

4. Revise § 2.174 to read as follows:

§ 2.174 Correction of Office mistake.

(a) Whenever a material mistake in a registration, incurred through the fault of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, is clearly disclosed by the records of the Office, a certificate of correction stating the fact and nature of the mistake, signed by the Director or by an employee designated by the Director, shall be issued without charge and recorded. A printed copy of the certificate of correction shall be attached to each printed copy of the registration certificate. Thereafter, the corrected certificate shall have the same effect as if it had been originally issued in the corrected form. In the discretion of the Director the Office may issue a new certificate of registration without charge.

(b) A request for correction of an Office error in a registration must be filed within one year after the date of registration.

5. Amend § 2.175 by revising paragraphs (a) and (b) to read as follows:

§ 2.175 Correction of mistake by registrant.

(a) Whenever a mistake has been made in a registration and a showing has been made that the mistake occurred in good faith through the fault of the registrant, the Director may issue a certificate of correction. In the discretion of the Director, the Office may issue a new certificate upon payment of the required fee, provided that the correction does not involve such changes in the registration as to require republication of the mark.

(b) Application for such action must:

- (1) Be filed within one year after the date of registration;
- (2) Include the following:
 - (i) Specification of the mistake for which correction is sought;
 - (ii) Description of the manner in which it arose; and
 - (iii) A showing that it occurred in good faith;
- (3) Be signed by the registrant and verified or include a declaration in accordance with § 2.20; and
- (4) Be accompanied by the required fee.

* * * * *

6. Amend § 2.176 to read as follows:

§ 2.176 Consideration of above matters.

The matters in §§ 2.171 to 2.175 will be considered in the first instance by the Post Registration Examiner. If the action of the Examiner is adverse, registrant may request the Director to review the action under § 2.146. If the registrant does not respond to an adverse action of the Examiner within six months of the

mailing date, the matter will be considered abandoned.

Dated: December 9, 2003.

James E. Rogan,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 03-31904 Filed 12-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-U

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[CT-057-7216d; A-1-FRL-7600-1]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for 2005 and 2007 Using MOBILE6.2 for the Connecticut Portion of the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island Nonattainment Area and for 2007 for the Greater Connecticut Nonattainment Area

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to approve a revision to the Connecticut State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the attainment and maintenance of the one-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ground level ozone submitted by the State of Connecticut. EPA is proposing approval of Connecticut's 2005 and 2007 motor vehicle emissions budgets recalculated using MOBILE6.2 for the Connecticut portion of the New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island nonattainment area and 2007 motor vehicle emissions budgets for the Greater Connecticut nonattainment area. This action is being taken under the Clean Air Act.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before January 20, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to David Conroy, Unit Manager, Air Quality Planning, Office of Ecosystem Protection (mail code CAQ), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, One Congress Street, Suite 1100, Boston, MA 02114-2023.

Comments may also be submitted electronically, or through hand delivery/courier, please follow the detailed instructions (Part (I)(B)(1)(i) through (iii) of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section) described in the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**. **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jeff Butensky, Environmental Planner, Air

Quality Unit, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA New England Regional Office, One Congress Street, Suite 1100 (CAQ), Boston, MA 02114-2023, (617) 918-1665, *butensky.jeff@epa.gov*.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without a prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If EPA receives no adverse comments in response to this action, we contemplate no further activity. If EPA receives adverse comments, we will withdraw the direct final rule and we will address all public comments we receive in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. Please note that if EPA receives adverse comment on an amendment, paragraph, or section of this rule and if that provision may be severed from the remainder of the rule, EPA may adopt as final those provisions of the rule that are not the subject of an adverse comment.

For additional information, see the direct final rule which is located in the Rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: December 10, 2003.

Robert W. Varney,

Regional Administrator, EPA New England.

[FR Doc. 03-31233 Filed 12-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 679

[I.D. 112803A]

RIN 0648-AR74

Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Rebuilding Overfished Fisheries

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 17 to the Fishery Management Plan for Bering Sea/ Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs (FMP). This amendment would implement a rebuilding plan for the overfished stock of Pribilof Islands blue king crab. This action is intended to ensure that conservation and management measures continue to be based on the best scientific information available and enhance the Council's ability to achieve, on a continuing basis, optimum yield from fisheries under its authority.

DATES: Comments on the amendment must be submitted on or before February 17, 2004.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted to Sue Salvesson, Assistant Regional Administrator, Sustainable Fisheries Division, Alaska Region, NMFS, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802-1668, Attn: Lori Durall. Comments also may be sent via facsimile (fax) to 907-586-7465. Comments will not be accepted if submitted via e-mail or Internet. Courier or hand delivery of comments may be made to NMFS in the Federal Building, Room 420, Juneau, AK 99801. Copies of Amendment 17 to the FMP, and the Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared for the amendment are available from the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gretchen Harrington, 907-586-7228 or gretchen.harrington@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NMFS declared the Pribilof Islands stock of blue king crab (*Paralithodes platypus*) overfished because the spawning stock biomass was below the minimum stock size threshold defined in Amendment 7 to the FMP. Amendment 7 specified objective and measurable criteria for identifying when any of the crab fisheries covered by the FMP are overfished or when overfishing is occurring (64 FR 11390, March 9, 1999).

On September 23, 2002, NMFS notified the Council that the Pribilof Islands blue king crab stock was overfished (67 FR 62212, October 4, 2002). The Council then took action to develop a rebuilding plan within 1 year of notification as required by section 304(e)(3) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). In October 2003, the Council adopted Amendment 17, the rebuilding plan, to accomplish the purposes outlined in the national standard guidelines to rebuild the overfished stock.

Amendment 17 specifies a time period for rebuilding the stock intended to satisfy the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Under the rebuilding plan, the Pribilof Islands blue king crab stock is estimated to rebuild, with a 50-percent probability, within 10 years. The stock will be considered "rebuilt" when it reaches the maximum sustainable yield stock size level in 2 consecutive years. This rebuilding time period is as short a possible and takes into account the status and biology of the stock, the needs of fishing communities, and the interaction of the overfished stock within the marine ecosystem, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act in section 304(e)(4)(A)(i).

The rebuilding plan consists of a framework that references the State of Alaska's harvest strategy. Section 8.3 of the FMP defers to the State of Alaska the authority to develop and implement harvest strategies, with oversight by NMFS and the Council. The rebuilding harvest strategy, and alternative harvest strategies, were developed and analyzed by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and reviewed and adopted by the Alaska Board of Fisheries. The rebuilding harvest strategy, and detailed alternatives analysis, were reviewed by the Council, its Scientific and Statistical Committee, and Crab Plan Team for consistency with the FMP, Magnuson-Stevens Act, and the National Standard guidelines. The analysis prepared for the rebuilding harvest strategy is contained in the EA prepared for this action.

The rebuilding harvest strategy, which closes the directed fishery until the stock is rebuilt, should result in more spawning biomass than allowing a fishery during rebuilding, because more large male crab would be conserved and fewer juveniles and females would die due to incidental catch and discard mortality. More spawning biomass would be expected to produce larger year-classes when environmental conditions are favorable.

This conservative rebuilding plan is warranted at this time for this stock given the concerns regarding the rebuilding potential of this stock, the potential vulnerability to overfishing, and the poor precision of survey estimates. The other alternatives under consideration, which would allow fishing prior to stock rebuilding, would not provide sufficient safeguards for this vulnerable stock. The preferred alternative, while forgoing harvest in the

short-term, is the strongest guarantee that the stock will be healthy and support a fishery in the long term. Once rebuilt, fishing communities would once again have expanded opportunities (both fishing and processing) in this potentially lucrative fishery. As this rebuilding plan applies the same restrictions to all participants, the plan allocates the fishery restrictions fairly and equitably among sectors of the fishery. Likewise, the plan allocates all recovery benefits fairly and equitably among sectors of the fishery.

No additional habitat or bycatch measures are part of this rebuilding plan because neither habitat nor bycatch measures are expected to have a measurable impact in rebuilding. Habitat is protected from fishing impacts by the existing Pribilof Islands Habitat Conservation Zone, which encompasses the majority of blue king crab habitat. Bycatch of blue king crab in both crab and groundfish fisheries is a negligible proportion of the total population abundance.

An EA was prepared for Amendment 17 that describes the management background, the purpose and need for action, the management alternatives, and the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the alternatives. A copy of the EA can be obtained from NMFS (see **ADDRESSES**).

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires that each regional fishery management council submit each FMP or FMP amendment it prepares to NMFS for review and approval, disapproval, or partial approval. The Magnuson-Stevens Act also requires that NMFS, upon receiving an FMP or FMP amendment, immediately publish a notification in the **Federal Register** that the amendment is available for public review and comment. This action constitutes such notice for FMP Amendment 17. NMFS will consider public comments received during the comment period in determining whether to approve this FMP amendment. To be considered, a comment must be received by close of business by the last day of the comment period (see **DATES**), regardless of the comment's postmark or transmission date.

Dated: December 12, 2003.

Bruce C. Morehead,
Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.
[FR Doc. 03-31226 Filed 12-17-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S