

Range 94 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, Group No. 673, was accepted July 23, 2008.

The plat and field notes representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the north boundary and subdivisional lines, the subdivision of section 4, and the metes and bounds survey of lots 5 and 6, section 4, Township 27 North, Range 103 West, of the Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, Group No. 687, was accepted August 7, 2008.

The plat representing the entire record of the dependent resurvey of a portion of Tract 49, designed to restore the corners in their true locations according to the best available evidence, Township 52 North, Range 97 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, Group No. 769, was accepted August 25, 2008.

The plat and field notes representing the dependent resurvey of Tract 105, portions of Tracts 106 and 107, a portion of the subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of Tracts 105 and 107, Township 52 North, Range 96 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, Group No. 770, was accepted August 25, 2008.

The plat and field notes representing the dependent resurvey of the south, east and west boundaries, a portion of the north boundary, and the subdivisional lines, Township 54 North, Range 78 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, Group No. 767, was accepted September 16, 2008.

The plat and field notes representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the Ninth Standard Parallel North through Range 110 West, portions of the east boundary and subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of section 1, Township 36 North, Range 111 West, of the Sixth Principal Meridian, Wyoming, Group No. 768, was accepted September 16, 2008.

Copies of the preceding described plats and field notes are available to the public at a cost of \$1.10 per page.

Dated: September 17, 2008.

John P. Lee,

Chief Cadastral Surveyor, Division of Support Services.

[FR Doc. E8-22337 Filed 9-23-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-22-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[OR-936-1430-ET; HAG-08-0208; WAOR-42920]

Notice of Proposed Withdrawal Extension and Opportunity for Public Meeting; Washington

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As required by 43 CFR 2310.3-1, notice is hereby given that on the behalf of the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management proposes to extend Public Land Order No. 6776 for a 20-year period. This order withdrew approximately 8,950 acres of National Forest System land from surface entry and mining to protect the natural, scenic, and recreational values, and the investment in federal funds in the North Cascades Scenic Highway Zone. The withdrawal created by Public Land Order No. 6776 will expire on April 17, 2010, unless extended. This notice also gives an opportunity to comment on the proposed action and to request a public meeting.

DATES: Effective Date: Comments and requests for a public meeting must be received by December 23, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Comments and meeting requests should be sent to the Oregon/Washington State Director, BLM, P.O. Box 2965, Portland, Oregon 97208-2965.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory B. Graham, Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, 509-664-9262, or, Charles R. Roy, Bureau of Land Management Oregon/Washington State Office, 503-808-6189.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States Forest Service has filed an application to extend Public Land Order No. 6776 (55 FR 14422 (1990)) lands from location and entry under the mining laws for a 20 year period, subject to valid existing rights.

The areas described aggregates approximately 8,950 acres in Chelan, Okanogan, Skagit, and Whatcom Counties.

The use of a right-of-way, interagency agreement, or cooperative agreement would not adequately constrain non-discretionary uses and would not provide adequate protection of the Federal investment in the improvements located on the land.

There are no suitable alternative sites with equal or greater benefit to the government.

No additional water rights will be needed to fulfill the purpose of the requested withdrawal.

The preliminary mineral potential evaluation found the above described lands to have a high potential for locatable minerals.

The purpose of the proposed withdrawal extension is to protect the scenic, natural, and recreation values, and the investment of federal funds at the North Cascades Scenic Highway Zone.

For a period of 90 days from the date of publication of this notice, all persons who wish to submit comments, suggestions, or objections in connection with the proposed withdrawal extension may present their views in writing to the State Director at the address indicated above.

Comments, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the address indicated above during regular business hours.

Individual respondents may request confidentiality. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold from public review your personal identifying information, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organization or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

Notice is hereby given that an opportunity for a public meeting is afforded in connection with the proposed withdrawal extension. All interested parties who desire a public meeting for the purpose of being heard on the proposed withdrawal must submit a written request to the State Director at the address indicated above within 90 days from the publication of this notice. Upon determination by the authorized officer that a public meeting will be held, a notice of the time and place will be published in the **Federal Register** at least 30 days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The application will be processed in accordance with the regulations set forth in 43 CFR part 2300.

Fred O'Ferrall,

Chief, Branch of Lands and Mineral Resources.

[FR Doc. E8-22347 Filed 9-23-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Public Notice: Clarifying the Definition of "Substantial Restoration of Natural Quiet" at Grand Canyon National Park, AZ

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Disposition of Public Comments and Adoption of Clarification.

SUMMARY: On April 9, 2008, the National Park Service (NPS) published a Public Notice of agency policy in the **Federal Register** with the above title (73 FR 19246-19248), clarifying the NPS definition of substantial restoration of natural quiet at Grand Canyon National Park (GCNP) to distinguish between aircraft noise generated above and below 17,999 feet mean sea level (MSL), and requesting comments on the proposed clarification. Specifically, the NPS proposed the following clarification:

(a) Substantial restoration of natural quiet at GCNP will be achieved when the reduction of noise from aircraft operations at or below 17,999 feet MSL results in 50% or more of the park achieving restoration of the natural quiet (*i.e.*, no aircraft audible) for 75% to 100% of the day, each and every day; and

(b) The NPS defines the substantial restoration of natural quiet from all aircraft above 17,999 feet MSL to mean that there will be an overall reduction in aviation noise generated above 17,999 feet MSL above the park over time through implementation of measures in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) commitments.

The NPS also clarified that 50% of the park is a minimum in the restoration goal.

The public comment period was open from April 9 to May 9, 2008. The NPS received and analyzed 127 comments in response to the Public Notice.

Comments were received from the National Air Transportation Association; environmental groups (*e.g.*, Sierra Club, Audubon Society, and Grand Canyon Trust); air tour operators;

and the general public. Comments beyond the scope of this clarification may be considered in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement for Special Flight Rules in the Vicinity of Grand Canyon National Park (EIS).

DATES: The clarification as published on April 9, 2008, is effective immediately.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ken McMullen, Grand Canyon National Park, 823 N. San Francisco St., Suite B, Flagstaff, AZ 86001, Telephone (928) 779-2095.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In response to the comments received pursuant to the publication of the NPS Public Notice in the April 9, 2008 **Federal Register**, the NPS explains the reasons for and the expected effects of the proposed clarification below and in the *Discussion of Comments* to follow.

Reasons for the Clarification

The notice published on April 9, 2008 in the **Federal Register** clarifies the definition used by GCNP for achieving substantial restoration of natural quiet as mandated by the 1987 Overflights Act (Pub. L. 100-91) (Overflights Act). This clarification of the definition is necessary to address current aircraft noise impacts, to comply with the intent of recommendations provided in the 1995 Report to Congress¹, and to respond to a 2002 U.S. Court of Appeals decision.² The provisions of Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) 50-2 have not resulted in substantial restoration of natural quiet at GCNP. Given the volume of high altitude commercial jet and general aviation traffic overflying the Grand Canyon above 17,999 feet MSL, the substantial restoration goal as previously defined cannot be attained.

Discussion of Comments

The NPS received 127 comments regarding the clarification of the definition of the "substantial restoration of natural quiet" at GCNP. Of those, 40 comments were substantive in nature while 87 were not substantive. NPS Directors Order 12, *Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision Making*,³ defines

substantive comments as those that raise, debate, or question a point of fact or policy. Comments solely in favor of or against the proposed action are not considered substantive. Also, a large number of comments were received that did not address the proposed clarification regarding 17,999 feet MSL; many addressed other issues that commentors said should be addressed in the EIS. While such comments are not substantive for this clarification, they will be considered as the EIS is developed. Substantive comments about the clarification are summarized and responded to below.

1. One commentor suggested the addition of the word "such" for clarity, so that Part (a) would read: "Substantial restoration of natural quiet at GCNP is achieved when the reduction of noise from aircraft operations at or below 17,999 feet MSL results in 50% or more of the park achieving restoration of natural quiet (*i.e.*, no such aircraft audible) for 75% to 100% of the day * * *"

NPS Response: The NPS believes that Part (a) of the clarification as stated in 73 FR 19246-19248 is sufficiently clear to address only those aircraft at or below 17,999 feet MSL. Therefore, the suggested change is not made.

2. Comments were received urging NPS to clarify that Part (b) is not a definition of the statutory term, but rather policy goals based upon FAA commitments. Two commentors stated that the FAA commitments are alluded to but not specified.

NPS Response: Part (b) of 73 FR 19246-19248 clarifies but does not redefine the NPS goal for substantial restoration of natural quiet from all aircraft above 17,999 feet MSL above the park. This goal is supported by FAA policy commitments to: (1) Actively pursue efforts to continue to reduce aircraft source noise throughout the aviation system. The recently introduced NextGen Aviation Reform Act strengthens the FAA's research and development capability and includes a performance objective for lower noise aircraft technology; (2) when the FAA is engaged in airspace redesign that affects a national park and there are alternative choices consistent with safety, operational, and environmental parameters, the FAA will give favorable consideration to alternative routes away from sensitive park resources; and, (3) as the FAA transitions to a more dynamic, satellite-based technology, future navigational flexibility will allow the FAA to reconsider opportunities to reduce national park overflights that are

¹ National Park Service. 1995. *Report of Effects of Aircraft Overflights on the National Park System*, Report to Congress, July.

² *United States Air Tour Association, et al., Petitioners v. Federal Aviation Administration, et al., Respondents; Grand Canyon Trust, et al., Intervenor*s, 353 U.S. App. D.C. 213; 298 F.3d. 997; 2002. U.S. App.

³ National Park Service. 2001. *Director's Order #12 and Handbook: Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision Making*, January.