

as well as some pinniped species. However, we disagree that a larger standard exclusion zone is warranted. As we explained in our rulemaking, our intent in prescribing standard exclusion zone distances is to: (1) Encompass zones for most species within which auditory injury could occur on the basis of instantaneous exposure; (2) provide additional protection from the potential for more severe behavioral reactions (e.g., panic, antipredator response) for marine mammals at relatively close range to the acoustic source; (3) provide consistency and ease of implementation for PSOs, who need to monitor and implement the exclusion zones; and (4) to define a distance within which detection probabilities are reasonably high for most species under typical conditions. Our use of 100-m and 500-m zones is not based directly on any quantitative understanding of the range at which auditory injury would be entirely precluded or any range specifically related to disruption of behavioral patterns. Rather, we believe it is a reasonable combination of factors. In summary, a practicable criterion such as this has the advantage of familiarity and simplicity while still providing in most cases a zone larger than relevant auditory injury zones, given realistic movement of source and receiver. Increased shutdowns, without a firm idea of the outcome the measure seeks to avoid, simply displace survey activity in time and increase the total duration of acoustic influence as well as total sound energy in the water.

We agree that, when practicable, the exclusion zone should encompass distances within which auditory injury is expected to occur on the basis of instantaneous exposure. However, potential auditory injury is based on the accumulation of energy, and is therefore not a straightforward consideration. For example, observation of a whale at the distance calculated as being the “Level A isopleth” does not necessarily mean that the animal has in fact incurred auditory injury. Rather, the animal would have to be at the calculated distance (or closer) as the mobile source approaches, passes, and recedes from the exposed animal, being exposed to and accumulating energy from airgun pulses the entire time.

When evaluating the nighttime ramp up of seismic airguns, NMFS determined the data from previous seismic monitoring programs did not suggest that there would be a difference in the severity of impacts to marine mammals by not fully clearing the exclusion zone during nighttime ramp up that was not addressed through the number and type of taking authorized

for Hilcorp’s activities in the rulemaking. Ramp up would still be required for use of airguns at night and the use of ramp up still allows marine mammals to avoid the area before the full source level is realized. The mitigation measure that would be least effective due to low visibility conditions at night would be the implementation of the full extent of the exclusion zone and as discussed above, it is unlikely that animals would remain within the exclusion zone for the duration of the seismic activity such that injury is incurred. However, in the event that injury is incurred, Level A take was authorized for species more likely to occur in the survey area or for species that are difficult to detect. Similarly, Level B take is authorized incidental to Hilcorp’s activities. These allowable takes were not calculated by assuming some underlying effectiveness of the mitigation and monitoring. No amount of Level B take was discounted from the total amount of take authorized because of assumptions of effectiveness of daytime monitoring. The amount of Level B take that may occur during seismic activity is unchanged, but the number of takes likely to be observed and recorded at night is slightly lessened by reduced visibility.

Regarding the counting and tracking of allowable takes, Hilcorp is using a methodology similar to that used by many other incidental take authorization applicants. Hilcorp will use the number of takes observed by PSOs within the monitored distance and will extrapolate those takes to estimate a number of unseen takes in the unmonitored area that is the rest of the relevant isopleth. Hilcorp will include these estimations in their reports to NMFS to ensure take is not exceeded during their activity.

Comment: The CBD and Cook Inletkeeper commented that NMFS’ estimation of take of Cook Inlet belugas is flawed because ramp-up is not considered a take in our analyses.

Response: It is unclear if the commenters are referencing estimation of take pre-activity or accounting for take post-activity. NMFS disagrees with the commenters. Any animal sighted at any distance from the vessel during pre-clearance, ramp-up, seismic surveying, or post-activity monitoring is recorded as an observation and this information will be provided to NMFS in Hilcorp’s monitoring reports. The sighting is not necessarily considered a take as the exclusion zone is derived from the energy output of the full seismic airgun array and any sound a marine mammal would be exposed to during ramp up is

a lesser amount of energy than the full airgun array.

Authorization

NMFS has issued a modified LOA (available at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/action/incidental-take-authorization-hilcorp-alaska-llc-oil-and-gas-activities-cook-inlet-alaska>) to Hilcorp Alaska LLC for the potential harassment of small numbers of four marine mammal species incidental to oil and gas activities in Cook Inlet, Alaska, provided the mitigation, monitoring and reporting requirements of the rulemaking are incorporated.

Dated: September 30, 2019.

Donna S. Wieting,

Director, Office of Protected Resources,
National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2019–21692 Filed 10–3–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

RIN 0648–XV087

Caribbean Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of a public webinar meeting.

SUMMARY: The Caribbean Fishery Management Council will hold a webinar meeting to consider establishing an advisory panel concerning Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management. The items to be discussed are contained in the agenda included in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

DATES: The webinar meeting will be held on October 23, 2019, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The webinar meeting will be held through GoToMeeting. You can join the meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone at <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/765313029>. You can also dial in using your phone. United States: +1 (786) 535–3211 Access Code: 765–313–029. If joining from a video-conferencing room or system, depending on your device, dial: 765313029@67.217.95.2 or 67.217.95.2##765313029

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Miguel A. Rolón, Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 270 Muñoz Rivera Avenue, Suite 401, San Juan,

Puerto Rico 00918–1903, telephone: (787) 766–5926.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

October 23, 2019, 10 a.m.–12 noon

- Considerations for Establishing an Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management Advisory Panel

- Action to Establish Advisory Panel (AP)

1:30 p.m.–2:30 p.m.

- Closed Session to Discuss AP Membership, if Established, and Internal Administrative Matters.

2:45 p.m.–5 p.m.

- Time Schedule for Continuing the Development of the Ecosystem-Based Fishery Management Plan (EBFMP)

- Other Business

The order of business may be adjusted as necessary to accommodate the completion of agenda items.

Special Accommodations

For more information on this webinar, please contact Mr. Miguel A. Rolón, Executive Director, Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 270 Muñoz Rivera Avenue, Suite 401, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00918–1903, telephone: (787) 766–5926.

Dated: October 1, 2019.

Tracey L. Thompson,

Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 2019–21647 Filed 10–3–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE BLIND OR SEVERELY DISABLED

Procurement List; Proposed Deletions

AGENCY: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.

ACTION: Proposed deletions from the Procurement List.

SUMMARY: The Committee is proposing to delete a product and service from the Procurement List that were furnished by nonprofit agencies employing persons who are blind or have other severe disabilities.

DATES: *Comments must be received on or before:* November 3, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, 1401 S. Clark Street, Suite 715, Arlington, Virginia 22202–4149.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information or to submit comments contact: Michael R.

Jurkowski, Telephone: (703) 603–2117, Fax: (703) 603–0655, or email CMTEFedReg@AbilityOne.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 8503(a)(2) and 41 CFR 51–2.3. Its purpose is to provide interested persons an opportunity to submit comments on the proposed actions.

Deletions

The following product and service are proposed for deletion from the Procurement List:

Product

NSN—Product Name:

8140–01–063–7681—Grommet

Mandatory Source of Supply: LC Industries, Inc., Durham, NC

Contracting Activity: W40M RHCO–ATLANTIC USAHCA, FORT BELVOIR, VA

Service

Service Type: Janitorial/Custodial

Mandatory for: USDA, Forest Service: 4886

Cottage Grove Avenue, Humboldt

Nursery, McKinleyville, CA

Contracting Activity: AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF, PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS DIVISION

Patricia Briscoe,

Deputy Director, Business Operations (Pricing and Information Management).

[FR Doc. 2019–21657 Filed 10–3–19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6353–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Certificate of Alternate Compliance for USS VERMONT (SSN 792)

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Issuance of Certificate of Alternate Compliance.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Navy hereby announces that a Certificate of Alternate Compliance has been issued for USS VERMONT (SSN 792). Due to the special construction and purpose of this vessel, Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General (DAJAG) (Admiralty and Maritime Law) has determined that it is a vessel of the Navy which, due to its special construction and purpose, cannot comply fully with the navigation lights provisions of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (72 COLREGS) without interfering with its special functions as a naval ship. The intended effect of this notice is to warn mariners in waters where 72 COLREGS apply.

DATES: This action takes effect October 4, 2019 and is applicable beginning September 11, 2019.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Lieutenant Thomas J. Bright, JAGC, U.S. Navy, United States Navy, Admiralty Attorney, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Admiralty and Maritime Law Division (Code 11), 1322 Patterson Ave. SE, Suite 3000, Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374–5066, 202–685–5040, or admiralty@navy.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background and Purpose. Executive Order 11964 of January 19, 1977 and 33 U.S.C 1605 provide that the requirements of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (72 COLREGS), as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights or shapes, as well as to the disposition and characteristics of sound-signaling appliances, shall not apply to a vessel or class of vessels of the Navy where the Secretary of the Navy shall find and certify that, by reason of special construction or purpose, it is not possible for such vessel(s) to comply fully with the provisions without interfering with the special function of the vessel(s). Notice of issuance of a Certificate of Alternate Compliance must be made in the **Federal Register**.

In accordance with 33 U.S.C 1605, the DAJAG (Admiralty and Maritime Law), under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Navy, hereby finds and certifies that USS VERMONT (SSN 792) is a vessel of special construction or purpose, and that, with respect to the position of the following navigational lights, it is not possible to comply fully with the requirements of the provisions enumerated in the 72 COLREGS without interfering with the special function of the vessel:

Rule 23(a) and Annex I, paragraph 2(a)(i), pertaining to the vertical placement of the masthead light, and Annex I, paragraph 2(f)(i), pertaining to the masthead light being above and clear of all other lights and obstructions;

Rule 30(a), Rule 21(e), and Annex I, paragraph 2(k), pertaining to the vertical separation of the anchor lights, vertical placement of the forward anchor light above the hull, and the arc of visibility of all-around lights;

Rule 23(a) and Annex I, paragraph 3(b), pertaining to the location of the sidelights; and Rule 21(c), pertaining to the location and arc of visibility of the sternlight.

The DAJAG (Admiralty and Maritime Law) further finds and certifies that these navigational lights are in closest possible compliance with the applicable provision of the 72 COLREGS.

Authority: 33 U.S.C 1605(c), E.O. 11964.