consideration. The range of a species can theoretically be divided into portions an infinite number of ways. However, there is no purpose to analyzing portions of the range that are not reasonably likely to be both (1) significant and (2) threatened or endangered. To identify only those portions that warrant further consideration, we determine whether substantial information indicates that: (1) The portions may be significant, and (2) the species may be in danger of extinction there or likely to become so within the foreseeable future. In practice, a key part of this analysis is whether the threats are geographically concentrated in some way. If the threats to the species are essentially uniform throughout its range, no portion is likely to warrant further consideration. Moreover, if any concentration of threats applies only to portions of the species’ range that are not significant, such portions will not warrant further consideration.

If we identify portions that warrant further consideration, we then determine whether the species is threatened or endangered in these portions of its range. Depending on the biology of the species, its range, and the threats it faces, the Service may address either the significance question or the status question first. Thus, if the Service considers significance first and determines that a portion of the range is not significant, the Service need not determine whether the species is threatened or endangered there. Likewise, if the Service considers status first and determines that the species is not threatened or endangered in a portion of its range, the Service need not determine if that portion is significant. However, if the Service determines that both a portion of the range of a species is significant and the species is threatened or endangered there, the Service will specify that portion of the range as threatened or endangered under section 4(c)(1) of the Act.

In our analysis for this listing determination, we determined that the Coleman’s coralroot does not meet the definition of an endangered or threatened species throughout its entire range. We found that there are geographically concentrated stressors. The effects from the proposed Rosemont Copper Mine (located on the east side of the Santa Rita Mountains) and Hermosa Drilling Project (located in the Patagonia Mountains) will be limited to 5 of 22 confirmed extant colonies of Coleman’s coralroot, including 4 colonies located in McCleary and Wasp Canyons in the Santa Rita Mountains, and 1 located in Hermosa Canyon in the Patagonia Mountains. Two of these colonies are expected to be extirpated. Even if these 2 colonies are extirpated, the Coleman’s coralroot will continue to remain in 20 other colonies across 7 mountain ranges. There is enough redundancy in the remaining populations spread over a wide geographic area that the species will continue to persist.

Furthermore, determining the effect of the potential loss of these individual plants on the rangewide status of the species is challenging because of the lack of information on population ecology and demographics. For instance, we have no information regarding the degree to which these populations exchange genetic material, if these two colonies represent a unique genetic diversity, or the degree to which they may behave as subpopulations within a metapopulation. There is no information regarding how the number of aboveground flowering plants correlates with the total number of orchids, including those living underground as a rhizome or tuber. Thus, it is very difficult to determine how resilient the species is to withstand demographic and environmental variation. These information gaps and uncertainties make it difficult to extrapolate population sizes, to evaluate trends, or to make meaningful comparisons within and across years. Based on the best available information, we have no evidence to indicate that the two colonies we expect to be extirpated are a significant portion of the current range of the species or that their loss would impact the representation, resiliency, or redundancy of the species. Therefore, we have no information to indicate that the contribution of five colonies that will be impacted from mining are at a level such that their loss would result in a decrease in the ability to conserve the species.

Our review of the best available scientific and commercial information indicates that the Coleman’s coralroot is not in danger of extinction now (endangered) nor likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future (threatened) throughout all or a significant portion of its range. Although we expect two colonies (upper McCleary and Wasp Canyons) to be severely compromised or lost, and three other colonies (lower and middle McCleary, and Hermosa Canyons) to be detrimentally affected, we have no information to indicate that these losses would have a negative impact on the overall species across its entire range. Accordingly, we do not find that threats to the portion of the species’ range in McCleary, Wasp, and Hermosa Canyons would likely place the species in danger of extinction throughout its entire range. Because the portion of the Coleman’s coralroot colonies in these canyons due to mining is not significant enough that their potential loss would render the species in danger of extinction now or in the foreseeable future, we conclude that these colonies do not constitute a significant portion of the species’ range. Therefore, we find that listing the Coleman’s coralroot as an endangered or threatened species under the Act is not warranted at this time.

We request that any new information concerning the status of, or threats to, Coleman’s coralroot be submitted to our Arizona Ecological Services Field Office (see ADDRESSES section) whenever it becomes available. New information will help us monitor the species and encourage its conservation. If an emergency situation develops for Coleman’s coralroot, or any other species, we will act to provide immediate protection.
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Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils (Councils) have submitted a Generic Amendment to the Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) in the Gulf and South Atlantic Regions (Generic Dealer Amendment) for review, approval, and implementation by NMFS. The Generic Dealer Amendment amends the following FMPs: Reef Fish Resources and the Red Drum Fishery of the Gulf; the Snapper-Grouper Fishery (including wreckfish), the Golden Crab Fishery, and the Shrimp Fishery (excluding penaeid shrimp) of the South Atlantic Region; the Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery of the Atlantic; and Coastal Migratory Pelagic (CMP) Resources and the Spiny Lobster Fishery of the Gulf and South Atlantic. The Generic Dealer Amendment would modify the permitting and reporting requirements for seafood dealers who first receive species managed by the Councils through the previously mentioned FMPs. These revisions would create a single dealer permit for dealers who first receive fish managed by the Councils, require both purchase and non-purchase reports to be submitted online on a weekly basis, not authorizing dealers to purchase fish from federally-permitted vessels if they are delinquent in submitting reports, and modify the sale and purchase provisions based on the new dealer permitting requirements. The intent of the amendment is to obtain timelier purchase information from dealers to help reduce annual catch limit (ACL) overages and closures, and achieve optimum yield in accordance with the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before February 18, 2014.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the amendment identified by “NOAA–NMFS–2012–0206” by any of the following methods:


- Mail: Rich Malinowski, Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, 263 13th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33701. Instructions: All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted to http://www.regulations.gov without change.

All Personal Identifying Information (for example, name, address, etc.) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information. NMFS will accept anonymous comments (enter N/A in the required field if you wish to remain anonymous).

To submit comments through the Federal e-Rulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov, enter “NOAA–NMFS–2012–0206” in the search field and click on “search.” After you locate the notice of availability, click the “Submit a Comment” link in that row. This will display the comment web form. You can then enter your submitter information (unless you prefer to remain anonymous), and type your comment on the web form. You can also attach additional files (up to 10MB) in Microsoft Word, Excel, WordPerfect, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

Comments received through means listed in this notice will be considered.

For further assistance with submitting a comment, see the “Commenting” section at http://www.regulations.gov/#fqa5 or the Help section at http://www.regulations.gov.

Electronic copies of the amendment may be obtained from the Southeast Regional Office Web site at http://sro.nmfs.noaa.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rich Malinowski, Southeast Regional Office, NMFS, telephone 727–824–5305; email: rich.malinowski@noaa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires each regional fishery management council to submit any fishery management plan or amendment to NMFS for review and approval, disapproval, or partial approval. The Magnuson-Stevens Act also requires that NMFS, upon receiving a plan or amendment, publish an announcement in the Federal Register notifying the public that the plan or amendment is available for review and comment.

The FMPs being revised by this amendment were prepared by the Councils and are implemented through regulations at 50 CFR part 622 and part 640 under the authority of the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

Background

The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires NMFS and regional fishery management councils to prevent overfishing and achieve, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from federally managed fish stocks. These mandates are intended to ensure fishery resources are managed for the greatest overall benefit to the nation, particularly with respect to providing food production and recreational opportunities, and protecting marine ecosystems. To further this goal, the Magnuson-Stevens Act requires fishery managers to specify their strategy to rebuild overfished stocks to a sustainable level within a certain time frame, to minimize bycatch and bycatch mortality to the extent practicable, and to establish accountability measures (AMs) for a stock to ensure ACLs are not exceeded.

The intent of the Generic Dealer Amendment is to improve the timeliness and accuracy of dealer reporting, which will help achieve harvest targets. Many commercial fisheries have AMs that implement closures of fisheries when the commercial ACLs are projected to be met. The current reporting frequency reduces the precision of the projections, which may result in estimates of landings significantly less or greater than the ACL. When fishery closures are closed well before the ACL is met, optimum yield may not be achieved. In turn, overages also decrease the ability of stocks to rebuild when overfished and may lead to overfishing conditions. The proposed actions, including increasing the frequency of dealer reporting and requiring more dealers to report, are intended to result in better monitoring of the ACLs. Actions Contained in the Generic Dealer Amendment.

The Generic Dealer Amendment would modify the current permitting and reporting requirements for seafood dealers who first receive fish managed by the Councils through eight FMPs. Currently, the following six Federal dealer permits exist for purchasing product in the Southeast Region: Atlantic Dolphin-Wahoo, Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Golden Crab, South Atlantic Rock Shrimp, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper (excluding wreckfish), and South Atlantic Wreckfish. The Generic Dealer Amendment proposes to create a single dealer permit that would be required for the species currently covered by the six dealer permits. In addition, the dealer permit would be required to first receive the following species from federally permitted vessels: Gulf and South Atlantic CMP, Gulf and South Atlantic spiny lobster, and Gulf Red Drum. If the proposed actions are implemented, the universal dealer permit would be required for all species managed by the Councils except for...
species in the following five FMPs: Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Pelagic Sargassum Habitat of the South Atlantic Region; Coral and Coral Reefs of the Gulf, Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf, and Shrimp Fishery of the South Atlantic Region (excluding rock shrimp).

The Councils exempted penaeid shrimp species from the universal dealer permit because there are no ACLs established for these species. Thus, the current reporting system is adequate for determining catch and effort for these species and the administrative burden of issuing such a large number of shrimp dealer permits would outweigh the benefits from more timely shrimp dealer reports. The Councils did not include corals or pelagic Sargassum because coral harvest is limited to octocoral harvest off Florida and does not require a Federal harvest permit if landed in Florida, and no recorded harvest of pelagic Sargassum from Federal waters occurs.

Currently, federally permitted Gulf reef fish, South Atlantic snapper-grouper, and South Atlantic wreckfish dealers, and dealers with records of king mackerel or Spanish mackerel from the previous year, are required to submit dealer purchase forms every 2 weeks via fax or online through the appropriate state trip ticket reporting system. South Atlantic golden crab, rock shrimp, and Atlantic dolphin-wahoo dealers are required to submit dealer purchase forms on a monthly basis via fax or online through the appropriate state trip ticket reporting system. Reports are currently due 5 days after the end of each reporting period.

If implemented, the Generic Dealer Amendment would require federally permitted dealers to submit forms electronically (via computer or internet) on a weekly basis. Dealer reports for trips landing species between Sunday through Saturday would be required to be submitted by 11:59 p.m., local time, the following Tuesday. In addition, federally permitted dealers would be required to submit records of no purchases electronically (via computer or internet) at the same frequency and via the same process as records for purchases.

Dealer reports would be required to be submitted through the dealer electronic trip ticket reporting system. Electronic reports are currently authorized in each state, except for South Carolina, which currently requires paper reporting. The data elements that would be required through this Generic Dealer Amendment are consistent with the information currently required by the state trip ticket programs.

This amendment would also stipulate that dealers who are delinquent in submitting their reports are not authorized to receive fish from federally-permitted vessels until they have submitted all reports on purchases and no purchases.

This amendment would place new restrictions on certain dealers who currently are not required to have a Federal dealer permit and on certain fishermen who can currently sell to state dealers. Dealers who first receive CMP fish and spiny lobster from federally-permitted commercial vessels or charter vessels/headboats, including federally permitted shrimp vessels, would be required to have a Federal dealer permit and would be required to report electronically on a weekly basis. Federally permitted vessels that currently sell CMP fish and spiny lobster to state dealers would be required to sell them to federally permitted dealers.

A proposed rule that would implement the management measures outlined in the Generic Dealer Amendment has been drafted. In accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NMFS is evaluating the proposed rule to determine whether it is consistent with the FMPs, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and other applicable laws. If the determination is affirmative, NMFS will publish the proposed rule in the Federal Register for public review and comment.

Consideration of Public Comments

The Councils submitted the Generic Dealer Amendment for Secretarial review, approval, and implementation. NMFS’ decision to approve, partially approve, or disapprove the Amendment will be based, in part, on consideration of comments, recommendations, and information received during the comment period on this notice of availability.

Public comments received by 11:59 p.m. eastern time, on February 18, 2014, will be considered by NMFS in its decision to approve, partially approve, or disapprove the Generic Dealer Amendment. All comments received by NMFS on the Generic Dealer Amendment or the proposed rule during their respective comment periods would be addressed in a final rule.

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

Dated: December 13, 2013.

Sean Corson,
Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.
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