

Rockville, MD 20857. Telephone: 301, 443-6470.

The meetings will be closed in accordance with the provisions set forth in secs. 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5, U.S.C. Applications and/or proposals and the discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications and/or proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Numbers 93.242, 93.281, 93.282)

Dated: May 22, 1996.

Susan K. Feldman,

*Committee Management Officer, NIH.*

[FR Doc. 96-13660 Filed 5-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-3778-N-87]

### Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development; Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for possible use to assist the homeless.

**DATES:** May 31, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Mark Johnston, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Room 7256, 451 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410; telephone (202) 708-1226; TDD number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708-2565, (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 1-800-927-7588.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with the December 12, 1988 court order in *National Coalition for the Homeless v. Veterans Administration*, No. 88-2503-OG (D.D.C.), HUD publishes a Notice, on a weekly basis, identifying unutilized, underutilized, excess and surplus Federal buildings and real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. Today's Notice is for the purpose of announcing that no additional properties have been determined suitable or unsuitable this week.

Dated: May 23, 1996.

Jacquie M. Lawing,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.*

[FR Doc. 96-13480 Filed 5-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-29-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Availability of the Final Joint Programmatic Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Impact Statement on the Proposed Issuance of Incidental Take Permits for the Coastal California Gnatcatcher and Six Other Listed Species in the Central and Coastal Natural Community Conservation Planning Subregion of Orange County, CA

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** This notice advises the public that the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) on the proposed issuance of nine incidental take permits for seven listed species in the Central and Coastal Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) Subregion of Orange County, California, is available. Publication of the Record of Decision and issuance of the permits will occur no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice. This notice is provided pursuant to regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1506.6).

**ADDRESSES:** The documents discussed herein are available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours, at the Carlsbad Field Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2730 Loker Avenue West, Carlsbad, California 92008 (telephone: 619-431-9440); and at the Planning Department, Orange County Environmental Management Agency, 300 North Flower Street, Santa Ana, California 92702 (telephone: 714-834-5550).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Gail Kobetich, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 619-431-9440; or Mr. Tim Neely, Planning and Zoning Administrator, Orange County Environmental Management Agency (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 714-834-2552.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

### Availability of Documents

Copies of the Final EIR/EIS and associated documents (comment letters on the Draft EIS/EIR, response to comments, the final Implementation Agreement, and final maps) can be obtained by contacting the Carlsbad or Santa Ana offices listed above (see **ADDRESSES**). The response to comments addresses changes that were made in draft documents associated with the permit applications that previously were made available for public review. The complete application file may be viewed during normal business hours, by appointment, at the Carlsbad and Santa Ana offices. A letter announcing availability of the Final EIR/EIS has been forwarded to all parties who previously received the notice of availability of the Draft EIR/EIS, and/or who requested a copy of, or commented on, the Draft EIR/EIS.

### Background

On March 30, 1993, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) published a final rule determining the coastal California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica californica*) as a threatened species (58 FR 16742). The "take" of threatened and endangered species is prohibited under section 9 of the Act and its implementing regulations. Take is defined in part as killing, harming or harassing listed species, including significant habitat modification that kills or injures listed species. The Service, however, may issue permits under section 10 of the Act to conduct activities involving the take of threatened and endangered species under certain circumstances, including carrying out scientific activities, enhancing the propagation or survival of the species, or incidentally taking the species in connection with otherwise lawful activities. Regulations governing such permits are at 50 CFR 17.22 and 17.32.

On December 10, 1993, the Service issued a final special rule for the coastal California gnatcatcher, pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act (58 FR 65088). Incidental take of the gnatcatcher is allowed under the special rule if such take results from activities conducted under a plan prepared pursuant to the NCCP Act of 1991, NCCP Process Guidelines, and the NCCP Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Conservation Guidelines. The special rule also requires Federal approval of the NCCP Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP).

The County of Orange (lead applicant), University of California-

Irvine, Transportation Corridor Agencies, Metropolitan Water District, Santiago County Water District, Irvine Ranch Water District, The Irvine Company, Chandis-Sherman Companies, and Southern California Edison each have applied to the Service for a 75-year incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act. In addition, the cities of Anaheim, Costa Mesa, Irvine, Laguna Beach, Laguna Niguel, Lake Forest, Newport Beach, Orange, and Tustin also may apply for individual permits. Should any of these cities apply for individual permits, the Final EIR/EIS will be used to satisfy their State and Federal environmental documentation requirements. In support of their permit application package, the applicants have prepared a NCCP Plan/HCP and an IA for the Central and Coastal NCCP Subregion of Orange County (Subregion). In December 1995, these documents were circulated for review and comment, along with the Draft EIR/EIS.

Under the proposed action, section 10(a)(1)(B) permits would be issued by the Service subject to the terms and conditions of the NCCP Plan/HCP and its IA. The proposed permits would authorize the incidental take of 44 species, 7 of which are listed species, including: the threatened coastal California gnatcatcher, and the endangered American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*), arroyo southwestern toad (*Bufo microscaphus californicus*), least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*), and the Pacific pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris pacificus*). Consistent with the U.S. Department of the Interior's "No Surprises" Policy, the permit applicants also request coverage of an additional 37 currently unlisted plant and animal species that occur within the NCCP Plan/HCP area, including 5 species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered, and 5 plant species on the Dana Point Headlands (Headlands) only. The NCCP Plan/HCP would conserve the 37 unlisted species according to standards required for species listed under the Act. Unlisted species would be named on the permits, with incidental take becoming effective upon their listing under the Act.

Although the NCCP Plan/HCP has focused on coastal sage scrub habitat (CSS), in keeping with the legislative intent of the California NCCP Act of 1991 to protect multiple habitat types, the applicants propose to protect four

additional habitat types to the extent that no additional mitigation or compensation would be required of participating landowners should any species dependent upon or associated with these habitats be listed during the 75-year permit period. These habitat types are: oak woodlands, Tecate cypress forest, cliff and rock, and chaparral (coastal subarea only). Should any species dependent upon or associated with these habitats be listed in the future, the Service will assume the responsibility for any additional mitigation measures, above and beyond the NCCP Plan/HCP implementation program, that would be required to provide the regulatory basis for issuing section 10(a)(1)(B) permits to participating landowners.

The NCCP Plan/HCP subregional planning area includes approximately 208,000 acres, of which about 104,000 acres remain as natural lands that are subject to intense development pressure. The Subregion contains about 30,833 acres of CSS supporting approximately 600 pairs of California gnatcatchers. Under the NCCP Plan/HCP, 5,336 acres of CSS, currently supporting 110 pairs of gnatcatchers, could be incidentally taken as a result of development by participating landowners. In addition, development of 2,108 acres of CSS habitat, currently supporting 11 pairs of gnatcatchers, could be incidentally taken by activities of non-participating landowners. Other habitats associated with CSS could also be developed, including about 2,550 acres of chaparral and 12,025 acres of grasslands.

The applicants propose to minimize and mitigate the impacts of take by establishing a 37,378-acre Reserve System. The Reserve System will contain more than 18,527 acres of CSS, 6,950 acres of chaparral, 5,732 acres of grasslands, and other habitats. The Reserve System will be managed by its public owners according to comprehensive management plans, including, but not limited to, fire management, grazing management, recreation/public access management, and habitat restoration plans. Such management will be funded by an endowment fund in excess of \$10.6 million, and by mitigation fees contributed by non-participating landowners who elect to use this fee option rather than pursue an individual HCP. Management of reserve lands will be coordinated by a non-profit Board of Directors, to be composed of public and private landowners, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and the Service.

To supplement the Reserve System, 1,906 acres are designated as Special Linkage Areas and another 3,796 acres are designated as Existing Use Areas. Another 3,831 acres within the Subregion will remain as public Open Space. The NCCP Plan/HCP also includes guidelines for the North Ranch Policy Plan Area to ensure that any future development in this area protects the reserve and subregional biodiversity. No take of covered species would be authorized in the Existing Use Areas or North Ranch Policy Plan Area.

Of the 44 covered species addressed in the NCCP Plan/HCP, 10 are conditionally covered and will be subject to specified mitigation measures, in addition to the establishment and management of the Reserve System. Conditionally covered species include: the least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, arroyo southwestern toad, Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*), Riverside fairy shrimp, San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegoensis*), Pacific pocket mouse, golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), prairie falcon (*Falco mexicanus*), and the foothill mariposa lily (*Calochortus weedii* var. *intermedius*). In general, impacts to habitats supporting smaller populations of conditionally covered species would be mitigated by habitat enhancement or restoration within the Reserve System. Mitigation for impacts to habitats or populations that may have significant conservation value would be handled on a case-by-case basis. Specific provisions for the Pacific pocket mouse include the creation of a 22-acre temporary preserve for up to 12 years at the Headlands, and providing \$700,000 towards a programmatic research and recovery effort to be initiated by the Service and CDFG; the Headlands landowner will contribute \$350,000 to be matched by the Service. If, through this research and recovery effort, the Service determines that the Headlands site is essential for the survival and recovery of the species, the Service has committed to purchase the site.

#### Development of the Final EIR/EIS

To assure compliance with the purpose and intent of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act, the Final EIR/EIS was developed cooperatively by the Service's Carlsbad Field Office (lead Federal agency) and the Orange County Environmental Management Agency (lead State agency). On June 24, 1993, the Service published in the Federal Register a Notice of Intent to prepare the EIR/EIS (58 FR 34270). This notice also

advertised a joint public scoping meeting, held on July 7, 1993. The scoping process was initiated in accordance with NEPA to solicit comments from a variety of Federal, State, and local entities on issues/alternatives to be addressed in the EIR/EIS. A report was prepared in September 1993, summarizing the scoping process. A joint Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EIS, and Notice of Receipt of applications for incidental take permits associated with the Orange County Central/Coastal Subregion NCCP Plan/HCP, was published in the Federal Register on December 15, 1995 (60 FR 64447).

Adverse and beneficial effects, associated with the implementation of each alternative, were described in the Draft EIR/EIS. The Service received 76 letters of comment on the Draft EIR/EIS that mainly focused on the following issues: (1) Creation of a permanent habitat Reserve System; (2) Headlands/Pacific pocket mouse issues; (3) reserve design and process; (4) habitat coverage; (5) species coverage; (6) adequacy of biological linkages/connectivity; (7) Coal Canyon habitat linkage; (8) El Toro Marine Corps Air Station; (9) extension of the comment period; (10) changes requested by local jurisdictions; (11) revisions to the draft IA; (12) role of adaptive management; and (13) assurance of implementation. Copies of all comments received and responses to all comments are available for public review. The Draft EIR/EIS, Draft NCCP Plan/HCP, and Draft IA were revised, where appropriate, based on public comments. No new issues or additional significant impacts were identified as a result of public comment on the Draft EIR/EIS.

#### Alternatives Analyzed in the Final EIR/EIS

Due to the scale of the NCCP program for the Subregion, the lead agencies assessed various regional conservation strategies and reserve designs. Four alternatives were advanced for detailed analysis in the Final EIR/EIS: (1) Proposed Project Alternative (approve and implement the NCCP Plan/HCP), (2) No Project/No Action Alternative, (3) No Take Alternative, and (4) a Programmatic Alternative. Each alternative was evaluated for its potential to result in significant adverse environmental impacts, and the adequacy or inadequacy of the proposed measures to avoid, minimize, and substantially reduce and mitigate such negative effects.

The Service's preferred action is approval of the NCCP Plan/HCP, and issuance of incidental take permits with

the mitigating, minimizing, and monitoring measures outlined in the Proposed Project Alternative. (See Background section for a description of this alternative).

Under the No Project/No Action Alternative, a comprehensive regional conservation strategy would not be undertaken, and a Reserve System would not be established. Development would occur as planned by the local jurisdictions. Protection of the coastal California gnatcatcher and its CSS habitat, and other federally listed species, would occur on a project-by-project basis through the section 7 and section 10 processes of the Act, as appropriate. Other unlisted species might be protected if included in the planning process for each project.

The No Take Alternative is similar to the No Project Alternative, except that it assumes that no take of gnatcatchers or their associated habitat would be allowed within the Subregion pursuant to section 9 of the Act, and that the section 7 and 10 processes would not be used to authorize or exempt such incidental take. Development would be limited to those projects that do not result in take of the gnatcatcher or its occupied habitat. Protection of other species (not federally listed) would occur only to the extent currently required by State environmental regulations.

Similar to the Proposed Project Alternative, the Programmatic Alternative would involve a subregional conservation strategy, including the creation of a large-scale habitat reserve and the implementation of a long-term management program. However, under the programmatic approach, specific boundaries for a habitat reserve system and design of the management program would be developed over time, as specific projects requiring mitigation are undertaken that contribute mitigation fees or dedication lands to a management entity.

The underlying goal of the Proposed Project Alternative is to implement ecosystem-based conservation measures, aimed at the protection of multiple species and multiple habitats on a regional scale, while accommodating compatible development. The Central and Coastal Orange County NCCP Plan/HCP would result in the implementation of a comprehensive reserve strategy for CSS and related habitats in the Subregion, that is expected to provide long-term benefits to the coastal California gnatcatcher and 43 other covered species and their habitats. The Service intends to approve the Orange County Central/Coastal NCCP Plan/HCP and issue section 10

incidental take permits to the applicants.

Dated: May 23, 1996.

Thomas J. Dwyer,

*Regional Director, Region 1, Portland, OR.*

[FR Doc. 96-13538 Filed 5-30-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## Bureau of Land Management

[ID-933-1430-01; IDI-31741]

### Notice of Public Meetings for Proposed Land Withdrawal; Idaho

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

**ACTION:** Notice of public meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of the Air Force proposes to withdraw 11,583.34 acres under Alternative Site No. 1 or 9,673.34 acres under Alternative Site No. 2 of public land from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, mining laws and mineral leasing laws, for the Mountain Home Air Force Base Enhanced Training in Idaho (ETI) site. Several public meetings will be held to gather comments on the proposal, at the dates, times, places and addresses described in this Notice.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** Date of publication.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Howard Hedrick, BLM Idaho State Office, 3380 Americana Terrace, Boise, Idaho 83706-2500, 208-384-3197.

The Department of the Air Force proposes that 11,583.34 acres under Alternative Site No. 1 or 9,673.34 acres under Alternative Site No. 2 of public land be withdrawn for a period of 20 years to provide protection of the ETI. The lands are described as follows:

Boise Meridian

(Alternative Site No. 1)—Proposal: Clover Butte Drop Zone

T. 12 S., R. 8 E.,

Sec. 10, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 11, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 12, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 13;

Sec. 14;

Sec. 15, E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 22, E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 23 to 26 inclusive;

Sec. 27, E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 34, E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 35.

T. 12 S., R. 9 E.,

Sec. 7, lot 4, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$  and S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 8, S $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ ;

Sec. 17 to 20 inclusive;

Sec. 29 to 32 inclusive.

(No Drop Zone)

T. 11 S., R. 4 E.,

Sec. 23, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .

T. 9 S., R. 6 E.,