

instruments, call the SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer on (301) 443-0525.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; © ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

**Proposed Project:** Evaluation of Model Programs Targeting Substance Abusing Pregnant and Postpartum Women and their Infants—Revision—Data are collected from clients, comparison group women, and staff on interventions received and maternal and child outcomes as part of an evaluation of model projects serving substance abusing pregnant and postpartum women and their infants. The model projects are funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, SAMHSA. This evaluation will assist CSAP in accomplishing national health objectives related to maternal and child health, especially those directly related to maternal substance abuse and its potential effects on birth outcomes and child development. In this proposed revision of an ongoing study, the data collection instruments remain unchanged. Sample sizes are somewhat smaller than originally anticipated resulting in a reduced annual burden. The estimated revised burden is shown below.

| Number of respondents | Re-sponses per respondent | Hours per response | Total burden hours |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 823                   | 5.48                      | 0.24               | 1082               |

Send comments to Deborah Trunzo, SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer, Room 16-105, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: June 25, 1996.

Richard Kopanda

*Executive Officer, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96-16831 Filed 7-01-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4162-20-P

## DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4100-N-01]

### Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner; Notice of Proposed Information Collection for Public Comment

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The proposed information collection requirement described below will be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Department is soliciting public comments on the subject proposal.

**DATES:** Comments due: September 3, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments regarding this proposal. Comments should refer to the proposal by name and/or OMB Control Number and should be sent to: Oliver Walker, Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451-7th Street SW., Room 9116, Washington, DC 20410.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ann M. Sudduth, Telephone number (202) 708-0740 (this is not a toll-free number) for copies of the proposed forms and other available documents.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department will submit the proposed information collection to OMB for review, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended).

The Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affecting agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond; including through the use of appropriate automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

This Notice also lists the following information:

**Title of Proposal:** Request for Occupied Conveyance.

**OMB Control Number:** 2502-0268.

**Description of the need for the information and the proposed use:** Information collected by this form provides information HUD needs to determine if the occupant is financially able to pay the fair market rent and/or whether a member of the immediate family residing in the residence suffers from a temporary, permanent or long-term illness or injury which would be aggravated by the process of moving. HUD field office personnel use this information to base its determination as to whether to approve or deny occupied conveyance.

**Agency form numbers:** HUD-9539.

**Members of affected public:** Individuals or households.

An estimation of the total numbers of hours needed to prepare the information collection is 17,387.50, number of respondents is 11,025, frequency response is one-time, and the hours of response is 4,012.50.

**Status of the proposed information collection:** Extension of a currently approved collection.

**Authority:** Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35, as amended.

Dated: June 21, 1996.

Nicolas P. Retsinas,

*Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.*

[FR Doc. 96-16789 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Office of the Secretary

#### National Environmental Policy Act: Implementing Procedures (516 DM 6, Appendix 9)

**AGENCY:** Department of the Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of a proposed addition to the Department of the Interior's Categorical Exclusions for the Bureau of Reclamation.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a proposed addition to the categorical exclusions included in Departmental Manual 516 DM 6, appendix 9, that lists actions excluded from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) procedures for the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). The proposed categorical exclusion pertains to transfer of title to single-purpose facilities within Reclamation projects to non-Federal entities.

**DATES:** Comments are due August 1, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to: Dr. Darrell Cauley, Manager, Environmental and Planning Coordination Office, Bureau of Reclamation, PO Box 25007, Denver Federal Center, Denver, CO 80225-0007.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. Willie R. Taylor, Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance; telephone (202) 208-3891. For Reclamation, Dr. Darrell Cauley, Manager, Environmental Planning and Coordination Office, telephone (303)-236-9336 extension 222.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Reclamation program was founded in 1902. Its original mission was one of civil works construction to develop the water resources of the arid Western United States to promote the settlement and economic development of that region. The results of that work are well known in the hundreds of projects that were developed to store and deliver water. That substantial infrastructure made Reclamation the largest wholesale supplier of water in the United States, the sixth largest electric power generator, and the manager of 45 percent of the surface water in the Western United States. Many of these projects were constructed at a time when there were no local communities and utilities. Today much of the West is settled and is, in some respects, the most urbanized region of the country. Reclamation owns and operates public utility facilities which, if located in other parts of the country, would likely be owned, operated, and funded by publicly regulated private corporations or local government agencies. Reclamation's policy for decades has been to transfer operation and maintenance of projects to local entities where and when appropriate, while retaining title to the project facilities in Federal ownership.

As part of the second phase of the National Performance Review (REGO II), Reclamation is undertaking a program to transfer title of facilities that could be efficiently and effectively managed by non-Federal entities and that are not identified as having national importance. This effort is a recognition of Reclamation's commitment to a Federal Government that works better and costs less. The transfer of title will divest Reclamation of the responsibility for the operation, maintenance, management, regulation of, and liability for the project. The transfer of title to single-purpose facilities within a project will, in effect, sever Reclamation's ties with that facility. Reclamation

recognizes that the complete severance of the relationship between Reclamation and the transferee may not be possible in all instances.

NEPA requires that when a major Federal action may have significant impacts on the quality of the human environment, a statement be prepared [section 102(2)(C)] detailing the impacts and effects to the human environment associated with the Federal action. When it is known in advance that a certain category of actions will not have a significant effect on the human environment, that category of actions may be excluded from further NEPA requirement (40 CFR 1508.4).

#### Introduction to Proposal

It is the intent of Reclamation to transfer title and responsibility for certain single-purpose facilities within projects, when and where appropriate, to entities who are currently operating and maintaining the facilities or managing the lands. The Department of the Interior (Department) proposes an additional categorical subparagraph 9.4.A(4) in appendix 9 in the Department Manual (516 DM 6). The excluded title transfer action would apply to a relatively small number of single-purpose facilities within projects where the transferees agree to make no significant changes in operations and maintenance, and/or land or water use after transfer. The proposed exclusion in a category of actions that does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. If any of the proposed title transfers involve any of the following, an environmental assessment (EA) and/or environmental impact statement (EIS) will be prepared in accordance with Reclamation's NEPA Handbook.

1. If the title transfer action involves any of the Departmental exceptions to the categorical exclusions listed in Departmental Manual 516 DM 2, Appendix 2.

2. If the title transfer action would result in significant changes in the operation and maintenance of the facilities or lands transferred, or land and water use in the foreseeable future.

3. If the title transfer action involves any controversy or unresolved issue associated with: protection of interstate compacts and agreements; meeting the Secretary of the Interior's (Secretary) Native American trust responsibilities; fulfilling treaty and international agreement obligations; or protection of the public aspects of the project.

4. Other criteria as determined by Reclamation to warrant an EA or EIS.

Appendix 8 must be interpreted in conjunction with the Department's NEPA procedures (516 DM 1-6) and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR parts 1500-1508). The Department's procedures were published in the Federal Register, 45 FR 27541, Apr. 23, 1980, and revised in 49 FR 21437, May 21, 1984.

#### Proposed Categorical Exclusion A. (4)

Transfer of title to single-purpose facilities within Reclamation projects, to entities who are currently operating and maintaining the facilities or managing the lands, and who would agree to make no significant changes in operation and maintenance, and/or land and water use within the foreseeable future.

Eligibility for this categorical exclusion would be determined by Reclamation based on results of on-site inspections, surveys, and other methods of evaluation and documentation prepared by Reclamation to determine the presence or absence of the exceptions. A public involvement process will be utilized as part of the title transfer process. Details of this determination process would be added to Reclamation's NEPA Handbook. Projects that do not fully meet any of these exceptions would not qualify for this categorical exclusion.

#### Discussion of Exceptions

A title transfer action involving one of the Departmental exceptions to categorical exclusions will require the preparation of an environmental assessment. Briefly, the list of exceptions contains criteria including adverse effects on public health or safety, parks, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, ecologically sensitive areas, wild and scenic rivers, wetlands, floodplains, properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or on designated Critical Habitats for these species, cultural resources, and Indian Trust Assets. Also, included in the Departmental exceptions to categorical exclusions are concerns related to environmental controversy, uncertainty, individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects, precedent setting decisions about future actions, and compliance with Federal, State, Tribal or local environmental laws, executive orders, and requirements. The complete list of Departmental exceptions will be referred to when applying the categorical exclusion.

Reclamation's general exceptions from the categorical exclusion include title transfer action that incorporates problems or activities which will require the preparation of an environmental assessment. Single-purpose facilities within projects which would be ineligible for the categorical exclusion are those involving the following:

1. Unresolved issues involving the future operation and maintenance of the transferred facilities and lands. Potential transferees must be able to demonstrate the technical capability to maintain and operate the facilities and lands on a permanent basis and an ability to meet financial obligations associated with the transferred assets. Operations and maintenance of the facilities must not change in the foreseeable future.

2. Unresolved issues involving future use of lands or water associated with the transferred facilities and lands. Potential transferees must agree not to change the use of the lands or water associated with the transferred facilities for the foreseeable future.

3. Unresolved issues involving protection of interstate compacts and agreements. All transfers must be willing to assume responsibilities for commitments made under existing interstate compacts and agreements.

4. Unresolved issues involving meeting the Secretary's Native American trust responsibilities. All transfers must ensure the United States' Native American trust responsibilities are satisfied. In addition, outstanding Native American claims that are directly pending before the Department and that would be directly affected by the proposed transfer will be resolved prior to transfer.

5. Unresolved issues involving fulfilling treaty and international agreement obligations.

6. Unresolved issues involving protection of the public aspects of the project or facilities. Potentially affected State, local, and Tribal Governments, appropriate Federal agencies, and the public will be notified of the initiation of discussions to transfer title and will have (1) the opportunity to voice their views and suggest options for remedying any problems, and (2) full access to relevant information, including proposals, analyses, and reports related to the proposed transfer. The title transfer process will be carried out in an open and public manner. Once Reclamation has negotiated an agreement with a transferee, Reclamation will seek legislation specifically authorizing the negotiated terms of the transfer of each facility.

To be considered, any comments on this proposed addition to the list of categorical exclusions in the Departmental Manual must be received by August 1, 1996, at the location listed under **ADDRESSES** above. Comments received after that date will be considered only to the extent practicable.

**Outline:** Chapter 6 (516 DM 6) Managing the NEPA Process, Appendix 9—Bureau of Reclamation, 9.4 Categorical Exclusions.

Dated: June 25, 1996.

Kenneth D. Naser,

*Acting Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance.*

516 DM 6, Appendix 9—Bureau of Reclamation, 9.4 Categorical Exclusions

\* \* \* \* \*

A. \* \* \*

4. Transfer of title to single-purpose facilities within Reclamation projects to entities who are currently operating and maintaining the facilities or managing the lands, and who would agree to make no significant changes in operation and maintenance, and/or land and water use within the foreseeable future.

[FR Doc. 96-16654 Filed 7-1-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-94-M

## Fish and Wildlife Service

### Notice of Availability of a Draft Recovery Plan for the Kootenai River Population of White Sturgeon in Idaho and Montana for Review and Comment

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

**ACTION:** Notice of document availability.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces the availability for public review of a draft recovery plan for the Kootenai River population of white sturgeon. The Kootenai River white sturgeon represents a land-locked population found in the Kootenai River from Kootenai Falls, Montana, downstream through Kootenay Lake to Corra Linn Dam on the lower West Arm of Kootenay Lake, British Columbia. The Service solicits review and comment from the public on this draft plan.

**DATES:** Comments on the draft recovery plan must be received on or before September 30, 1996, to receive consideration by the Service.

**ADDRESSES:** The draft recovery plan is available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at either the Service's Upper Columbia River Basin Office, 11103 East

Montgomery Drive, Suite #2, Spokane, Washington, 99206 or the Snake River Basin Office, 4696 Overland Road, Room 576, Boise, Idaho, 83705. Persons wishing to review the draft recovery plan may obtain a copy by contacting the Supervisor, Snake River Basin Office, at the above address or by calling (208) 334-1931. Written comments and materials regarding the plan should be sent to the Service's, Snake River Basin Office, attention Recovery Team Leader, at the above Boise address. Comments and materials received are available on request for public inspection by appointment at the Snake River Basin Office.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Ruesink or Steve Duke, at the Service's, Snake River Basin Office, 4696 Overland Road, Room 576, Boise, Idaho 83705. (208) 334-1931.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

Restoring an endangered or threatened animal or plant to the point where it is again a secure, self-sustaining member of its ecosystem is a primary goal of the Service's endangered species program. Recovery plans describe actions considered necessary for conservation of the species, establish criteria for the recovery levels for downlisting and delisting species, and estimate time and cost for implementing the recovery measures needed.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) requires the development of recovery plans for listed species unless such a plan would not promote the conservation of a particular species. Section 4(f) of the Act, as amended in 1988, requires that public notice and an opportunity for public review and comment be provided during recovery plan development. The Service will consider all information presented during a public comment period prior to approval of each new or revised recovery plan. The Service and other Federal agencies will also take these comments into account in the course of implementing approved recovery plans.

The Kootenai River white sturgeon became isolated from other white sturgeon in the Columbia River basin during the last glacial age (approximately 10,000 years ago). Since then, the population has adapted to the pre-development habitat conditions in the Kootenai River drainage. Historically, spring runoff peaked during the first half of June in the Kootenai River upstream of the existing Libby Dam in Montana. Runoff from