restructured, either directly or through the private sector partner.

C. Describe your approach for involving tenants and communities in the restructuring effort.

D.i. For nonprofits operating nationally with a network of local affiliations, explain how the participation of this local network would complement the organization's role as HUD's partner.

ii. Explain how the organization will identify and resolve potential conflicts between the organization's other activities and its role as managing general partner of the partnership with HUD; for example, in its relationships with property owners, lenders, and contractors.

Dated: July 10, 1997.

Nicolas P. Retsinas,

Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 97–18780 Filed 7–11–97; 5:04 pm]

BILLING CODE 4210–27–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Availability of an Environmental Assessment, Finding of No Significant Impact, and Receipt of an Application for an Incidental Take Permit for a Project Called Satellite Motel Time-Share, a Residential Project, in Brevard County, Florida

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Towne Realty Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Applicant), is seeking an incidental take permit (ITP) from the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act), as amended. The ITP would authorize the take of one family of the threatened Florida scrub jay, *Aphelocoma coerulescens coerulescens* and the threatened Eastern indigo snake, *Drymarchon corais couperi,* in Brevard County, Florida, for a period of ten (10) years. The proposed taking is incidental to construction and redevelopment of approximately 6.7 acres of beachfront property, including the replacement of the older Satellite Motel which is currently present on the site (Project). The Project contains about 2.3 acres of occupied Florida scrub jay habitat, and the potential exists for the entire Project to provide habitat to the Eastern indigo snake. A description of the mitigation and minimization measures outlined the Applicant's Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) to address the effects of the Project to the protected species is as described further in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section below.

The Service also announces the availability of an environmental assessment (EA) and HCP for the incidental take application. Copies of the EA and/or HCP may be obtained by making a request to the Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**). Requests must be in writing to be processed. This notice also advises the public that the Service has made a preliminary determination that issuing the ITP is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended. The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is based on information contained in the EA and HCP. The final determination will be made no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice. This notice is provided pursuant to Section 10 of the Act and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6). The Service specifically requests comment on the appropriateness of the ''No Surprises'' assurances should the Service determine that an ITP will be granted and based upon the submitted HCP. Although not explicitly stated in the HCP, the Service has, since August 1994, announced its intention to honor a ''No Surprises'' Policy for applicants seeking ITPs. Copies of the Service's ''No Surprises'' Policy may be obtained by making a written request to the Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**). The Service is soliciting public comments and review of the applicability of the ''No Surprises'' Policy to this application and HCP.

DATES: Written comments on the permit application, EA, and HCP should be sent to the Service's Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**) and should be received on or before August 15, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to review the application, HCP, and EA may obtain a copy by writing the Service's Southeast Regional Office, Atlanta, Georgia. Documents will also be available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the Regional Office, 1875 Century Boulevard, Suite 200, Atlanta, Georgia 30345 (Attn: Endangered Species Permits), or Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 6620 Southpoint Drive, South, Suite 310, Jacksonville, Florida 32216–0912. Written data or comments concerning the application, EA, or HCP should be submitted to the Regional Office. Requests for the documentation must be in writing to be processed. Comments must be submitted in writing to be processed. Please reference permit number PRT–831754 in such comments, or in requests of the documents discussed herein.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Rick G. Gooch, Regional Permit Coordinator, (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 404/679–7110; or Ms. Dawn Zattau, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Jacksonville Field Office, (see **ADDRESSES** above), telephone: 904/232–2580, extension 120.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Aphelocoma coerulescens coerulescens* is geographically isolated from other subspecies of scrub jays found in Mexico and the Western United States. The Florida scrub jay is found almost exclusively in peninsular Florida and is restricted to scrub habitat. The total estimated population is between 7,000 and 11,000 individuals. Due to habitat loss and degradation throughout the State of Florida, it has been estimated that the Florida scrub jay population has been reduced by at least half in the last 100 years. Surveys have indicated that one family of Florida scrub jays inhabit the Project site. Construction of the Project's infrastructure and subsequent construction of the individual homesites will likely result in death of, or injury to, *Aphelocoma coerulescens coerulescens* incidental to the carrying out of these otherwise lawful activities. Habitat alteration associated with property development will reduce the availability of feeding, shelter, and nesting habitat.

The EA considers the environmental consequences of three alternatives. The no action alternative may result in loss of habitat for *Aphelocoma coerulescens coerulescens* and exposure of the Applicant under Section 9 of the Act. A third alternative is the proposed Project that is designed with a different mitigation strategy, focusing on mitigation of the project's impacts on the barrier island of Brevard County. The proposed action alternative is issuance of the ITP. The affirmative conservation measures outlined in the HCP to be employed to offset the anticipated level of incidental take to the protected species are the following:

1. Approximately 4.9 acres of scrub habitat would be purchased and preserved within Section 27, Township 29 South, Range 37 East. This area has been inspected by the Service and approved as an acceptable mitigation site and is located within a ''core'' as identified by the draft Brevard County Scrub Conservation and Development Plan. The 4.9-acre mitigation area would

first be donated to and subsequently managed by a holding company. After initial habitat restoration, the property would then be conveyed to Brevard County or other acceptable land conservation program, along with a conservation easement, requiring preservation and management for Florida scrub-jays (and eastern indigo snakes) into perpetuity.

2. The Applicant would pay $4,900 into an endowment fund which would be used to fund the long-term management of the mitigation site. The conservation easement accompanying the land would require Brevard County to manage the land for Florida scrub-jays and eastern indigo snakes into perpetuity. This provides for restrictions of construction activity, purchase of offsite habitat for the Florida scrub jay, the establishment of an endowment fund for the offsite acquired habitat, and donation of additional offsite habitat.

3. No clearing of scrub vegetation would occur during the nesting season of the Florida scrub jay.

4. The HCP provides a funding mechanism for these mitigation measures.

As stated above, the Service has made a preliminary determination that the issuance of the 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. This preliminary information may be revised due to public comment received in response to this notice and is based on information contained in the EA and HCP. An appropriate 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.

4. Other than impacts to endangered and threatened species as outlined in the documentation of this decision, the indirect impacts which may result from issuance of the ITP are addressed by other regulations and statutes under the jurisdiction of other government entities. The validity of the Service's ITP is contingent upon the Applicant's compliance with the terms of the permit and all other laws and regulations under the control of State, local, and other Federal governmental entities.

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 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: July 9, 1997.

Marvin E. Moriarty,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 97–18656 Filed 7–15–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Proposed Finding for Federal Acknowledgment of the Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians of Michigan

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of proposed finding.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.10(h), notice is hereby given that the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs (Assistant Secretary) proposes to acknowledge that the Match-e-be-nash-she-wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians of Michigan (MBPI), 112 W. Superior Street, Wayland, MI 49348, exists as an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law. This notice is based on the determination that the tribe satisfies all of the criteria set forth in 25 CFR 83.7 as modified by 25 CFR 83.8, and, therefore, meets the requirements for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

DATES: As provided by 25 CFR 83.10(i), any individual or organization wishing to comment on the proposed finding may submit arguments and evidence to support or rebut the evidence relied upon. This material must be submitted within 180 calendar days from the date of publication of this notice. As stated in the regulations, 25 CFR 83.10(i), parties who submit arguments and evidence to the Assistant Secretary must also provide copies of their submissions to the petitioner.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the proposed finding and/or request for a copy of the report of evidence should be addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 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 petitioner, formerly called the Gun Lake Band of Grand River Ottawa, consists of descendants from Match-e-be-nash-she-wish's Potawatomi band, which received a three-mile square reserve at Kalamazoo, Michigan, under the Treaty of 1821. The Band moved northward from Kalamazoo to its current location in Allegan County, Michigan, after the 1833 Treaty of Chicago. Because of its location as the northernmost of the Potawatomi bands in Michigan, it was incorporated for payment purposes with the Grand River Ottawa under the Compact of 1838 following the 1836 Ottawa Treaty.

The band was a signatory to the 1855 Treaty of Detroit. It received annuity payments under this and prior treaties until the final commutation payment in 1870. The petitioner thus meets the requirements of section 83.8 as having unambiguous previous Federal acknowledgment and has been considered under the modifications of section 83.7 that are prescribed by section 83.8. The date of the band's final annuity commutation payment, 1870, has been used as the date of the latest Federal acknowledgment for purposes of this finding to enable the petitioner to proceed under the provisions of section 83.8.

Between 1870 and 1904, the petitioner's ancestors continued to reside on lands of the former Griswold Mission, which was referred to as an ''Indian Colony'' in the 1880 Federal census of Allegan County, Michigan. During 1883–1884, the former Griswold Reserve lands were allotted among the families, generating extensive court records which identified the community and its members. In 1900 and 1910, the Federal census enumerated the Allegan County settlement on the special Indian Population schedules.

The 1904 Taggart Roll and the 1908 Durant Roll—rolls compiled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) special agents to settle claims of Michigan's Potawatomi and Ottawa Indians, respectively—listed ancestors of the petitioner. From 1885 onward, the Methodist Church designated the church near Bradley on the former Griswold Reserve lands as an Indian mission. In 1917, a sister church of the petitioner was established at Salem in Allegan County, also designated as an Indian mission by the Methodist