detailed burn criteria in an effort to better understand the impacts of prescribed burning and to better implement its use in meeting management objectives.

Prescribed Grazing: Future use of prescribed grazing on the Refuges will be largely dictated by the results of research currently being conducted. In the future, if and when grazing is used, prescriptions will delineate the location of the site to be grazed and specific objectives and purposes of the tool such as to control weeds, increase new growth, and provide a competitive advantage to certain vegetation. This site-by-site evaluation and planning will allow for maximum control and flexibility of this tool as well as ensuring that only delineated sites are affected by the tool and that all factors and interests are considered.

Farming: Under this Alternative, migrating birds would be provided with the same amount of small grain food from crops currently provided. The existing mixed organic/non-organic farming program operated by Refuge staff would be converted to a cooperative farming program. Farming would continue but Refuge staff would only be responsible for irrigation of the crops. The cooperating farmer would continue the crop rotation of two years of small grains followed by two years of alfalfa and then one year fallow. The cooperating farmer would be allowed to keep all or a portion of the alfalfa crop based on yields of the small grain crops.

Refuge staff would also augment the farming program with a moist soil plant management program to diversify the types of feed available to the birds. The farming and moist soil plant programs would be monitored and managed through the adaptive management concept. Research would be encouraged to help identify the amount and kinds of high energy food sources the Refuge could and should be providing for migrating and wintering avian species.

Habitat Protection: Under the proposed Alternative, current support for the Service's Partners for Wildlife program would continue in order to ensure the program's growth and success. The Refuge would also continue to be an active partner in Colorado Wetlands Initiative Legacy project led by the Colorado Division of Wildlife.

Public Use: Under this Alternative, educating the public as to the nature and value of wetlands will focus on contrasting the intensely managed wetlands of Monte Vista NWR with the more natural aspects on the Alamosa NWR wetlands. To assure compliance with public use minimum standards, money will be targeted for projects through RONS and MMS. Currently, funding proposals are developed for projects that will improve the quality of visitor experiences.

Hunting: Current waterfowl and small game hunting would continue to be supported and encouraged. To the extent feasible, the hunting experience would be further tailored to meet the desires of hunters using the Refuges based on periodic questioning of waterfowl hunters and other public input.

Fishing: Same as that described under the No Action Alternative.

Wildlife Observation: Support for the Crane Festival would continue as described under the No Action Alternative. Under this Alternative, on the Monte Vista NWR, public and scientific input would be sought regarding the seasonal expansion of the auto tour route, development of wildlife observation sites at Parker Pond, and development of wildlife observation decks along County Road 3E. Opinion and information would also be sought regarding the development of an observation deck adjacent to the Refuge Headquarters at the Alamosa NWR and near the proposed visitor center and education facility at the Monte Vista NWR.

Wildlife Photography: Same as that described under the No Action Alternative.

Interpretation: A multi-purpose education and visitor center facility on the Monte Vista NWR is the highest educational priority for the Complex. Also under this Alternative, the Refuge staff would implement an interpretation program centered around the cultural resources found on the Complex and around the Valley. Interpretation of past human use would focus on the theme that humans have always, and still depend upon natural resources for survival.

Environmental Education: Environmental education goals and programs would be the same as those under No Action.

Universal Access and Design: Efforts in this area would be the same as that described under the No Action Alternative with a few additional efforts. Developments would include new rest room facilities and wildlife observation blinds and/or platforms. Universally accessible hunting blinds would be built on both Refuges. All of these projects will follow the Americans with Disabilities Accessibility Guidelines.

Cultural Resources: Archaeological work on the Complex will be expanded to include work needed to determine the eligibility of four documented sites for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Management under this Alternative would also include a sample archaeological inventory of Refuge lands over a 15-year period.

Elk Management: Under this Alternative, the resident elk would be managed to discourage their use of Monte Vista NWR in large numbers with the intent to prevent habitat degradation.

Dated: November 25, 2002.

John A. Blankenship,

Acting Regional Director, Region 6, Denver, Colorado.

[FR Doc. 03–7453 Filed 3–27–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Double-Crested Cormorants; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability for public comment; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is extending the comment period on a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that is available for public review. The DEIS analyzes the potential environmental impacts of alternative strategies to reduce damages associated with double-crested cormorants in the continental United States. The analysis provided in the DEIS is intended to accomplish the following: inform the public of the proposed action and alternatives; address public comment received during the scoping period; and disclose the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed actions and each of the alternatives. The Service invites the public to comment on the DEIS.

DATES: Written comments on the DEIS must be received on or before May 16, 2003.

ADDRESSES: Mail requests for copies of the DEIS to Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, MBSP–4107, Arlington, Virginia 22203. You can also download copies of the DEIS from the Division of Migratory Bird Management Web site at *http://migratorybirds.fws.gov/issues/cormorant/deis/deis.html.* Send comments on the DEIS to the above address. Alternatively, you may submit comments electronically to the

following address: *cormorants@fws.gov.* The public may inspect comments during normal business hours in Room 4701, 4501 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian Millsap, Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Management, or Shauna Hanisch (703) 358–1714.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On December 3, 2001, we published a notice of availability in the **Federal Register** (66 FR 60218) to announce that the DEIS on double-crested cormorant management was available for public comment. On December 19, 2001, we published a **Federal Register** notice of meetings and extension of the comment period (66 FR 65510) to announce the schedule of public hearings to invite further public participation in the DEIS review process.

The DEIS evaluates alternative strategies to reduce damages associated with double-crested cormorants in the continental United States. The DEIS is a comprehensive programmatic plan intended to guide and direct double-crested cormorant management activities. The DEIS examined six management alternatives for addressing conflicts with double-crested cormorants: (A) No action, (B) Nonlethal control, (C) Increased local damage control, (D) Public resource depredation order, (E) Regional population reduction, and (F) Regulated hunting. The proposed action/preferred alternative in the DEIS was alternative D, Public resource depredation order. This alternative entails: revising the existing aquaculture depredation order that applies to commercial freshwater aquaculture facilities and hatcheries to allow winter roost control; establishing a new depredation order to protect public resources from cormorant damages; and revising Director's Order 27 to allow lethal take of double-crested cormorants at public fish hatcheries. Alternative D is intended to enhance the ability of resource agencies to deal with cormorant damages in an effective and timely manner by giving them more regulatory flexibility. In the DEIS, alternatives were analyzed with regard to their potential impacts on double-crested cormorant populations, fish, other birds, vegetation, federally-listed threatened and endangered species, and socioeconomics.

On March 17, 2003 (68 FR 12653), we published a proposed rule in the **Federal Register** that would implement our preferred alternative. Because of the publication of the proposed rule, we have extended the comment period on the DEIS. We note that the proposed rule presents the preferred alternative in a more detailed manner than the DEIS and advise the reader to refer to it. It is available at our Web site *http://migratorybirds.fws.gov.* The Service invites careful consideration by all parties, and welcomes serious scrutiny from those committed to the long-term conservation of migratory birds.

In order to be considered, electronic submission of comments must include your name and postal mailing address; we will not consider anonymous comments. All comments received, including names and addresses, will become part of the public record. Requests for such comments will be handled in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Council on Environmental Quality's National Environmental Policy Act regulations [40 CFR 1506.6(f)]. Our practice is to make comments available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. If a respondent wishes us to withhold his/her name and/or address, this must be stated prominently at the beginning of the comment.

Dated: March 24, 2003.

Paul R. Schmidt,

Assistant Director, Migratory Birds and State Programs.

[FR Doc. 03–7474 Filed 3–27–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 02–15]

Genesis 1:29 Corporation; Denial of Application

On December 13, 2001, the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Genesis 1:29 Corporation (Respondent) of Petaluma, California, proposing to deny its application for DEA Certificate of Registration as a manufacturer of marijuana and tetrahydrocannaboinois (''THC''), both Schedule I controlled substances. The statutory basis for the Order to Show Cause was Respondent's lack of state authorization to manufacture controlled substances in the State of California. 21 U.S.C. 824(a)(3). In addition, the Order to Show Cause alleged that Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest, as the term is used in 21 U.S.C. 823(a) and 824(a)(4).

By letter dated January 9, 2002, the Respondent, acting *pro se* through its CEO Robert G. Schmidt (Mr. Schmidt), requested a hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause. The matter was then docketed before Administrative Law Judge Gail A. Randall (Judge Randall). In its request for hearing, Mr. Schmidt on behalf of the Respondent indicated that with respect to medical grade cannabis, the Respondent's interest in the instant proceeding was ''to develop a federally approved and federally regulated dispensary model and research facility.'' The Respondent further indicated that its position on the pending DEA application was ''flexible since there are no federally established guidelines for dispensing medical cannabis to patients other than for research purposes.''

On January 25, 2002, Judge Randall issued an Order for Prehearing Statements. Following the filing of Prehearing Statements by the respective parties, on April 30, 2002, the Government filed its Request for Stay of Proceedings and Motion for Summary Judgment (''motion''). On May 23, 2002, Respondent filed its response to the Government's motion. On June 26, 2002, Judge Randall issued her Opinion and Recommended Ruling, granting the Government's motion, and recommending that Respondent's application for registration as a manufacturer be denied. Neither party filed exceptions to Judge Randall's Opinion and Recommended Ruling and on August 8, 2002, Judge Randall transmitted the record of these proceedings to the Deputy Administrator. The Deputy Administrator has considered the record in its entirety, and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth.

In its motion, the Government asserted that on November 11, 2001, DEA transmitted a series of written questions to the Respondent regarding its method of operations and intended customers. The Government attached to its motion a copy of the Respondent's November 26, 2001 response letter to DEA's questionnaire. In the attached response letter, Respondent indicated that the intended purpose of its bulk manufacture of marijuana was to ''supply clinical cannabis to physician's patients operating within California state laws and guidelines established by California Public Health and Safety Code 11362.5 including 11362.7 and 11362.9 * * *'' The letter further