

Source of flooding and location of referenced elevation	♦ Elevation in feet (NAVD)		Communities affected
	Existing	Modified	
Approximately 28,150 feet downstream of U.S. Highway 50.	♦544	♦543	Osage County (Unincorporated Areas).
Approximately 131,850 feet upstream of U.S. Highway 50.	None	♦557	

Maps are available for inspection at Osage County Courthouse, 106 East Main Street, Linn, Missouri.

Send comments to Mr. Bradley J. Strope, Floodplain Administrator, P.O. Box 1011, Linn, Missouri 65051.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.100, "Flood Insurance")

Dated: October 6, 2004.

David I. Maurstad,

*Acting Director, Mitigation Division,
Emergency Preparedness and Response
Directorate.*

[FR Doc. 04-23307 Filed 10-18-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-12-P

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Federal Emergency Management Agency

44 CFR Part 67

[Docket No. FEMA-B-7449]

Proposed Flood Elevation Determinations

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, Department of Homeland Security.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: Technical information or comments are requested on the proposed Base (1% annual-chance) Flood Elevations (BFEs) and proposed BFE modifications for the communities listed below. The BFEs and modified BFEs are the basis for the floodplain management measures that the community is required either to adopt or to show evidence of being already in effect in order to qualify or remain qualified for participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

DATES: The comment period is ninety (90) days following the second publication of this proposed rule in a

newspaper of local circulation in each community.

ADDRESSES: The proposed BFEs for each community are available for inspection at the office of the Chief Executive Officer of each community. The respective addresses are listed in the table below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Doug Bellomo, P.E. Hazard Identification Section, Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-2903.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FEMA proposes to make determinations of BFEs and modified BFEs for each community listed below, in accordance with Section 110 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and 44 CFR 67.4(a).

These proposed BFEs and modified BFEs, together with the floodplain management criteria required by 44 CFR 60.3, are the minimum that are required. They should not be construed to mean that the community must change any existing ordinances that are more stringent in their floodplain management requirements. The community may at any time enact stricter requirements of its own, or pursuant to policies established by other Federal, State, or regional entities. These proposed elevations are used to meet the floodplain management requirements of the NFIP and are also used to calculate the appropriate flood premium rates for the new buildings built after these elevations are made final, and for the contents in these buildings.

National Environmental Policy Act. This proposed rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental

Consideration. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Regulatory Flexibility Act. The Mitigation Division Director of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate certifies that this proposed rule is exempt from the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act because proposed or modified BFEs are required by the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, 42 U.S.C. 4104, and are required to establish and maintain community eligibility in the NFIP. No regulatory flexibility analysis has been prepared.

Regulatory Classification. This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action under the criteria of Section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993, Regulatory Planning and Review, 58 FR 51735.

Executive Order 12612, Federalism. This proposed rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under Executive Order 12612, Federalism, dated October 26, 1987.

Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This proposed rule meets the applicable standards of Section 2(b)(2) of Executive Order 12778.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Part 67

Administrative practice and procedures, Flood insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 44 CFR Part 67 is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 67—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 67 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376, § 67.4.

2. The tables published under the authority of § 67.4 are proposed to be amended as follows:

State	City/town/ county	Source of flooding	Location	+Elevation in feet (NAVD)	
				Existing	Modified
North Dakota ...	Lincoln (City), Burleigh County.	Apple Creek ...	Just upstream of Railroad	None	+1,644

State	City/town/ county	Source of flooding	Location	+Elevation in feet (NAVD)	
				Existing	Modified
			Approximately 5,000 feet downstream of confluence of Hay Creek.	None	+1,646

+North American Vertical Datum

Maps are available for inspection at City Hall, 74 Santee Road, Lincoln, North Dakota 58504.

Send comments to The Honorable Glen Christmann, Mayor, City of Lincoln, 74 Santee Road, Lincoln, North Dakota 58504.

Utah	Paragonah (Town), Iron County	Red Creek	Approximately 1,900 feet downstream of Center Street	None	+5,900
		Water Canyon	Approximately 1,600 feet upstream of Center Street	None	+5,989
			Approximately 850 feet upstream of 100 West Street	None	+5,878
			Approximately 1,200 feet upstream of 100 West Street	None	+5,891

+North American Vertical Datum

Maps are available for inspection at Town Hall, 44 North 100 West, Paragonah, Utah 84760.

Send comments to The Honorable Constance Robinson, Mayor, Town of Paragonah, P.O. Box 600247, Paragonah, Utah 84760.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.100, "Flood Insurance")

Dated: October 6, 2004.

David I. Maurstad,

*Acting Director, Mitigation Division,
Emergency Preparedness and Response
Directorate.*

[FR Doc. 04-23306 Filed 10-18-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-12-U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018-AT45

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Notice of the Availability of Draft Economic Analysis for the Proposed Designation of Critical Habitat for the Riverside Fairy Shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*)

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of availability of draft economic analysis and reopening of public comment period.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of a draft economic analysis of the proposed designation of critical habitat for the Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*), and the reopening of the public comment period on the proposed rule to designate critical habitat for the Riverside fairy shrimp. Comments previously submitted for this proposed rule need not be resubmitted as they have already been incorporated into the public record and will be fully considered in any final decision.

DATES: We will accept comments and information until 5 p.m. on November 18, 2004. Any comments received after the closing date may not be considered in the final decision on this action.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and materials may be submitted to us by any one of the following methods:

1. You may submit written comments and information to the Jim Bartel, Field Supervisor, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, 6010 Hidden Valley Road, Carlsbad, CA 92009;

2. You may hand-deliver written comments and information to our Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office at the above address, or fax your comments to 760/431-9618; or

3. You may send your comments by electronic mail (e-mail) to fw1rvfs@r1.fws.gov. For directions on how to submit electronic filing of comments, by e-mail see the "Public Comments Solicited" section. In the event that our internet connection is not functional, please submit your comments by the alternate methods mentioned above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jim Bartel, Field Supervisor, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, at the above address (telephone 760/431-9440; facsimile 760/431-9618).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Public Comments Solicited

We will accept written comments and information during this reopened comment period. We solicit comments on the original proposed critical habitat designation and on our draft economic analysis of the proposed designation. We are particularly interested in comments concerning:

(1) The reasons why any habitat should or should not be determined to be critical habitat as provided by section 4 of the Act, including whether the

benefits of exclusion outweigh the benefits of specifying such area as part of the critical habitat;

(2) Specific information on the amount and distribution of Riverside fairy shrimp and its habitat, and which habitat is essential to the conservation of this species and why;

(3) Land use designations and current or planned activities in the subject areas and their possible impacts on proposed critical habitat;

(4) Any foreseeable economic or other impacts resulting from the proposed designation of critical habitat, in particular, any impacts on small entities or families;

(5) How our approach to critical habitat designation could be improved or modified to provide for greater public participation and understanding, or to assist us in accommodating public concern and comments;

(6) We request information on how many of the State and local environmental protection measures referenced in the draft Economic Analysis were adopted largely as a result of the listing of the Riverside fairy shrimp, and how many were either already in place or enacted for other reasons;

(7) Whether the economic analysis identifies all State and local costs attributable to the proposed critical habitat designation. If not, what other costs are overlooked;

(8) Are the adjustments to local governments' economic data made by the draft Economic Analysis, as set out in its appendices, reasonable? If not, please provide alternative interpretations and the justification for the alternative and/or the reasons the interpretation in the draft Economic Analysis is incorrect;

(9) Whether the economic analysis makes appropriate assumptions