

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of this information collection:

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* Extension of a previously approved information collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:* Nonimmigrant Petition Based on Blanket L Petition.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Homeland Security sponsoring the collection:* Form I-129S, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or Households. This information collection will be used by an employer to classify employees as L-1 nonimmigrant intracompany transferees under a blanket L petition approval. The USCIS will use the data on this form to determine eligibility for the requested immigration benefit.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 250,000 responses at 35 minutes (.583 hours) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 145,750 annual burden hours.

If you have additional comments, suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument, please contact Richard A. Sloan, Director, Regulatory Management Division, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20529.

Dated: August 24, 2005.

Richard A. Sloan,

*Director, Regulatory Management Division,
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.*
[FR Doc. 05-17147 Filed 8-26-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Invasive Species Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice is hereby given of meetings of the Invasive Species Advisory Committee. The purpose of the Advisory Committee is to provide advice to the National Invasive Species Council, as authorized by Executive Order 13112, on a broad array of issues related to preventing the introduction of invasive species and providing for their control and minimizing the economic, ecological, and human health impacts that invasive species cause. The Council is Co-chaired by the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. The duty of the Council is to provide national leadership regarding invasive species issues. The purpose of a meeting on October 11-13, 2005 is to convene the full Advisory Committee; and to discuss implementation of action items outlined in the National Invasive Species Management Plan, which was finalized on January 18, 2001.

DATES: Meeting of Invasive Species Advisory Committee: Tuesday, October 11, 2005 through Thursday, October 13, 2005; beginning at approximately 8 a.m., and ending at approximately 5 p.m. each day.

ADDRESSES: Wyndham City Center Hotel, 1143 New Hampshire Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20037. Meeting will be held all three days in the New Hampshire Ballroom.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kelsey Brantley, National Invasive Species Council Program Analyst; Phone: (202) 513-7243; Fax: (202) 371-1751.

Dated: August 24, 2005.

Lori C. Williams,

Executive Director, National Invasive Species Council.

[FR Doc. 05-17133 Filed 8-26-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-RK-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Final Decisions Regarding Self-Determination and Self-Governance Funding Agreement Language on Fiduciary Trust Records Management

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of final decision.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the final decision regarding Self-Determination and Self-Governance language to be negotiated into funding agreements for 2006 regarding fiduciary trust records management. The **Federal Register** notice published on February 2, 2005 (70 FR 5457) presented a proposed policy on fiduciary trust records management for Self-Determination (Title I) and Self-Governance (Title IV) Tribes/Consortia and language to be negotiated into 2006 Title I and Title IV funding agreements. The February 2, 2005, notice also announced three consultation meetings and an invitation to submit written comments on the proposed policy and funding agreement language.

Final Decision: After reviewing numerous comments and suggestions, both written and oral, the Department decided not to institute the proposed policy on fiduciary trust records management for Title I and Title IV Tribes/Consortia; rather, the Department will negotiate with each Tribe/Consortium a specific section in the funding agreement that addresses Tribe's/Consortium's and the Secretary's respective responsibilities regarding the management of fiduciary trust records. This specific section will include the definition of "fiduciary trust records," "Indian trust assets," and "management." The language to be negotiated into the 2006 Title I and Title IV funding agreements regarding fiduciary trust records management is the following and will replace the three options used in the past.

The Tribe/Consortium and Secretary agree to the following:

The Tribe/Consortium agrees to:

(a) Preserve, protect and manage all fiduciary trust records, created and/or maintained by the Tribes/Consortia during their management of trust programs in their Title IV agreements. (A fiduciary trust record is any document that reflects the existence of an Indian trust asset and was used in the management of an Indian trust asset. An Indian trust asset refers to lands, natural resources, monies or other assets held in trust at a particular time by the Federal Government for a Tribe, Alaska natives

or that are or were at a particular time restricted against alienation, for individual Indians. Management includes actions that influence, affect, govern, or control an Indian trust asset. The following are examples not considered to be fiduciary trust records: General administrative, personnel or travel records; education records; law enforcement records; health records; law making unrelated to Indian trust assets; tribal council resolutions and laws unrelated to Indian trust assets; and tribal elections.)

(b) Make available to the Secretary all fiduciary trust records maintained by the Tribe/Consortium, provided that the Secretary gives reasonable oral or written advance request to the Tribe/Consortium. Access shall include visual inspection and, at the expense of the Secretary, the production of copies (as agreed upon between the parties), and shall not include the removal of the records without tribal approval; and

(c) Store and permanently retain all inactive fiduciary trust records at the Tribe/Consortium or allow such records to be removed and stored at the American Indian Records Repository (AIRR) in Lenexa, Kansas, at no cost to the Tribe/Consortium.

The Secretary agrees to:

(a) Allow the Tribe/Consortium to determine what records it creates to implement the trust programs assumed under its Title IV agreement, except that the Tribe/Consortium must create and maintain the information required by statute and regulation. No additional record keeping requirements are required by this agreement.

(b) Store all inactive fiduciary trust records at the American Indian Records Repository (AIRR) at no cost to the Tribe/Consortium when the Tribe/Consortium no longer wishes to keep the records. Further, the Tribe/Consortium will retain legal custody and determine access to these records. Such records shall not be treated as Federal records for purposes of chapter 5 of Title 5 of the United States Code unless expressly agreed to by the Tribe;

(c) Create and manage a single tribal storage and retrieval system for all fiduciary trust records stored at AIRR (No records will be accepted at AIRR until such a retrieval system exists); and

(d) Provide filing equipment and technical assistance for Tribes/Consortia in preserving, protecting and managing their fiduciary trust records from available funds appropriated for this purpose.

Summary of Comments: The final decision above is the result of a nearly 2-year consultation process by the Department with some Title I and IV

Tribes/Consortia. This process included: Conducting pre-scoping telephone conversations with tribal leaders, staff and consultants; holding a scoping meeting as part of a 2-day conference on Indian trust records management at Haskell Indian Nations University; forming a Tribal Fiduciary Trust Records Management Workgroup; conducting four workgroup meetings; transmitting a tribal leader letter soliciting comments on the proposed policy language to be presented for consultation; and engaging in discussions with Tribal leaders and staff at the Fall 2004, Self-Governance Conference. This process culminated with three consultation meetings held in Nashville, Tennessee; Portland, Oregon; and Phoenix, Arizona that were attended by approximately 60 tribal leaders, staff and consultants. In addition, written comments were received from 14 tribes, tribal organizations or tribal consultants some of whom attended the consultation meetings.

The comments received can be grouped into the following four major categories:

Category 1: New funding agreement language is not needed because existing compact and funding agreement language sufficiently provides for the maintenance of records of trust programs managed by the Tribes/Consortia, and Tribes/Consortia should not be required to implement a Federal policy on fiduciary trust records management through their funding agreements. The Department respectfully disagrees. The Department believed that the three options available to Tribes/Consortia in the past are too vague and do not specifically address the Secretary's primary concerns that fiduciary trust records not be destroyed and that the Secretary have the right to access those records if needed in her capacity as trustee delegate. The Department does agree with the comments that a Federal policy does not need to be instituted through the Departmental Manual. Instead the Department has chosen to negotiate language with each Tribe/Consortium into its funding agreement to address fiduciary trust records management.

Category 2: The definition of "fiduciary trust records" is too broad and vague and the Department should produce a specific list of what fiduciary trust records should be maintained and preserved by the Tribe/Consortium. The definition is purposely broad in recognition of tribal sovereignty. It allows Tribes/Consortia the flexibility to create those records they believe are necessary to properly manage their trust

assets through their Title I or Title IV funding agreements. For the Department to create a list of fiduciary trust records would have been both overly restrictive for some Tribes/Consortia and overly expansive for others. A Department-generated list to be used by all Tribes/Consortia would have been restrictive in that it could deter tribes from creating certain records they feel were appropriate and at the same time it could be expansive by "requiring" Tribes/Consortia to create fiduciary trust records they did not believe were necessary for effective management of their trust assets. The Department's concern is that whatever trust records are created be properly protected and available to the Secretary.

Category 3: The funding agreement language creates an unfunded mandate because no funding is being provided, and the language requires Tribes/Consortia to maintain record facilities and administer and monitor a records policy. The Department believes that the language proposed for negotiation does not require Tribes/Consortia to create and keep any additional records beyond those they now keep; namely, those that are required by statute or regulation or those records the Tribe/Consortium chooses to create in the management of its own trust resources. The language does not require a tribe to have any other kind of record keeping system other than the ones they currently operate. Before becoming a Title I or Title IV Tribe/Consortium, a Tribe/Consortium had to demonstrate that it had a functional record keeping system and this language does not expand that requirement. Further, while the language does indicate that Tribes/Consortia are to preserve, protect and manage all fiduciary trust records and that all fiduciary trust records are to be kept permanently, once the Tribe/Consortium chooses that it no longer wants to house their inactive fiduciary trust records at their facility, the Secretary has offered to store those records, at the Secretary's expense, at the American Indian Records Repository. Finally, the Secretary is willing to provide to the Tribes/Consortia equipment, training and technical assistance, subject to availability of appropriated funds for that purpose.

Category 4: A potential problem exists for Tribes/Consortia in storing records at AIRR in that outside interests might gain access to Tribal/Consortium trust records through the Freedom of Information Act because the Tribal/Consortium trust records are held on the Tribe's/Consortium's behalf by the Department in a Federal facility. To

accommodate this concern, language was inserted stating that the Tribe/ Consortium retains legal custody and determines access to those records. Further, language was inserted stating that such records shall not be treated as Federal records for purposes of chapter 5 of Title 5 of the United States Code, unless expressly agreed to by the Tribe.

Dated: August 19, 2005.

Abraham E. Haspel,

Assistant Deputy Secretary—Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 05–17137 Filed 8–26–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–W8–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Receipt of an Application for an Incidental Take Permit for the Florida Scrub-jay Resulting From Construction of a Single-Family Home in Charlotte County, FL

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Mr. and Mrs. Nicholas Tamburri (Applicants) request an incidental take permit (ITP) for a period of one year, pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act), as amended (U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). The Applicants anticipate removal of about 1.2 acres of occupied Florida scrub-jay (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*) (scrub-jay) nesting, foraging, and sheltering habitat, incidental to partial land clearing of their 5-acre lot and subsequent residential construction of a single-family home and supporting infrastructure in Charlotte County, Florida. Up to three scrub-jay individuals could be taken as a result of the Applicants' proposed action. It is not currently known if these three scrub-jays are part of the same scrub-jay family.

The Applicants' Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) describes the mitigation and minimization measures proposed to address the effects of the project to the scrub-jay. These measures are outlined in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below. We announce the availability of the ITP application, HCP, and accompanying Environmental Assessment (EA). Copies of the application, HCP, and EA may be obtained by making a request to the Southeast Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**). Requests must be in writing to be processed. This notice is provided pursuant to section 10 of the Act and

National Environmental Policy Act regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

DATES: Written comments on the ITP application and HCP, and EA should be sent to the Service's Southeast Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**) and should be received on or before October 28, 2005.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to review the application, HCP, and EA may obtain a copy by writing the Service's Southeast Regional Office at the address below. Please reference permit number TE093169–0 in such requests.

Documents will also be available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the Southeast Regional Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1875 Century Boulevard, Suite 200, Atlanta, Georgia 30345 (Attn: Endangered Species Permits), or also at the South Florida Ecological Services Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, Florida 32960–3559 (Attn: Field Supervisor).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. David Dell, Regional HCP Coordinator, Southeast Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 404/679–7313, facsimile: 404/679–7081; or Ms. Constance Cassler, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, South Florida Ecological Services Office (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 772/562–3909, ext. 243.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If you wish to comment, you may submit comments by any one of several methods. Please reference permit number TE093169–0 in such comments. You may mail comments to the Service's Southeast Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**). You may also comment via the Internet to david_dell@fws.gov. Please submit comments over the Internet as an ASCII file, avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Please also include your name and return address in your e-mail message. If you do not receive a confirmation from us that we have received your e-mail message, contact us directly at either telephone number listed above (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to either Service office listed above (see **ADDRESSES**). Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home addresses from the administrative record. We will honor such requests to the extent allowable by law. There may also be other circumstances in which we would withhold from the administrative record a respondent's identity, as allowable by

law. If you wish us to withhold your name and address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. We will not, however, consider anonymous comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

The Florida scrub-jay (scrub-jay) is geographically isolated from other species of scrub-jays found in Mexico and the western United States. The scrub-jay is found exclusively in peninsular Florida and is restricted to xeric uplands (well-drained, sandy soil habitats supporting a growth of oak-dominated scrub). Increasing urban and agricultural development has resulted in habitat loss and fragmentation, which has adversely affected the distribution and numbers of scrub-jays. The total estimated population is between 7,000 and 11,000 individuals. The decline in the number and distribution of scrub-jays in Florida has been exacerbated by tremendous urban growth in the past 50 years.

Xeric upland vegetative communities in southwestern Florida are restricted primarily to ancient coastal dunes which are typically much dryer and less susceptible to flooding due to their deep, well-drained soils. Historically, these areas extended in a nearly continuous, narrow band along the western mainland portions of northern Charlotte to southern Hillsborough County. However, the same physical attributes that resulted in the evolution of xeric vegetation on these sandy dunes also provided sites for both agricultural and urban development. Over the past 50 years, these ancient dunes have served as the backbone of residential and commercial growth in southwestern Florida. The project area is under tremendous development pressure, as is much of Charlotte County. Much of the remaining scrub-jay habitat is now relatively small and isolated. What remains is largely degraded, due to interruption of the natural fire regime that is needed to maintain xeric uplands in conditions suitable for scrub-jays.

Florida scrub-jays were documented using this residential lot on ten separate occasions between October 9 and October 16, 2002, by consultants from AMS Engineering and Environmental, Incorporated. Based on the consultant's report, it appears that at least three scrub-jays use this residential lot. It is not known whether these scrub-jays previously nested on the subject lot, though the birds roost regularly on a turkey oak there. Scrub-jays using the