

B. We are considering changing regulations to clarify current requirements and to allow better rangeland management and permit administration. Changes we are considering include:

- Clarifying the permit renewal performance review requirements when grazing permits are pledged as security for loans.
- Clarifying who is qualified for public lands grazing use and who will receive preference for a grazing permit or lease.
- Clarifying the provisions addressing grazing preference transfers.
- Reinstating an earlier provision that BLM and the permit holder may share title to certain range improvements if the improvement was constructed under a Cooperative Range Improvement Agreement.
- Clarifying that BLM will follow state law with respect to the acquisition of water rights.
- Examining whether BLM should authorize temporarily locked gates on public lands in order to protect private land and improve livestock operations.
- Clarifying which non-permit related violations BLM may take into account in penalizing a permittee.
- Considering ways to streamline the grazing decision appeal process.
- Extending the time period that BLM may approve nonuse of forage from 3 to 5 years for resource improvement, business, or personal needs.

C. We are also considering amendments related to changes in permitted use. Amendments we are considering include:

- Creating provisions re-emphasizing consideration of social, economic, and cultural impact, in addition to the ecological impacts, of Federal actions to ensure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.
- Requiring a permittee/lessee to apply to renew a permit or lease.
- What criteria BLM will consider before approving increases in permitted use.
- Considering whether to amend the provision stating when BLM will implement action that changes grazing management after determining that the allotments used by a permittee or lessee are not meeting or significantly progressing toward meeting land health standards.

D. We are considering adding the following new provisions to the regulations.

- Establishing and administering a new concept called "Reserve Common Allotments" (RCA). RCAs would be managed as reserve forage areas for use by permittees whose allotments are

undergoing restoration treatments and require rest from grazing. RCA forage would be allocated on a temporary non-renewable basis to permittees participating in restoration on their allotments.

- Adding a fee schedule for preference transfers, crossing permits, applications for nonuse, and replacement/supplemental billing under existing service charge authority. We do not intend to address grazing fees in this rulemaking.

E. We also plan to make minor revisions to correct typographical errors and to make technical changes to improve the clarity of the rule. One change we will make is to remove references to "conservation use" permits to reflect the decision in *Public Lands Council v. Babbitt*, 929 F.Supp. 1436 (D. Wyo. 1996), *rev'd in part and aff'd in part*, 167 F.3d 1287 (10th Cir. 1999), *aff'd*, 529 U.S. 728 (2000).

Additional information about BLM's Rangeland, Soils, Water, and Air Program is available at <http://web.blm.gov/internal/wo-200/wo-220/index.html>.

Dated: January 17, 2003.

**Rebecca W. Watson,**

*Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. 03-4933 Filed 2-28-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-84-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Research and Special Programs Administration

#### 49 CFR Part 192

[Docket No. RSPA-00-7666; Notice 6]

RIN 2137-AD54

#### Pipeline Safety: Pipeline Integrity Management in High Consequence Areas (Gas Transmission Pipelines)

**AGENCY:** Office of Pipeline Safety (OPS), Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a one-day public meeting to address issues raised at a recent workshop jointly organized by the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA) Foundation and the American Gas Association (AGA) on the proposed 49 CFR part 192.763, "Pipeline Integrity Management in High Consequence Areas". This meeting is intended to give participants a better understanding of the proposed rule. OPS representatives will give an overview of the proposed

regulation and will fully discuss identification of high consequence areas and moderate risk areas; confirmatory direct assessment methods; assessment schedules, and criteria for the performance approach to the program. RSPA/OPS is also seeking information on the costs and benefits of implementing the proposed requirements.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting is open to all. There is no cost to attend. This meeting will be held on Friday March 14, 2003, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. at the Marriott at Metro Center hotel located at 775 12th Street, NW., Washington, DC; Tel: 202-737-2200; fax: 202-347-5886; website: [www.marriott.com](http://www.marriott.com). You may register electronically for this meeting at: <http://primis.rspa.dot.gov/meetings>. Please make your reservations as soon as possible as hotel rooms are limited. For other details on this meeting contact Janice Morgan at 202-366-2392.

You may submit written comments by mail or delivery to the Dockets Facility, U.S. Department of Transportation, Room PL-401, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590-0001. The dockets facility is open from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except on Federal holidays. You should submit the original and one copy. Anyone who wants confirmation of receipt of their comments must include a stamped, self-addressed postcard. You may also submit comments to the docket electronically. To do so, log on to the Internet Web address <http://dms.dot.gov>. And click on "Help" for instructions on electronic filing of comments. All written comments should identify the docket number RSPA-03-14448; Notice 3.

Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comments (or signing the comments, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the U.S. Department of Transportation's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78), or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jenny Donohue by phone at (202) 366-4046, regarding this document. General information about RSPA/OPS programs may be obtained by accessing RSPA's Internet page at <http://rspa.dot.gov>.

*Information on Services for Individuals With Disabilities*

For information on facilities or services for individuals with disabilities

or to request special assistance, contact Janice Morgan, (202) 366-2392.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

To better prevent pipeline failures that can imperil the health and safety of nearby residents and cause significant damage to their property, RSPA/OPS is promulgating a series of rules to require pipeline operators to develop integrity management programs. The programs include conducting baseline and periodic assessments of certain pipeline segments. Although the hazardous liquid and natural gas programs are structured somewhat differently to accommodate the differences between the two types of pipeline systems, both integrity management programs are designed to identify the best method(s) for maintaining the structural soundness (*i.e.*, integrity) of pipelines operating across the United States.

On January 9, 2002, RSPA/OPS began the integrity management rulemakings for gas transmission lines by first proposing a definition of high consequence areas (*See* 67 FR 1108). We also described our plan to propose integrity management program requirements for gas transmission pipelines affecting those areas. RSPA/OPS finalized the high consequence area definition on August 6, 2002 (67 FR 50824), and published the proposed rule on integrity management program requirements on January 28, 2003 (68 FR 4278).

This meeting is being held to give participants a better understanding of the proposed rule. OPS representatives will give an overview of the proposed rule and discuss fully the identification and protection of high consequence areas and moderate risk areas; and the methodology of confirmatory direct assessment. OPS will answer any questions related to the proposed rule and will seek additional information from the public about costs and benefits of implementing the proposed rule.

The preliminary agenda for this meeting is as follows:

*Pipeline safety legislation*—The impact of the recently passed legislation on integrity management program requirements.

*Overview of proposed regulation*—The intent and structure of the proposed rule.

*HCA Identification*—The refinement of the definition of high consequence areas and moderate risk areas in the proposed rule.

*Risk assessment, plan development, and data integration*—Proposed risk assessment, with particular emphasis on confirmatory direct assessment

methods, and the proposed plan development process, identification of high consequence areas and moderate risk areas; confirmatory direct assessment methods; assessment schedules, and criteria for the performance approach to the program.

##### *IMP Implementation & Data Integration*

*Costs and benefits*—The draft regulatory evaluation.

##### *Open Forum & Q&A*

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 26, 2003.

**Stacey L. Gerard,**

*Associate Administrator for Pipeline Safety.*

[FR Doc. 03-4919 Filed 2-28-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-60-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

#### 50 CFR Part 600

[Docket No. 030128024-3024-01; I.D. 121002A]

RIN 0648-AQ63

#### Fisheries of the United States; National Standard 1

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

**ACTION:** Advance notice of proposed rulemaking; consideration of revision to national standard 1 guidelines; extension of comment period.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS extends the public comment period on an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking that announces that the agency is considering revisions to the national standard guidelines for national standard 1 that specify criteria for determining overfishing and establishing rebuilding schedules. Because the scientific community, fisheries managers, the fishing industry, and environmental groups expressed concern about the appropriateness of some aspects of national standard 1 guidelines, particularly in light of new issues arising from rebuilding programs that have been underway for several years, this action solicits public input on the effectiveness and appropriateness of these guidelines in complying with the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act).

**DATES:** Comment period is extended from March 17, 2003, to April 16, 2003.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be mailed to Mr. John H. Dunnigan, Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Room 13362, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910; or faxed to 301-713-1193. Comments will not be accepted if submitted via e-mail or Internet.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mark R. Millikin, at 301-713-2341 or via e-mail at [Mark.Millikin@noaa.gov](mailto:Mark.Millikin@noaa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The preamble of the advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPR)(68 FR 7492, February 14, 2003) is republished here in its entirety for the convenience of the public. This action extends the public comment period of the ANPR another 30 days, from March 17, 2003, to April 16, 2003.

National standard 1 reads, "Conservation and management measures shall prevent overfishing while achieving, on a continuing basis, the optimum yield from each fishery for the United States fishing industry." In 1996, the Sustainable Fisheries Act (SFA) amended the Magnuson-Stevens Act (16 U.S.C. 1801, *et seq.*) to, among other things, provide definitions for "overfishing" and modify the definition of "optimum yield." The Magnuson-Stevens Act, in section 303(a)(10), now requires each fishery management plan (FMP) to "specify objective and measurable criteria for identifying when the fishery to which the FMP applies is overfished." In addition, section 304(e) specifies requirements for rebuilding overfished fisheries. The revised national standard guidelines, including national standard 1, were proposed at 62 FR 41907, August 4, 1997, and published as final guidelines at 63 FR 24212, May 1, 1998.

As they currently exist, the national standard 1 guidelines provide definitions and require determination, to the extent possible, of maximum sustainable yield (MSY), or an acceptable surrogate; specification of status determination criteria including a maximum fishing mortality threshold and a minimum stock size threshold; ending overfishing and rebuilding overfished stocks; and specification of optimum yield (OY) in fisheries.

In response to the SFA, these national standard guidelines were implemented in 1998, over 5 years ago. Since that time, we have developed new perspectives, new issues, and new problems regarding their application. Concerns that have been identified for possible revision include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The definition and use of the minimum stock size threshold (MSST) for determining when a stock is