

respect to a particular environmental impact statement, and will either accept or deny such requests. If such a request is denied, bureaus will state in writing, within the environmental impact statement, the reasons for such denial.

F. Throughout the development of the environmental impact statement, the bureau will collaborate, to the fullest extent practicable, with all cooperating agencies, concerning those issues relating to their jurisdiction and/or special expertise. Collaboration will be to:

- (1) Identify issues to be addressed in the environmental impact statement;
- (2) arrange for the collection and/or assembly of necessary resource, environmental, social, economic, and institutional data;
- (3) analyze data;
- (4) develop alternatives; (1) Evaluate alternatives and estimate the effects of implementing each alternative; and
- (6) carry out any other task necessary for the development of the environmental impact statement.

G. Bureaus and eligible governmental entities are required to express in a memorandum of understanding their respective roles, assignment of issues, schedules, and staff commitments so that the NEPA process remains on track and within the time schedule.

[FR Doc. 05-11129 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-R6-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment/Habitat Conservation Plan and Receipt of a Permit Application (Reyna) for Incidental Take of the Houston Toad

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability and 60-day public comment period.

SUMMARY: Jesus Reyna (Applicant) has applied for an incidental take permit (TE-104765-0) pursuant to Section 10(a) of the Endangered Species Act (Act). The requested permit would authorize incidental take of the endangered Houston toad. The proposed take would occur as a result of the construction and occupation of a primary residence and detached garage, guest house and detached garage, workshop, well pump house, and three septic systems on an approximately 16.545-acre (6.68-hectare) tract of land located on Felix Road, Bastrop County, Texas.

DATES: To ensure consideration, written comments must be received on or before August 5, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to review the application may obtain a copy by

writing to the Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 1306, Room 4102, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103. Persons wishing to review the draft Environmental Assessment/Habitat Conservation Plan (EA/HCP) may obtain a copy by contacting Clayton Napier, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Austin, Texas 78758 (512/490-0057). Documents will be available for public inspection by written request, by appointment only, during normal business hours (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service office, Austin, Texas. Written data or comments concerning the application and EA/HCP should be submitted to the Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Austin, Texas, at the above address. Please refer to permit number TE-104765-0 when submitting comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Clayton Napier at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Austin, Texas 78758 (512/490-0057).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 9 of the Act prohibits the "taking" of endangered species such as the Houston toad. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) may issue permits to take endangered wildlife species, if the take is incidental to, and not the purpose of, otherwise lawful activities. Regulations governing permits for endangered species are at 50 CFR 17.22.

The Service has prepared the draft EA/HCP for the incidental take application. A determination of jeopardy or non-jeopardy to the species and a decision pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) will not be made until at least 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. This notice is provided pursuant to Section 10(c) of the Act and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Applicant: Jesus Reyna plans to construct a primary residence and detached garage, guest house and detached garage, workshop, well pump house, and three septic systems on an approximately 16.545-acre (6.68-hectare) tract of land located on Felix Road, Bastrop County, Texas. This action will eliminate 0.5 acres of Houston toad habitat and result in indirect impacts. The Applicant proposes to compensate for incidental take of the Houston toad by providing \$3,000.00 to the Houston Toad Conservation Fund at the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for the specific purpose of land acquisition and management within Houston toad habitat and by complying with other

mitigation measures found in the incidental take permit.

Joy E. Nicholopoulos,

Acting Regional Director, Region 2, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

[FR Doc. 05-11151 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Temporary Concession Contract for Great Smoky Mountains National Park, TN

ACTION: Notice of proposed award.

SUMMARY: Public notice is hereby given that the National Park Service (NPS) proposes to award a temporary concession contract that requires the operation of horseback riding stables and vending machine sales of soft drinks and bottled water, and authorizes limited souvenir sales in the Sugarlands region of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park near Gatlinburg, Tennessee for a term not to exceed October 31, 2006.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 27, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Henry Benedetti, Chief, Commercial Services, National Park Service, Southeast Region, 404-562-3112, extension 661.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The temporary concession contract is being awarded to Smoky Mountain Stables, Inc., a qualified person, as that term is defined in 36 CFR 51.3. The NPS terminated the prior concession contract at Sugarlands on May 2, 2005, has taken all reasonable and necessary steps to consider alternatives to avoid further interruption of visitor services, and has determined that this award is necessary to avoid further interruption of visitor services.

This action is issued pursuant to 36 CFR 51.24(a). This is not a request for proposals and no prospectus is being issued at this time. The Director intends to issue a prospectus in 2006 to allow the competitive award of a long-term concession contract that will be effective prior to the 2007 operation season at Sugarlands. You may be placed on a mailing list for receiving information regarding the prospectus by sending a written request to the above address.

Dated: May 16, 2005.

Patricia A. Hooks,

Regional Director, Southeast Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 05-11145 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-53-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Colorado National Monument, CO

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Colorado National Monument.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(C), the National Park Service announces the availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Colorado National Monument, Colorado.

DATES: The National Park Service will execute a Record of Decision (ROD) no sooner than 30 days following publication by the Environmental Protection Agency of the Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

ADDRESSES: Information will be available for public inspection in the office of the Superintendent, and at the following locations:

Colorado National Monument Visitor Center/Headquarters, Bruce Noble, Superintendent, 7 miles east of Fruita on Rim Rock Drive, Fruita, CO 81521-0001, Tel: (970) 858-3617, ext. 300.

Fruita Branch Mesa County Public Library District, 324 East Aspen Avenue, Fruita, CO 81521, Tel. (970) 858-7703.

Mesa County Central Library, 530 Grand Avenue, Grand Junction, CO 81502-5019, Tel. (970) 243-4442.

Internet Address: <http://planning.nps.gov/plans.cfm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Contact Superintendent Bruce Noble, Colorado National Monument, Fruita, CO 81521-0001; Tel: (970) 858-3617, ext. 300; FAX: (970) 858-0372; e-mail: bruce.noble@nps.gov.

Dated: April 27, 2005.

Michael D. Snyder,

Acting Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 05-11142 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-CP-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Crater Lake National Park, Douglas, Jackson and Klamath Counties, OR; Notice of Availability

SUMMARY: Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR part 1500-1508), the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, has prepared a final general management plan (GMP) and environmental impact statement (EIS) for Crater Lake National Park, Oregon. The final EIS identifies and analyzes four GMP alternatives which respond to both NPS planning requirements and to the issues identified during the public scoping process. The "no-action" alternative (Alternative 1) describes the existing conditions and trends of park management and serves as a baseline for comparison in evaluating the other alternatives. The three "action" alternatives variously address visitor use, natural and cultural resource management, and park development. Alternative 2, the preferred alternative, emphasizes increased opportunities in recreational diversity, resource preservation, research and resource education. Under Alternative 3 visitors would experience a greater range of natural and cultural resources through recreational opportunities and education. The focus of Alternative 4 would be on preservation and restoration of natural processes.

Background: Public meetings and newsletters have been used to keep the public informed and involved in the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process for the GMP. A mailing list was compiled that consisted of members of government agencies, nongovernmental groups, businesses, legislators, local governments, and interested citizens. The Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on May 25, 2001. A newsletter issued January 2001 introduced the GMP planning process (a total of 72 written comments were received in response). Public meetings were held during April 2001 in Klamath Falls, Medford, Roseburg, and Salem and were attended by 96 people. A second newsletter issued in July 2001 summarized all comments received in the meetings and in response to newsletter 1. These comments were used to complete the

park purpose and significance statements that serve as the foundation for the rest of the GMP planning (and were referred to throughout development of the GMP).

A third newsletter distributed in the spring of 2002 described the draft alternative concepts and management zoning proposed for managing the park (a total of 95 comments were received in response). In general, opinions were fairly divided in support of individual alternatives and potential ways to address issues. A number of letters favored continued snowmobile use, while other people favored eliminating snowmobiles in the park. Opinions were also divided regarding ways to manage traffic congestion on Rim Drive—maintaining current two-way traffic, converting part of the road to one-way traffic, using shuttles, or closure of the road to traffic. Most respondents favored use of shuttles. A number of people who opposed partnering with private industry were concerned with potential for large-scale commercialization within the park.

The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIS and GMP was printed August 3, 2004. The public comment period was open until October 6, 2004. A total of 646 comments were received. Forty-seven letters and e-mails were sent in by individuals. Four agencies responded. Three different form letters accounted for the remaining 599 comments. The most common comment issues were snowmobiles (24 letters/e-mails and all 3 form letters), road closure (15 letters/e-mails and 2 of 3 form letters), shuttles (7 letters/e-mails and 1 of 3 form letters), and snow coaches (4 letters/e-mails and 1 of 3 form letters). Comments and representative letters received on the Draft document have been incorporated into the Final EIS and GMP.

Proposed Plan and Alternatives: Alternative 1 is the "no action" alternative and represents continuation of the current management direction and approach at the park. It is a way of evaluating the proposed actions of the other three alternatives. Existing buildings and facilities in the park would remain; some historic structures would be adaptively used. Munson Valley would continue to serve as the center of NPS administration, maintenance, and housing. The existing road access and circulation system within the park would continue, and visitor recreational opportunities and interpretive programs in the park would continue.

Alternative 2 is the "agency preferred" alternative and has also been determined to be the "environmentally