

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****Bureau of Land Management**

[AK-964-1410-00-P]

**Notice for Publication, AA-12373;  
Alaska Native Claims Selection**

In accordance with Departmental regulation 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that a decision to issue conveyance under the provisions of Section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of December 18, 1971, 43 U.S.C. 1601, 1613(h)(1), will be issued to Doyon, Limited, for a portion of land located within Sec. 30, T. 22 N., R. 59 W., Seward Meridian, containing approximately 16.06 acres, in the vicinity of Holy Cross, Alaska.

A notice of the decision will be published once a week, for four (4) consecutive weeks, in the Tundra Drums. Copies of the decision may be obtained by contacting the Alaska State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7599 (907) 271-5960.

Any party claiming a property interest which is adversely affected by the decision, an agency of the Federal government or regional corporation, shall have until August 17, 1995, to file an appeal. However, parties receiving service by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal. Appeals must be filed in the Bureau of Land Management at the address identified above, where the requirements for filing an appeal may be obtained. Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4, subpart E, shall be deemed to have waived their rights.

**Nora A. Benson,***Land Law Examiner, Branch of Northern Adjudication.*

[FR Doc. 95-17547 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JA-P

**Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement Analyzing the Impacts of a Proposed Expansion of Castle Mountain Mine, San Bernardino County, California**

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Bureau of Land Management will be directing preparation of a joint Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in conjunction with San Bernardino County's administration of the California Environmental Quality Act. The EIS/EIR will be prepared by a

third party contractor on the impacts of the proposed mine expansion and ten year extension of mining and processing activities at the Castle Mountain open pit, heap leach gold mine located in northeastern San Bernardino County, California. Public scoping meetings will be held in connection with the document's preparation.

**DATES:** The public is invited to participate in defining the scope of analysis. Public meetings will be held at the following times and locations: 7 p.m., Wednesday, August 2, 1995, at the Searchlight Community Center, Parks and Recreation Department, 200 Michael Wendall Way, Searchlight, Nevada; 7 p.m., Thursday, August 3, 1995, at the Holiday Inn, 1511 East Main Street, Barstow, California. Written comments will be accepted through August 14, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be addressed to U.S.D.I., Bureau of Land Management, Needles Resource Area, 101 W. Spikes Road, Needles, California 92363.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** George R. Meckfessel, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, telephone (619) 326-3896.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Viceroy Gold Corporation has proposed expanded development of additional ore deposits adjacent to deposits currently being mined at the Castle Mountain open-pit, heap-leach gold mine. Under the mine's present permits, mining and processing activities could continue through December 31, 2010. Under the proposed expansion, these activities could continue through December 31, 2020. The proposal consists of expanding existing and planned open pit areas, consolidating two heap leach pads and eliminating two others, creating a new overburden storage area as well as expanding existing overburden piles, expanding growth media storage areas and partially backfilling the Jumbo South/Lesley Ann open pits. The proposed ten-year extension of the mining and processing phases of the mine would ultimately affect up to 1,437 acres of public and private lands, as compared to a total of 890 acres presently authorized.

The EIS/EIR will consider alternative sitings of heap-leach pads and waste dumps, and backfilling alternatives. The EIS/EIR will examine potentially significant impacts to visual resources, air quality, cultural resources, groundwater quality/quantity, land use,

vegetation, wildlife and cumulative effects.

**Richard E. Fagan,***Area Manager.*

[FR Doc. 95-17664 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-M

[OR-014-95-1610-00: G5-166]

**Notice of Availability**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability, Proposed Final Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), gives notice of the availability of the proposed Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan and final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS). The FEIS was prepared pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, section 202(f) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the BLM's planning procedures (43 CFR 1610). The PRMP/FEIS describes and analyzes the effects of restoring land of the acquired Wood River property, approximately 3,220 acres in Klamath County, Oregon, to a functioning wetland community.

Preparation of the proposed final Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS) is a separate process from the recently completed Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement process. Although both plans are comparable (that is, guiding future management actions in specified areas), they were prepared separately due to the geographical distance between the Wood River property and the rest of the BLM-administered lands in the Resource Area.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Public participation has occurred throughout the planning process. A Notice of Intent was filed in the **Federal Register** in October 1993. Since that time, many public meetings, mailings, and briefings were conducted to solicit comments and ideas. The draft RMP/EIS was available for public review from March 1, 1994 to June 17, 1994. Written comments were received from agencies, organizations, and individuals. Oral comments were also heard in eighteen public meetings with interested groups, organizations,

government agencies, and individuals. All comments provided were considered during the preparation of the PRMP/FEIS.

Copies of the PRMP/FEIS and a summary of it may be obtained from the Klamath Falls Resource Area office. Public reading copies will be available for review at the public libraries in Klamath Falls (Oregon) and Redding (California), the Klamath County Office Building, all government document depository libraries, BLM Oregon/Washington State Office, BLM District Offices in Oregon/Washington, and at the following BLM locations:

Office of External Affairs, Main Interior Building, Room 5600, 18th and C Streets, NW., Washington, DC 20240  
Public Room, Oregon State Office, 1515 SW. 5th, 7th floor, Portland, Oregon 97201

A public meeting on the proposed plan will be announced in the local print media. Information on the public meeting can also be obtained by calling Wedge Watkins at (503) 885-4110.

Anyone adversely affected by the proposed plan may file a protest. Protests should be sent to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, Resource Planning (480), P.O. Box 65775, Washington D.C. 20235, within the 30-day protest period. The period for filing a protest begins on the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability of the final environmental impact statement concerning the proposed resource management plan and will end 30 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. To be considered complete, a protest must contain the following information: The name, mailing address, telephone number, and interest of the person filing the protest; a statement of the issue or issues being protested; a statement of the part or parts of the plan being protested; a copy of all documents addressing the issue or issues that were submitted during the planning process, or a reference to the date the issue or issues were discussed for the record; a concise statement explaining why the BLM State Director's decision is believed to be incorrect.

At the end of the 30-day protest period, the BLM may issue a Record of Decision approving implementation of any portions of the proposed plan not under protest. Approval will be withheld on any portion of the plan under protest, until the protest has been resolved.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** A. Barron Bail, Area Manager, Klamath

Falls Resource Area Office, Phone (503) 883-6916.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The PRMP/FEIS describes and analyzes four alternatives for BLM-administered lands in the Upper Klamath Basin near the Wood River to address the goals of wetland restoration and water quality improvement. The alternatives include a No Action alternative (continuation of current management) which does not include wetland restoration, and three alternatives that do include wetland restoration. In all four alternatives the following issues were addressed: water resources (quality and quantity), wetland restoration, special status species habitat, fish and wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities, access, livestock grazing, and public involvement.

The No Action Alternative would maintain the current use of the property as predominantly for livestock grazing in an irrigated pasture. Livestock grazing would be limited to a maximum of 3,600 animal unit months per year. Water would be pumped off in the spring at current schedules. The amounts of upland, wet meadow, and marsh habitat would remain constant. Recreation facilities would not be developed. Recreation use, limited to day use only, would neither be encouraged nor restrained and the area would remain closed to motorized vehicles.

Alternative B would restore the Wood River property to a functioning wetland with diverse plant communities and healthy, productive vegetation. Initial management actions could require highly engineered techniques, such as restoring the Wood River and Sevenmile Creek to their historic meandering channels; however, in the long term, wetland restoration systems and methods would be designed for minimum maintenance using the existing landscape features. The minimum maintenance methods used would vary, but could include such tools as prescribed fire, and mechanical vegetation manipulation. Some recreation facilities would be developed. Recreation use and some motorized access would be allowed, but would be limited to certain areas and times of day.

Alternative C would also restore the Wood River property to a functioning wetland with diverse plant communities and healthy, productive vegetation. Initial and long-term restoration actions could involve highly engineered techniques and could include experimental techniques, such as artificial water circulation, or other

constructed wetlands. General design principles could be complex. The research would encompass both the methods used for wetland restoration and the examination of the effects of restoration on water quality and quantity, fish and wildlife habitat, etc. Recreation would be limited to day use only. Development of recreation facilities would emphasize wetland restoration education. Various tools, such as grazing, prescribed fire, mechanical manipulation of vegetation, chemical manipulation, and water level fluctuations could be used to meet the goals of this alternative.

The Preferred Plan, Alternative D, would restore the Wood River property to its previous form and function as a wetland community, within unalterable constraints (such as water rights, land ownership patterns, and funds). Labor-intensive, highly engineered wetland restoration methods using complex designs would be allowed; however, the preference would be to use wetland restoration systems and methods that were designed with less labor-intensive practices using the existing landscape features. Long-term improvements in water quality entering Agency Lake would be a goal. Adaptive management, the process of changing land management as a result of monitoring or research, would be used.

The Preferred Plan would emphasize improving and increasing wetland/riparian habitat to benefit federally listed fish species. It would also protect habitats of federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species to avoid contributing to the need to list category 1 and 2 federal candidate, state-listed, and Bureau sensitive species. This alternative would emphasize management of special status species, including completing inventories for these species and maintaining a diversity of habitats. Other wildlife species would have habitat improved within the constraints of other resource objectives. Recreation would be managed for low to moderate use levels, with roaded natural and semi-primitive recreation experiences provided. Vehicles would be limited to designated, signed roads. The area would be identified as a Watchable Wildlife site.

The Wood River property, approximately 3,220 acres, would be designated an Area of Critical Environmental Concern to protect the area's relevant and important values (cultural, fish, and wildlife values, and natural processes and systems). Off-highway vehicle use will be prohibited; mining location will be prohibited; mineral leasing will be restricted; and

rights-of-way will be restricted in the ACEC. The Wood River and Seven Mile Creek were studied for eligibility under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Neither the Wood River nor Sevenmile Creek were found eligible or suitable for designation under any of the alternatives for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This notice meets the requirements of 43 CFR 1610.7-2 for designation of areas of critical environmental concern and the requirements of the final revised Department of the Interior—Department of Agriculture Guidelines for Eligibility, Classification, and Management of Rivers (**Federal Register** Vol. 47, No. 173, page 39454).

**M. Joe Tague,**

*District Manager, Acting.*

[FR Doc. 95-17510 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-P

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Availability of an Environmental Assessment and Receipt of an Application To Amend the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan Pursuant to Section 10(a) of the Endangered Species Act

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The County of San Mateo (County) has applied to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) for an amendment to the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan (Plan) and incidental take permit PRT 2-9818 pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). The proposed amendment, the Watson Communications System 1994 Master Plan project, would authorize the incidental take of the endangered mission blue butterfly (*Icaricia icarioides missionensis*) in an area of the Plan originally designated as conserved habitat. The proposed amendment was necessitated by revision of the 1983 development plan for the Radio Ridge. An environmental assessment (EA) is available for the project. This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(c) of the Act and National Environmental Policy Act regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

**DATES:** Written comments on the EA and the application should be received on or before August 17, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments regarding the adequacy of the EA and the application should be addressed to: Field Supervisor, Sacramento Field Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1823,

Sacramento, California 95825-1846. All comments should reference the permit number PRT 2-9818. All comments, including names and addresses, received will become part of the administrative record and may be made available to the public.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael Horton at the above address or telephone 916-979-2725. Individuals wishing a copy of the application or EA should contact the above individual.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Section 9 of the Act prohibits the "taking" of endangered species, like the mission blue butterfly. However, the Service, under limited circumstances, may issue permits to take endangered wildlife species incidental to, and not the purpose of, otherwise lawful activities. Regulations governing permits for endangered species may be found in 50 CFR 17.22.

In 1983, the Service issued the County of San Mateo (County), California a permit for the incidental take of mission blue butterfly on San Bruno Mountain. The County has requested an amendment to section 10(a)(1)(B) permit No. PRT 2-9818 for the San Bruno Mountain Habitat Conservation Plan (SBM HCP). The SBM HCP currently reflects a 1983 development plan for the Radio Ridge, which would allow the construction of 7 structures, 6 additional earth/satellite stations, and associated facilities, and would conserve 15 acres as conserved habitat. Watson Communications Systems, the property owner has proposed a number of construction activities that differ from the 1983 SBM HCP. This includes construction of 2 dwelling units, relocation of a tower, and construction of 2 new buildings, installation of 40 new dish antennae, and associated facilities. Aside from increasing the amount of habitat that would be lost by 1.2 acres, the new proposal reconfigures the developed areas. The applicant has proposed minimization measures and would provide additional funds to the HCP Trust Fund as mitigation. The County approved the 1994 Master Plan project and certified an Environmental Impact Report prepared for the project on December 20, 1994.

On August 23, 1994, the County applied to the Service for an amendment to the SBM HCP and permit PRT 2-9818. The proposed Radio Ridge amendment includes the above Watson Communications Systems project and would authorize the incidental take of the mission blue butterfly in an area originally designated in the SBM HCP as conserved habitat. In addition to the proposed amendment, (the proposed

action), the No Action Alternative was considered.

Dated: July 12, 1995.

**Thomas Dwyer,**

*Deputy Regional Director, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.*

[FR Doc. 95-17549 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

### National Park Service

#### Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan Haleakala National Park, Maui County, Hawaii; Record of Decision

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190 as amended) and regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service has approved a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan (FEIS/GMP) for Haleakala National Park.

The National Park Service will implement the selected plan, identified as the proposal in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, issued in March, 1995.

Copies of the approved Record of Decision may be obtained from the Superintendent, Haleakala National Park, Box 369, Makawao, Maui, HI 96768; or by calling the park at (808) 572-9230.

Dated: June 27, 1995.

**Patricia L. Neubacher,**

*Field Director, Pacific West Field Area.*

[FR Doc. 95-17638 Filed 7-17-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

### Acadia National Park Advisory Commission; Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770, 5 U.S.C. App. 1, Sec. 10), that the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission will hold a meeting on Monday, August 14, 1995.

The Commission was established pursuant to Pub. L. 99-420, Sec. 103. The purpose of the commission is to consult with the Secretary of the Interior, or his designee, on matters relating to the management and development of the park, including but not limited to the acquisition of lands and interests in lands (including conservation easements on islands) and