

Assistance Grants; 97.039, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.)

**R. David Paulison,**

*Under Secretary for Federal Emergency Management and Director of FEMA.*

[FR Doc. E7-6074 Filed 3-30-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-10-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

### Federal Emergency Management Agency

[FEMA-1684-DR]

#### Pennsylvania; Amendment No. 1 to Notice of a Major Disaster Declaration

**AGENCY:** Federal Emergency Management Agency, DHS.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice amends the notice of a major disaster declaration for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (FEMA-1684-DR), dated February 23, 2007, and related determinations.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 26, 2007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Magda Ruiz, Recovery Division, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Washington, DC 20472, (202) 646-2705.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The notice of a major disaster declaration for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is hereby amended to include the following area among those areas determined to have been adversely affected by the catastrophe declared a major disaster by the President in his declaration of February 23, 2007: Schuylkill County for Public Assistance.

(The following Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Numbers (CFDA) are to be used for reporting and drawing funds: 97.030, Community Disaster Loans; 97.031, Cora Brown Fund Program; 97.032, Crisis Counseling; 97.033, Disaster Legal Services Program; 97.034, Disaster Unemployment Assistance (DUA); 97.046, Fire Management Assistance; 97.048, Individuals and Households Housing; 97.049, Individuals and Households Disaster Housing Operations; 97.050 Individuals and Households Program—Other Needs, 97.036, Public Assistance Grants; 97.039, Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.)

**R. David Paulison,**

*Under Secretary for Federal Emergency Management and Director of FEMA.*

[FR Doc. E7-6094 Filed 3-30-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-10-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Notice of Availability of Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment for the 39 North Dakota Limited-Interest National Wildlife Refuges

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces that a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for the 39 North Dakota Limited-interest National Wildlife Refuges is available. This CCP, prepared pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, describes how the Service intends to manage these 39 Refuges for the next 15 years.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of the CCP may be obtained by writing to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuge Planning, 134 Union Boulevard, Suite 300, Lakewood, CO 80228; or downloaded from <http://mountain-prairie.fws.gov/planning>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Laura King, Planning Team Leader, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, telephone 701-724-3097; fax 701-724-3683; or e-mail: [laura\\_king@fws.gov](mailto:laura_king@fws.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The 39 North Dakota Limited-interest National Wildlife Refuges are Appert Lake, Ardoch, Bone Hill, Brumba, Buffalo Lake, Camp Lake, Canfield Lake, Cottonwood Lake, Dakota Lake, Half-way Lake, Hiddenwood, Hobart, Hutchinson Lake, Johnson Lake, Lake George, Lake Otis, Lake Patricia, Lambs Lake, Little Goose, Lords Lake, Lost Lake, Maple River, Pleasant Lake, Pretty Rock, Rabb Lake, Rock Lake, Rose Lake, School Section Lake, Sheyenne Lake, Sibley Lake, Silver Lake, Snyder Lake, Springwater, Stoney Slough, Sunburst Lake, Tomahawk, Willow Lake, Wintering River, and Wood Lake National Wildlife Refuges. Each of these refuges started out in the 1930s as flowage and/or refuge easement lands. This was the era of droughts, depression, and declining waterfowl populations. This flowage and/or refuge easement program (program) was initiated by the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration to address these crises on private lands. Through these easements, the Service acquired the right to control hunting and trapping on the entire easement area, and impound, maintain, and control water levels, and

control the uses that occur on that water or other main water bodies (such as rivers and lakes). The landowners of these easement lands retain all other rights including the right to farm, graze, build structures, etc.

An additional status (beyond the existing flowage and/or refuge easements) was added in the late 1930s. Adjoining easement lands were combined and an approved acquisition boundary was designated resulting in 31 new National Wildlife Refuges. These Refuges were established through separate Executive Orders signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt for the purpose of “\* \* \* refuge[s] and breeding ground[s] for migratory birds and other wildlife \* \* \*.” Seven additional Refuges were established in 1948 in the same manner but under the authority of the precursor to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Lake Otis, the remaining refuge, was established in the early 1970s as “\* \* \* an inviolate sanctuary for migratory birds.” Combined, these Refuges encompass 47,296 acres, ranging in size from 160 acres (Half-way Lake) to 5,506 acres (Rock Lake). Although these are National Wildlife Refuges in name, the language in the establishing authorities does not apply unless the lands are acquired by the Service. After 70 years, 99 percent of the lands within the approved acquisition boundaries remain in private ownership; therefore, the original 1930s easement language remains the purpose for the majority of these refuges. Due to this fact, the Service has “limited-interest” in these refuges due to the restrictive management capabilities (as stated above) afforded by the easement.

The Draft CCP and Environmental Assessment (EA) was made available to the public for a 60-day review and comment period following the announcement in the **Federal Register** on October 5, 2005 (70 FR 58232). The Draft CCP/EA identified and evaluated two alternatives for managing these 39 Refuges for the next 15 years. Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would have continued current management, which for the most part, has been minimal. Only minor improvements, such as repairs to water control structures on the impoundments, would continue under this alternative. No funding would be provided for this program, as in the past, and partnerships would be incidental to common interests and not actively pursued. Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative (Enhance the Program), first proposes that six Refuges, which have no potential to ever fully function as National Wildlife