

on groundwater quality and quantity, potential impacts on surface water quality and quantity, potential influence on channel migration, and potential access to gravel ponds by anadromous salmonids.

(2) Gravel processing.

(3) Site reclamation activities including, but not limited to, the creation of emergent and open water wetland habitat and riparian and valley-bottom forest restoration; habitat rehabilitation, riparian irrigation, and low flow augmentation to Dean Creek; and construction of facilities (such as trails and parking lots) to support future incorporation of the site into the open space and greenbelt reserve.

(4) Monitoring and maintenance of conservation measures.

The duration of the proposed Permits and Plan is 25 years, though some aspects of the conservation measures associated with the proposed Plan would continue in perpetuity.

The Services formally initiated an environmental review of the project through publication of a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 1999 (64 FR 72318). That notice also announced a 30-day public scoping period during which interested parties were invited to provide written comments expressing their issues or concerns relating to the proposal. A second **Federal Register** notice was published on November 22, 2002 (67 FR 70408), announcing a 60-day public comment period for a draft Statement, draft Plan with appendices, and a draft Implementing Agreement. The comment period was extended an additional 30 days in direct response to requests from the public. This resulted in a total comment period of 90 days. Comments received on the draft documents and responses to those comments are included in the final Statement.

The final Statement compares Storedahl's proposal against two no-action alternatives. Differences between the no-action alternatives and the proposed action are considered to be the effects that would occur if the proposed action were implemented. One alternative to Storedahl's proposal is also analyzed against the two no-action alternatives. The analysis comparing these alternatives is contained in the final Statement.

Alternatives considered in the analysis include the following:

(1) Alternative A-1: Partition the property into 20-acre (8.1 ha) parcels and sell as rural residential/agricultural tracts - No Action.

(2) Alternative A-2: Mine the property without an ITP and avoid take - No Action.

(3) Alternative B: Mine and undertake habitat enhancement and reclamation activity at the Daybreak property implementing the May 2001 Public Review Draft HCP - Preferred Alternative.

(4) Alternative C: Mine and undertake habitat enhancement and reclamation activity at the Daybreak property following design and conservation measures presented to the Services in July, 2000.

One alternative was considered during scoping but not analyzed in detail. That alternative is essentially a combination of the two no-action alternatives listed above, Alternatives A-1 and A-2. That alternative would have involved mining on the portion of the property currently zoned for mining, with subsequent partitioning and sale of the mined and unmined property for low-density rural residential development. This was dismissed from detailed analysis because the vast majority of marketable sand and gravel on the portion of the property currently zoned for mining has already been extracted, rendering the alternative not feasible.

This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(a) of the ESA, and NEPA regulations. The Services will evaluate the application, associated documents, and comments submitted thereon to determine whether the application meets the requirements of the ESA and NEPA. If it is determined that the requirements are met, Permits will be issued for the incidental take of listed species. The final permit decision will be made no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice.

Dated: October 30, 2003.

David J. Wesley,

Deputy Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1, Portland Oregon.

November 10, 2003.

Phil Williams,

Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 03-29730 Filed 11-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODES 3510-22-S, 4310-55-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 112403B]

Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

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

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) will convene a joint public meeting via conference call of the Standing and Special Reef Fish Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC).

DATES: The meeting will be via conference call on December 12, 2003 beginning at 10 a.m. EDT.

ADDRESSES: Listening stations will be available at the following locations:

NMFS Southeast Regional Office, 9721 Executive Center Drive, North, St. Petersburg, FL 33702; Contact: Peter Hood at 727-570-5305;

NMFS Panama City Laboratory, 3500 Delwood Beach Road, Panama City, FL; Contact: Gary Fitzhugh at 850-234-6541, extension 214.

Council address: Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, 3018 U.S. Highway 301 North, Suite 1000, Tampa, FL 33619.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Steven Atran, Population Dynamics Statistician, Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council; telephone: 813-228-2815.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The SSC will be convened to evaluate the socioeconomic information contained in Reef Fish Secretarial Amendment 1, red grouper rebuilding plan and deep-water grouper quotas. The SSC will be asked specifically to provide the Council with guidance on the economic impacts of trip limits vs. closed seasons.

Red grouper were declared overfished by NMFS in October 2000. Following additional analyses and a subsequent stock assessment in 2002, the Council, in May 2003, submitted Reef Fish Secretarial Amendment 1 to NMFS. This amendment contained a rebuilding plan that called for approximately a 10 percent reduction in harvest, to be achieved through a reduction in the commercial shallow-water grouper quota, replacing the February 15 to March 15 commercial closed season on gag, red and black grouper with a shallow-water grouper trip limit, and a recreational bag limit of no more than

two red grouper (out of the 5 aggregate grouper bag limit). The rebuilding plan also proposed a reduction in the deep-water grouper quota and setting of a tilefish quota in order to discourage effort shifting to those stocks. Because more than one year had passed since the designation of red grouper as overfished, the amendment was submitted as a Secretarial Amendment rather than as a Council Plan Amendment.

NMFS reviewed the plan as submitted by the Gulf Council and made revisions to it. The revisions included retaining the February 15-March 15 commercial closed season, implementing a hard quota on red grouper so that the commercial shallow-water grouper fishery will close when either the red grouper or shallow-water grouper quota is met, whichever comes first, and not implementing a trip limit.

A draft of the revised Secretarial Amendment was reviewed by the SSC at a meeting held October 28-29, 2003. However, the NMFS revisions were not provided to the SSC until just prior to the meeting, and the SSC was unable to review the socioeconomic information contained in the amendment's regulatory impact review section. At the November 9-12, 2003 Council meeting in Biloxi, Mississippi, Council members debated whether it would be less economically disruptive to the commercial shallow-water grouper fishery to have a potential quota closure or a shallow-water grouper trip limit set low enough to prevent a quota closure. Since the Council will have another opportunity to review and comment on Secretarial Amendment 1 at its January 12-16, 2004 meeting in Austin, TX, the Council decided to ask the SSC to reconvene by conference call to evaluate the socioeconomic information in the amendment, with particular emphasis on the economic impacts of trip limits vs. closed seasons.

To obtain a copy of Reef Fish Secretarial Amendment 1, contact Phil Steele, NMFS Southeast Regional Office, 9721 Executive Center Drive, North, St. Petersburg, FL 33702; telephone: 727-570-5305, fax: 727-570-5583, e-mail: Phil.Steele@noaa.gov

A copy of the agenda can be obtained by contacting the Council (see addresses above).

Although non-emergency issues not contained in the agenda may come before the AP/SSC for discussion, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA), those issues may not be the subject of formal action during this meeting. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically identified in

this notice and any issues arising after publication of this notice that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the MSFCMA, provided the public has been notified of the Council's intent to take final action to address the emergency.

The listening stations are physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Anne Alford at the Council (see ADDRESSES) by December 5, 2003.

Dated: November 24, 2003.

Richard W. Surdi,

Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 03-29737 Filed 11-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title, Form Number, and OMB Number: Civil Aircraft Landing Permit System; OMB Number 0701-0050; DD Form 2400, 2401, 2402; OMB Number 0701-0050.

Type of Request: Reinstatement.

Number of Respondents: 3,600.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 3,600.

Average Burden per Response: 30 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 1,800.

Needs and Uses: The information collection requirement is necessary to ensure that the security and operational integrity of military airfields are maintained; to identify the aircraft operator and the aircraft to be operated; to avoid competition with the private sector by establishing the purpose for use of military airfields; and to ensure the U.S. Government is not held liable if the civil aircraft becomes involved in an accident or incident while using military airfields, facilities, and services.

Affected Public: Business of Other For-Profit; Not-For-Profit Institutions; Individuals or Households.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Required to obtain or retain benefits.

Pamela Fitzgerald,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 03-29710 Filed 11-26-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-01-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sunshine Act; Notice of Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (5 U.S.C. 552b), notice is hereby given of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board's (Board) meeting described below. The Board will also conduct a series of public hearings pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2286b and invites any interested persons or groups to present any comments, technical information, or data concerning safety issues related to the matters to be considered.

TIME AND DATE OF MEETING: 9 a.m., December 16, 2003.

PLACE: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Public Hearing Room, 625 Indiana Avenue, NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20004-2001.

Additionally, as a part of the Board's E-Government initiative, the meeting will be presented live through Internet video streaming. A link to the presentation will be available on the Board's Web site (<http://www.dnfsb.gov>).

STATUS: Open. While the Government in the Sunshine Act does not require that the scheduled discussion be conducted in a meeting, the Board has determined that an open meeting in this specific case furthers the public interests underlying both the Sunshine Act and the Board's enabling legislation.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: The Board has been reviewing the Department of Energy's (DOE) current oversight and management of the contracts and contractors it relies upon to accomplish the mission assigned to DOE under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. We will focus on what impact, if any, DOE's new initiatives may have or might have had upon assuring adequate protection of the health and safety of the public and workers at DOE's defense nuclear facilities. The sixth public meeting will collect information needed to understand and address any health or safety concerns that may require Board action. This will include, but is not limited to, presentations by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to explain their contract management and oversight initiatives and possibly further presentations by Board staff.