Determining If a Species Is Threatened or Endangered

Section 4(a)(1) of the ESA requires that we determine whether a species is endangered or threatened based on one or more of the five following factors: (1) the present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range; (2) overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; (3) disease or predation; (4) the inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; or (5) other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence. Section 4(b) also requires that our determination be made on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available after conducting a review of the status of the species and after taking into account those efforts, if any, being made by any State or foreign nation, to protect such species.

Public Solicitation of New Information

To ensure that the 5-year reviews are complete and based on the best available scientific and commercial data, we are soliciting new information from the public, governmental agencies, Tribes, the scientific community, industry, environmental entities, and any other interested parties concerning the status of white abalone and/or black abalone. The 5-year reviews consider the best scientific and commercial data that has become available since the listing determination for white abalone in May 2001 and for black abalone in January 2009. Categories of requested information include: (1) Species biology including, but not limited to, population trends, distribution, abundance, demographies, and genetics; (2) habitat conditions including, but not limited to, amount, distribution, and important features for conservation; (3) status and trends of threats; (4) conservation measures that have been implemented that benefit the species, including monitoring data demonstrating effectiveness of such measures; (5) need for additional conservation measures; and (6) other new information, data, or corrections including, but not limited to, taxonomic or nomenclatural changes and improved analytical methods for evaluating extinction risk.

If you wish to provide information for the 5-year reviews, you may submit your information and materials electronically or via mail (see ADDRESSES section). We request that all information be accompanied by supporting documentation such as maps, bibliographic references, or reprints of pertinent publications. We also would appreciate the submitter's name, address, and any association, institution, or business that the person represents; however, anonymous submissions will also be accepted.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.
Dated: December 14, 2016.
Angela Somma,
Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service.
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AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of a public meeting.

SUMMARY: The Pacific Fishery Management Council’s (Pacific Council) Groundfish Management Team (GMT) will hold a week-long work session that is open to the public.

DATES: The GMT meeting will begin at 1 p.m. on Monday, January 9, 2017, and end at close of business on Friday, January 13, 2017, to view the agenda see SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Pacific Council, Large Conference Room, 7700 NE Ambassador Place, Suite 101, Portland, Oregon 97220–1384.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
Agenda

The primary purpose of the GMT working meeting is to prepare for the 2017 Council meetings, including the development of harvest specifications and management measures for 2019–2020. Specific agenda topics include revisions to the nearshore and non-nearshore projection models; review of the sablefish and lingcod discard mortality rates; and review of the latest West Coast Groundfish Observer Program data. A detailed agenda will be available on the Council’s Web site prior to the meeting. The GMT may also address other assignments relating to groundfish management. No management actions will be decided by
the GMT. The GMT’s task will be to develop recommendations for consideration by the Pacific Council at its meetings in 2017.

Although nonemergency issues not contained in the meeting agenda may be discussed, those issues may not be the subject of formal action during these meetings. Action will be restricted to those issues specifically listed in this document and any issues arising after publication of this document that require emergency action under section 305(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, provided the public has been notified of the intent to take final action to address the emergency.

Special Accommodations

The public listening station is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to Mr. Kris Kleinschmidt, at 503–820–2425 at least ten business days prior to the meeting.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

Dated: December 16, 2016.

Tracey L. Thompson,
Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.
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CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Information Collection; Submission for OMB Review, Comment Request

AGENCY: Corporation for National and Community Service.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) has submitted a public information collection request (ICR) entitled AmeriCorps State and National Grantee Progress Report for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. Copies of this ICR, with applicable supporting documentation, may be obtained by calling the Corporation for National and Community Service, Carla Ganiel, at 202–606–6773 or email to cganiel@cnsc.gov. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TTY–TDD) may call 1–800–833–3722 between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time, Monday through Friday.

DATES: Comments may be submitted, identified by the title of the information collection activity, within January 23, 2017.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

Address: Comments may be submitted, identified by the title of the information collection activity, to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attn: Ms. Sharon Mar, OMB Desk Officer for the Corporation for National and Community Service, by any of the following two methods within 30 days from the date of publication in the Federal Register: (1) By fax to: 202–395–6974, Attention: Ms. Sharon Mar, OMB Desk Officer for the Corporation for National and Community Service; or (2) By email to: smar@omb.eop.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The OMB is particularly interested in comments which:

• Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of CNCS, including whether the information will have practical utility;

• Evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

• Propose ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

• Propose ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments

A 60-day Notice requesting public comment was published pursuant to the PRS, Public Law 104–13, (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), in the Federal Register on September 16, 2016, at 81 FR 63746. This comment period ended November 15, 2016. Five public comments were received from this Notice.

Summary of comments by Category and CNCS response:

Category 1: Statements of Support for a GPR Update. A total of four comments expressed support for updates to the GPR instructions. One commenter noted that the revised instructions eliminated duplication. Two commenters expressed support for changes made to narrative questions. One commenter expressed appreciation for CNCS’s electronic reporting system.

Response: CNCS agrees with these comments.

Category 2: Time Estimate. Two comments addressed the time estimate. One commenter stated that the time estimate of 8 hours per GPR was accurate. One commenter stated that the time estimate should be set at 10 hours per GPR.

Response: CNCS believes that the time required varies depending on the type of GPR and has adjusted time to reflect this variation. CNCS estimates ten hours for end-of-year GPRs, eight hours for mid-year GPRs and four hours for final GPRs and planning grants.

Category 3: Demographic Indicators. Three comments addressed demographic indicators. Two commenters suggested removal of outdated demographic indicators in the Volunteer Generation Fund demographics. One commenter stated that new monitoring demographics in the Commission Support Grant GPR would increase burden, and two commenters questioned the utility and clarity of proposed demographic indicators related to monitoring activities.

Response: CNCS has removed the indicators specified in the public comments from the Volunteer Generation Fund and Commission Support Grant GPRs.

Category 4: Instructions. Two comments stated that the Commission-specific GPR guidance was difficult to understand.

Response: This comment is outside the scope of the information request, which does not include Commission-specific GPR guidance.

Category 5: Midyear GPR. Two comments recommended removing the requirement to explain unmet performance measure targets in the mid-year GPR.

Response: CNCS agrees and has removed the requirement to explain unmet targets in the mid-year GPR.

Category 6: Narratives. Four comments addressed GPR narrative questions. One commenter recommended an additional narrative question requiring national direct grantees to describe how they collaborate with State Commissions.

Two commenters did not support removing narrative questions from the Volunteer Generation Fund GPR. Two commenters stated that the “other explanations” narrative should only be used to collect information specified in the GPR instructions.

Response: The recommended question for national direct grantees would not provide enough useful information to justify its inclusion in the GPR. While some narratives have been removed from the Volunteer Generation Fund instructions to reduce burden and duplication, CNCS has revised one of the remaining narratives to collect additional information about VGF activity. CNCS intends that the