the species than at the time of critical habitat designation, be more specific about the extent of habitat protection necessary for recovery.

We also intend to redesign other aspects of the process for designating critical habitat. We encourage comments on how economic analyses can evolve into a streamlined and cost-effective process. We also solicit comments on how NEPA compliance, when required, may be conducted in a simple and efficient manner. Completing programmatic assessments and analyses, for example, may be an efficiency mechanism. Perhaps multispecies/geographic species groupings to reduce and eliminate administrative redundancy should be more common. We request comments and suggestions relative to how we can effectively streamline the process and specifically whether and how our existing regulations might or should be changed to accomplish this. We also request comments and suggestions on possible legislative corrections that might improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the critical habitat process.

Public Comments Solicited

We intend that any actions resulting from this notice and subsequent proposed guidance be as accurate and as effective as possible. Therefore, we solicit any suggestions from the public, concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, environmental groups, industry, commercial trade entities, or any other interested party concerning any aspect of this notice. We will take into consideration any comments and additional information received and will announce proposed guidance after the close of the public comment period and as promptly as possible after all comments have been reviewed and analyzed. We will make available for your review and comment any critical habitat guidance, policy, or regulatory changes that are developed.

Executive Order 12866 requires each agency to write regulations/notices that are easy to understand. We invite your comments on how to make this notice easier to understand including answers to questions such as the following: (1) Are the requirements in the notice clearly stated? (2) Does the notice contain technical language or jargon that interferes with the clarity? (3) Does the format of the notice (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing, etc.) aid or reduce its clarity? (4) Is the description of the notice in the ''Supplementary Information'' section of the preamble helpful in understanding the notice? What else could we do to make the notice easier to understand?

References Cited

National Research Council. 1995. Science and the Endangered Species Act. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. 271 pp.

Sidle, J.G. 1987. Critical Habitat Designation: Is it Prudent? Environmental Management 11(4):429–437.

Authority: The authority for this notice is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*

Dated: May 3, 1999.

Jamie Rappaport Clark,

Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 99–15080 Filed 6–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, Chiricahua National Monument, Arizona

AGENCY: National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the General Management Plan, Chiricahua National Monument.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Park Service is preparing an environmental impact statement for the General Management Plan for Chiricahua National Monument. This statement will be approved by the Regional Director, Intermountain Region. The plan is needed to guide the protection and preservation of the natural and cultural environments considering a variety of interpretive and recreational visitor experiences that enhance the enjoyment and understanding of the park resources.

The effort will result in a comprehensive general management plan that encompasses preservation of natural and cultural resources, visitor use and interpretation, roads, and facilities. In cooperation with local and national interests, attention will also be given to resources outside the boundaries that affect the integrity of park resources. Alternatives to be considered include no-action, the preferred alternative, and other alternatives addressing the following:

To clearly describe specific resource conditions and visitor experiences in various management units throughout the park and

To identify the kinds of management, use, and development that will be appropriate to achieving and maintaining those conditions.

Ongoing scoping was started with an Environmental Assessment process in 1992. A list of topics considered is available upon request from the park. Comments on this notice must be received by July 10, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent Alan Cox Chiricahua National Monument, Dos Cabezas Rt., Box 6500 Willcox, AZ 85643–9737 (520) 824–3560.

Dated: June 7, 1999.

Ron Everhart,

Regional Director, Intermountain Region.

[FR Doc. 99–14969 Filed 6–11–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, Fort Bowie National Historic Site, Arizona

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the General Management Plan, Fort Bowie National Historic Site.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, the National Park Service is preparing an environmental impact statement for the General Management Plan for Fort Bowie National Historic Site. This statement will be approved by the Regional Director, Intermountain Region.

The plan is needed to guide the protection and preservation of the natural and cultural environments considering a variety of interpretive and recreational visitor experiences that enhance the enjoyment and understanding of the park resources.

The effort will result in a comprehensive general management plan that encompasses preservation of natural and cultural resources, visitor use and interpretation, roads, and facilities. In cooperation with local and national interests, attention will also be given to resources outside the boundaries that affect the integrity of park resources.

Alternatives to be considered include no-action, the preferred alternative, and other alternatives addressing the following questions:

To clearly describe specific resource conditions and visitor experiences in various management units throughout the park and