

*cokendolpheri*), and Helotes mold beetle (*Batrissodes venyivi*). Seven additional species have been identified as potentially affected by the proposed covered activities and maybe considered for inclusion in the RHCP: Whooping crane (*Grus americana*), big red sage (*Salvia penstemonoides*), to busch fishhook cactus (*Sclerocactus brevihamatus* ssp *tobuschii*), bracted twistflower (*Streptanthus bracteatus*), golden orb (*Quadrula aurea*), Texas pimpleback (*Quadrula petrina*), and Texas fatmucket (*Lampsilis bracteata*). Incidental take authorization for these additional species may be necessary during the term of the ITP. Inclusion of these species will be determined during the RHCP planning and development process. The RHCP may include conservation measures to benefit these species, where practicable, and support research to help fill data gaps regarding the biology, habitat, distribution, and/or management of these species, even if incidental take coverage is not requested under the ITP.

Candidate and Federally listed species not likely to be taken by the covered activities, and therefore not covered by the proposed ITP, may also be addressed in the draft RHCP to explain why the applicants believe these species will not be taken.

Counties included in the proposed permit area are Bexar, Medina, Bandera, Kerr, Kendall, Blanco, and Comal Counties.

#### Public Availability of Comments

Written comments we receive become part of the public record associated with this action. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that the entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

#### Environmental Review

The Service will conduct an environmental review to analyze the proposed action, as well as other alternatives evaluated and the associated impacts of each. The draft EIS will be the basis for the impact evaluation for each species covered and the range of alternatives to be addressed. The draft EIS is expected to provide biological descriptions of the affected species and habitats, as well as the effects of the alternatives on other

resources, such as vegetation, wetlands, wildlife, geology and soils, air quality, water resources, water quality, cultural resources, land use, recreation, water use, local economy, and environmental justice.

Following completion of the environmental review, the Service will publish a notice of availability and a request for comment on the draft EIS and the applicants' permit application, which will include the draft RHCP. The draft EIS and draft RHCP are expected to be completed and available to the public in late 2011.

**Joy E. Nicholopoulos,**

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

[FR Doc. 2011-10143 Filed 4-26-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4510-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

**[FWS-R8-FHC-2011-N083; 81331-1334-8TWG-W4]**

#### Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group (TAMWG) affords stakeholders the opportunity to give policy, management, and technical input concerning Trinity River (California) restoration efforts to the Trinity Management Council (TMC). The TMC interprets and recommends policy, coordinates and reviews management actions, and provides organizational budget oversight. This notice announces a TAMWG meeting, which is open to the public.

**DATES:** TAMWG will meet from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Tuesday, May 17, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at the Weaverville Victorian Inn, 1709 Main Street, Weaverville, CA 96093.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

**Meeting Information:** Randy A. Brown, TAMWG Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1655 Heindon Road, Arcata, CA 95521; telephone: (707) 822-7201. *Trinity River Restoration Program*

**(TRRP) Information:** Jennifer Faler, Acting Executive Director, Trinity River Restoration Program, P.O. Box 1300, 1313 South Main Street, Weaverville, CA 96093; telephone: (530) 623-1800; e-mail: [jfaler@usbr.gov](mailto:jfaler@usbr.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory

Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), this notice announces a meeting of the TAMWG. The meeting will include discussion of the following topics:

- TRRP FY 2012 budget and work plan,
- Temperature and reservoir management and recent CVO letter,
- Acting Executive Director's Report,
- Policies for work in tributary watersheds,
- Initial report on peak releases,
- Channel rehabilitation phase II planning update,
- TMC chair report,
- TAMWG bylaws, and
- Designated Federal Officer topics.

Completion of the agenda is dependent on the amount of time each item takes. The meeting could end early if the agenda has been completed.

Dated: April 21, 2011.

**Joseph Polos,**

*Supervisory Fishery Biologist, Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office, Arcata, CA.*

[FR Doc. 2011-10141 Filed 4-26-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Final Determination Against Federal Acknowledgment of the Choctaw Nation of Florida

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Determination.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior (Department) declines to acknowledge that the group known as the "Choctaw Nation of Florida" (CNF, formerly known as the Hunter Tsalagi-Choctaw Tribe), Petitioner #288, c/o Mr. Alfonso James, Jr., Post Office Box 6322, Marianna, Florida 32447, is an American Indian group that exists as an Indian tribe under Department procedures. This notice is based on a determination that the petitioner does not meet one of the seven mandatory criteria set forth in 25 CFR 83.7, specifically criterion 83.7(e), descent from a historical Indian tribe, and therefore, the Department may not acknowledge the petitioner under 25 CFR part 83. Based on the limited nature and extent of comment and consistent with previous practices, the Department did not produce a detailed report or other summary under the criteria pertaining to this FD. This notice is the Final Determination (FD).

**DATES:** This determination is final and will become effective 90 days from

publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** on July 26, 2011, according to section 83.10(l)(4), unless a request for reconsideration is filed with the Interior Board of Indian Appeals according to section 83.11.

**ADDRESSES:** Requests for a copy of the **Federal Register** notice should be addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Attention: Office of Federal Acknowledgment, 1951 Constitution Avenue, NW., MS: 34B—SIB, Washington, DC 20240. The **Federal Register** notice is also available through <http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/AS-IA/OFA/RecentCases/index.htm>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** R. Lee Fleming, Director, Office of Federal Acknowledgment, (202) 513-7650.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On July 2, 2010, the Department issued a proposed finding (PF) that the CNF petitioner was not an American Indian group that exists as an Indian tribe under Department procedures because the petitioner did not meet one of the seven mandatory criteria for Federal acknowledgment as an Indian tribe, criterion 83.7(e). This criterion requires that the petitioner's membership consist of individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity. The review of the evidence for the proposed finding clearly established that the petitioner did not meet criterion 83.7(e) and the Department issued a proposed finding denying acknowledgment under that one criterion (83.10(e)(1)). The Department published a notice of the PF in the **Federal Register** on July 12, 2010 (75 FR 39703). Publishing notice of the PF initiated a 180-day comment period during which time the petitioner and interested and informed parties could submit arguments and evidence to support or rebut the PF. In response to the PF, the petitioner or third parties must provide evidence for the FD that the petitioner meets the criterion in question under the standard set forth at 25 CFR 83.6(d). This initial comment period ended on January 10, 2011.

By letter dated January 3, 2011, the petitioner's attorney submitted on the petitioner's behalf copies of 44 documents consisting of 74 pages described as "additional information" for the Department "to consider in making its final decision." The Department received these comments on January 6, 2011, before the close of the comment period on January 10, 2011. The petitioning group did not provide any narrative or thorough explanation regarding the relevance of these

documents to criterion 83.7(e). The petitioner did not submit any changes to its most current membership list of 77 individuals. The Department analyzed the submitted documents as the group's comments on the PF. The Department did not receive comments from any party other than the petitioner. After the close of the applicable comment periods, the Department received an additional comment from the petitioner's attorney. In accord with the regulations, the Department did not consider this unsolicited comment in the preparation of the FD (83.10(l)(1)).

The petitioner claims to be a group of Choctaw Indians that migrated from North Carolina to Georgia and then Florida following the Choctaw Indian removal of the 1830s. None of the evidence in the record for the PF demonstrated the validity of this claim. None of the evidence in the record for the PF demonstrated the petitioner's members or claimed ancestors descended from a Choctaw Indian tribe or any other Indian tribe. The petitioner did not submit any materials in its submission for the FD that established, by the standard set forth at 83.6(d), descent from a historical Indian tribe as required by criterion 83.7(e).

Of the 44 documents the petitioner submitted for the FD, 37 were previously submitted and analyzed for the PF. Only seven of the documents were new submissions, and six of them did not provide evidence for documenting descent from a historical tribe as required by criterion 83.7(e). Of these six documents, the first described statutes of 1852, 1898, and 1902; the second was a one-sentence description of "Fort Chippola"; the third briefly described the courthouse history of Walton County, Florida; the fourth described the Choctawhatchee River; the fifth was a two-page list of Choctaw villages transcribed for the Internet from the *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico* (1907); and the sixth described United States Code, Title 18, Section 1164, "Destroying boundary and warning signs." None of these documents provides descent evidence linking members of the petitioner to a historical Indian tribe.

Only one document received from the petitioner in the comment period had any bearing on criterion 83.7(e): A Dawes Commission Roll index entry for a Lucy Pope. The Department finds this evidence insufficient to document the required descent for the petitioner under criterion 83.7(e) for the following reasons.

For the PF, the Department determined that most of the current group's members descend from a Burton

Hunter (b.ca. 1836–1842) and his wife Lucy (b.ca. 1844–1850) whose maiden name was not documented. The petitioner claimed Lucy's last name was "Pope" and submitted for the PF two Federal census entries in an attempt to support its theory: An 1860 Federal census entry for an "L. Pope" of South Carolina and an 1870 Federal census entry for a "Lucy Pope" of Florida. Evaluation presented in the PF demonstrates that the census entries pertained to two women, neither of whom could have been the wife of Burton Hunter. Further, the PF found no evidence in the record that Burton Hunter's wife Lucy was a Pope or that either he or Lucy descended from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe or any other Indian tribe.

For the FD, the petitioner submitted a two-page index from an Internet Web site that listed a Lucy Pope among some Choctaw Indians whose names appeared on the 1898–1914 Dawes Commission Roll. The petitioner placed an asterisk next to the entry for Lucy Pope, Roll No. 8626. The Department believes the petitioner is using this annotation to advance a claim that the Dawes Commission, a Federal organization that Congress authorized in 1893, had enrolled one of its claimed ancestors as a member of the Choctaw Nation in Indian Territory (now Oklahoma).

The Department examined the evidence behind the Dawes Commission Roll index reference and found that the enrolled Choctaw Lucy Pope is different from Burton Hunter's documented wife Lucy and different from both of the Pope women the petitioner claimed as Burton Hunter's wife. As explained in the PF, Burton Hunter's wife Lucy was born around 1842 in Florida and died in 1907 in Florida. The "L. Pope" the petitioner claimed as Burton Hunter's wife, citing the 1860 Federal census of South Carolina, was born between 1831 and 1833 in South Carolina, and the other "Lucy Pope" claimed as Burton Hunter's wife, citing the 1870 Federal census of Florida, was born about 1832 in Florida. In contrast, the Dawes Commission enrollment record for a Lucy Pope, Roll No. 8626 on Census Card #2933, submitted by the petitioner for the FD, shows that this Lucy Pope was born around 1878, her maiden name was Sam, and she was married to a Pope. She appeared on the 1910 Federal Census as living with her family in Pittsburg County, Oklahoma. Therefore, this Lucy (Sam) Pope (b. 1878–d.aft. 1910) is not the same person as any of the three women analyzed in the PF as the wife of Burton Hunter: L. Pope (b. 1831–1833 SC), Lucy Pope (b. 1832 FL) or Lucy [—?—] Hunter (b. 1842

FL) (documented wife of Burton Hunter).

In the PF, the Department discussed in detail Lucy [—?—] Hunter as well as the L. Pope and Lucy Pope the petitioner claimed as the wife of Burton Hunter. None of the evidence for the PF demonstrated any descent from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe or other historical Indian tribe for Lucy Hunter or the other Pope women the petitioner claimed. The evidence behind the Dawes Commission Roll index reference pertains to a Lucy Pope who is not the petitioner's claimed ancestor although her married name is the same as that of two individuals previously analyzed in the PF. Therefore, the Dawes Commission Roll evidence does not demonstrate Indian ancestry for Burton Hunter's documented wife Lucy or either of the Pope women whom the petitioner claimed as the wife of its ancestor Burton Hunter.

None of the material submitted for the FD changes the conclusions of the PF that the petitioner does not meet the requirements of criterion 83.7(e), which requires that the petitioner's membership consist of individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes that combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity.

To summarize, the petitioner claims to have descended as a group from a historical tribe of Choctaw Indians. There is no primary or reliable secondary evidence submitted by the petitioner or located by the Department showing that any of the named ancestors or members of the group descended from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe or any other Indian tribe. None of the documentation on the petitioner's members and their claimed individual ancestors, submitted by the petitioner or found by the Department's researchers, supports the petitioner's claim of descent from a historical Choctaw Indian tribe or any other Indian tribe. No document in the record identified the petitioner's members and claimed ancestors as part of the historical Choctaw or other Indian tribe. In fact, the evidence shows the petitioner's members and claimed ancestors were consistently identified as non-Indians living in non-Indian communities. The extensive evidence in the record does not demonstrate descent from any historical Indian tribe.

The Department declines to acknowledge the CNF petitioner as an Indian tribe because the evidence in the record does not demonstrate, by the standard set forth at 25 CFR 83.6(d), that the membership descends from a

historical Indian tribe as required by mandatory criterion 83.7(e).

After the publication of notice of the FD, the petitioner or any interested party may file a request for reconsideration with the Interior Board of Indian Appeals (IBIA) under the procedures set forth in section 83.11 of the regulations. The IBIA must receive this request no later than 90 days after the publication of the FD in the **Federal Register**. The FD will become final and effective as provided in the regulations 90 days from the **Federal Register** publication, unless a request for reconsideration is received within that time.

Dated: April 21, 2011.

**Larry Echo Hawk,**

*Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 2011-10117 Filed 4-26-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-G1-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Backcountry Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Backcountry Management Plan, Grand Canyon National Park.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)), the National Park Service (NPS) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the Backcountry Management Plan for Grand Canyon National Park. This plan will help guide park decisions on protecting natural and cultural resources while providing for a variety of visitor opportunities to experience the park's backcountry. Over 94% of the park has been proposed as wilderness, and an updated plan is needed to comply with NPS wilderness policy and other policies. A range of reasonable alternatives for managing the park's backcountry will be developed, with public input, through this planning process and will include, at a minimum, a no-action and an agency preferred alternative.

Major issues the plan will address include visitor access and use of the park's backcountry, levels of commercial services, levels of administrative and scientific research activities, management of natural and cultural resources, and the protection of wilderness character. The National Park

Service will identify additional issues to be addressed through public scoping.

A scoping newsletter is being prepared that details the issues identified to date. Copies of that information will be made available on NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca>.

**DATES:** The Park Service will accept comments from the public through June 27, 2011. Public meetings will occur in Flagstaff and Grand Canyon, Arizona and other locations to be determined. Specific dates, times, and locations will be announced in the local media and on the internet at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca>.

**ADDRESSES:** Information will be available for public review and comment online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca>, in the Office of the Superintendent, Jane Lyder, 1 Village Loop, Grand Canyon, Arizona 86023, 928-638-7945, or in the Office of Planning and Compliance, 1 Village Loop, Grand Canyon, Arizona 86023.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jane Lyder, Acting Superintendent, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, Arizona, 86023, 928-638-7945, [Jane\\_Lyder@nps.gov](mailto:Jane_Lyder@nps.gov) or Rachel Bennett, Environmental Protection Specialist, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, Arizona 86023, 928-638-7326, [Rachel\\_Bennett@nps.gov](mailto:Rachel_Bennett@nps.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** If you wish to comment on the scoping newsletter or on any other issues associated with the plan, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may comment via the Internet at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/grca>. If you do not have access to a computer, you may mail comments to Jane Lyder, Acting Superintendent, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023. Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to Grand Canyon National Park Headquarters, 1 Village Loop, Grand Canyon, AZ.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.