

5. James T. Blake, Deputy to the Commander, PEO STRI.

6. Paul Bogosian, Deputy Program Executive for Aviation, AAE.

7. T. Kevin Carroll, Program Executive Officer, Enterprise Information Structure, AAE.

8. Donald L. Damstetter, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Plans, Programs, and Resource, OASA (Acquisition, Logistics & Technology).

9. Edward G. Elgart, Director, CECOM Acquisition Center.

10. Kevin J. Flamm, Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization Operations OASA (Acquisition, Logistics & Technology).

11. Craig D. Hunter, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Defense Exports and Cooperation), OASA (Acquisition, Logistics & Technology).

12. Joann H. Langston, Competition Advocate of the Army, Army Acquisition Executive Support Agency.

13. Russell W. Lenz, Director, Simulation and Training Technology Center, Research, Development and Engineering Command.

14. BG Michael R. Mazzucchi, Program Executive Officer, Command, Control, and Communications (Tactical).

15. Steven L. Messervy, Program Manager, Joint Simulation Systems, Army Acquisition Executive Support Agency.

16. Levator Norsworthy, Jr., Deputy General Counsel (Acquisition), Office of the General Counsel.

17. Michael A. Parker, Deputy to the Commander, U.S. Army Soldier & Biological Chemical Command.

18. John C. Perrapato, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Command and Control Systems, AAE.

19. Shelba J. Proffitt, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Air and Missile Defense, AAE.

20. Sandra O. Sieber, Director, Army Contracting Agency.

21. Albert P. Puzzuoli, Deputy Program Executive Officer, Armored Systems Modernization, AAE.

22. Wimpy D. Pybus, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Integrated Logistics Support, OASA (Acquisition, Logistics & Technology).

23. BG Stephen M. Seay, Program Executive Officer, PEO STRI.

24. BG Jeffrey A. Sorenson, Program Executive Officer, Tactical Missiles.

25. MG John M. Urias, Program Executive Officer, Air Missile Defense/ Deputy Command General for Research, Development and Acquisition, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command.

26. MG Joseph L. Yakovac, Program Executive Officer, Ground Combat Systems.

**Luz D. Ortiz,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 03-29008 Filed 11-19-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710-08-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Performance Review Board Membership for the U.S. Army Office of the Surgeon General

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is given of the names of members of a Performance Review Board for the Department of the Army.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 13, 2003.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Marilyn Ervin, U.S. Army Senior Executive Service Office, Assistant Secretary of the Army, Manpower & Reserve Affairs, 111 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0111.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 4314(c)(1) through (5) of Title 5, U.S.C., requires each agency to establish, in accordance with regulations, one or more Senior Executive Service performance review boards. The boards shall review and evaluate the initial appraisal of senior executives' performance by supervisors and make recommendations to the appointing authority or rating official relative to the performance of these executives.

The members of the Performance Review Board for the U.S. Army Office of The Surgeon General are:

1. MG Kenneth L. Farmer, Chairperson, Deputy Surgeon General.

2. Mr. Mark R. Lewis, Director, Plans, Resources and Operations, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-1.

3. Ms. Zita M. Simutis, Director, Army Research Institute.

4. Mr. Jack E. Hobbs, Project Director, Army Workload and Performance System.

**Luz D. Ortiz,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 03-29009 Filed 11-19-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710-08-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

#### Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Flood Damage Reduction Study, Missouri River Levees System Units L-455 and R 471-460, Buchanan County, MO and Doniphan County, KS

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas City District (KCD), intends to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Feasibility Study of flood damage reduction measures for property currently afforded flood protection by the Missouri River Levee System (MRLS) Units L-455 and R 471-460, in Buchanan County, Missouri and Doniphan County, Kansas. The purpose of this DEIS is to consider the economic, environmental, and social impacts that may occur as a result of various alternatives being considered in a flood damage reduction study, concerning flood protection provided by the existing MRLS Units L-455 and R 471-460. The study would determine the existing level of flood protection as well as possible flood damage reduction measures beyond what currently exists, under the authority of Section 216 of the 1970 Flood Control Act.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Maria Chastain-Brand, Formulation Section, Planning Branch, ATTN: CENWK-PM-PF, U.S. Army Engineer District, Kansas City, 601 East 12th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106-2896, Phone 816-983-3107 or *Maria E. Chastain-Brand@usace.army.mil*.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

1. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, KCD, intends to prepare a DEIS and Feasibility Study of flood damage reduction measures for property currently afforded flood protection by the MRLS Units L-455 and R 471-460, in Buchanan County, Missouri and Doniphan County, Kansas. The purpose of this DEIS is to consider the economic, environmental, and social impacts that may occur as a result of various alternatives being considered in a flood damage reduction study. The Study would determine the existing level of flood protection as well as possible flood damage reduction measures beyond what currently exists, under the authority of Section 216 of the Flood Control Act.

2. The MRLS Units L-455 and R 471-460, are existing flood damage reduction projects which provide local flood protection for agricultural needs, the metropolitan area of St. Joseph, Missouri and the communities of Wathena and Elwood in Kansas. The two levees units are located on opposite sites of the Missouri River.

Levee unit L-455 is located on the left bank of the Missouri River in Buchanan County, Missouri, and connects to high ground in the southwestern part of St. Joseph, Missouri. The levee unit extends from Missouri River mile 447.3 downstream to mile 437.3 and then upstream along Contrary Creek. Levee unit L-455 is 15.6 miles long, averages 13 feet in height, and protects approximately 7,500 acres of urban and rural areas from flooding. Rural lands consist of about 6,500 acres. Urban lands include industrial, commercial, and residential areas of the city of St. Joseph, Missouri, including the residential and recreational development in the Lake Contrary area.

Levee unit R 471-460 is located on the right bank of the Missouri River between river mile 441.7 and 456.6 in eastern Doniphan County, Kansas, and a portion of western Buchanan County, Missouri. This levee unit is 13.8 miles long, averages 14.8 feet in height and protects approximately 13,500 acres of rural and urban areas from flooding. Rural lands consist of about 10,000 acres. Urban lands include the communities of Elwood and Wathena, Kansas. It also includes the area within an oxbow, which is a part of St. Joseph, Missouri and contains the Rosecrans Memorial Air National Guard Base.

3. KCD's study will evaluate the no action alternative as well as various structural and non-structural alternatives to determine:

- a. Flood damage reduction costs and benefits;
- b. Regional social and economic impacts; and
- c. Environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

Reasonable alternatives KCD will examine include the feasibility of various structural and non-structural measures to reduce flood damage within areas protected by the existing MRLS Units L-455 and R 471-460. Structural alternatives may include reinforcing the existing structures, raising the existing levee with earth fill, floodwalls with a corresponding rise of appurtenances, or other change to the existing levee systems. Non-structural measures may include the development of contingency plans.

#### 4. Scoping Process

a. A public workshop/scoping meeting will be held in the spring of 2004 in St. Joseph, MO area. The exact date, time, and location of the scoping meeting will be announced when the details are finalized. Additional workshops and meetings will be held as the study progresses to keep the public informed. Coordination meetings will be held as needed with the affected/concerned local, State, and Federal governmental entities, and tribes. These workshops and meetings, as well as any meetings which were previously held regarding this project, will serve as the collective scoping process for the preparation of the DEIS. Draft documents forthcoming from the study will be distributed to Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as interested members of the general public, for review and comment.

b. Potential issues to be analyzed in depth include evaluations of:

- (1) Level of flood protection provided by the existing flood protection project and need for increased level of protection;
- (2) Costs and benefits associated with alternatives that increase the flood protection level of the existing flood protection project;
- (3) Fish and wildlife resources;
- (4) Recreation;
- (5) Cultural resources.

c. Environmental consultation and review will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as per regulations of the Council of Environmental Quality (code of Federal Regulations Parts 40 CFR 1500-1508), and other applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines.

5. The anticipated date of availability of the DEIS for public review is late 2004.

**Luz D. Ortiz,**

*Army Federal Register Liaison Officer.*

[FR Doc. 03-29010 Filed 11-19-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3710-KN-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army; Corps of Engineers

#### Intent To Prepare a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Coastal Erosion Protection and Community Relocation, Shishmaref, AK

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Army Engineer District, Alaska, intends to prepare a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to evaluate the feasibility of constructing erosion protection alternatives and community relocation alternatives at Shishmaref, Alaska. Shishmaref, population 562, is on a barrier island on the Chukchi Sea on the northwestern coast of Alaska. The shoreline at the community is being rapidly eroded by storm waves possibly because the ice pack has been forming later in the autumn than in the past, allowing more of the force of late season storm energy to reach the shore. The programmatic DEIS will determine whether Federal action is warranted, and if so, and community relocation is selected, site alternatives will be addressed in more detail in a second tier of the EIS process.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Lizette Boyer (907) 753-2637, Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Resources Section (CEPOA-EN-CW-ER), P.O. Box 6898, Elmendorf AFB, AK 99506-6898. E-mail:

*Lizette.P.Boyer@poa02.usace.army.mil.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This study is authorized under Section 203, 33 U.S.C. Tribal Partnership Program. The community of Shishmaref has existed on Sherichief Island for centuries. The four-mile-long island, formed by littoral drift, is steadily eroding along the Chucki Sea. As early as the 1950's the community began taking steps to fight the annual erosion problem. Strong wave and current action cause massive scouring and erosion of the fine sand embankment. Bank revetment structures (gabions filled with sand and concrete mattresses) were installed but failed to stop the erosion for long. Severe fall storms in 1989, 1990, and 1997 undermined the protective structures and caused buildings to be moved or abandoned. The late formation of the shorefast ice pack in recent years aggravates erosion damage during fall storms. Without shore protection structures and continued maintenance of them, all the community infrastructure is in jeopardy.

The programmatic DEIS will consider alternatives including the continuation of erosion protection structures to prevent land and property losses. The community has obtained funding for efforts to protect a stretch of the beach to the west of the school property where a Bureau of Indian Affairs road is at risk. The Corps of Engineers currently is conducting an emergency bank protection study to protect the school. Longer term protection for the