

### 9. The Professional Investment & Financial Group, San Gabriel, California

Action: Proposed Settlement Agreement that includes payment to the Department of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$1,000; and revision of the advertising used by the company in its HUD-FHA Title I program activities.

Cause: Use of misleading advertising by the company in connection with the Title I property improvement loan program.

### 10. Magna Financial Corporation, Irvine, California

Action: Settlement Agreement that includes indemnification to the Department for any claim losses in connection with five improperly originated Title I loans; payment to the Department of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$1,000; and corrective action to assure compliance with HUD-FHA requirements.

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations by the company of HUD-FHA Title I property improvement loan program requirements that included: failure to verify borrowers' source of funds required for initial payment; failure to properly verify borrower's income; requiring a minimum loan amount; failure to meet program requirements for the promissory note; failure to ensure that detailed descriptions of improvements were provided by borrowers; and failure to comply with HUD-FHA reporting requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA).

### 11. Randall Mortgage, Inc., Maitland, Florida

Action: Settlement Agreement that includes: indemnification to the Department in the amount of \$87,657 for its claim loss in connection with an improperly originated HUD-FHA insured mortgage; indemnification for any future claim losses in connection with seven improperly originated mortgages; payment to the Department of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$2,500; and corrective action to assure compliance with HUD-FHA requirements.

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations of HUD-FHA requirements that included: failure to maintain an adequate Quality Control Plan for the origination of HUD-FHA insured mortgages; failure to verify borrowers' source of funds used for downpayment; failure to ensure that borrowers made the minimum required investment in the property; requiring a borrower to deposit excess escrow funds

at closing; inadequate or lack of face-to-face interviews with borrowers; and failure to properly complete HUD Form 92900 Applications.

Dated: July 20, 1995.

**Jeanne K. Engel,**

*General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.*

[FR Doc. 95-18727 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-P

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[ID-942-1110-00]

#### Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plat of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., July 21, 1995.

The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the subdivisional lines, the 1962-1969 fixed and limiting boundary, the 1962-1969 meander lines of the right and left banks of Henrys Fork, of certain islands, and of lot 22 in section 16, the subdivision of section 15, and the survey of portions of the meander lines of the 1993-1994 right and left banks of Henrys Fork, of lot 13 in section 16, and of a partition line in section 15, T. 7 N., R. 40 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group No. 816, was accepted, July 18, 1995.

This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Branch of Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3380 Americana Terrace, Boise, Idaho 83706.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

**Duane E. Olsen,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.*

[FR Doc. 95-18673 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

---

[ID-942-1640-00]

#### Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plat, in 2 sheets of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., July 21, 1995.

The plat, in 2 sheets, representing the corrective dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines and the dependent resurvey of portions of the west boundary, subdivisional lines,

and the boundaries of certain segregation and mineral surveys, the subdivision of certain sections, and the survey of lot 18 in section 17, T. 48 N., R. 2 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group No. 859, was accepted, July 18, 1995.

This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Branch of Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3380 Americana Terrace, Boise, Idaho, 83706.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

**Duane E. Olsen,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.*

[FR Doc. 95-18672 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

---

## National Park Service

### Petroglyph National Monument, Draft General Management Plan/ Development Concept Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of the Draft General Management Plan/ Development Concept Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement for Petroglyph National Monument, Bernalillo County, New Mexico.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Public Law 101-313 (the legislation that established the monument) the National Park Service announces the availability of the Draft General Management Plan/Development Concept Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/DCP/EIS) for Petroglyph National Monument. This notice also announces public meetings for the purpose of receiving public comment on the Draft GMP/DCP/EIS.

The Draft GMP/DCP/EIS has been prepared in cooperation with the City of Albuquerque, the State of New Mexico, and the Federal Aviation Administration. The purpose of this Draft GMP/DCP/EIS is to set forth the basic management philosophy of the monument and the overall approaches to resource management, visitor use, and facility development that would be implemented over the next 10-15 years.

Petroglyph National Monument, encompassing 7,244 acres, was established in June 1990 as a new unit of the National Park System to preserve the more than 15,000 prehistoric and historic petroglyphs and other significant natural and cultural resources that are on the west side of

Albuquerque, New Mexico. The monument is the first National Park System area specifically established to protect and interpret rock carvings and their setting.

Public input and meetings identified issues and concerns addressed in the combined document, which include partnership responsibilities, cultural and natural resource protection, protection of sites and values of culturally affiliated groups, and location and function of visitor and administrative facilities such as a visitor center, parking areas and trail heads, a heritage education center, and a petroglyph research center. Other issues addressed in the GMP/DCP/EIS include interpretation, education, visitor circulation and access, public use of the monument, and boundary adjustments.

There are four alternatives for the development, resource management, and visitor use of the monument. The alternatives describe different visitor experiences and different kinds and locations for facilities under a common resource management and protection approach. All alternatives have a common resource management approach because of resource management laws and policies that apply to various aspects of all National Park System areas, including cultural landscape and archaeological site values, natural resources, and various other aspects of monument management.

**Alternative 1:** The overall approach of the proposed action and National Park Service's preferred alternative, would be to provide various ways for visitors of different ages and abilities to see and appreciate many of the monument's significant resources. Visitors would be directed to a visitor center/heritage education center at Boca Negra Canyon. Horseback and bicycle riding would be permitted on selected designated mesa-top trails and at three crossing points. No horses or bicycles would be allowed in petroglyph viewing areas or archaeological sites anywhere in the monument. Mesa-top resources and visitor experiences would be monitored to identify adverse impacts. Most impacts on the cultural and natural resources would be minimal or, in some cases, beneficial. New structures would impact the cultural landscape. There could be adverse impacts on values held by culturally affiliated groups from the intrusion of bicycles and horses.

**Alternative 2:** This alternative would preserve the greatest portion of the monument and adjacent lands in as natural a condition as possible, with the fewest intrusions from development and fewer opportunities for public access

and use. Visitors would be directed to a visitor center in Lava Shadows where they would have access to selected petroglyphs. A heritage education center would be built at Boca Negra Canyon. Visitors would have more opportunities to see the petroglyphs with a greater sense of solitude than in Alternative 1. More areas of the monument would be reserved for research, American Indian use, and occasional guided tours than in the other alternatives. Horse and bicycle use would not be permitted in this alternative except at two escarpment crossings. Impacts would be similar to and in some cases slightly more positive under this alternative than under Alternative 1 because there would be fewer facilities and these facilities would be in previously disturbed areas.

**Alternative 3:** The overall approach would be to provide the easiest and greatest amount of access to areas with many petroglyphs and to the scenic mesa-top vistas. Visitors would be directed to a visitor/heritage education center in Rinconada Canyon. From the visitor center many visitors would drive to a new 10-mile mesa-top loop road that would provide easy access to the mesa-top views and the volcanoes. Parking and trails would be developed at the volcanoes and geologic windows areas. Horse and bicycle use would be provided at three escarpment crossings. This alternative would have the greatest impact on natural resources, cultural resources, and values held by culturally affiliated groups.

**Alternative 4:** The "no-action" alternative, describes the conditions and impacts that would exist at the monument without a change in current management direction or an approved management plan. There would be no new visitor or heritage education center. This alternative would have the fewest facilities. Horseback and bicycle riding would be permitted within the monument only where currently allowed. The interim visitor center at Las Imagines would become the primary visitor center, accommodating only a limited number of visitors.

Archeological sites, petroglyphs, and the cultural landscape would continue to be adversely impacted by vandalism.

**DATES:** Comments on the Draft GMP/DCP/EIS should be received no later than November 6, 1995. The dates and times for public meetings regarding the Draft GMP/DCP/EIS can be obtained by contacting Petroglyph National Monument at 505-839-4429.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the Draft GMP/DCP/EIS should be submitted to Superintendent, Petroglyph National Monument, 4735 Unser Blvd., NW.,

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120, 505-839-4429.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Public reading copies of the Draft GMP/DCP/EIS will be available for review at the following locations: Department of Interior Natural Resources Library, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240; Office of Public Affairs, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240; Southwest Systems Support Office, 1100 Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, New Mexico; Petroglyph National Monument, Las Imagines Visitor Center, 4735 Unser Blvd., NW., Albuquerque, New Mexico; and local public libraries.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

**Ernest W. Ortega,**

*Acting Superintendent, Southwest System Office.*

[FR Doc. 95-18676 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Immigration and Naturalization Service

[INS No. 1730-95; AG Order No. 1981-95]

RIN 1115-AC30

#### Extension of Designation of Bosnia-Herzegovina; Under Temporary Protected Status Program

**AGENCY:** Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice extends, until August 10, 1996, the Attorney General's designation of Bosnia-Herzegovina under the Temporary Protected Status program provided for in section 244A of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended ("the Act"). Accordingly, eligible aliens who are nationals of Bosnia-Herzegovina, or who have no nationality and who last habitually resided in Bosnia-Herzegovina, may re-register for Temporary Protected Status and extension of employment authorization. This re-registration is limited to persons who already have registered for the initial period of Temporary Protected Status which ended on August 10, 1993. In addition, some Bosnians may be eligible for late initial registration pursuant to 8 CFR 240.2(f)(2).

**EFFECTIVE DATES:** This extension of designation is effective on August 11, 1995, and will remain in effect until August 10, 1996. The primary re-registration procedures become effective on July 31, 1995, and will remain in effect until August 29, 1995.