[AZ–930–1430–01, AR–035844]

**Application Cancellation, Mohave and Yuma Counties, Arizona**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** By decision dated July 20, 1994, the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers' application number AR–035844 to withdraw an additional 3,486.62 acres of public land for the Alamo Lake Flood Control Project was denied. The decision was based on the finding that there was not sufficient need or justification to withdraw additional lands for project purposes and that any future needs could be otherwise authorized.

Additionally, under Title I of Pub. L. 101–628, (Arizona Desert Wilderness Act), approximately 1,120.00 acres of the Arrastra Mountain and Rawhide Mountains Wilderness Areas overlapped the applied for land. Designation of the Arrastra Mountain and Rawhide Mountains Wilderness Areas satisfied the withdrawal need on the subject land and therefore negated the need for an additional withdrawal. The segregative effect resulting with the filing of withdrawal application AR–035844 terminated by statute on October 20, 1991. Based upon the State Director's recommendation and decision and upon publication in the Federal Register, application AR–035844 is cancelled and closed on the Bureau of Land Management records.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Mezes, BLM Arizona State Office, P.O. Box 16563, Phoenix, Arizona 85011, (602) 650–0518.


Herman L. Kast,
Deputy State Director, Resource Planning, Use & Protection Division.

[Dated: April 19, 1995.]

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

**Notice of Availability, Final Apex Houston Oil Spill Restoration Plan**

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) herein releases the final Apex Houston Oil Spill Restoration Plan (Final Plan). The Final Plan describes the techniques, schedule, and budget for a project to restore natural resources injured as a result of an oil spill that killed approximately 9,000 seabirds along the coast of central California in 1986. The Final Plan also includes responses to comments about the Draft Plan (Federal Register/Vol. 59/No. 213/55282) that were received during a 45-day public comment period that ended on December 19, 1994. Money to carry out this project was obtained via a Consent Decree that ended litigation on the case in August 1994. The Service will begin implementation of the Final Plan in 1995 and will conclude the project in approximately 2004. A Natural Resources Trustee Council containing representatives of the Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the California Department of Fish and Game will oversee the project.

**DATES:** Written comments on the Final Plan must be submitted on or before June 26, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments or materials regarding the Final Plan should be sent to the following address. Comments or requests for copies of the Final Plan can also be sent via FAX to (916) 979–2128. Daniel Welsh, Chief, Branch of Natural Resource Damage Assessment, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E–1803, Sacramento, CA 95825, (916) 979–2110.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for further information or additional copies of the Final Plan may be made to: Daniel Welsh, Chief, Branch of Natural Resource Damage Assessment, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E–1803, Sacramento, CA 95825, (916) 979–2110.

**Restoration of Nearshore Breeding Seabird Colonies on the Central California Coast: Final Plan**

1. Executive Summary

Between January 28 and February 4, 1986, the transportation barge APEX Houston discharged an undetermined amount of San Joaquin Valley crude oil while in transit from San Francisco Bay to the Long Beach Harbor. The oil spill caused damage to State of California and Federal resources from San Francisco to the Big Sur coast. Approximately 9,000 seabirds were killed, including 6,000 common murre (Uria aalge), in addition to other aquatic life in and around the coastal waters of central California. Both the State and Federal governments responded to the spill and began assessing damages as a result of the spill. The State and Federal natural resource trustees commenced litigation in this matter against potentially...