boundary, east boundary, subdivisional lines, and 1873 meander lines of Summit Lake, and the subdivision of section 35, and the survey of the 1988–1991 meander lines and an informative traverse of the 1988–1991 bank of a portion of Summit Lake, T. 42 N., R. 25 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, Group No. 655, Nevada, was accepted March 16, 1995.

The plat, in three sheets, representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the south boundary, subdivisional lines, 1873 meander lines of Summit Lake, and the Camp McGarry Military Reservation Line, and the subdivision of certain sections, and the survey of the 1988–1991 meander lines of a portion of Summit Lake, T. 42 N., R. 26 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, Group No. 655, Nevada, was accepted March 16, 1995.

The plat representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the west boundary of T. 41 N., R. 26 E.; and the survey of a portion of the south boundary of T. 41½ N. R. 25 E.; and the survey of a portion of the subdivisional lines of T. 41 N., R. 25 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, Group No. 655, Nevada, was accepted March 16, 1995.

The plat representing the survey of a portion of the subdivisional lines of T. 41½ N., R. 25 E., Mount Diablo Meridian, Group No. 655, Nevada, was accepted March 16, 1995.

These surveys were executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management.

3. Subject to valid existing rights the provisions of existing withdrawals and classifications, the requirements of applicable laws, and other segregations of record, those portions of the lands listed under item 2 that are original survey are open to application, petition, and disposal, including application under the mineral leasing laws. All such valid applications received on or prior to May 17, 1995, shall be considered as simultaneously filed at that time. Those received thereafter shall be considered in order of filing.

4. The above-listed surveys are now the basic record for describing the lands for all authorized purposes. These surveys will be placed in the open files in the BLM Nevada State Office and will be available to the public as a matter of information. Copies of the surveys and related field notes may be furnished to the public upon payment of the appropriate fees.

Dated: March 31, 1995.

Robert H. Thompson,

Acting Chief Cadastral Surveyor, Nevada.

[FR Doc. 95–9320 Filed 4–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–HC–P

Bureau of Reclamation

Environmental Impact Statement on the City of San Jose's South Bay Water Recycling Program, San Jose, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) proposes to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the City of San Jose's (City) proposed construction of facilities to support the South Bay Water Recycling Program (SBWRP). The EIS will be based on a 1992 environmental impact report (EIR) prepared by the City. The SBWRP would divert treated freshwater effluent from South San Francisco Bay through a water reclamation program. This project would include construction of pump stations and recycled distribution pipelines.

DATES: Written comments on the scope of alternatives and impacts to be considered should be sent to Reclamation by May 17, 1995. Reclamation estimates that the EIS will be available for public review in late spring of 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the project scope should be sent to Mona Jefferies-Soniea, Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, Division of Resources Management Planning, 2800 Cottage Way, MP–720, Sacramento, California 95825.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Jefferies-Soniea at the above address; telephone (916) 979–2297.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The SBWRP, formerly known as the San Jose Nonpotable Reclamation Project, was developed in response to an order from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board in order to re-establish salinity levels of the salt water marsh in the southern tip of San Francisco Bay. In addition to protecting the South Bay habitat, the program also develops nonpotable water supply for the Santa Clara Valley, which can be used in place of potable water for appropriate purposes. Funding will come from loans from the State Water Resources Control Board and EPA, a grant from Reclamation, and local funding.

The SBWRP would be implemented in two phases: Phase I would consist of installing facilities to supply up to 9,000 acre-feet/year of nonpotable water for landscape irrigation, agriculture and industrial uses. Phase II would consist of installing facilities to supply an additional up to 27,000 acre-feet/year for either nonpotable or potable use.

The City completed a final EIR for the SBWRP in November 1992. At that time, Reclamation had not been involved and therefore no compliance with NEPA was needed. Because federal funding is now being used to support the SBWRP, compliance with NEPA is required at this time. The EIS will be based on this final EIR. The EIR analyzed Phase I in detail and analyzed Phase II programmatically. Supplemental local and Federal environmental compliance will be done later this year to analyze Phase II in detail.

An EIS scoping meeting is not planned because of scoping already done by the City. The City sent out a notice of preparation of their EIR to the public in 1992 and held a public scoping meeting on February 19, 1992.

The proposed action (Phase I) is to construct pump stations, storage tanks, 48.5 miles of 6- to 54-inch diameter pipeline and appurtenant facilities in the cities of San Jose, Santa Clara, and Milpitas. There would also be minor modifications of the existing San Jose/Santa Clara Water Pollution Control Plant to provide additional chlorination.

Alternatives to the proposed action include:

- Pipeline Alignment Alternative, to avoid construction of pipelines near residences.
- Flow Allocation Alternative, which would allocate most of the reclaimed water for potable uses. The water would be used for groundwater recharge, mainly using percolation basins.
- Habitat Enhancement Alternative, to also supply water to riparian restoration areas along creeks and rivers in the study area, as well as for potable and other nonpotable purposes.
- No Action.

Dated: April 7, 1995.

Roger K. Patterson,

Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 95–9340 Filed 4–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–94–P

Fish and Wildlife Service

Endangered and Threatened Species Permit Application

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of application, document availability, and public comment period.

The following applicant has applied for permits to conduct certain activities with endangered species. This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531, *et seq.):*

Applicant: Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services, Region 3, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota.

Permit No. PRT–697830

The applicant requests an amendment to their current permit to take the following species for scientific purposes and the enhancement of propagation or survival in accordance with recovery outlines, recovery plans, listing, or other Service work for those species.

1. Clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*)
2. Cracking pearly mussel (*Hemistena (=Lastena) lata*)
3. Ring pink (*=golf stick pearly*) mussel (*Obovaria retusa*)
4. Purple cat's paw pearly mussel (*Epioblasma (=Dysnomia) obliquata obliquata (=E. sulcata sulcata*))
5. Northern riffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*)
6. Hungerford's crawling water beetle (*Brychius hungerfordi*)
7. Hine's emerald dragonfly (*Somatochlora hineana*)

Documents and other information submitted with these applications are available to the public during normal business hours (7:30 a.m.—4 p.m.) in Room 650, Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Endangered Species, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111–4056.

Interested persons may comment on any of these applications within 30 days of the date of this publication by submitting written views, arguments, or data to the Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111–4056. Please refer to PRT–697830 when submitting comments.

Dated: April 10, 1995.

William F. Hartwig,

Regional Director, Region 3, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota.

[FR Doc. 95–9339 Filed 4–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

Record of Decision for a Final Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (SPEIS) on the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration and Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Programs

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has selected the No Change Alternative for its operation of the Sport Fish Restoration and Wildlife Restoration Programs into the next century. This decision was based on the Service analysis of the program contained in a SPEIS to augment the Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) published in 1978 and comments received from the public regarding that SPEIS.

ADDRESSES: Columbus H. Brown, Chief, Division of Federal Aid, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arlington Square Building, Room 140, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Columbus H. Brown, Chief, Division of Federal Aid, Telephone (703) 358–2156.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Federal Aid in Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program was initiated with the passage of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 *et seq.*) in 1937. This Act has been commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act in honor of the sponsors of the Act. The purpose of the Act was to provide a stable and secure source of funding to the States for the management, conservation, and enhancement of wildlife species. The Act was passed in response to dramatic declines in the populations of a number of game species and was originally intended as a mechanism to restore those populations to healthy levels. Funding for the Wildlife Restoration Program is derived from Federal excise taxes on sporting arms, ammunition, and certain archery equipment.

The Wildlife Restoration Act authorizes the Service to deduct a maximum of 8 percent of the funds for administration of the Act and for carrying out the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. After making administrative deductions, the remaining funds are apportioned to the States based on the geographic area, number of hunting license holders, and State population. Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands, receive a fixed percentage of the funds apportioned. Funds apportioned under the Wildlife Restoration Program for fiscal year 1994 came to a total of $182,081,117.

While the Wildlife Restoration Act was specifically directed toward developing funds for wildlife management, it served as the pattern for a similar funding mechanism directed at fisheries management. In 1950, the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777 *et seq.*), commonly called the Dingell-Johnson Act was passed. The legislation was further augmented by the Wallop-Breaux amendment of 1984, providing additional funds. The Sport Fish Restoration Program provides stable funding for restoration, conservation, management and enhancement of sport fish, and the provision of benefits from these resources to the public; improved boating access; and aquatic resource education. Funds provided by this Act are derived from Federal excise taxes on fishing tackle and related equipment, federal taxes on gasoline used in motorboats, duties on imported boats, and fishing tackle, and interest earned on investment of these funds.

Sport Fish Restoration Program funds are apportioned based on the number of fishing license holders and the geographic area of each State. Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District of Columbia receive a fixed percentage of the funds apportioned. The Service may deduct up to 6 percent for administration of the Act. State funds apportioned under the Sport Fish Restoration program for fiscal year 1994 came to a total of $174,628,718.

The mentioned Act form the basis of the Federal Aid in Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program, or the Federal Aid Program (Program). The Program is administered by the Service's Division of Federal Aid (Division). The Division's mission is to strengthen the ability of State and Territorial fish and wildlife agencies to restore and manage fish and wildlife resources to meet effectively the consumptive and nonconsumptive needs of the public for fish and wildlife resources.

Alternatives Considered

Five alternatives, listed below, were considered in the SPEIS. Each alternative was developed by Service, State, and public inputs and focuses on the needs and direction of the Federal Aid Program into the next century. Under each of these alternatives, the basic core of Program activities would continue as it is at present with gradual changes in emphasis in response to public interest and need.

Alternative 1—No Change to the Existing Program Direction. Continue current administration and activities.

Alternative 2—Emphasis on National and Regional Priorities. Encourage States to consider funding projects contributing to national or regional