

In Alternative C (Salvage Following South Cascade Late-Successional Reserve Assessment Guidelines and Moderate Restoration Emphasis), area salvage emphasis is proposed in high and moderate burn severity areas greater than 10 acres where the fire resulted in a stand-replacement event. Alternative C salvage is based on guidelines from the Late-Successional Reserve Assessment for snag and coarse woody debris retention. Restoration projects include fish habitat improvement, Late-Successional Reserve thinning, pine and oak woodlands restoration, reforestation of stand-replacement areas greater than 5 acres, fuels reduction along ridgelines, wildlife habitat enhancement projects, and road improvement projects.

In Alternative D (Late-Successional Reserve Guidelines for Salvage Using DecAID Wood Advisor Tool for Snags and Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) and Moderate Restoration Emphasis), area salvage emphasis is proposed in high and moderate burn severity areas greater than 10 acres where the fire resulted in a stand-replacement event. Instead of following LSRA salvage guidelines, snag and coarse woody debris retention levels in this alternative are based on the DecAID Wood Advisor tool. Restoration projects would be the same as Alternative C.

In Alternative E (High Level of Salvage and Extensive Restoration Emphasis), area salvage emphasis is proposed in high, moderate, low and very low burned severity areas. Snag retention levels within the high and moderate burn severity areas would be 6–14 snags/acre. This is based on study by Haggard and Gaines (2001) which found the highest diversity in cavity nesting species and the highest number of nests where snag densities ranged from 6–14 snags/acre. Snag retention within the low and very low burn severity areas with canopy cover greater than 40 percent would be 4 snags/acre. The coarse woody debris level in this alternative would be a minimum of 120 linear feet/acre. Extensive restoration would increase the scope of the projects (acres, miles of roads, etc.), intensity of the treatments, and location of the treatments identified in Alternative C and D. Alternative E also proposes seasonal closure of some roads.

In Alternative F (Salvage Logging and Post-fire rehabilitation actions consistent with report on *Recommendations for Ecologically Sound Post-Fire Salvage Management and Other Post-Fire Treatments on Federal Lands in the West* (Beschta *et al.*, 1995)), area salvage emphasis is based on recommendations to avoid severely burned areas, erosive sites,

fragile soils, riparian areas, steep slopes, or sites where accelerated erosion is possible. Existing snags and coarse woody debris levels would be retained on all these areas. Salvage would occur in 3–10 acre patches of fire-killed trees. Within each of these patches, a minimum of 2 acres would be reserved from salvage. The Beschta *et al.* report does not address actions outside of a burned area. As a result, no Late-Successional Reserve restoration actions are proposed. However, restoration projects within the fire perimeter, consistent with Beschta *et al.* report are proposed.

In Alternative G (Preferred Alternative—Salvage Including Research and Moderate Restoration Emphasis), area salvage emphasis is based on research to study the effects of various snag levels on selected wildlife species. Sixteen units were selected to be included in this study. These units are generally 30 acres or greater and would be salvaged at various levels. In addition, four control units would not be salvaged. Stand replacement areas (high and moderate burn severity) outside of research units greater than 10 acres would also be considered for salvaging. Snag and coarse woody debris levels would meet DecAid Wood Advisor recommendations, as well as, other local and regional recommendations. A reforestation study is also included, which would evaluate a variety of planting densities, species, and follow-up treatments in both salvaged and unsalvaged areas. Restoration projects would be the same as Alternatives C and D. Alternative G also proposes seasonal closure of some roads.

It is not the intent of this project to change land use allocations, nor Standard and Guidelines made through the Northwest Forest Plan and later adopted through the Medford District Resource Management Plan. The Preferred Alternative has been determined to be consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan and Medford District Resource Management Plan. However, if alternative E or F is selected as the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS, a plan amendment may be required.

Mary Smelcer,

Acting District Manager.

[FR Doc. 03–19205 Filed 7–31–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–33–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[CA–930–1020–AC]

Notice of Public Meetings: Northwest California Resource Advisory Council; Northeast California Resource Advisory Council; Central California Resource Advisory Council; California Desert District Advisory Council

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (FACA), the U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Northwest California Resource Advisory Council; Northeast California Resource Advisory Council; Central California Resource Advisory Council and California Desert District Advisory Council will meet as indicated below.

DATES: Northwest California Resource Advisory Council—September 3, 2003, 10 a.m. to 3 p.m., Holiday Inn, 1900 Hilltop Dr., Redding, CA. The council will discuss the Sustaining Working Landscapes initiative. Public comment will be received at 1 p.m.

Northeast California Resource Advisory Council—September 26–27, 2003. On September 26, the meeting begins at 8 a.m. at the BLM Eagle Lake Field Office, 2950 N. State St., Susanville, CA. The council will discuss the Sustaining Working Landscapes initiative and will receive public comment beginning at 1 p.m. Additional agenda items include juniper management and land use updates. A Public land improvement project field tour will be conducted on September 27, 2003. Members of the public are welcome. They must provide their own transportation and lunch.

California Desert District Advisory Council: September 19–20, 2003, at the Kerr McGee Center, 100 West California Avenue, Ridgecrest, CA. The Council will discuss a variety of agenda topics on Friday, September 19. Saturday, September 20 will include a briefing and overview of the Sustaining Working Landscapes initiative from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. followed by public comment from 10:15 a.m. to 12 noon and 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m., followed by comments/recommendations from Council members. A court reporter will record all public comments. The meeting will adjourn 5 p.m.

Central California Resource Advisory Council—October 3–4, 2003 in the

conference room of the BLM Bakersfield Field Office, 3801 Pegasus Avenue, Bakersfield, CA. On October 3, the council will discuss the Sustaining Working Landscapes initiative and will receive public comment beginning at 3 p.m. On October 4, the council will continue discussion on Sustaining Working Landscapes. Other Central California land management issues will be discussed as time allows.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For Northwest and Northeast Advisory Councils, contact BLM Public Affairs Officer Jeff Fontana, Eagle Lake Field Office, Susanville, CA, (530) 252-5332.

California Desert District Advisory Council, contact BLM Public Affairs Officer Doran Sanchez, California Desert District Office, Moreno Valley, CA, (909) 697-5220.

Central California Resource Advisory Council, contact BLM Folsom Field Office Manager Deane Swickard, or Community Planner John Scull at (916) 985-4474.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The members of the councils advise the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with public land management in California. At these meetings, the major agenda topics will be the Sustaining Working Landscapes initiative in which the Bureau is considering new management approaches intended to promote better partnerships with grazing permittees, advance the long-term health and productivity of the public lands, provide for sustainable ranching and improve BLM's business practices. The councils will discuss the initiative and receive public comments. All meetings are open to the public. Members of the public may present written comments to the council. Each formal council meeting will have time allocated for public comments. Depending on the number of persons wishing to speak, and the time available, the time for individual comments may be limited. Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation and other reasonable accommodations, should contact the BLM as provided above.

Dated: July 28, 2003.

J. Anthony Danna,

Deputy State Director, Resources.

[FR Doc. 03-19583 Filed 7-31-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Inventory Completion: Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003, of the completion of an inventory of human remains in the possession of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. The human remains were removed from Middlesex and Worcester Counties, MA.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations within this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum, institution, or Federal agency that has control of the Native American human remains. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations within this notice.

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology professional staff in consultation with officials of Nipmuc Nation (a nonfederally recognized Indian group) and Wampanoag Repatriation Confederation, representing Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), Mashpee Wampanoag Indian Tribe (a nonfederally recognized Indian group), and Assonet Band of the Wampanoag Nation (a nonfederally recognized Indian group).

In 1878, human remains representing one individual were collected by A.F. Aldrich from Uxbridge, Worcester County, MA, and were donated by Mr. Aldrich to the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. No known individual was identified. No associated funerary objects are present.

Osteological characteristics indicate that the individual is Native American. Museum documentation indicates that a tin box containing cloth and a thimble were located with the human remains; these objects date the interment to the Historic or Contact periods (post-A.D. 1500). The objects are not in the possession of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology and their location is unknown. Archeological, historical, and ethnographic sources, along with consultation with regional

Native American groups, indicate that this region of Massachusetts was the aboriginal homelands of the Nipmuc Nation during the Historic and Contact periods.

In 1890, human remains representing one individual were collected by Adams Tolman from Concord, Middlesex County, MA, and were donated by Mr. Tolman to the Peabody Museum of Archeology and Ethnology. No known individual was identified. No associated funerary objects are present.

Osteological characteristics indicate that the individual is Native American. The pattern of copper stains present on the human remains indicates that they were interred sometime after European contact (circa A.D. 1500). Archeological, historical, and ethnographic sources, along with consultation with regional Native American groups, indicate that during the Historic and Contact periods this area of Massachusetts was the border region between the Nipmuc Nation and the Massachusett people. Because there is no known present-day tribe representing the Massachusett people, shared group identity may be reasonably traced only to the Nipmuc Nation.

The Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology has determined that the human remains described in this notice cannot be affiliated with an Indian tribe according to the definition of cultural affiliation at 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), and are considered culturally unidentifiable. According to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Review Committee's charter, the Review Committee is responsible for recommending specific actions for disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains. In October 1998, the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology presented a disposition proposal to the Review Committee to repatriate two culturally unidentifiable human remains to the Nipmuc Nation. The proposal was considered by the Review Committee at its December 1998 meeting.

The Review Committee recommended disposition of the human remains to the Nipmuc Nation contingent upon the museum's meeting two requirements. A January 11, 2000, letter from the National Park Service to the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology requested that the museum publish a Notice of Inventory Completion in the Federal Register, and that it consider documentation compiled as part of the inventory process as public information and available for educational and scientific uses. The two requirements will have been met with the publication of this notice in the Federal Register.