

References Cited

Lists of the references cited in the petition findings are available on the Internet at <http://www.regulations.gov> and upon request from the appropriate person, as specified under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Authors

The primary authors of this document are the staff members of the Unified Listing Team, Ecological Services Program.

Authority

The authority for this section is section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: June 24, 2016.

Stephen Guertin,

Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2016-15935 Filed 7-5-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Parts 223 and 224

[Docket No. 160524463-6544-01]

RIN 0648-XE657

Endangered and Threatened Species; Removal of the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin Distinct Population Segment of Canary Rockfish From the Federal List of Threatened and Endangered Species, and Removal of Designated Critical Habitat, and Update and Amend the Listing Descriptions for the Yelloweye Rockfish DPS and Bocaccio DPS

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

ACTION: Proposed rule; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We, NMFS, are issuing a proposed rule to remove the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish (*Sebastes pinniger*) Distinct Population Segment (DPS) from the Federal List of Threatened and Endangered Species and remove its critical habitat designation as recommended in the recent five-year review under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). We propose these actions based on newly obtained genetic information that demonstrates that the Puget Sound/

Georgia Basin canary rockfish population does not meet the DPS criteria and therefore does not qualify for listing under the ESA.

We also propose to update and amend the listing description for the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin yelloweye rockfish (*S. ruberrimus*) DPS based on a geographic description to include fish within specified boundaries. Further, although the current listing description is not based on boundaries, with this proposal we are also correcting a descriptive boundary for the DPS depicted on maps to include an area in the northern Johnstone Strait and Queen Charlotte Channel in waters of Canada consistent with newly obtained genetic information on yelloweye rockfish population grouping.

We also propose to update and amend the listing description for the bocaccio DPS based on a geographic description and to include fish within specified boundaries.

DATES: Information and comments on the subject action must be received by September 6, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Reference materials supporting this rulemaking can be obtained via the Internet at: <http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/> or by submitting a request to Dan Tonnes, Protected Resources Division, West Coast Region, National Marine Fisheries Service, 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle WA, 98115.

You may submit comments, identified by the code: NOAA-NMFS-2016-0070 by either of the following methods:

- **Electronic Submissions:** Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal. Go to www.regulations.gov/ #*docketDetail;D=NOAA-NMFS-2016-0070*. Click the "Comment Now" icon, complete the required fields, and enter or attach your comments.
- **Mail:** Send comments to Chris Yates, Assistant Regional Administrator, Protected Resources Division, NMFS, West Coast Regional Office, Attn: Dan Tonnes, 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115.

Instructions: You must submit comments by one of the above methods to ensure that we receive, document, and consider them. Comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period, may not be considered. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted for public viewing on <http://www.regulations.gov> without change. All personal identifying information (*e.g.*, name, address, etc.), confidential business information, or

otherwise sensitive information submitted voluntarily by the sender will be publicly accessible. We will accept anonymous comments (enter "N/A" in the required fields if you wish to remain anonymous).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dan Tonnes, NMFS, West Coast Region, Protected Resources Division, 206-526-4643; or Chelsey Young, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, 301-427-8403.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

We have been petitioned several times to list various "DPSs" of rockfish in the Puget Sound region. In response to a petition in 1999, we conducted a status review of brown rockfish, copper rockfish, and quillback rockfish (Stout *et al.* 2001). During this status review, the Biological Review Team (BRT) that we established determined that the available genetic information for each species demonstrated population structure and supported a determination of discreteness as defined by the joint NMFS and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 1996 DPS Policy (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996). Based on this examination, the BRT identified a DPS for each of the three rockfish species in Puget Sound proper that can be considered a species under the ESA, and concluded that none of the identified DPSs were at risk of extinction (Stout *et al.* 2001).

On April 9, 2007, we received a petition from Mr. Sam Wright (Olympia, Washington) to list DPSs of five rockfish species (yelloweye, canary, bocaccio, greenstriped and redstripe) in Puget Sound, as endangered or threatened species under the ESA and to designate critical habitat. We found that this petition did not present substantial scientific or commercial information to suggest that the petitioned actions may be warranted (72 FR 56986; October 5, 2007). On October 29, 2007, we received a letter from Mr. Wright presenting information that was not included in the April 2007 petition, and requesting reconsideration of the decision not to initiate a review of the species' status. We considered the supplemental information as a new petition and concluded that there was enough information in this new petition to warrant conducting status reviews of these five rockfish species. The status review was initiated on March 17, 2008 (73 FR 14195) and completed in 2010 (Drake *et al.* 2010).

In the 2010 status review, the BRT used the best scientific and commercial data available at that time, including environmental and ecological features of

the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin, but noted that the limited genetic and demographic data for the five petitioned rockfish species populations created some uncertainty in the DPS determinations (Drake *et al.* 2010). The BRT assessed genetic data from the Strait of Georgia (inside waters of eastern Vancouver Island) for yelloweye rockfish (Yamanaka *et al.* 2006), that indicated a distinct genetic cluster that differed consistently from coastal samples of yelloweye rockfish, but also observed that genetic data from Puget Sound were not available for this species. The BRT also noted there was genetic information for canary rockfish (Wishard *et al.* 1980) and bocaccio (Matala *et al.* 2004, Field *et al.* 2009) in coastal waters, but no genetic data for either species from inland Puget Sound waters. The BRT found that in spite of these data limitations there was other evidence to conclude that each noted population of rockfish within inland waters of the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin was discrete from its coastal counterpart. Specifically, the BRT noted similar life histories of rockfish and based their determinations, in part, on the status review of brown rockfish, copper rockfish, and quillback rockfish (Stout *et al.* 2001) and the genetic information for those species that supported separate DPSs for inland compared to coastal populations (Drake *et al.* 2010). Thus, based on information related to rockfish life history, genetic variation among populations, and the environmental and ecological features of Puget Sound and the Georgia Basin, the BRT identified Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPSs for yelloweye rockfish, canary rockfish, and bocaccio, and a Puget Sound proper DPS for greenstriped rockfish and redstripe rockfish (Drake *et al.* 2010).

Informed by the BRT recommendations and our interpretation of best available scientific and commercial data, on April 28, 2010, we listed the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPSs of yelloweye rockfish and canary rockfish as threatened under the ESA, and the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS of bocaccio as endangered (75 FR 22276). The final critical habitat rule for the listed DPSs of rockfishes was published in the **Federal Register** on November 1, 2014 (79 FR 68041). We determined that greenstriped rockfish (*S. elongatus*) and redstripe rockfish (*S. proriger*) within Puget Sound proper each qualified as a DPS, but these DPSs were not at risk of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of their ranges (Drake *et al.* 2010).

In 2013, we appointed a recovery team and initiated recovery planning for

the listed rockfish species. Through the process of recovery planning, priority research and recovery actions emerged. One such action was to seek specific genetic data for each of these rockfish species to better evaluate and determine whether differences exist in the genetic structure of the listed species' populations between inland basins where the DPSs occur and the outer coast.

In 2014 and 2015, we partnered with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, several local fishing guides, and Puget Sound Anglers to collect samples and compare the genetic structure of the species' populations between the different basins of the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPSs area and the outer coast.

In 2015, we announced a five-year review (80 FR 6695; February 6, 2015) for the three rockfish DPSs. The five-year review was completed on May 5, 2016 (NMFS 2016), and is available at: http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/protected_species/other/rockfish/5.5.2016_5yr_review_report_rockfish.pdf. To complete the review, we collected, evaluated, and

incorporated all information on the species that has become available since April 2010, the date of the listing, including the 2014 final critical habitat designation and the newly obtained genetic information. This newly obtained genetic information and the five-year review inform the conclusions in this proposed rule.

Policies for Delineating and Listing Species Under the ESA

Under the ESA, the term "species" means a species, a subspecies, or a DPS of a vertebrate species (16 U.S.C. 1532(16)). A joint NMFS-USFWS policy clarifies the Services' interpretation of the phrase "Distinct Population Segment," or DPS (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996). The DPS Policy requires the consideration of two elements when evaluating whether a vertebrate population segment qualifies as a DPS under the ESA: (1) Discreteness of the population segment in relation to the remainder of the species/taxon; and, if discrete, (2) the significance of the population segment to the species/taxon to which it belongs. Thus, under the DPS policy a population segment is considered a DPS if it is both discrete from other populations within its taxon and significant to its taxon.

A population may be considered discrete if it satisfies either one of the following conditions: (1) It is markedly separated from other populations of the same taxon as a consequence of

physical, physiological, ecological, or behavioral factors; or (2) it is delimited by international governmental boundaries within which differences in control of exploitation, management of habitat, conservation status, or regulatory mechanisms exist that are significant in light of section 4(a)(1)(D) of the ESA (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996). According to the policy, quantitative measures of genetic or morphological discontinuity can be used to provide evidence for item (1) below.

A population may be considered significant if it satisfies any one of the following conditions: (1) Persistence of the discrete segment in an ecological setting unusual or unique for the taxon; (2) evidence that loss of the discrete segment would result in a significant gap in the range of the taxon; (3) evidence that the discrete segment represents the only surviving natural occurrence of a taxon that may be more abundant elsewhere as an introduced population outside its historical range; or 4) evidence that the discrete segment differs markedly from other populations of the species in its genetic characteristics.

The ESA gives us clear authority to make listing determinations and to revise the Federal list of endangered and threatened species to reflect these determinations. Section 4(a)(1) of the ESA authorizes us to determine by regulation whether "any species," which is defined to include species, subspecies, and DPSs, is an endangered species or a threatened species based on certain factors. Review of a species' status may be commenced at any time, either on the Services' own initiative—through a status review or in connection with a five-year review under Section 4(c)(2)—or in response to a petition. Because a DPS is not a scientifically recognized entity, but rather one created under the language of the ESA and effectuated through our DPS Policy (61 FR 4722; February 7, 1996), we have some discretion to determine whether populations of a species should be identified as DPSs and, based upon their range and propensity for movement, what boundaries should be recognized for a DPS. Section 4(c)(1) of the ESA gives us authority to update the Federal list of threatened and endangered species to reflect these determinations. This can include revising the list to remove a species or reclassify the listed entity.

Under sections 4(c)(1) and 4(a)(1) of the ESA, the Secretary shall undertake a five-year review of a listed species and consider, among other things, whether a species' listing status should be

continued. Pursuant to implementing regulations at 50 CFR 424.11(d), a species shall be removed from the list if the Secretary of Commerce determines, based on the best scientific and commercial data available after conducting a review of the species' status, that the species is no longer threatened or endangered because of one or a combination of the section 4(a)(1) factors. A species may be delisted only if such data substantiate that it is neither endangered nor threatened for one or more of the following reasons:

(1) Extinction. Unless all individuals of the listed species had been previously identified and located, and were later found to be extirpated from their previous range, a sufficient period of time must be allowed before delisting to indicate clearly that the species is extinct.

(2) Recovery. The principal goal of the Services is to return listed species to a point at which protection under the ESA is no longer required. A species may be delisted on the basis of recovery only if the best scientific and commercial data available indicate that it is no longer endangered or threatened.

(3) Original data for classification in error. Subsequent investigations may show that the best scientific or commercial data available when the species was listed, or the interpretation of such data, were in error (50 CFR 424.11(d)).

DPS and Status Determinations

Genetics Data Collection and Analysis Methods

Analysis of the geographical distribution of genetic variation is a powerful method of identifying discrete populations (Drake *et al.* 2010); thus, genetic analysis provides useful information to address the uncertainties associated with the limited information that informed our initial discreteness determinations for yelloweye rockfish, canary rockfish and bocaccio.

To address the need for specific genetic data from yelloweye rockfish, canary rockfish and bocaccio within the inland Puget Sound/Georgia Basin area to compare to genetic data from rockfish in coastal areas as defined during recovery planning, we collected biological samples for genetic analysis several ways. Over the course of 74 fishing trips, biological samples were gathered from listed rockfishes using hook-and-line recreational fishing methods in Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Additional samples were gathered from archived sources from Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the

NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center's Fisheries Resource Division, and the NMFS Northwest Fisheries Science Center's West Coast groundfish bottom trawl survey. Samples collected from these sources were used to examine the population structure for each species. Population structure was examined using three methods: principal components analysis, calculation of F_{ST} (fixation index; measure of population differentiation) among geographic groups, and a population genetics based model clustering analysis (termed STRUCTURE) (NMFS 2016).

NMFS' Puget Sound/Georgia Basin rockfish BRT reviewed the results from the new genetic information. Their recommendations (Ford 2015) informed and were further evaluated during the five-year review. The results are summarized below.

Yelloweye Rockfish Findings

Several different analytical methods indicated significant genetic differentiation between the inland and coastal samples of yelloweye rockfish at a level consistent with the limited genetic data for this species (Yamanaka *et al.* 2006) that were available at the time of the 2010 status review. The BRT concluded that these new data represent the best available science and commercial data and are consistent with and confirm the existence of an inland population of Puget Sound/Georgia Basin yelloweye rockfish that is discrete from coastal yelloweye rockfish (Ford 2015). In addition, yelloweye rockfish from Hood Canal were genetically differentiated from other Puget Sound/Georgia Basin fish, indicating a previously unknown degree of population differentiation within the DPS.

The BRT also found that new genetic information from Canada demonstrates that yelloweye rockfish occurring in the northern Johnstone Strait and Queen Charlotte Channel clustered genetically with yelloweye rockfish occurring in the northern Strait of Georgia, the San Juan Islands, and Puget Sound. This is consistent with additional genetic analysis identifying a population of yelloweye rockfish inside the waters of eastern Vancouver Island (Yamanaka *et al.* 2006, COSEWIC 2008, Yamanaka *et al.* 2012, Seigle *et al.* 2013). Based on this information and the five-year review, this proposed rule would correct the previous description of the northern boundary of the threatened Puget Sound/Georgia Basin yelloweye rockfish (*S. ruberrimus*) DPS to include this area. This proposed rule would also update and amend the description of the

DPS as fish residing within certain boundaries (including this geographic area farther north in the Strait of Georgia waters in Canada). We propose this change because this description better aligns with yelloweye rockfish life-history and their sedentary behavior as adults, rather than the current description of fish originating from the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin.

Canary Rockfish Findings

These same analytical methods were used to analyze population structure in canary rockfish. These current analyses indicate a lack of genetic differentiation of canary rockfish between coastal and inland Puget Sound/Georgia Basin samples. F_{ST} values, a metric of population differentiation, among groups were not significantly different from zero among geographic regions, and STRUCTURE analysis did not provide evidence supporting population structure in the data. None of these analyses provided any evidence of genetic differentiation between canary rockfish along the coast from the canary rockfish within the boundaries of the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS (NMFS 2016).

The BRT noted that the very large number of loci provided considerable power to detect differentiation among sample groups and concluded that the lack of such differentiation indicated that it is unlikely that the inland Puget Sound/Georgia Basin samples are discrete from coastal areas (Ford 2015). In the context of this newly obtained genetic information, the BRT considered whether other factors that supported the original discreteness determination, such as oceanography and ecological differences among locations, continue to support a finding of discreteness for this population. In considering this newly obtained genetic data in the context of the other evidence, the BRT found that their original interpretation of the scientific data informing discreteness is no longer supported. Rather, they concluded that the lack of genetic differentiation indicates sufficient dispersal to render a discreteness determination based on environmental factors implausible. The BRT found that current genetic data evaluated and interpreted in the context of all available scientific information now provides strong evidence that canary rockfish of the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin are not discrete from coastal area canary rockfish. Based on the BRT findings, the five-year review, and best available science and commercial information, and in accordance with the DPS policy, we have determined that the canary rockfish of the Puget Sound/

Georgia Basin do not meet the criteria to be considered a DPS. The new genetic data reveal that canary rockfish of the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin are part of the larger population occupying the Pacific Coast. Canary rockfish of the Pacific Coast was declared overfished in 2000 and a rebuilding plan under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act was put in place in 2001. NMFS determined the stock to be “rebuilt” in 2015 (Thorson and Wetzel 2015, NMFS 2016).

Based on the discussion above and the recommendation of the five-year review, we are proposing to remove Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish from the Federal List of Threatened and Endangered Species because the new genetic data evaluated and interpreted in the context of all best available science indicate they are not a discrete population. Under section 4(c)(1) of the ESA and the implementing regulations at 50 CFR 424.11(d)(3), we may propose to delist canary rockfish if, among other things, subsequent investigation demonstrates that our interpretation of best scientific or commercial information was in error. After considering this newly obtained genetic data in the context of the other evidence supporting discreteness, we determined that our original interpretation of discreteness for Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish is no longer supported and was in error. Based on this reasoning, there is no

need for a post-delisting monitoring plan.

Bocaccio Findings

Bocaccio are rare within the DPS area and we were able to obtain only a few samples of them in the genetic study. Because of their rarity, the genetic analysis for bocaccio included only two samples from within the DPS area, and this is not sufficient information to change our prior status review determination that Puget Sound/Georgia Basin bocaccio are discrete from coastal fish (Ford, 2015).

The BRT noted that bocaccio have a propensity for greater adult movement than more benthic rockfish species, similar to the case for canary rockfish. The BRT considered that the lack of genetic differentiation between coastal and Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish might suggest a similar lack of genetic differentiation for bocaccio because of similarities in the life history of the two species. However, the BRT concluded that the new information was not sufficient to change the conclusions of the previous BRT documented in Drake *et al.* (2010). This is consistent with the five-year review recommendation (NMFS 2016) and is based upon best available scientific data and commercial information.

Similar to yelloweye rockfish, we propose to update and amend the listing description of the bocaccio DPS to describe boundaries to include fish residing within the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin rather than fish

originating from the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin.

Effects of the New Determinations


Based on the new information and the BRT’s determination, we propose that Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish be removed from the Federal List of Threatened and Endangered Species. The Puget Sound/Georgia Basin yelloweye rockfish DPS shall remain threatened under the ESA, and the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin bocaccio DPS shall remain endangered.

We also propose to remove designated critical habitat for canary rockfish. The critical habitat designation for the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin yelloweye rockfish and bocaccio DPSs will remain in place. The area removed as designated critical habitat for canary rockfish will continue to be designated critical habitat for bocaccio and, thus, there will be no change to the spatial area that was originally designated. Maps of critical habitat can be found on our Web site at <http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov> and in the final critical habitat rule (79 FR 68041; November 13, 2014).

Additionally, we propose to update and amend the listing description of the yelloweye rockfish DPS to define geographical boundaries including an area farther north of the Johnstone Strait in Canada (Figure 1). This boundary would not have an effect on critical habitat, because we do not designate critical habitat outside U.S. territory.

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P

Figure 1. Updated Yelloweye Rockfish Dps Area, Which Extends Farther North Into Canada.



BILLING CODE 3510-22-C

If the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish DPS is delisted, then the requirements under section 7 of the ESA would no longer apply. Federal agencies would be relieved of the need to consult with us on their actions that may affect Puget Sound/Georgia Basin canary rockfish and their designated critical habitat and to insure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of canary rockfish or adversely modify their critical habitat. ESA section 7 consultation requirements will remain in place for the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin yelloweye rockfish and bocaccio DPSs. Recovery planning efforts will continue for these listed DPSs as well.

References Cited

The complete citations for the references used in this document can be obtained by contacting NMFS (See **ADDRESSES and FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**) or on our Web page at: <http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov>.

Information Quality Act and Peer Review

In December 2004, OMB issued a Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review pursuant to the Information Quality Act. The Bulletin was published in the **Federal Register** on January 14, 2005 (70 FR 2664). The Bulletin established minimum peer review standards, a transparent process for public disclosure of peer review planning, and opportunities for public participation with regard to certain

types of information disseminated by the Federal Government. Peer review under the OMB Peer Review Bulletin ensures that our listing determinations are based on the best available scientific and commercial information. Prior to a final rule, and during the public comment period, NMFS will solicit the expert opinions of three qualified specialists selected from the academic and scientific community, Federal and state agencies, or the private sector to review our five-year review and underlying science supporting this action, to ensure the best biological and commercial information is being used in the decision-making process.

Classification

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The 1982 amendments to the ESA, in section 4(b)(1)(A), restrict the information that may be considered when assessing species for listing. Based on this limitation of criteria for a listing decision and the opinion in *Pacific Legal Foundation v. Andrus*, 657 F. 2d 829 (6th Cir. 1981), we have concluded that NEPA does not apply to ESA listing actions. (See NOAA Administrative Order 216–6.)

Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Flexibility Act, and Paperwork Reduction Act

As noted in the Conference Report on the 1982 amendments to the ESA, economic impacts cannot be considered when assessing the status of a species. Therefore, the economic analysis requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act are not applicable to the listing process. In addition, this proposed rule is exempt from review under Executive Order 12866. This proposed rule does not contain a

collection of information requirement for the purposes of the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Executive Order 13122, Federalism

In accordance with E.O. 13132, we determined that this proposed rule does not have significant federalism effects and that a federalism assessment is not required. In keeping with the intent of the Administration and Congress to provide continuing and meaningful dialogue on issues of mutual state and Federal interest, this proposed rule will be shared with the relevant state agencies in Washington state.

List of Subjects

50 CFR Part 223

Endangered and threatened species, Exports, Imports, Transportation.

50 CFR Part 224

Endangered and threatened species.

Dated: June 23, 2016.

Samuel D. Rauch, III,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR parts 223 and 224 are proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 223—THREATENED MARINE AND ANADROMOUS SPECIES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 223 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1531–1543; subpart B, § 223.201–202 also issued under 16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*; 16 U.S.C. 5503(d) for § 223.206(d)(9).

■ 2. In § 223.102, in the table in paragraph (e), under the subheading “Fishes”, remove the entry for “Rockfish, canary (Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS)”; and revise the table entries for “Rockfish, yelloweye (Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS)”, to read as follows:

§ 223.102 Enumeration of threatened marine and anadromous species.

* * * * *
(e) * * *

Species ¹			Citation(s) for listing determination(s)	Critical habitat	ESA rules
Common name	Scientific name	Description of listed entity			
*	*	*	*	*	*
FISHES					
*	*	*	*	*	*
Rockfish, yelloweye (Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS).	<i>Sebastes ruberrimus.</i>	Yelloweye rockfish residing within the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin, inclusive of the Queen Charlotte Channel to Malcom Island, in a straight line between the western shores of Numas and Malcom Islands—N. 50 50'46", W. 127 5'55" and N. 50 36'49", W. 127 10'17". The Western Boundary of the U.S. side in the Strait of Juan de Fuca is N. 48 7'16", W. 123 17'15" in a straight line to the Canadian side at N. 48 24'40", 123 17'38".	75 FR 22276, Apr 28, 2010.	226.224	NA
*	*	*	*	*	*

¹Species includes taxonomic species, subspecies, distinct population segments (DPSs) (for a policy statement, see 61 FR 4722, February, 1996), and evolutionarily significant units (ESUs) (for a policy statement, see 56 FR 58612, November 20, 1991).

PART 224—ENDANGERED MARINE AND ANADROMOUS SPECIES

■ 3. The authority citation for part 224 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1531–1543 and 16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*

■ 4. In § 224.101, paragraph (h), under the subheading “Fishes”, revise the

table entry for “Bocaccio (Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS)” to read as follows:

§ 224.101 Enumeration of endangered marine and anadromous species.

* * * * *
(h) * * *

Species ¹			Citation(s) for listing determination(s)	Critical habitat	ESA rules
Common name	Scientific name	Description of listed entity			
*	*	*	*	*	*
FISHES					
Bocaccio (Puget Sound/Georgia Basin DPS).	<i>Sebastes paucispinis</i> .	Bocaccio residing within the Puget Sound/Georgia Basin to the Northern Boundary of the Northern Strait of Georgia along the southern contours of Quadra Island, Maurelle Island and Sonora Island, all of Bute Inlet. The Western Boundary of the U.S. side in the Strait of Juan de Fuca is N. 48 7'16", W. 123 17'15" in a straight line to the Canadian side at N. 48 24'40", 123 17'38".	75 FR 22276, Apr 28, 2010.	226.224	NA
*	*	*	*	*	*

¹ Species includes taxonomic species, subspecies, distinct population segments (DPSs) (for a policy statement, see 61 FR 4722, February, 1996), and evolutionarily significant units (ESUs) (for a policy statement, see 56 FR 58612, November 20, 1991).

[FR Doc. 2016-15923 Filed 7-5-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-P