State Implementation Plan were submitted by the Director of the Department of Environmental Quality of October 15, 1986. Revisions are: OAR 340-24-330 (Light Duty Motor Vehicle Emission Control Cutpoints or Standards) and OAR 340-24-335 (Heavy Duty Gasoline Motor Vehicle Emission Control Emission Standards).

(i) *Incorporation by Reference.* (A) Letter dated October 15, 1986 from the Director of the Department of Environmental Quality to EPA Region 10.

(B) OAR 340-24-330 (Light Duty Motor Vehicle Emission Control Cutpoints or Standards) as adopted by the Environmental Quality Commission on September 12, 1986.

(C) OAR 340-24-335 (Heavy Duty Gasoline Motor Vehicle Emission Control Emission Standards) as adopted by the Environmental Quality Commission on September 12, 1986.

[FR Doc. 87-5440 Filed 3-2-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

---

40 CFR Part 65

[A-3-FRL-3167-5]

Approval of a Delayed Compliance Order Issued by the Allegheny County Health Department to Papercraft Corp.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency hereby approves a Delayed Compliance Order (Order) issued by the Allegheny

County Health Department to Papercraft Corporation. The Order requires the Company to bring air emissions from its graphic arts facility in Papercraft Park, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, into compliance with certain regulations contained in the Federally-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Allegheny County by April 21, 1987. Because of the Administrator's approval, compliance with the Order will preclude suits under the enforcement provisions under section 113 of the Act or the citizen suit provisions under section 304 of the Act for violations of the SIP regulations covered by the Order during the period the Order is in effect.

DATE: This rule will take effect on March 13, 1987.

ADDRESS: A copy of the Delayed Compliance Order, and supporting material, and any comments received in response to a prior **Federal Register** notice proposing approval of the Order are available for public inspection and copying (for appropriate charges) during normal business hours at the address below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosemarie P. Nino, Environmental Protection Specialist, Enforcement Policy and State Coordination Section, Air Management Division, U.S. EPA Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Telephone: (215) 597-9839.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 22, 1986, Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's Region III Office published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 51, No. 163, Page 30080 a notice proposing approval of a Delayed Compliance Order issued by the Allegheny County Health Department to Papercraft Corporation Inc. The basis for EPA's conclusion supporting the issuance of the DCO is set forth in that notice. The notice asked for the public comments by September 22, 1986, on the EPA proposal. No public comments were received in response to the notice. The Delayed Compliance Order issued to Papercraft Corporation is hereby approved by the Administrator of EPA pursuant to the authority of section 113(d)(2) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7413(d)(2). The Order places Papercraft Corporation on a schedule to bring its graphic arts facility in Allegheny County into compliance as expeditiously as practicable with Section 531(A) of Allegheny County Health Department, Rules and Regulations, Article XX, Air Pollution Control, a part of the Federally-approved State Implementation Plan for Allegheny County. The Order requires emission monitoring and reporting requirements as required by sections 113(d)(6) and 113(d)(7) of the Act. If the conditions of the Order are met, it will permit Papercraft Corporation to delay compliance with SIP regulations covered by the Order until April 21, 1987. Papercraft Corporation was unable to comply with these regulations prior to the compliance date called for by the DCO because low solvent coatings were still being developed. EPA has determined that its approval of the Order shall be effective March 13, 1987, because of the need to immediately place Papercraft Corporation on a Federally-enforceable schedule under the Clean Air Act requiring compliance with the applicable requirements of the State Implementation Plan.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of the date of publication of this notice of final rulemaking. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements. (See section 307(b)(2).)

Dated: March 9, 1987.

Lee M. Thomas,

Administrator.

In consideration of the foregoing, Chapter I of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 65—DELAYED COMPLIANCE ORDER

1. The authority citation for Part 65 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7413, 7601.

2. By adding the following entry in alphabetical order to the table in § 65.431.

§ 65.431 EPA Approval of State Delayed Compliance Orders Issued to Major Stationary Sources.

* * * * *

Source	Location	Order No.	Date of FR Proposal	SIP Regulation Involved	Final Compliance Date
	* *	*	* *	* *	
Papercraft Corporation	Papercraft Park, Allegheny County, PA.		Aug. 21, 1986	Sec. 531(A) of Allegheny County Health Department, Rules & Regulations, Article XX, Air Pollution Control.	Apr. 21, 1987
	* *	*	* *	* *	

[FR Doc. 87-5437 Filed 3-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 65

[A-3-FRL-3167-4]

Approval of a Delayed Compliance Order Issued by the Allegheny County Health Department to Allegheny Label, Inc.

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rulemaking.

SUMMARY: The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency hereby approves a Delayed Compliance Order (Order) issued by the Allegheny County Health Department to Allegheny Label, Inc. The Order requires the Company to bring air emissions from its graphic arts facility in Cheswick Township, Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, into compliance with certain regulations contained in the Federally-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Allegheny County by April 21, 1987. Because of the Administrator's approval, compliance with the Order will preclude suits under the enforcement provisions under section 113 of the Act or the citizen suit provisions under section 304 of the Act for violations of the SIP regulations covered by the Order during the period the Order is in effect.

DATES: This rule will take effect on March 13, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosemarie P. Nino, Environmental Protection Specialist, Enforcement Policy and State Coordination Section, Air Management Division, U.S. EPA Region III, 841 Chestnut Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107. Telephone: (215) 597-9839.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the Delayed Compliance Order, and supporting material, and any comments received in response to a prior **Federal Register** notice proposing approval of the Order are available for public inspection and copying (for appropriate charges) during normal business hours at the address below.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 21, 1986, the Regional Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's Region III Office published in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 51, No. 162, Page 29949 a notice proposing approval of a Delayed Compliance Order issued by the Allegheny County Health Department to Allegheny Label, Inc. The basis for EPA's conclusion supporting the issuance of the DCO is set forth in that notice. The notice asked for the public comments by September 22, 1986, on the EPA proposal. No public comments were received in response to the notice.

The Delayed Compliance Order issued to Allegheny Label, Inc., is hereby approved by the Administrator of EPA pursuant to the authority of section 113(d)(2) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7413(d)(2). The Order Places Allegheny Label, Inc. on a schedule to bring its graphic arts facility in Allegheny County into compliance as expeditiously as practicable with section 531(A) of Allegheny County Health Department, Rules and Regulations, Article XX, Air Pollution Control a part of the Federally-approved State Implementation Plan for Allegheny County. The Order requires emission monitoring and reporting requirements as required by sections 113(d)(6) and 113(d)(7) of the Act. If the conditions of the Order are met, it will permit Allegheny Label, Inc., to delay compliance with SIP regulations covered by the Order until April 21, 1987. Allegheny Label, Inc. was unable to comply with these regulations prior to the compliance date called for by the DCO because low solvent coatings were still being developed. EPA has determined that its approval of the Order shall be effective (the date of publication of this notice) because of the need to immediately place Allegheny Label, Inc., on a Federally-enforceable schedule under the Clean Air Act requiring compliance with the applicable requirements of the State Implementation Plan. Under section 307(b)(1) of the Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit within 60 days of the date of publication of this notice of final rulemaking. This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements.

(See section 307(b)(2))

Dated: March 9, 1987.

Lee M. Thomas,

Administrator.

In consideration of the foregoing, Chapter I of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 65—DELAYED COMPLIANCE ORDER

1. The authority citation for Part 65 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7413, 7601.

2. By adding the following entry in alphabetical order to the table in § 65.431.

§ 65.431 EPA approval of State delayed compliance orders issued to major stationary sources.

* * * * *

Source	Location	Order No. 2	Date of FR proposal	SIP regulation involved	Final compliance date
Allegheny Label, Inc.	Cheswick Township, Allegheny County, PA.		Aug. 21, 1986	Section 531(A) of Allegheny County Health Department, Rules & Regulations, Article XX, Air Pollution Control.	Apr. 21, 1987

[FR Doc. 87-5436 Filed 3-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

40 CFR Part 81

[Region II Docket No. 70; FRL-3168-1]

Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Revisions to Section 107 Attainment Status Designations for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the Environmental Protection Agency's approval of a request from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to revise the air quality designation of the Catano Air Basin from "cannot be classified" to "better than national standards" with respect to the primary and secondary sulfur dioxide standards. Such designations are required by section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act, and may be revised at the request of a state. This action means that the air quality in the Catano Air Basin will be designated as better than both the respective sulfur dioxide primary and secondary standards.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This action is effective April 13, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Conrad Smith, (212) 264-2301.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act directed each state to submit to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) a list of national ambient air quality standard attainment status designations for all areas within the state. EPA received such designations from the states and promulgated them on March 3, 1978 (43 FR 8962). As authorized by the Clean Air Act, after EPA review and approval, these designations have been revised from time to time at a state's request.

On October 15, 1985 the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico submitted a request to revise the air quality designation for the Catano Air Basin from "cannot be classified" to "better than national standards" with respect to the areas' attainment of the sulfur dioxide primary and secondary national ambient air quality standards. The redesignation request is based on the results of dispersion modeling and air quality monitoring in the Catano Air Basin.

In the July 9, 1986 issue of the **Federal Register** (51 FR 24854) EPA advised the public that, based on its review of the technical material submitted by the Commonwealth, it was proposing to approve the requested redesignation. The reader is referred to the July 9, 1986 notice for a detailed description of EPA's review criteria and findings. No comments were received by EPA during the comment period which ended on August 8, 1986.

EPA is today approving the redesignation request submitted by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The request has been found to meet the requirements of sections 107 and 301 of the Clean Air Act and applicable EPA guidelines.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12291.

Under section 307(b)(1) of the Clean Air Act, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by (sixty days from publication). This action may not be challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (See section 307(b)(2).).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 81

Air pollution control, National Parks and Wilderness areas.

Dated: March 9, 1987.

Lee M. Thomas,

Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

PART 81—DESIGNATION OF AREAS FOR AIR QUALITY PLANNING PURPOSES

Title 40 Chapter I, Subchapter C; Part 81, Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

Subpart C—Section 107 Attainment Status Designations

1. The authority citation for Part 81 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401-7642.

2. Section 81.355 is amended by removing the entries "Catano Air Basin" and footnote 1 and revising the entry for the "Remainder of AQCR" in the sulfur dioxide attainment status designation table "Puerto Rico SO_2" as follows:

§ 81.355 Puerto Rico.

* * * * *

Designated area	Does not meet primary standards	Does not meet secondary standards	Cannot be classified	Better than national standards
Puerto Rico SO_2				
Puerto Rico AQCR				X

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 87-5441 Filed 3-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Public Health Service

42 CFR Part 37

Amendment to Specifications for Medical Examinations of Underground Coal Miners

AGENCY: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Centers for Disease Control, Public Health Service, HHS.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This rule amends the specifications for chest roentgenograms (X-rays) obtained in medical examinations of underground coal miners. The amendments will enable X-ray readers in the Department's medical surveillance program for underground coal miners to interpret miners' chest X-rays more accurately to classify any existing or developing pneumoconiosis.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 13, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Mitzie Martin, Chief, Receiving Center Section, Examinations Processing Branch, Division of Respiratory Disease Studies, NIOSH, CDC, 944 Chestnut Ridge Road, Morgantown, WV 26505—Phone: (304) 291-4301 or FTS: 923-4301.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This final rule implements revisions proposed in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) published in the **Federal Register** on August 27, 1985 (50 FR 34723), to amend Part 37 of Title 42, Code of Federal Regulations. The NPRM proposed to expand the specification for X-ray film size, specify film/screen combinations and speeds which can be used, and specify the method for obtaining a definitive interpretation of chest X-rays when two readers' interpretations do not agree. Interested persons were invited to comment on the proposed amendment; no comments were received.

The Department of Health and Human Services has determined that this amendment will not significantly impact on a substantial number of small entities and, therefore, does not require preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, Public Law 96-354. The Department also has determined that this amendment is not a "major rule" under Executive Order 12291 because it will not have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, result in significant adverse effects in competition, nor otherwise meet the thresholds established in the Executive Order. Therefore, preparation of a regulatory impact analysis is not required.

List of Subjects in 42 CFR Part 37

Health care, Lung diseases, Medical research, Mine safety and health, Miners, X-rays.

Part 37 of Title 42, Code of Federal Regulations, is hereby amended as set forth below.

Dated: December 29, 1986.

Steven A. Grossman,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Health.

Approved: February 19, 1987.

Otis R. Bowen,

Secretary.

PART 37—[AMENDED]

42 CFR 37 is amended as follows:

1. The authority for Part 37 reads as follows:

Authority: Sec. 203, 83 Stat. 763 (30 U.S.C. 843).

2. In § 37.41, paragraphs (a) and (h)(3) are revised to read as follows:

§ 37.41 Chest roentgenogram specifications.

(a) Every chest roentgenogram shall be a single posteroanterior projection at full inspiration on a film being no less than 14 by 17 inches and no greater than 16 by 17 inches. The film and cassette shall be capable of being positioned both vertically and horizontally so that the chest roentgenogram will include both apices and costophrenic angles. If a miner is too large to permit the above requirements, then the projection shall include both apices with minimum loss of the costophrenic angle.

* * * * *

(h) To insure high quality chest roentgenograms: * * *

(3) Medium speed film and medium speed intensifying screens are recommended. However, any film-screen combination, the rated "speed" of which is at least 100 and does not exceed 300, which produces roentgenograms with spatial resolution, contrast, latitude and quantum mottle similar to those of systems designated as "medium speed" may be employed.

* * * * *

3. In § 37.52, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 37.52 Method of obtaining definitive interpretations.

* * * * *

(b) Two interpreters shall be considered to be in agreement when they both find either stage A, B, or C complicated pneumoconiosis, or their findings with regard to simple pneumoconiosis are both in the same major category, or (with one exception noted below) are within one minor category (ILO Classification 12-point scale) of each other. In the last situation, the higher of the two interpretations shall be reported. The only exception to the one minor category principle is a reading sequence of 0/1, 1/0, or 1/0, 0/1. When such a sequence occurs, it shall not be considered agreement, and a third (or more) interpretation shall be obtained until a consensus involving two or more readings in the same major category is obtained.

[FR Doc. 87-5463 Filed 3-12-87; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4160-19-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Part 571

[Docket No. 86-04; Notice 2]

Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Seating Systems

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This notice amends Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 207, *Seating Systems*, to remove an unnecessary restriction. The standard requires most folding seats to be equipped with a self-locking device for restraining the hinged or folding seat or seat back and with a specific control, such as a knob, lever, push button, etc., for releasing that restraining device. The purpose of the latter requirement is to ensure that the restraining device can be released to enable occupants seated behind such seats to exit the vehicle. The requirement was worded so it applied to a folding or hinged seat regardless of whether anyone can sit behind that seat. The agency concluded that this requirement was unnecessarily restrictive and is therefore amending the standard to make it clear that a specific control is not required if there are no seats behind the folding seat.

DATES: The amendment made by this rule is effective April 13, 1987. Petitions for reconsideration must be received by April 13, 1987.

ADDRESSES: Petitions for reconsideration should be submitted to: Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Guy Hunter, Office of Vehicle Safety Standards, NRM-12, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 (202-366-4915).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section S4.3 of Standard No. 207 requires hinged or folding occupant seats or occupant seat backs, with some exceptions, to be equipped with a self-locking device for restraining the hinged or folding seat or seat back and a specific control for releasing that restraining device. The purpose of the requirement for the self-locking device is to reduce the forces acting on an occupant of the seat in an accident by preventing the seat or seat back from folding onto the occupant. The purpose of the requirement for the control to release the restraining device is to ensure that occupants seated behind such seats are able to exit the vehicle. Section S4.3.1 specifies that if there is a designated seating position immediately behind a seat equipped with a restraining device, the control for releasing the device must be readily accessible to the occupant of the seat equipped with the device. That section also specifies that if access to the control is required in order to exit from the vehicle, the control must be readily accessible to the occupant of the designated seating position immediately behind the seat.

On July 2, 1986, NHTSA published in the **Federal Register** (51 FR 24176) a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) to remove an unnecessary restriction resulting from the language of section S4.3. The agency noted that it had received a letter asking whether a proposed design would meet that section's requirements. The design was for a folding seat which would be installed between the driver's and assistant's seats in large trucks. When the seat back is folded down, the back of the seat could be used as a console box. When the seat back is raised, the seat back would automatically be locked. To fold the seat back after locking, one must lift the seat back manually, thereby raising a pivot, in order to release the folding seat back. A drawing included with the letter indicated that no seats would be located behind the folding seat, either immediately to the rear or to the sides.

The primary interpretation issue raised by the letter was whether section S4.3 required a specific control to release the restraining device for a folding seat even if no seats are located behind that folding seat. The language of section S4.3 was sufficiently broad to require a control in those circumstances. Since the purpose for requiring a specific control is to ensure that occupants in seats locked behind folding seats are able to exit the vehicle, the agency tentatively concluded that the requirement should not apply if there are no such seats. Accordingly, NHTSA proposed to amend Standard No. 207 to provide an exception to the requirement that folding seats have a specific control for releasing the required restraining device. Under the proposal, a specific control was not to be required if there are no seats, i.e., no designated seating positions or auxiliary seating accommodations, behind the folding seat.

NHTSA received five comments on the NPRM. Chrysler, Ford, General Motors, and Volkswagen submitted comments agreeing with the proposal and its rationale.

The fifth commenter, Mr. Robert Schlegel, argued that the proposal should not apply to folding seats located in front of the cargo areas of station wagons, mini-vans, and certain sport cars. That commenter stated that while such areas are not designated for passenger travel, children often occupy the areas for short trips. That commenter urged that such passengers should be able to move the seat back forward, if necessary to exit the vehicle.

After carefully considering the comments, NHTSA is issuing a final rule along the lines of the proposal. A typographical error in the regulatory text, pointed out by Ford, has been corrected.

NHTSA shares Mr. Schlegel's concern for the safety of children and urges that parents and other drivers not permit children to travel in cargo areas, and instead ensure that the children are safely restrained in child safety seats or safety belts. To the extent that some children do travel in cargo areas, however, the agency does not believe that requiring specific controls to release the restraining device of folding seats located in front of such areas would result in any safety benefits. Children typically enter such areas by climbing over the forward seat or, for some vehicles, through a transverse rear door, and can thus easily exit the vehicle in one or both of these manners.

This amendment becomes effective in 30 days. Since the amendment does not impose any new requirements but instead relieves an unncessary restriction, the agency finds good cause for an effective date within that time period.

The agency has analyzed this amendment and determined that it is neither "major" within the meaning of Executive Order 12291 nor "significant" within the meaning of the Department of Transportation regulatory policies and procedures. The agency has determined that the economic effects of this amendment are so minimal that a full regulatory evaluation is not required. Since the amendment relieves a restriction, it is conceivable that it will result in some minor, nonquantifiable cost savings.

In accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the agency has evaluated the effects of this action on small entities. I certify that the amendment will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Few, if any, vehicle manufacturers are considered to be small businesses. Therefore, small businesses, small organizations, and small governmental units will generally be affected by the amendment only to the extent that they purchase motor vehicles. For the reasons discussed above, the amendment will not significantly affect vehicle prices. Accordingly, no regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

Finally, the agency has analyzed the effects of this action under the National Environmental Policy Act. The agency has determined that the amendment will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 571

Imports, Motor vehicle safety, Motor vehicles, Rubber and rubber products, Tires.

PART 571—[AMENDED]

In consideration of the foregoing, § 571.207 is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 49 CFR Part 571 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 1392, 1401, 1403, 1407; delegation of authority at 49 CFR 1.50.

§ 571.207 [Amended]

2. S4.3 is revised to read as follows:

S4.3. *Restraining device for hinged or folding seats or seat backs.* Except for a passenger seat in a bus or a seat having a back that is adjustable only for the comfort of its occupants, a hinged or folding occupant seat or occupant seat back shall—

(a) be equipped with a self-locking device for restraining the hinged or folding seat or seat back, and

(b) if there are any designated seating positions or auxiliary seating accommodations behind the seat, either immediately to the rear or to the sides, be equipped with a control for releasing that restraining device.

Issued on March 10, 1987.

Diane K. Steed,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 87-5496 Filed 3-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-59-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Parts 611 and 672

[Docket No. 61220-7033]

Fishing Conservation and Management; Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska

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

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NOAA issues a final rule to implement Amendment 15 (amendment) to the Fishery Management Plan for the Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska (FMP). The amendment revises the management goals and objectives and (1) establishes a single optimum yield (OY) range and an administrative framework procedure for setting annual harvest levels for each species category of groundfish: (2) establishes an administrative procedure for setting prohibited species catch limits (PSCs) for full utilized groundfish species applicable to joint venture and foreign fisheries; (3) revises an existing domestic reporting requirement for catcher/processor and mothership/processor vessels; (4) establishes four time/area closures to non-pelagic trawling around Kodiak Island for a three-year period to protect king crab; and (5) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to make certain inseason changes to gear regulations seasons, and harvest quotas.

In addition, NOAA is making other regulatory changes to clarify domestic reporting requirements. These additional regulatory changes are not part of Amendment 15, but are new interpretations of existing authority in the FMP. One of these additional changes was substantially altered in response to public comment. Hence, NOAA is reproposing this one regulatory change and requesting additional public comment. The proposed rule will be published within 30 days.

The regulations implementing Amendment 15 and the additional regulatory changes in this rule are intended to implement conservation and management measures that respond to the best available biological and socioeconomic information on the status of the groundfish and king crab fisheries, while providing for full development and utilization of Gulf of Alaska groundfish resources.

EFFECTIVE DATES: April 8, 1987. Section 672.24(c) is effective from April 8, 1987 through December 31, 1989.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the amendment, the environmental assessment (EA), and the regulatory impact review/final regulatory flexibility analysis (RIR/FRFA) may be obtained from the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, P.O. Box 103136, Anchorage, AK 99510, 907-274-4563.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald J. Berg (Fishery Biologist, NMFS), 907-586-7230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (Council) approved the six parts of Amendment 15 at its September 24-26, 1986, meeting and submitted it to the Secretary, who received it on November 19, 1986, for review. The Secretary, or his designee, is required by the Magnuson Act to approve, disapprove, or partially disapprove FMPs and FMP amendments before the close of the 95th day following receipt. Following receipt of Amendment 15, the Director, Alaska Region (Regional Director), immediately commenced a review of the amendment to determine whether it was consistent with the national standards, other provisions of the Magnuson Act, and any other applicable law. A Notice of Availability of the amendment was published in the **Federal Register** on November 25, 1986 (51 FR 42603). Proposed implementing regulations were filed with the Office of the **Federal Register** on December 9, 1986, and published December 12, 1986 (51 FR 44812). The Notice of Availability invited public review and comment on the amendment until January 10, 1987. The proposed implementing regulations invited public review and comment on the regulations until January 17, 1987. This final rule implementing Amendment 15 takes three letters of public comments into account. Comments received are summarized and responded to below.

The preamble to the proposed rule described and presented the reasons for each of the five parts of the amendment. The Secretary has reviewed each part of the proposed rule and the reasons for it. He has also reviewed the revisions to the FMP's management goals and objectives, which do not involve rulemaking.

During this review, the Secretary has considered comments received from the public, fishing associations, and interested agencies. He has determined that each part of the amendment, including the revisions to the goals and objectives, is consistent with the