

for the effects of authorized take of only those two species. Under Alternative D, the applicant would manage the ownership based on standards and guidelines for Matrix land under the Northwest Forest Plan. Alternative B, the Proposed Habitat Conservation Plan Alternative, would provide minimizing and mitigating measures for proposed take of the listed and currently proposed species mentioned above. In addition, protection for unlisted species would be provided through the retention of habitat structures from harvested stands into the subsequent rotation, buffering of habitat biotopes, supplemental habitat management, and through overall landscape level management goals.

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1531–1544, and 4201–4245.

Dated: January 16, 1997.

Thomas J. Dwyer,
Acting Regional Director, Region 1, Portland,
Oregon.

[FR Doc. 97–1601 Filed 1–22–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

Availability of Amended Environmental Assessment and Receipt of Application for Amendment To Previously Issued Incidental Take Permit From Sage Development Company, LLC, Daphne, AL

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Sage Development Company, LLC, (Sage) seeks an amendment to their previously issued incidental take permit (ITP), PRT–811416, from the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) (Act), as amended. The ITP authorizes for a period of 30 years the incidental take of an endangered species, the Alabama beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*), known to occupy a 25.7-acre tract of land owned by Sage on the Fort Morgan Peninsula, Baldwin County, Alabama. Sage proposes to expand the original project, known as The Dunes, by 9.6 acres to occupy a total project area of 35.3 acres, and expand construction to include a total of 4 condominium complexes, 50 single family/duplex lots, their associated landscaped grounds and parking areas, recreational amenities, and dune walkover structures. The originally permitted project included 3 condominium complexes, and 38 single family/duplex lots.

The Service also announces the availability of a supplement to the May

15, 1996, environmental assessment (EA) and an amended habitat conservation plan (HCP) for the revised incidental take. Copies of the EA and/or HCP may be obtained by making a request to the Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**). This notice also advises the public that the Service has made a preliminary determination that re-issuing the ITP with the requested amendment 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 amended 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).

DATES: Written comments on the amended application, EA, and amended HCP should be sent to the Service's Regional Office (see **ADDRESSES**) and should be received on or before February 24, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Persons wishing to review the amended 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 at the Jackson, Mississippi, Field Office, 6578 Dogwood View Parkway, Suite A, Jackson, Mississippi 39213. Written data or comments concerning the application, EA, or HCP should be submitted to the Regional Office. Comments must be submitted in writing to be processed. Please reference permit PRT–811416 in such comments, or in requests for the documents discussed herein. Requests for the documents 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Alabama beach mouse (ABM), *Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*, is a subspecies of the common oldfield mouse *Peromyscus polionotus* and is restricted to the dune systems of the Gulf Coast of Alabama. The known

current range of ABM extends from Fort Morgan eastward to the western terminus of Alabama Highway 182, including the Perdue Unit on the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge (BSNWR). The sand dune systems inhabited by this species are not uniform; several habitat types are distinguishable. The species inhabits primary dunes, interdune areas, secondary dunes, and scrub dunes. The depth and area of these habitats from the beach inland varies. Population surveys indicate that this subspecies is usually more abundant in primary dunes than in secondary dunes, and usually more abundant in secondary dunes than in scrub dunes. Optimal habitat consists of dune systems with all dune types. Though fewer ABM inhabit scrub dunes, these high dunes can serve as refugia during devastating hurricanes that overwash, flood, and destroy or alter secondary and frontal dunes. ABM surveys on the applicant's property reveal habitat occupied by ABM. The applicant's property contains designated critical habitat for the ABM. Expansion of the previously-permitted project may result in the death of, or injury to, ABM in excess of that previously expected. Habitat alterations due to expanded condominium placement and subsequent human habitation of the amended project may result in further reductions of available habitat for food, shelter, and reproduction.

The supplement to the May 15, 1996, EA considers the environmental consequences of several alternatives for the amended project. One action proposed is issuance of the amended ITP based upon submittal of the revised HCP as proposed. This alternative provides for restrictions that include placing no habitable structures seaward of the designated ABM critical habitat, establishment of walkover structures across designated critical habitat, a prohibition against housing or keeping pet cats, ABM competitor control and monitoring measures, scavenger-proof garbage containers, creation of educational and information brochures on ABM conservation, and the minimization and control of outdoor lighting. Further, the revised HCP proposes to increase, in relative proportion compared to the original project, an endowment to acquire ABM habitat off-site or otherwise perform some other conservation measure for the ABM. The revised HCP provides additional funding for these mitigation measures. Another alternative is consideration of different project designs that further minimize permanent loss of ABM habitat. A third

alternative is no-action, or deny either request for authorization to incidentally take the ABM.

As stated above, the Service has made a preliminary determination that the issuance of an amended 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, HCP, and appropriate amendments. 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 amended ITP would not have significant effects on the human environment in the project area.
2. The additional proposed take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity.
3. The applicant has ensured that adequate additional funding will be provided to implement the measures proposed in the submitted revisions to the 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 amended 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 his 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 the amended 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 opinions, in combination with the above findings, will be used in the final analysis to determine whether or not to issue an amended ITP.

Dated: January 15, 1997.

Noreen K. Clough,
Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 97-1604 Filed 1-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

Geological Survey

Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC); Public Review of Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The FGDC is sponsoring a public review of the draft Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards to be considered for adoption as FGDC standards. If adopted, the standards must be followed by all Federal agencies for geospatial data collected directly or indirectly, through grants, partnerships, or contracts.

In its assigned leadership role for developing the National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI), the FGDC recognizes that the standards must also meet the needs and recognize the views of State and local governments, academia, industry, and the public. The purpose of this notice is to solicit such views. The FGDC invites the community to review, test, and evaluate the proposed standards. Comments are encouraged about the content, completeness, and usability of the proposed standard.

The FGDC anticipates that the proposed standards will be adopted as Federal Geographic Data Committee standards after updating or revision. The standards may be forwarded to voluntary standards bodies for adoption if interest warrants such actions.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 15, 1997.

CONTACT AND ADDRESSES: Requests for written copies of or review comments for the "Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards" should be addressed to Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards Review, FGDC Secretariat (attn: Jennifer Fox), U.S. Geological Survey, 590 National Center, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, Virginia, 20192; telephone 703-648-5514; facsimile 703-648-5755; or Internet "gdc@usgs.gov." The standard may be downloaded from this Internet address: <ftp://www.fgdc.gov/pub/standards/Accuracy/>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Geospatial Positioning Accuracy Standards provide a common methodology for reporting the horizontal and vertical accuracy of clearly defined features where the location is represented by a single point coordinate: examples are survey monuments; prominent landmarks, such as church spires, standpipes, radio towers, tall chimneys, and mountain peaks; and targeted photogrammetric control points. It facilitates the

interoperability of spatial data by providing a consistent means for users to directly compare positional accuracies obtained by different methods for the same point. It addresses positional accuracy reporting and testing requirements for various spatial data applications. The document consists of the following parts:

Part 1, Reporting Methodology: The general accuracy reporting standard for the horizontal component is the radius of a circle of uncertainty, such that the true (theoretical) location of the point falls within the circle 95-percent of the time. The general accuracy reporting standard for the vertical component is a linear uncertainty value, such that the true (theoretical) location of the point falls within \pm of that linear uncertainty value 95-percent of the time. This reporting methodology is adopted in the subsequent parts of the draft standard.

Part 2, Standards for Geodetic Networks. Part 2 addresses accuracy reporting for geodetic surveys. Geodetic control surveys are usually performed to establish a basic control network from which supplemental surveying and mapping work are performed. Geodetic network surveys are distinguished by use of redundant, interconnected, permanently monumented control points that comprise the framework for the National Spatial Reference System (NSRS) or are often incorporated into the NSRS. This standard is intended to replace accuracy standards previously issued by the Federal Geodetic Data Subcommittee.

Part 3, National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy. The National Standard for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) provides a common methodology for testing and reporting accuracy of maps and geospatial data derived from sources such as aerial photographs, satellite imagery, and maps. The NSSDA is intended to replace the United States National Map Accuracy Standards (U.S. Bureau of the Budget, 1947).

The NSRS may be used to reference mapping project control surveys to a common georeference system. The accuracy of geospatial data derived from project control surveys is expressed using the NSSDA. The NSSDA also may be related to the NSRS by using NSRS points as check points to test accuracy of geospatial data derived from aerial photographs, satellite imagery, maps, and other secondary sources.

Dated: January 14, 1997.

Richard E. Witmer,
Acting Chief, National Mapping Division.
[FR Doc. 97-1593 Filed 1-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-31-M