

majority of commenters supported a 5 percent cap, and many of these commenters recommended that partial funding of proposals based on their merit be allowable.

*Response:* For fiscal year 2006, the funding cap will remain at 5 percent, and we will consider partial funding of proposals based on merit on an as-needed basis. In the future, if the total amount of LIP funds continues to decline and the quality of many proposals remains high, we may consider lowering the cap to 3 percent.

*Comment 17:* For the Landowner Incentive Program to succeed, the level of the national funding must increase. Some commenters felt that the program should remain competitive, while others stated that it should not be competitive.

*Response:* The Service is not responsible for determining the annual appropriation for the program, nor can it decide whether it is competitive or not. Any change from a competitive to a non-competitive program needs congressional authorization.

*Other Comments*

*Comment 18:* The guidelines and ranking criteria guidance for the Landowner Incentive Program should remain as flexible as possible to maximize the ability of the States to succeed in conserving at-risk species on private lands.

*Response:* We have attempted to maintain flexibility in the ranking criteria guidance, while also establishing clear criteria that will allow us to distinguish between the merits of proposals. Clear ranking criteria are essential given the requirement that the program be competitive and given the high demand for this limited funding source.

*Comment 19:* The combined points allocated to criterion 3 (Objectives) and criterion 4 (Expected Results and Benefits) should be greater or equal to the points allocated to criterion 5 (Approach). The outcomes for at-risk species are equally if not more important than the approach to achieving these outcomes.

*Response:* We believe that the weight given to criteria related to Approach is reasonable given that we evaluate Landowner Incentive Programs overall, not specific projects. Clearly, the approach taken in implementing these programs will greatly affect whether they are ultimately successful.

*Comment 20:* States have been delayed in spending previous Tier 2 awards, due to lengthy reviews associated with Federal compliance requirements including Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act. States undergoing these lengthy compliance reviews should not be penalized in the ranking criteria for slow spending of previously awarded funds.

*Response:* We are aware of the problems associated with compliance review for Landowner Incentive Program grants. The Division of Federal Assistance is working to fix these problems and quicken the review procedures.

*Comment 21:* The length of time between proposal submittal and award announcement should be reduced to allow States more quickly to implement their programs.

*Response:* We will try to reduce these delays in the announcement of LIP awards in the future.

**Pamela A. Matthes,**  
Acting Assistant Director.  
[FR Doc. E6-2431 Filed 2-21-06; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

**Migratory Bird Permits; Allowed Take of Nestling American Peregrine Falcons**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We (the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) have updated information on nesting of American peregrine falcons (*Falco peregrinus anatum*) in the western United States and have determined the allowed take of nestlings in 12 western States in 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Millsap, Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 703-358-1714, or Dr. George T. Allen, Wildlife Biologist, 703-358-1825.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 2004, we completed a Final Revised Environmental Assessment (FEA) considering the take of nestling American peregrine falcons in 12 States in the western United States. Since completion of the FEA, we have consulted with the States in which take of nestlings is allowed, and have considered recent information on the numbers of nesting American peregrine falcon populations and production of young American peregrine falcons in those states, as outlined in the "Management of Falconry Take" section of the FEA. Having considered the most recent data available to us, we have updated the population information from the FEA. For states with no new statewide survey data, we assumed no population growth since the last survey.

The allowed take in 2004 was approximately 4.8 percent of the total estimated production of young; actual harvest, however, was approximately 0.5 percent of the estimated production. The allowed take in 2005 was 4.1 percent of the estimated production of young, but the actual harvest was only 0.6 percent of the estimated production. The allowed take of nestling American peregrine falcons in the western U.S. in 2006 is shown in the last column of the data summary. Because the number of nestlings allowed to be taken in each state is rounded down to the next lowest whole number, the allowed take will be approximately 4.4 percent of the total estimated production of young for 2006.

State	Nesting pairs reported in the FEA	Minimum 2005 nesting pairs	Recent productivity (young per nesting pair)	2005 allowed take	2005 actual take	2006 allowed take
Alaska .....	930	930	0.95	44	1	44
Arizona .....	167	167	1.02	8	2	8
California .....	167	167	1.52	11	0	11
Colorado .....	87	87	1.71	7	0	7
Idaho .....	24	26	1.47	1	0	1
Montana .....	41	54	1.89	4	0	4
Nevada .....	9	24	( <sup>1</sup> )	0	0	0
New Mexico .....	37	37	1.47	2	0	2
Oregon .....	70	76	1.70	6	0	6
Utah .....	164	164	1.55	12	5	12

State	Nesting pairs reported in the FEA	Minimum 2005 nesting pairs	Recent productivity (young per nesting pair)	2005 allowed take	2005 actual take	2006 allowed take
Washington .....	46	*104	1.47	3	3	*8
Wyoming .....	58	65	1.79	5	3	5
Total .....	1,800	1,826	NA	103	14	108

\* Based on calculations of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, as allowed under the FEA.

<sup>1</sup> Insufficient Data.

The states may regulate details of take, consistent with the federal falconry regulations found at 50 CFR 21.28 and 21.29. For example, the state may decide whether to allow take of nestlings, numbers of individuals of each sex that may be taken, timing and location of take of nestlings, restrictions on aerie access, and allocation of take among interested falconers.

Dated: February 1, 2006.

**Matt Hogan,**

*Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.*

[FR Doc. E6-2428 Filed 2-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[CA-190-05-1610-DT]

#### Notice of Availability of Record of Decision for the Clear Creek Management Area Resource Management Plan Amendment and Route Designations

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of record of decision.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) management policies, the BLM announces the availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Clear Creek Management Area (CCMA) Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) and Route Designations. CCMA is located in San Benito and western Fresno counties in California. In accordance with BLM regulations, 43 Code of Federal Regulation 1610.5-2(b), all protests to the Director on planning decisions were resolved prior to approving the ROD. The decision of the Director is the final decision for land use planning decisions of the Department of the Interior. The ROD was signed on January 13, 2006 and was effective immediately.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the ROD are available upon request from the Hollister Field Office, Bureau of Land Management, 20 Hamilton Court Hollister, CA 95023 or e-mail, [George\\_Hill@ca.blm.gov](mailto:George_Hill@ca.blm.gov). An electronic copy of the ROD is also available on-line at <http://www.ca.blm.gov/hollister>.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

George Hill, Hollister Field Office Manager, Address: 20 Hamilton Court, Hollister, CA 95023, Telephone: (831) 630-5000 E-mail address: [George\\_Hill@ca.blm.gov](mailto:George_Hill@ca.blm.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The CCMA ROD/Approved RMPA was developed with broad public participation through a three year collaborative planning process. The CCMA ROD and RMPA address BLM management on approximately 63,000 acres of public land in the planning area. The CCMA ROD/Approved RMPA is designed to achieve or maintain desired future conditions developed through the planning process. It includes a series of management actions to meet the desired resource conditions for recreation resources, watershed resources, and special status species. The CCMA ROD/Approved RMPA is essentially the same as the proposed action in the CCMA Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS), published in September 2005. BLM received eleven protests to the PRMP/FEIS. No inconsistencies with State or local plans, policies, or programs were identified during the Governor's consistency review of the PRMP/FEIS. As a result, only minor modifications were made in preparing the CCMA ROD and Approved RMPA. These modifications corrected errors that were noted during review of the PRMP/FEIS and provide further clarification for some of the decisions. The CCMA ROD includes a section titled "Changes to the Proposed RMP Amendment" that identifies the location of the corrections in the Clear Creek Management Area Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment.

Dated: December 30, 2005.

**J. Anthony Danna,**

*Deputy State Director, Resources.*

[FR Doc. E6-2425 Filed 2-21-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[ID-300-1020-PH]

#### Notice of Public Meeting, Idaho Falls District Resource Advisory Council Meeting

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

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (FACA), the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Idaho Falls District Resource Advisory Council (RAC), will meet as indicated below.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held March 14-15, 2006 at the BLM Idaho Falls District Office, 1405 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401. The meeting will start at 1 p.m. on March 14, with the public comment period as the first agenda item. The second day will conclude at or before 3 p.m.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The 15-member Council advises the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with public land management in the BLM Idaho Falls District (IFD), which covers eastern Idaho. At this meeting, the Advisory Council will receive updates on Idaho's proposed Sage Grouse Conservation Strategy, and will review the plan if available. The RAC will also review information from the BLM Idaho State Office on OHV initiatives, information on the Smoky Canyon Mine Draft EIS process, the Pocatello Resource Management Plan, Noxious Weed Management in the Idaho Falls District, and other agenda items and current issue as appropriate.