long-term management of *G. Caespitosa*. (2) Inventory potential habitat for additional occurrences of the species. (3) Identify and establish management guidelines which will ensure overall long term survivability of the species.

Public Comments Solicited

The Fish and Wildlife Service will use information received during the public comment period in its determination as to whether it should be a signatory party to the agreements.

Comments or suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, industry, or any other interested party concerning the draft documents are hereby solicited. All comments and materials received will be considered prior to the approval of any final document.

Author: The primary author of this notice is John L. England (see **ADDRESSES** section) (telephone 801/524-5001).

Authority: The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*)

Dated: August 15, 1997.

Elliott N. Sutta,

Acting Regional Director, Denver, Colorado.

[FR. 97–22312 Filed 8–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Receipt of Petition for Federal Acknowledgment of Existence as an Indian Tribe

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

This is published in the exercise of authority delegated by the Secretary of the Interior to the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs by 209 DM 8.

Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.9(a) notice is hereby given that the Chilkoot Kaagwaantaan Clan, P.O. Box 275, Haines, Alaska 99827 has filed a petition for acknowledgment by the Secretary of the Interior that the group exists as an Indian tribe. The petition was received by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) on April 22, 1997, and was signed by members of the group's governing body.

This is a notice of receipt of petition and does not constitute notice that the petition is under active consideration. Notice of active consideration will be sent by mail to the petitioner and interested parties at the appropriate time.

Under Section 83.9(a) of the Federal regulations, parties may submit factual and/or legal arguments in support of or in opposition to the group's petition. Any information submitted will be made available on the same basis as other information in the BIA's files. Third parties are required to submit copies of their comments directly to the petitioner. The petitioner will be provided an opportunity to respond to such submissions prior to a final determination regarding the petitioner's status.

The petition may be examined, by appointment, in the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, Room 3427–MIB, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240, Phone: (202) 208–3592.

Dated: July 31, 1997.

Hilda Manuel,

Deputy Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–22297 Filed 8–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Proposed Finding Against Federal Acknowledgment of the Chinook Indian Tribe

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of proposed finding.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.9(f), notice is hereby given that the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs (Assistant Secretary) proposes to decline to acknowledge that the Chinook Indian Tribe, Inc., P.O. Box 228, Chinook, WA 98614, exists as an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law. This notice is based on a determination that the group does not satisfy three of the seven criteria set forth in 25 CFR 83.7, and therefore does not meet the requirements for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

DATES: As provided by 25 CFR 83.9(g), any individual or organization wishing to comment on this proposed finding may submit arguments and evidence to support or rebut the evidence relied upon. This material must be submitted on or before December 22, 1997. Interested parties who submit arguments and evidence to the Assistant Secretary should provide copies of their submissions to the petitioner as well.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the proposed finding and/or requests for a copy of the report of evidence should be addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1849 C Street NW, Washington, DC, 20240, Attention: Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, Mailstop 4603–MIB.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Holly Reckord, Chief, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, (202) 208–3592.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published in the exercise of authority delegated by the Secretary of the Interior to the Assistant Secretary by 209 DM 8. The Chinook Indian Tribe's petition was under active consideration at the time that the revised regulations became effective on March 28, 1994. The petitioner was given the choice under 25 CFR 83.5(f) of the revised regulations of being evaluated under the 1994 revised regulations or the regulations that were published on September 5, 1978. The Chinook Indian Tribe, by letter dated April 21, 1994, requested that the BIA continue to evaluate its petition under the 1978 regulations. Therefore, all references to 25 CFR part 83 in this notice will refer to the 1978 regulations.

The Chinook Indian Tribe petitioner consists primarily of descendants of the historical Lower Band of Chinook Indians. While most of the petitioner's members can trace their ancestry back to the Lower Band of Chinook, the petitioner has not existed as a tribal entity continuously since the time of first sustained contact in 1811 between the historical Lower Band of Chinook and non-Indians. The petitioner's ancestors were identified as an Indian entity by external sources from 1792 to at least 1855. The available evidence indicates that the petitioner, as a whole, has not formed a distinct social or geographical community since 1880. The evidence also demonstrates that the petitioner has not exercised political authority over its members since 1855.

Of the seven mandatory criteria for Federal acknowledgment as an Indian tribe, the petitioner has met criteria (d), (e), (f), and (g), but has failed to meet criteria (a), (b), and (c).

At the time of first sustained contact with non-Indians, the historical Lower Band of Chinook was described as living in villages along the north shore of the Columbia River where it empties into the Pacific Ocean. There were also Lower Chinook villages along the tributaries that fed into the Columbia River and into Shoalwater Bay. Three other bands of Chinookan-speaking Indians lived in proximity to the Lower Band of Chinook: the Wahkiakum, the Kathlamet, and the Clatsop. Federal negotiators signed treaties with each of

these Chinookan bands in 1851, but the treaties were never ratified. In 1855, the Federal Government attempted to negotiate another treaty with the Lower Chinook, but the Chinook refused to sign that treaty. In 1951, some Chinook descendants formed an organization to pursue a compensation claim for aboriginal Chinook lands. Although its secretary claimed that the group had previously formed an organization in 1925, there is no contemporary evidence which demonstrates that there was a Chinook organization between 1925 and 1951. The organization split in 1953 into two Chinook councils, the Chinook Nation and the Chinook Tribes, Inc. The available evidence indicates that the Chinook Tribes, Inc., ceased to function about 1958. In 1970, a new Chinook organization, the Chinook Indian Tribe, Inc., was formed by some Chinook descendants at Ilwaco. This is the organization that is petitioning for Federal acknowledgment.

The petitioner has satisfied criterion (e) because the available evidence demonstrates that approximately 85 percent of its 1995 members descend from either the Lower Chinook, Wahkiakum, Kathlamet, or Clatsop Indian tribes, with almost all of these individuals having descent from the Lower Band of Chinook. Approximately another 15 percent of the petitioner's members descend from Rose LaFramboise. Some evidence indicates that she descended from a Lower Band of Chinook family, and other evidence suggests she was the daughter of a Hudson's Bay Company employee and a Cayuse/Sioux métis woman. Whatever her specific ancestry, the evidence indicates that Rose LaFramboise and her descendants who lived in Cathlamet and Skamokawa were associated with Chinook descendants since the 1870's, and that her family was an accepted part of previous Chinook organizations.

The petitioner has met criterion (d) by providing a copy of the constitution of the Chinook Indian Tribe, Inc., which was adopted on June 16, 1984. This constitution, which is currently in effect, describes the petitioner's membership criteria. There is no evidence that a significant percentage of the petitioner's members belong to any federally-recognized tribe, and therefore it meets criterion (f). About three percent of the petitioner's members descend exclusively from the Clatsop Tribe, over which Federal supervision was terminated by the Western Oregon Termination Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 724). Under this act, these members would not be eligible for services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Neither this act nor any other legislation, however, terminated the Chinook of Washington State, so the petitioner as an entity meets criterion (g).

The Chinookan Indians lived in isolated, homogeneous Indian villages until about 1855, which is sufficient to meet the requirements of criterion (b) until that year. The available evidence demonstrates that Chinook descendants continued to form a distinct social community until 1880, based on the fact that they were fishing together at Chinookville, a village inhabited almost exclusively by Chinook descendants, and because of the primary kinship relations between them.

Chinookville ceased to exist sometime before the 1900 Federal census was taken, and probably soon after the 1880 census was recorded. By 1900, the Chinook descendants who remained in the Chinook aboriginal territory were primarily concentrated in three locations: Bay Center, Dahlia, and Ilwaco. Bay Center had the largest number of Chinookan descendants, and about half of them lived in a segregated part of the town known as Goose Point. The Chinookan descendants at Bay Center lived with other Indians from western Washington in a distinct Indian community until about 1920. There is evidence that the Chinookan Indians living at Goose Point continued to speak the Chehalis language at least as late as 1900, supported a Shaker Church until about 1920, and were part of the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation community as late as 1920. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that the Chinook residents at Dahlia formed a separate geographical community at any point in time. There is some very limited evidence, based on primary kinship relations, that the residents of Dahlia may have been a separate social community until 1932, but this conclusion cannot be reached based on the limited data provided. Also, there is no evidence that the Chinook residents of Ilwaco formed a community. There is very little evidence that suggests the Chinook descendants in Bay Center and Dahlia were ever a single social community. Because there is no evidence that the petitioner's ancestors, or their members, as a whole, have ever formed a single social community at any time since 1880, the petitioner does not meet criterion (b) since that date.

Because the petitioner's Lower Band of Chinook ancestors had headmen who negotiated treaties with the Federal Government in 1851 and 1855, the petitioner meets the requirements of criterion (c) until 1855. Some evidence suggests that Shoalwater Bay Indians (the Indians living on Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation and those in Bay Center) acted as a group or had leadership from the 1870's to the 1920's, but not that they acted together with Chinook descendants in Ilwaco or Dahlia. The available evidence does not reveal that an existing group decision-making process was utilized to decide to bring claims suits in 1899 and 1925. The Court of Claims concluded in 1906 that the Lower Band of Chinook had ''long ceased to exist,'' and a Federal district court in 1928 concluded that the Chinook had lost their tribal organization. Although the petitioner contends that the Chinook formed a formal organization and a tribal council in 1925, no contemporaneous evidence supports this claim. There is some evidence of leadership by one individual between 1927 and 1932 to gather witnesses for a claims case and data to obtain allotments of land for Chinook descendants, but the available evidence does not reveal that she exercised political influence over the Chinook descendants between 1925 and 1951. In 1951, a formal Chinook organization was formed soon after a petition was submitted to the Indian Claims Commission. Although it claimed continuity with an earlier council, the Indian agency superintendent concluded that any earlier organization had disappeared. In 1953, two Chinook councils were formed; one was active until 1958, and the other until 1967. The modern petitioner's organization was formed in 1970. Its minutes demonstrate that participation by members was very low during the 1970's. The petitioner's evidence of correspondence between the council chairman and external government and Indian representatives does not provide evidence of an internal political process among its members. The available evidence does not demonstrate that there were leaders who exercised political authority or influence over the group as a whole from 1856 to the present. Therefore, the petitioner meets criterion (c) to 1855, but does not meet criterion (c) from 1856 to the present.

A historical Chinook tribe or band at the mouth of the Columbia River was identified by explorers, traders, missionaries, and Government agents from the 1790's into the 1850's. The Federal Government clearly identified the Lower Chinook Indians as an Indian entity by negotiating treaties with them in 1851 and 1855. The Government expressed some responsibility for Chinook Indians until the Quinault Reservation was expanded in 1873, but from the 1850's into the 1870's its Indian agents also distinguished the

Indians of Shoalwater Bay from the Chinook Indian descendants along the Columbia River. During the early-20th century, some non-Indians identified an Indian village at Bay Center, but concentrations of Chinook descendants at Ilwaco and Dahlia were not identified as Indian entities, or as parts of a single Indian entity in conjunction with the Bay Center Indian community. From the 1930's to the 1950's, anthropologists recognized that some Chinook descendants were still living, but agreed that they had lost their traditional culture and tribal organization. Since 1951, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, local governments, and local newspapers have noted the existence of three different organizations of Chinook descendants, but have not credited them with continuity with each other. Because external sources have not continuously identified the petitioner from 1855 to the present on a substantially continuous basis, the petitioner does not meet criterion (a).

Dated: August 11, 1997.

Ada E. Deer,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 97–22298 Filed 8–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[MT–962–1430–00-CCAM]

Notice of Availability for the Cooke City Area Mineral Withdrawal Record of Decision; Montana

AGENCY: Forest Service, Agriculture; Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Record of Decision (ROD) on the final environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Cooke City Area Mineral Withdrawal is available. The ROD documents the selection of the Preferred Alternative, the mineral withdrawal of approximately 22,065 acres of Federal land, and provides background information and rationale for the decision. The ROD also documents the decision to amend the Custer and Gallatin Forest Plans to reflect the intent of the mineral withdrawal.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Thompson, BLM Co-Lead, or Larry Timchak, FS Co-Lead, CCAM, BLM Montana State Office, PO Box 36800, Billings, Montana 59107–6800, 406–255–0322.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Final EIS for the Cooke City Area Mineral Withdrawal was released and made available for a 30-day public availability period on July 11, 1997. The final EIS documents the effects of withdrawing from federal mineral location and entry 22,065 acres of federal mineral estate near Cooke City, Montana. The mineral withdrawal would also apply to hardrock minerals acquired by the United States and managed as leasable minerals. The mineral withdrawal would be subject to review after 20 years. Forest plans for the Custer and Gallatin National Forests would be amended to reflect the intent of the mineral withdrawal. Unpatented mining claims with valid existing rights and private lands would not be affected. The decisions are not subject to administrative appeal or protest under Forest Service and BLM regulations.

Dated: August 12, 1997.

James R. Lyons,

Under Secretary Natural Resources and Environment.

Bob Armstrong,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Lands and Minerals Management.

[FR Doc. 97–21970 Filed 8–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–DN–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[MT–060–1020–00]

Lewistown District Resource Council Meeting

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Lewistown District Office.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Lewistown District Resource Advisory Council will meet September 10 and 11, 1997, at the Cotton Wood Inn, on Highway 2 East, in Glasgow, Montana.

The September 10 portion of the session will begin at 7 a.m. with a tour of the Bitter Creek Wilderness Study Area in the morning and the Missouri/Lonetree Watershed in the afternoon. The council should return to Glasgow around 5 p.m.

The September 11 portion will begin at 8 a.m. at the Cotton Wood Inn in Glasgow. The meeting will begin with a review of old business including the Lonesome Lake project, the Lewistown District's project list, proposed council charter revisions, moisture conditions throughout the district, and comments concerning grazing standards and guidelines.

The District Manager will also discuss the recent appointment of Mr. Pat Shea as Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

New council members will be introduced and if necessary, the group will address the election of officers and other matters of organization.

The group will hear/consider presentations concerning the Eye of the Needle, flooding earlier on the Upper Missouri National Wild and Scenic River, the status of the Devil's Kitchen plan amendment, current status of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation's Two Crow acquisition, proposed range improvements in the district, the need for a revised council mission statement, the status of prairie dogs in the Phillips Resource Area, the Judith-Valley-Phillips oil and gas amendment, and off-road-vehicle regulation implementation.

There will be a public comment period at 11:30 a.m. during the September 11 meeting.

DATES: September 10 and 11, 1997.

LOCATION: Glasgow, MT.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: District Manager, Lewistown District Office, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 1160, Airport Road, Lewistown, MT 59457.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The meeting is open to the public and there will be a public comment period as detailed above.

Dated: August 11, 1997.

David L. Mari,

District Manager.

[FR Doc. 97–22304 Filed 8–21–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–DN–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[UT–020–07–1430–00]

Notice of Availability for Proposed Plan Amendment to the Pony Express Resource Management Plan in the Salt Lake District, UT

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management completed a Proposed Plan Amendment/EA/FONSI for the Pony Express Resource Management Plan (RMP) August 11, 1997. The proposed plan amendment specifically addresses the management of resources and land uses in the North Oquirrh Mountains on a total of 14,254 acres of public land, of which 8,291 acres have been acquired