

throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

How Do We Determine Whether a Species Is Endangered or Threatened?

Section 4(a)(1) of the Act establishes that we determine whether a species is endangered or threatened based on one or more of the five following factors:

- A. The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range;
- B. Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes;
- C. Disease or predation;
- D. The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; or
- E. Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence.

Section 4(a)(1) of the Act requires that our determination be made on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.

What Could Happen as a Result of This Review?

If we find that there is new information concerning the delta smelt indicating a change in classification may be warranted, we may propose a new rule that could do one of the following: (a) Reclassify the species from threatened to endangered; or (b) remove the species from the List. If we determine that a change in classification is not warranted, the delta smelt will remain on the List under its current status.

What Will Happen if No New Information Is Submitted for the Species Under Review?

If there is no new information no changes will be made to the classification of the delta smelt under this review. However, we are not limited to reviewing listed species only during a 5-year review. We may review a species at any time, and may initiate reclassification or delisting whenever the best available scientific and commercial information indicates that such action is warranted.

Public Solicitation of New Information

We request any new information concerning the status of the delta smelt. New information is considered to be scientific and commercial data that has become available since the time of the species' current listing determination. In particular, we are seeking information such as:

- A. Species biology including, but not limited to, population trends, distribution, abundance, demographics, and genetics;

- B. Habitat conditions including, but not limited to, amount, distribution, and suitability;

- C. Conservation measures that have been implemented that benefit the species;

- D. Threat status and trends (see five factors under heading "How do we determine whether a species is endangered or threatened?"); and

- E. Other new information, data, or corrections including, but not limited to, taxonomic or nomenclatural changes, identification of erroneous information contained in the List, and improved analytical methods.

Information submitted should be supported by documentation such as maps, bibliographic references, methods used to gather and analyze the data, and/or copies of any pertinent publications, reports, or letters by knowledgeable sources.

Authority: This document is published under the authority of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: July 16, 2003.

Matt Hogan,

Deputy Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 03-19587 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[ID-075-03-1330-EO]

Notice of Availability of Supplemental Mine and Reclamation Plan, North Rasmussen Ridge Mine, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Caribou County, ID

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations and Bureau of Land Management policy, this notice announces the publication of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Supplemental Mine and Reclamation Plan for the North Rasmussen Ridge phosphate mine, Caribou County, Idaho.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act 102(2)(C) of 1969, the environmental impact statement was prepared to assess the impacts of implementing the Supplemental Mine and Reclamation Plan, and to disclose those impacts to the public and the lead agency decision-maker.

The environmental impact statement analyzes the potential impacts related to

the expansion of mining at Agrium's North Rasmussen Ridge Mine in southeast Idaho. The Proposed Action includes developing two mine pits and a haul road. Use of existing support and transportation systems would continue. Existing operations at the Central Rasmussen Ridge Mine were approved in a 1997 Record of Decision. This environmental analysis reviews potential impacts from selenium and updates the previous impact analyses for other resources. Alternatives to the Proposed Action are also analyzed and site-specific mitigation measures developed. The agency Preferred Alternative is the Proposed Action because it disturbs the least acreage of the action alternatives and all waste material is backfilled to the pits.

DATES: A 30-day availability period will start when the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of availability and filing of the FEIS in the **Federal Register**. The public can comment on the FEIS during that 30-day period. Upon completion of the 30-day availability period, the BLM will consider the comments received on the FEIS and then will issue a Record of Decision (ROD).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request a copy of the document, please call (208) 478-6353, or write or e-mail Mr. Wendell Johnson, BLM Pocatello Field Office, 1111 North 8th Avenue, Pocatello, Idaho 83201, or e-mail ID_NRasmussen_EIS@blm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement was published in the **Federal Register** on May 18, 2001. A Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was published in the **Federal Register** on March 7, 2003. In addition to the Proposed Action (the Agencies Preferred Alternative) of continuing mining along the strike of the ore while backfilling previously mined-out pits, two additional alternatives are being considered—Alternative 1 is similar to the proposed alternative, but includes impermeable capped backfilled wastes—Alternative 2 is described as the No-Action Alternative and would not allow mineral extraction to occur on the approved leases. Two additional alternatives were identified and considered in comments received on the DEIS—the first additional alternative suggested in the comments included a redesign of the partially backfilled pit bottom to allow water to drain to one end of an impermeable layer lined pit. The water collected within the pit could then be pumped to adjacent wetlands. The second alternative identified from