

e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(a) of the Act and the regulations for implementing NEPA, as amended (40 CFR 1506.6). We will evaluate the application, associated documents, and comments submitted thereon to determine whether the application meets the requirements of NEPA regulations and section 10(a) of the Act. If we determine that those requirements are met, we will issue a permit to the Applicant for the incidental take of the DSF. We will make our final permit decision no sooner than 60 days from the date of this notice.

Dated: July 25, 2007.

Ken McDermond,

Deputy Manager, California/Nevada Operations Office, Sacramento, California.
[FR Doc. E7-14859 Filed 7-31-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Fisher Family Residence Construction Project, Mendocino County, CA

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability of Environmental Assessment (EA); Receipt of an Application for Incidental Take Permit.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce that Denise and Andy Fisher (applicant) have applied for an incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended. We are considering issuing an 80-year permit to the application that would authorize take of the federally endangered Point Arena mountain beaver (*Aplodontia rufa nigra*; "PAMB") and the federally endangered Behren's silverspot butterfly (*Speyeria zerene behrensii*; "BSSB"). The proposed permit would authorize the take of 28 PAMB and 2 BSSB incidental to otherwise lawful activities. The applicant needs the permit because take of PAMB and BSSB would occur as a result of construction and occupation of

a single family residence, and installation of related improvements such as fencing and landscaping, on a 24.25 acre parcel near Point Arena, Mendocino County, California. The permit application includes a proposed Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) that describes the proposed action and the measures that the Applicant will undertake to minimize and mitigate take of PAMB and BSSB.

DATES: We must receive any written comments on or before October 1, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Ms. Amedee Brickey, ES Program Manager, Fish and Wildlife Service, 1655 Heindon Road, Arcata, California 95521. You also may send comments by facsimile to (707) 822-8411.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Amedee Brickey, (see **ADDRESSES**), (707) 822-7201.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Availability of Documents

You may obtain copies of these documents for review by contacting the above office. Documents also will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the above address.

Background

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulations prohibit the "take" of fish and wildlife species listed as endangered or threatened. Take of federally listed fish and wildlife is defined under the Act to include "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct." We may, under limited circumstances, issue permits to authorize incidental take (i.e., take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity). Regulations governing incidental take permits for threatened and endangered species are found in 50 CFR 17.32 and 17.22.

The Applicant proposes to construct and permanently occupy a 1,493 square foot single-family residence on a 24.25 acre parcel in Mendocino County, California. In addition to the construction of the residence, the applicant proposes to construct a driveway and a fenced livestock pasture, install power, water and septic utilities, and plant vegetation.

Construction and occupation of the single-family residence would directly impact the PAMB by removing 0.39 acres of occupied PAMB habitat, and 10.25 acres of potential BSSB habitat on the 24.25-acre parcel. The proposed

development would result in the take of 28 PAMB and two BSSB.

To mitigate and offset the take of PAMB and BSSB, the applicant proposes to implement seasonal disturbance restrictions, and to dedicate two on-site conservation areas totaling 9.75 acres to be managed and preserved in perpetuity.

Our Environmental Assessment considers the environmental consequences of three alternatives, including: (1) The Proposed Project Alternative that would result in the development of the proposed project, the issuance of an ITP and the implementation of the measures in the HCP, including conservation areas; (2) an Alternative Project Layout Alternative that would result in the development of fewer acres, would not take any listed species, and would not include conservation areas; and (3) the No Action Alternative that would result in no development of the proposed project, would not take any listed species and would not include conservation areas.

National Environmental Policy Act

Proposed permit issuance triggers the need for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Accordingly, a draft NEPA document has been prepared. We are the Lead Agency responsible for compliance under NEPA. As the NEPA lead agency, we provide notice of the availability and are making available for public review the EA.

Public Review

We invite the public to review the HCP and EA during a 60-day public comment period (see **DATES**). Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

We provide this notice pursuant to section 10(a) of the Act and the regulations for implementing NEPA, as amended (40 CFR 1506.6). We will evaluate the application, associated documents, and comments submitted thereon to determine whether the application meets the requirements of NEPA regulations and section 10(a) of the Act. If we determine that those requirements are met, we will issue a permit to the Applicant for the

incidental take of PAMB and BSSB. We will make our final permit decision no sooner than 60 days from the date of this notice.

Dated: July 25, 2007.

Ken McDermond,

Deputy Manager, California/Nevada Operations Office, Sacramento, California.
[FR Doc. E7-14888 Filed 7-31-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

60-Day Notice of Intention To Request Clearance of Collection of Information; Opportunity for Public Comment

AGENCY: Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*) and 5 CFR part 1320, the National Park Service (NPS) invites public comments on a revision of a currently approved information collection (OMB #1024-0038).

DATES: Public comments on the proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) will be accepted on or before October 1, 2007.

ADDRESSES: *Send Comments To:* John W. Renaud, Project Coordinator, Historic Preservation Grants, Heritage Assistance Programs, NPS, 1849 C St., NW., (2256), Washington, DC 20240; via fax at 202/371-1961, or via e-mail at John_Renaud@nps.gov. Also, please send a copy of your comments to Leonard Stowe, Information Collection Clearance Officer, NPS, 1849 C St., NW., (2605), Washington, DC 20240, or by e-mail at Leonard_Stowe@nps.gov. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John W. Renaud, Project Coordinator, Historic Preservation Grants, Heritage Assistance Programs, NPS, 1849 C St., NW., (2256), Washington, DC 20240; or via fax at 202/371-1961, or via e-mail at John_Renaud@nps.gov, or via telephone at 202/354-2066. You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free-of-charge.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Procedures for State, Tribal, and Local Government Historic Preservation Programs; 36 CFR 61.

Bureau Form Number(s): None.

OBM Number: 1024-0038.

Expiration Date: November 30, 2007.

Type of Request: Revision of a currently approved collection of information.

Description of Need: This set of information collections has an impact on State, tribal, and local governments that wish to participate formally in the National Historic Preservation Partnership (NHPP) Program, and State and tribal governments that wish to apply for Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grants. The NPS uses the information collection to ensure compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*), as well as the government-wide grant requirements that OMB has issued and the Department of the Interior implements through 43 CFR part 12. This information collection also produces performance data that NPS uses to assess its progress in meeting goals set in Departmental and NPS strategic plans created pursuant to the 1993 Government Performance and Results Act, as amended. This request for OMB approval includes local government burden for information collections associated with various aspects of the Certified Local Government (CLG) program; State government burden for information collections related to the CLG program, the program-specific aspects of the Historic Preservation Fund grants to States, maintenance of a State inventory of historic and prehistoric properties, tracking State Historic Preservation Office historic preservation consultation with Federal agencies, reporting on other State historic preservation accomplishments, and the State role in the State Program Review Process; and tribal government burden for information collections related to the program-specific aspects of HPF grants to Tribal Historic Preservation Officers/Offices (THPOs).

This request includes information collections related to HPF grants to States and THPOs. NPS is seeking a revision to reflect the increased number of partners participating in the NHPP, and consequently, in the previously approved information collections. In addition, a revision is needed because some information collections had not been recognized as such during preparation for earlier OMB approvals. Section 101(b) of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, (16 U.S.C. 470a(b)), specifies the role of States in the NHPP Program. Section 101(c), and section 301 of the Act (16 U.S.C. section 103(c), 470a(c), 16 U.S.C. 470c(c), and 16 U.S.C. 470w), specify the role of local governments in the

NHPP program. Section 101(d) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(d)) specifies the role of tribes in the NHPP Program. Section 108 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 470h) created the HPF to support activities that carry out the purposes of the Act. Section 101(e)(1) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(e)) directs the Secretary of the Interior through the NPS to “administer a program of matching grants to the States for the purposes of carrying out” the Act. Similarly, sections 101(d) and 101(e) of the Act direct a program of grants to THPOs for carrying out their responsibilities under the Act. Each year Congress directs the NPS to use part of the annual appropriation from the HPF for the State grant program and the tribal grant program. The purpose of both the HPF State grants program and the HPF THPO grants program is to assist States and tribes in carrying out their statutory role in the national historic preservation program. HPF grants to States and THPOs are program grants; i.e., each State/THPO selects its own HPF-eligible activities and projects. Each HPF grant to a State/THPO has two years of fund availability. At the end of the first year, NPS employs a “Use or Lose” policy to ensure efficient and effective use of the grant funds. All 59 States, territories, and the District of Columbia participate in the NHPP Program. Almost 1,600 local governments have become Certified Local Governments (CLGs) in order to participate in the NHPP program. Approximately 54 local governments become CLGs each year. Fifty-seven Federally-recognized tribes have joined formally the NHPP and have established THPOs and tribal historic preservation offices. Typically, each year five to seven tribes join the partnership. NPS developed the information collections associated with 36 CFR Part 61 in consultation with State, Tribal, and local government partners. The obligation to respond is required to provide information to evaluate whether or not State governments meet minimum standards and requirements for participation in the National Historic Preservation Program; and to meet government-wide requirements for Federal grant programs.

Comments are invited on: (1) The practical utility of the information being gathered; (2) the accuracy of the burden hour estimate; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden to respondents, including use of automated information collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Before including your