(5) Do you use Coast Guard HF radio Simplex Teletype over Radio (SITOR) (also known as Narrow Band Direct printing (NBBDP)) to receive marine weather forecasts? (Yes or No) If yes, how often do you use Coast Guard SITOR radio broadcasts and how critical are they to your safety and operation as compared to the other sources you listed in your response to Question 2?

(6) What alternative source(s) for obtaining marine weather forecasts would you pursue if Coast Guard HF broadcasts were no longer available? How would you rate the alternative source(s) in terms of (a) user cost and (b) usefulness of the information as compared to the Coast Guard HF broadcast it replaces?

(7) Would the loss of Coast Guard HF marine weather broadcasts affect you? Please explain.

(8) How far seaward does your vessel primarily operate? (For example, coastal (0–25 nautical miles (nm) seaward); offshore (25–200 nm seaward); or, high seas (more than 200 nm seaward.) In what geographic area(s) do you generally operate your vessel? (For example, mid-Atlantic, New England, North Central Pacific, Hawaii, Gulf of Mexico, etc.)

As noted previously, comments regarding these questions, and any other pertinent matters brought to our attention during the comment period, will be taken into account in our future actions regarding the issues raised by these questions.


C.S. Johnson, JR.,
Captain, U.S. Coast Guard, Acting Assistant Commandant for Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Information Technology.
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SUMMARY: This notice amends the notice of an emergency declaration for the State of Indiana (FEMA–3274–EM), dated March 12, 2007, and related determinations.

adverse modification of suitable habitat across the owl’s entire range and the inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms to conserve the owl. Currently, populations of northern spotted owls are declining, especially in the northern parts of the species’ range.

Scientific research and monitoring have reported that northern spotted owls generally rely on older forested habitats because such habitats contain the structures and characteristics required for nesting, roosting, and foraging. Recent landscape-level studies in several southern portions of the northern spotted owl’s range suggest a mosaic of forest conditions may result in good northern spotted owl habitat, though other studies have not reported that finding.

The most important threat currently facing the northern spotted owl is believed to be competition with the barred owl (Strix varia). Actions associated with addressing the barred owl threat were given the highest priority. This action “must be taken to prevent extinction or prevent the species from declining irreversibly in the foreseeable future.” Other important threats to the northern spotted owl continue to be loss of habitat quality and quantity as a result of past activities and disturbances, and ongoing and projected loss of habitat as a result of fire, logging and conversion of habitat to other uses.

The draft recovery plan provides two options for recovery, and we are seeking public comment on the effectiveness of both options to achieve recovery. Both options are based on the same underlying science, and contain essentially the same recovery goal, objectives, criteria, and actions. The options differ in that option 1 identifies (i.e., maps) the specific conservation area boundaries in which most of the recovery actions and criteria will be targeted. Option 2 does not designate specific conservation area boundaries, rather it provides a “rule set” that will help guide the Federal land management agencies when undertaking conservation actions for the northern spotted owl. Both options rely on Federal lands to provide the primary contribution for northern spotted owl recovery.

The intent of providing two options for public comment in a draft recovery plan is to promote open public discussion about how to successfully recover this species.

Public Comments Solicited

We will conduct four public meetings, from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., to receive oral comments about this plan on:

• May 22, 2007, Tuesday at the Douglas County Fairgrounds Complex Conference Hall, 2110 SW Frear Street, Roseburg, OR;
• May 23, 2007, Wednesday at the Redding Convention Center, 700 Auditorium Drive, Redding, CA;
• May 30, 2007, Wednesday at the Oregon Convention Center, Portland Ballroom, 777 Northeast Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Portland, OR; and
• May 31, 2007, Thursday at St. Martin’s University, Norman Worthington Conference Center, 3300 Pacific Ave. SE., Lacey, WA.

Persons with disabilities needing reasonable accommodations to participate in the public meetings are invited to contact Angela Butsch at 1–888–812–5759 (voice) or 503–231–6263 (TTY), or angela_butsch@fws.gov. Reasonable accommodation requests should be received at least 3 business days prior to the meeting to help ensure availability: 2 weeks notice is requested for ASL/ESL interpreter needs.

We are also soliciting written comments on the draft recovery plan described. All comments received by the date specified above will be considered in the finalization of this plan. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. Comments and materials received will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

We would specifically appreciate comments on the following topics found in both options:

• The methods used to determine desired habitat percentages listed in Recovery Criterion 4. If recommendations are offered, respondents are asked to explain the scientific foundation supporting their comments;
• The biological need, design and feasibility of attempting to provide connectivity between the Olympic Peninsula and central Washington northern spotted owl populations;
• The biological value in identifying conservation areas in southwest Washington and northwest Oregon;
• The practicality of Appendix E, which provides examples of how a salvage logging action (Recovery Action 22) may be implemented;
• The identified boundaries of the Managed Owl Conservation Areas (option 1 only) and the Conservation Support Areas:
  • Methods for managing the threat posed by barred owls; and
  • Ways to create incentives for private land owners and managers to support recovery of the northern spotted owl.

Authority: The authority for this action is section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1533(f).


David J. Welser,
Acting Regional Director, Region 1, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
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SUMMARY: The Fish and Wildlife Service is initiating 5-year reviews of the Southeastern beach mouse (Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris), rice rat (Oryzomys palustris nator), Florida salt marsh vole (Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecambelli), Key Largo woodrat (Neotoma floridana smalli), Florida grasshopper sparrow (Ammodramus savannarum floridanus), Atlantic salt marsh snake (Nerodia clarkii tenuata), Schaus swallowtail butterfly (Hercalides aristodemus ponceanus), Squirrel Chimney Cave shrimp (Palaemonetes cammigi), Florida bonamia (Bonamia grandiflora), pigeon wings (Clitorea fragrans), short-leaved rosemary (Conradina brevifolia), Jugel’s pawpaw (Deeringothamnus rugelli), longspurred mint (Dicerandra cornutissima), Lakela’s mint (Dicerandra immaculata), scrub buckwheat (Eriogonum longifolium var. naphalifolium), Telephus spurge (Euphorbia telephioides), Highlands scrub hypericum (Hypericum cumulicola), scrub lupine (Lupinus aridorum), papery whillowort (Paronychia chartacea), Micosouke gooseberry (Ribes echinellum), Cooley’s meadowrue (Thalictrum cooleyi), and Carter’s mustard (Warea carteri), under section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), as amended (Act). The purpose of reviews conducted under this section of