

The area is bounded by the following coordinates:

*Latitude and Longitude*

A: 25°00'37.96364" N 80°22'14.60425" W  
 B: 25°00'31.20173" N 80°22'22.54159" W  
 C: 25°00'45.20646" N 80°22'22.54159" W  
 D: 25°00'38.44445" N 80°22'29.96212" W

Dated: May 8, 2002.

**Jamison S. Hawkins,**

*Deputy Assistant Administrator for Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.*

[FR Doc. 02-12004 Filed 5-13-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-NK-M**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

[I.D. 050302A]

**Endangered Species; Permit No. 1351**

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

**ACTION:** Issuance of permit.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that Dr. Frank A. Chapman, Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, University of Florida, University of Florida, 7922 N.W. 71 St., Gainesville, Florida 32653, has been issued a permit to take Shortnose Sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*) for purposes of scientific research and enhancement.

**ADDRESSES:** The permit and related documents are available for review upon written request or by appointment in the following office(s):

Permits, Conservation and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Room 13705, Silver Spring, MD 20910; phone (301)713-2289; fax (301)713-0376.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Lillian Becker, (301)713-2289.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On September 17, 2001, notice was published in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 48031) that a request for a scientific research/enhancement permit to take shortnose sturgeon had been submitted by the above-named individual. The requested permit has been issued under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) and the regulations governing the taking, importing, and exporting of endangered and threatened species (50 CFR parts 222-226).

The Holder was issued a four year permit [#1351] to identify the physical, chemical, and biological parameters necessary for optimal survival and

growth of shortnose sturgeon. The research activities proposed in this investigation address the goals and objectives of the shortnose sturgeon recovery plan.

Issuance of this permit, as required by the ESA, was based on a finding that such permit (1) was applied for in good faith, (2) will not operate to the disadvantage of the endangered species which is the subject of this permit, and (3) is consistent with the purposes and policies set forth in section 2 of the ESA.

Dated: May 8, 2002.

**Eugene T. Nitta,**

*Acting Chief, Permits, Conservation and Education Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 02-12034 Filed 5-13-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-S**

**CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION**

**[CPSC Docket No. 02-2]**

**In the Matter of DAISY MANUFACTURING COMPANY Inc.; d/b/a/ Daisy Outdoor Products, 400 West Stribling Drive, Rogers, Arkansas 72756; Prehearing Conference**

**AGENCY:** Consumer Product Safety Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of first prehearing conference.

**DATES:** This notice announces a prehearing conference to be held in the matter of Daisy Manufacturing Company, Inc. on June 7, 2002 at 10 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The prehearing conference will be in hearing room 420 of the East-West Towers Building, 4330 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Maryland 20814.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Todd A. Stevenson, Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington, DC; telephone (301) 504-0800; telefax (301) 504-0127.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This public notice is issued pursuant to 16 CFR 1025.21(b) of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings to inform the public that a prehearing conference will be held in administrative proceeding under section 15 of the Consumer Product Safety Act ("CPSA"), 15 U.S.C. 2064 and section 15 of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act ("FHSAs"), 15 U.S.C. 1274, captioned CPSC Docket No. 02-2, In the Matter of DAISY MANUFACTURING COMPANY, Inc. doing business as

Daisy Outdoor Products. The Presiding Officer in the proceeding is United States Administrative Law Judge William B. Moran. The Presiding Officer has determined that, for good and sufficient cause, the time period for holding the first prehearing conference had to be extended to the date announced above, which date is beyond the fifty (50) day period referenced in 16 CFR 1025.21(a).

The public is referred to the Code of Regulations citation listed above for identification of the issues to be raised at the conference and is advised that the date, time and place of the hearing also will be established at the conference.

Substantively, the issues being litigated in this proceeding are described by the Presiding Officer to include: Whether certain identified models of the Daisy Powerline Airgun, designed to shoot BBs or pellets, contain defects which create a substantial product hazard defect in that, allegedly, BBs can become lodged within a "virtual magazine," or fail to feed into the firing chamber, with the consequences that one may fire or shake the gun without receiving any visual or audible indication that is still loaded. Consequently, the complaint asserts that these alleged problems can lead consumers to erroneously believe that the gun is empty and that such phenomena means that the gun is "defective" within the meaning of section 15 of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2064 and section 15 of the FHSAs, 15 U.S.C. 1274. The Complaint further alleges that the gun's design, by making it difficult to determine when looking into the loading port whether a BB is present, constitutes a "defect" under the CPSA and the FHSAs and presents a "substantial product hazard," creating a substantial risk of injury to consumers, within the meaning of section 15(a)(2), of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2064(a)(12), and presents a substantial risk of injury of children under section 15(c)(1) and (c)(2) of the FHSAs, 15 U.S.C. 1274(c)(1) and (c)(2). The public should be mindful that these are allegations only and the CPSC bears the burden of proof in establishing any violations. Should these allegations be proven, Complaint Counsel for the Office of Compliance of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission seeks a finding that these products present a substantial product hazard and present a substantial risk of injury to children and that public notification of such hazard and risk of injury be made pursuant to section 15(c) of the CPSA and that other appropriate relief be directed, as set forth in the Complaint.