

is destroyed, recolonization would be impossible and the population supported by that breeding pond would be extirpated.

Habitat loss on private lands is an imminent threat that is compounded by a variety of other factors. Fire suppression on private lands occupied by the frosted flatwoods salamander represents one of the biggest threats to the species' habitat and the continued existence of the species on these sites. However, 62 percent of frosted flatwoods salamander populations have an improved chance of surviving demographic and environmental stochasticity given that the distribution of breeding sites occurs within an adult salamander's dispersal distance.

We believe that, when combining the effects of historical, current, and projected habitat loss and degradation, historical and ongoing drought, and the exacerbating effects of disease, predation, small population size, and isolation, the frosted flatwoods salamander continues to be likely to become an endangered species throughout all of its range within the foreseeable future. We believe these threats, particularly the threats to populations resulting from habitat degradation and fragmentation, small population size, and drought, are current and are projected to continue into the future. We have determined that these threats are operating on the species and its habitat with a moderate degree of magnitude throughout most of its range and with a moderate degree of severity, as discussed above.

Based on the best available scientific and commercial information, we have determined that the preferred action is for the frosted flatwoods salamander to retain its status as a threatened species under the Act. Without the protection of the Act, significant management of threats would likely occur on public lands; however, there is still substantial risk of loss of ponds to drought and disease and, on private lands, a variety of potential threats (for example, introduction of fish, predation, pesticides), and development. As discussed previously, declines resulting from drought can occur within only a few years. In the case of the frosted flatwoods salamander, 38 percent of populations have only one breeding pond. If the habitat at that site is destroyed, recolonization would be impossible and the population supported by that breeding pond would be extirpated. This could occur within a few years given recurring drought conditions and existing threats. While not in immediate danger of extinction, the frosted flatwoods salamander is

likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range if the present trends that negatively affect the species, and its limited and restricted habitat, continue. Furthermore, because these threats to the species are of comparable magnitude and severity across all of the species' range, we have determined that an analysis of whether a specific portion of the range might require a different listing status is not warranted at this time.

Available Conservation Measures

For additional information on available conservation measures, please refer to the proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** on August 13, 2008 (73 FR 47258).

References Cited

A complete list of all references cited in this document is available upon request from the Field Supervisor Ray Aycock, Mississippi Field Office (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

Author(s)

The primary authors of this package are the staff of the Mississippi Field Office (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

Authority

The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: September 5, 2008.

Lyle Laverty,

Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. E8-21878 Filed 9-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 600

[Docket No. 0808041047-81182-01]

RIN 0648-AW62

Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Scientific and Statistical Committees; Peer Review; National Standard Guidelines

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

ACTION: Advanced notice of proposed rulemaking; request for comments.

SUMMARY: NMFS announces that it is considering, and is seeking public

comment on proposed rulemaking to revise National Standard 2 (NS2) guidelines regarding use of best scientific information available, in light of reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act). NMFS is considering modifying the language describing the content and purpose of the Stock Assessment and Fishery Evaluation (SAFE) Report or related documents, and adding language regarding peer review processes, the role of the scientific and statistical committees (SSCs) of the Regional Fishery Management Councils (Councils), and the relationship between peer reviews and SSCs.

DATES: Written comments must be received on or before 5 p.m., local time, December 17, 2008.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments, identified by 0648-AW62, by any one of the following methods:

- Electronic Submissions: Submit all electronic public comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal <http://www.regulations.gov>.

- Fax: Attn: William Michaels 301-713-1875.

- Mail: William Michaels, NOAA Fisheries Service, Office of Science and Technology, 1315 East-West Highway, F/ST4, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

Instructions: All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted to <http://www.regulations.gov> without change. All Personal Identifying Information (for example, name, address, etc.) voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

NMFS will accept anonymous comments. Attachments to electronic comments will be accepted in Microsoft Word, Excel, WordPerfect, or Adobe PDF file formats only.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bill Michaels, 301-713-2363 x136.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On January 12, 2007, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (MSRA) was signed into law. The MSRA amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Act included provisions to improve the use of science in decision-making, provide for a stronger role for Councils' SSCs and enhance peer review processes.

Currently, the NS2 guidelines address the use of best scientific information available to support fishery management actions, prescribe the content and purpose of SAFE reports or similar

documents, and assign responsibility for the preparation and review of SAFE reports to the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary). SAFE reports are intended to provide the Councils with a summary of current scientific information available to make management decisions and are intended to contain information upon which Councils are to base harvest specifications, including annual harvest levels from each stock. At this time, NS2 does not specifically mention that the SAFE should include SSC recommendations for acceptable biological catch from either the SSC or peer review process (established under Section 302(g)(1)(E) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act). SSC recommendations for acceptable biological catch are the basis upon which each Council is to set annual catch limits (ACLs), and ACLs are not to exceed these fishing level recommendations per Section 302(h)(6) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. NMFS is considering, and is seeking public comment on how to revise the discussion of SAFE reports in the NS2 to include the scientific recommendations that are to be provided by the SSCs under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as reauthorized.

NMFS is inviting comment on the extent to which the NS2 guidelines should provide guidance as to what constitutes "best scientific information available." In 2004, the National Research Council (NRC) of the National

Academies was charged with examining the application of the term "best scientific information available" as the basis for fishery conservation and management measures required under NS2 and recommended approaches for a more uniform application of the standard within the context of current and future fisheries management efforts. The NRC recommendations can be found in their publication, "Improving the Use of the Best Scientific Information Available' Standard in Fisheries Management" (NRC 2004, <http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php>). Although NMFS has informally adopted many of the NRC recommendations, this advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPR) is an opportunity to solicit and incorporate recommendations into the NS2 guidance.

Section 302(g)(1)(E) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act provides that "(T)he Secretary and each Council may establish a peer review process for that Council for scientific information used to advise the Council about the conservation and management of the fishery. The review process, which may include existing committees or panels, is deemed to satisfy the requirements of the guidelines issued pursuant to section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal year 2001," otherwise known as the Information Quality Act. At present,

none of the 10 national standards, or national standard guidelines, directly discuss or provide guidance on peer review processes.

NMFS is considering expanding NS2 to include specific language regarding peer review processes. NS2 appears to be the logical national standard to provide further guidance regarding peer reviews, since a peer review process is one method for ensuring that the best scientific information available is utilized in Council decisions. This language may include minimum criteria for peer review processes, based in part on the public comments received. Furthermore, there may be a need to clarify the relationship between the peer review processes that may be established by the Secretary and each Council and the role of the SSC of that Council vis-à-vis the peer review process.

Finally, NMFS seeks comments from the public on other issues or clarifications to NS2 that the public would like to see addressed in this rulemaking.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1851.

Dated: September 15, 2008.

Samuel D. Rauch III,

*Deputy Assistant Administrator for
Regulatory Programs, National Marine
Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. E8-21837 Filed 9-17-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-S

Vision for the National SSC Workshop

DRAFT 9/19/08

The Magnuson Stevens Act (MSA) requires that each regional fishery management council maintain and utilize its Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) to assist in the development, collection, evaluation, and peer review of information relevant to the development and amendment of fishery management plans. In addition, the MSA mandates that each SSC shall provide its Council ongoing scientific advice for fishery management decisions, including recommendations for acceptable biological catch (ABC), preventing overfishing, maximum sustainable yield, and achieving rebuilding targets, and reports on stock status and health, bycatch, habitat status, social and economic impacts of management measures, and sustainability of fishing practices.

Some councils have a long history of using their SSCs to provide recommendations on ABC limits and peer review of analytical documents for FMP/regulatory amendments; for other councils this is a new requirement. Some SSCs also function as the scientific peer review process required by the Information Quality Act (PL 106-554). In addition, a proposed rule on implementing National Standard 1 has been published, and once finalized, will provide guidance for all SSCs with respect to establishing fishing levels that prevent overfishing.

Back in 2005, the Managing Our Nations Fisheries II conference advisory panel, SSC, and main conference panel all recommended that national SSC meetings be held, where members from different regions could discuss best practices and seek to identify analytical and research needs. Given the new requirements of MSA and the proposed guidelines for annual catch limits (ACLs), a national SSC workshop is scheduled to be held November 12-14, 2008.

Presentations and Discussion

The agenda is basically divided into three sessions: SSC operating procedures, annual catch limits, and dealing with uncertainty. Presentations from each region will be made for the first two sessions. In most cases, presentations will be given by SSC delegates from each council. In other cases, presentations will be given by regional council staff. It is up to each delegation to decide who will give their presentation for each session. For the third session dealing with uncertainty, a couple of invited presenters will provide a short presentation to get the discussion rolling.

We anticipate that most presentations would be made using a powerpoint presentation. A powerpoint projector will be available, but you will want to bring a memory stick with your presentation to load on the WPFMC laptop computer set up for this purpose.

Session 1: SSC Operating Procedures

We envision a 15-20 minute presentation from each council SSC that describes their SSC structure and process. Presentations should include the following items:

- frequency and duration of meetings,
- seating arrangements, etc.
- process for public input,
- composition and recruitment of SSC members,
- terms and selection of officers,
- development of advice to Councils,
- development of research priorities,
- document review and staff presentations,
- scientific peer review process of impact analyses (EA/RIR./IRFAs) and other reports,
- procedures for decision-making: votes, consensus, minority reports, etc.
- preparation of minutes, and
- other MSA requirements for SSCs.

Time will be available for questions following each presentation.

The purpose of this session is to share information so as to discuss best practices for SSC meetings. We have at least 2 1/2 hours set aside for discussion following the presentations.

Session 2: Stock Assessment Review and Annual Catch Limits

We envision a 20 minute presentation from each council SSC that describes how their SSC provides peer review of stock assessments and develops ACLs. Presentations should include the following items: a description of the stock assessment process, peer review provided by the SSC, how ACLs (e.g., ABC and OFL) have been (or will be) established by the SSC, how ACLs are set in data poor situations or for species complexes. A few examples may help to describe the procedure. Time will be available for questions following each presentation.

The purpose of this session is to discuss possible approaches to the SSC role in reviewing stock assessments and setting ACLs. We have at least 2 1/2 hours set aside for discussion following the presentations. We anticipate this to be a lively and productive discussion.

Session 3: Dealing with Uncertainty

One of the more interesting aspects of providing scientific advice for fisheries management is that uncertainty prevails. In this session, a couple of presenters will discuss a case or two where the SSC was required to be creative to address uncertainty in stock assessment, setting ACLs, or other outcome.

The purpose of this session is to discuss how the SSC can address uncertainty and still convey useful scientific advice to the councils.

Meeting Briefing Book

A briefing book, containing background documents including SSC procedures from each Council, will be prepared and distributed at the meeting.

Preparation of the Workshop Report

A written report of the workshop findings will be prepared. Council staff will prepare a draft of the report, which will be circulated to participants for their review prior to publication. Ideally, this report would be completed within several weeks of the workshop and available for distribution. *To improve efficiency, accuracy, and timeliness of the workshop report, it would be very helpful for SSC delegates to bring a 2 to 3 page written summary of each presentation.*

Checklist of Responsibilities of Participants

Make travel arrangements ASAP. To make your hotel reservation, simply email Neil Simon (Neil.Simon@resortquesthawaii.com), your arrival and departure dates, noting that you will be attending the National SSC Workshop hosted by the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, and would like to reserve a room at the Executive Centre Hotel in Honolulu. Neil will bill the WPFMC directly. Make sure you cc Lentina Villa (Lentina.Villa@noaa.gov) at the WPFMC on your reservation request so she can confirm it for you. Note that WPFMC is planning for participants to travel to Honolulu on November 10th and to depart on Saturday November 15th, and thus will pay the room costs at the Executive Centre for those dates. If you have any questions, contact Lentina at (808) 522-7496. Hotel info:

ResortQuest at the Executive Centre Hotel

Island of Oahu

1088 Bishop Street

Honolulu, HI 96813

Phone: (808) 539-3000

Fax: (808) 523-1088

Send a link to reference materials you wish to share in advance. It would be helpful if we had copies of procedures followed by the SSC for inclusion in the briefing book. Usually, these can be excerpted from the Council SOPPs. But there may be other procedures not included in the SOPP, or other items of interest to meeting participants, such as stock assessment reports. Please send a web link, or a electronic file, of those items you wish to share to Paul.Dalzell@noaa.gov . We will email a list of all links to participants prior to the workshop.

Arrive at the meeting prepared. Bring your presentation on a memory stick. Also bring a copy of your written summary. And be prepared to ask questions and participate in the discussions.

Go out of your way to meet people. This will be a small group of experts from around the country, and making connections is an important part of the workshop. At some future point, you may find yourself wanting to call an SSC person from another Council to ask how they dealt with a particular situation.

Submit travel claims promptly to WPFMC after the meeting. Travel claims will be made available to participants at the workshop. Be sure to include your airfare receipts.