must be in writing to be adequately processed.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Rick G. Gooch, Regional Permit Coordinator, Atlanta, Georgia (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 404/679–7110; or Mr. Will McDearman at the Jackson, Mississippi, Field Office (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 601/965–4900 ext. 24.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Red Hill's salamander (RHS), *Phaeognathus hubrichti*, is a plethodontid salamander known only from the Red Hills region of south-central Alabama in portions of Butler, Conecuh, Covington, Crenshaw, and Monroe Counties. This physiographic subdivision of the Gulf Coastal Plain is distinguished by hilly, dissected terrain, frequently with steep side slopes extending 200 feet from the ridge to the base of the lower slope. Natural vegetation of these moist, steep, sheltered slopes and ravines consists of a beech-magnolia forest community. Characteristic woody species in the forest overstory include American beech (*Fagus grandifolia*), bigleaf magnolia (*Magnolia macrophylla*), southern magnolia (*M. grandiflora*), white oak (*Quercus alba*), and tulip tree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*). Portions of this and closely related forest types in the Red Hills region are underlain by clays, claystones, and siltones of the Tallahatta and Hatchetigbee formations. RHS occupy subterranean burrows within the fissures and channels of these formations on relatively steep slopes beneath undisturbed and moderately disturbed hardwood and hardwood-pine dominated forests. RHS, which rarely leave their burrows, prey upon ground-dwelling arthropods located within burrows or outside burrows near the burrow entrance. Substrates of the Tallahatta and Hatchetigbee formation apparently are important for maintaining suitable moisture required for these amphibians. Other important factors preventing the dessication of RHS microhabitat include loamy soils, leaf litter from deciduous trees, and a well developed overstory canopy of hardwoods that intercepts direct sunlight. Timber management practices that reduce or eliminate the forest canopy, disturb or compact soils, and convert hardwood-dominated forests to pine-dominated forests can incidentally kill or injure RHS in violation of Section 9 of the Act. Such practices can involve timber harvest, the operation of vehicular logging equipment, timber regeneration, and site preparation in habitat occupied by RHS. Based on RHS surveys conducted by the Applicant, RHS may occur on about 3,810 acres of lands owned or managed by Union Camp Corporation. This represents about seven percent of the rangewide total habitat estimated to remain in 1978.

The EA considers the environmental consequences of two alternatives. The proposed action is the issuance of the ITP based upon the submittal of the HCP. This action is based on a preliminary determination by the Service that the HCP will satisfy the requirements of Section 10(a)(2)(B) of the Act. By this alternative, the HCP restricts timber management activities in habitat preferred by RHS. Preferred habitat occupies about 1,816 acres with steep (>30 degree) slopes, underlain by the Tallahatta or Hatchetigbee formations, with a hardwood or mixed hardwood-pine forest. Pine will be harvested by limited single tree selection while maintaining a hardwood canopy coverage over at least 90 percent of a site. To minimize disturbance to soils and destruction of burrows, no vehicular logging equipment will operate within preferred habitat. Felled timber will be pulled from preferred habitat by cable from vehicular or other logging equipment located in adjacent, non-preferred habitat. In habitat marginally suitable for RHS, about 1,994 acres, normal industrial forest silvicultural practices will be applied. Marginally suitable habitat consists of slopes less than 30 degrees, with Tallahata or Hatchetigbee formations and forest cover of mixed hardwood-pine or pine. RHS populations in marginally suitable habitat will be significantly reduced or eliminated as a result of clearcutting, site preparation, and conversion to pine forests. Because RHS are more common and abundant in preferred (optimal) habitat, the HCP will conserve core RHS populations where most RHS exist. Populations in preferred habitat are expected to remain viable, contributing to the recovery of the species. The HCP also includes maintaining forest buffer zones adjacent to preferred habitat, staff training to implement the HCP, funding, and monitoring and reporting of management actions in preferred and marginally suitable habitat.

The second alternative in the EA is the no action alternative in which the Service would not issue the ITP. The basis for this alternative would be the failure of the Applicant to satisfy requirements of Section 10(a)(2)(B) of the Act for ITP issuance. Without the authority to incidentally take RHS, the Applicant is expected to continue to manage forests in occupied habitat according to existing current company guidelines or modified guidelines that substantially reduce or eliminate the likelihood of incidental take in preferred and marginally suitable habitat.

Such measures, in comparison to the first alternative, would be expected to involve additional restrictions on timber harvest and managing habitat occupied by RHS in a manner to avoid incidental take.

As stated above, the Service has made a preliminary determination that the issuance of this ITP is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA and will result in the FONSI. This preliminary determination is based on information in the EA and HCP. The determination may be revised due to public comment received in response to this notice. An excerpt from the FONSI reflecting the Service's finding on the application is provided below:

Based on the analysis conducted by the Service, it has been determined that:

1. Issuance of an ITP would not have significant effects on the human environment in the project area.

2. The proposed take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity.

3. The Applicant has ensured that adequate funding will be provided to implement the measures proposed in the submitted HCP.

The Service will also evaluate whether the issuance of a Section 10(a)(1)(B) ITP complies with Section 7 of the Act by conducting an intra-Service Section 7 consultation. The results of the Section 7 biological opinion, in combination with the above findings, will be used in the final analysis to determine whether or not to issue the ITP.

Dated: November 11, 1996.

Garland B. Pardue,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 96–28986 Filed 11–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Geological Survey

Request for Public Comment on Proposed Information Collection To Be Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

The proposal for the collection of information described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for approval under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Copies of the proposed collection of information may be obtained by contacting the Bureau's clearance officer at the phone number

listed below. Comments and suggestions on the proposal should be made within 60 days directly to the Bureau clearance officer, U.S. Geological Survey, 208 National Center, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive., Reston, Virginia, 20192, telephone (703) 648–7313.

Title: National Mapping Division Data Grant Program for Land Processes Research.

OMB approval number: 1028–0052.

Abstract: Respondents supply information and awardees supply a final report. Application information identifies the land processes research project and remotely sensed data requirements. Final report identifies utility of Data Grant Program in the completion of the nonprofit institution's research project.

Bureau form number: None.

Frequency: Annually.

Description of respondents: Non-profit institutions.

Estimated completion time: 25 hours.

Annual responses: 520.

Annual burden hours: 13,000 hours.

Bureau clearance officer: John Cordyack, 703–648–7313.

Dated: November 4, 1996.

Richard E. Witmer,

Acting Chief, National Mapping Division.

[FR Doc. 96–28944 Filed 11–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–31–M

Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC); Public Meeting of the FGDC Facilities Working Group

AGENCY: U.S. Geological Survey, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice is to invite public participation in meetings of the FGDC Facilities Working Group and its subgroups. The major topic for these meetings is development of a Facility ID standard, a utility data content standard, and an environmental hazard data content standard.

TIME AND PLACE: 9 December 1996, at Headquarters U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in Room 8124C of the Pulaski Building, 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC. The Pulaski building is located just a few blocks west of Union Station. The Facilities Working Group will meet from 1:00 p.m. until 3:00 p.m.; the Facility ID and Environmental Hazard Data Content Standard teams will meet from 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon; and Utility Data Content Standard team will meet from 3:15 until 4:15 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Fox, FGDC Secretariat, U.S. Geological Survey, 590 National Center, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, Virginia 20192; telephone (703) 648–5514; facsimile (703) 648–5755; Internet ''gdc@usgs.gov''.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FGDC is a committee of Federal agencies engaged in geospatial activities. The FGDC Facilities Working Group specifically focuses on geospatial data issues related to facilities and facility management. A facility is an entity with location, deliberately established as a site for designated activities. A facility database might describe a factory, a military base, a college, a hospital, a power plant, a fishery, a national park, an office building, a space command center, or a prison. The database for a complex facility may describe multiple functions or missions, multiple buildings, or even a county, town, or city. The objectives of the Working Group are to: promote standards of accuracy and currentness in facilities data which are financed in whole or in part by Federal funds; exchange information on technological improvements for collecting facilities data; encourage the Federal and non-Federal community to identify and adopt standards specifications for facilities data; and promote the sharing of facilities data among Federal and non-Federal organizations.

Dated: November 1, 1996.

Wendy A. Budd,

Associate Chief, National Mapping Division.

[FR Doc. 96–28949 Filed 11–12–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–31–M

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible To Receive Services From the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given of the current list of tribal entities recognized and eligible for funding and services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs by virtue of their status as Indian tribes. This notice is published pursuant to Section 104 of the Act of November 2, 1994 (Pub. L. 103–454; 108 Stat. 4791, 4792).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daisy West, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Tribal Government Services, MS–4641–MIB, 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20240. Telephone number: (202) 208–2475.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is published in exercise of authority delegated to the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs under 25 U.S.C. 2 and 9 and 209 DM 8.

Published below are lists of federally acknowledged tribes in the contiguous 48 states and in Alaska. The list is updated from the last such list published in February 16, 1995 (60 FR 9250), to include tribes acknowledged through the Federal acknowledgment process. The listed entities are acknowledged to have ''the immunities and privileges available to other federally acknowledged Indian tribes by virtue of their government-to-government relationship with the United States as well as the responsibilities, powers, limitations and obligations of such tribes.'' 25 CFR 83.2 (1996 ed.). We have, however, continued the practice of listing the Alaska Native entities separately solely for the purpose of facilitating identification of them and reference to them given the large number of complex Native names.

Indian Tribal Entities Within the Contiguous 48 States Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services From the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs

Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California
Ak Chin Indian Community of Papago Indians of the Maricopa, Ak Chin Reservation, Arizona
Alabama and Coushatta Tribes of Texas
Alabama-Quassarte Tribal Town of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma
Alturas Indian Rancheria of Pit River Indians of California
Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation, Wyoming
Aroostook Band of Micmac Indians of Maine
Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana
Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Augustine Reservation, California
Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians of the Bad River Reservation, Wisconsin
Bay Mills Indian Community of the Sault Ste. Marie Band of Chippewa Indians, Bay Mills Reservation, Michigan
Bear River Band of the Rohnerville Rancheria of California
Berry Creek Rancheria of Maidu Indians of California
Big Lagoon Rancheria of Smith River Indians of California