

and HUD regulations in 24 CFR Part 58, and EIS under the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

The proposed development would consist of approximately 152 rental housing units, 23 buildings, approximately 41.7 percent site coverage, and a density of 12.4 units per acre. All of the units would be affordable to families with incomes at or below 80 percent of the median income. An internal looped roadway system with separate points for both entry and exit is proposed as part of the project. National Avenue would provide the main access from State Route 28. Points of access to the complex from National Avenue that are being considered include: Grey Lane and Toyon Road, with Wildwood Road via Estates Drive being an alternative or emergency access road. A Class 1 bike trail and onsite parking are also proposed for the site.

#### Alternatives to the Proposed Action

There are five alternatives to the proposed action to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. The alternatives are all variations of the site layout and density. Alternative sites for the project were explored early in the process and it was determined that no other more viable site was available.

##### Alternative B, 132 Units

Coverage Ratio: 38.6 percent  
Population: 364 (Assuming 1 person/  
bedroom)

##### Alternative C, 160 Units

Coverage Ratio: 44.0 percent  
Population: 452 (Assuming 1 person/  
bedroom)

##### Alternative D, 144 Units

Coverage Ratio: 30 percent  
Population: 568 (Assuming 1 person/  
bedroom)

##### Alternative E, 152 Units

Coverage Ratio: 50 percent  
Population: 394 (Assuming 1 person/  
bedroom)

##### Alternative F, No Project/No Action

If nothing were done, no additional affordable housing would be built. The project site would remain vacant.

#### Probable Environmental Effects

The following subject areas will be analyzed in the combined EIS/EIR for probable environmental effects: water quality, soils and geology, air quality, noise, transportation, vegetation, wildlife and scenic resources, cultural and historic resources, land use, growth inducement, public services and public utilities.

#### Lead Agencies

For purposes of complying with NEPA and CEQA, Placer County is the Lead Agency and as the Responsible Entity under 24 CFR 58.2(a)(7) assumes the responsibility for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action that would otherwise apply to HUD under NEPA. Respectively, section 104(g) of Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act (42 U.S.C. 5304(g)) and section 288 of Title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12838) authorize recipients of HUD assistance to assume NEPA responsibilities in projects involving CDBG for infrastructure development and possibly HOME funds for affordable housing development.

The TRPA is the Lead Agency for the EIS written in accordance with Tahoe Regional Planning Compact and TRPA's Code of Ordinances.

TRPA is a multi-state (California and Nevada) agency that has its own Code of Ordinances. These are based on both CEQA and NEPA but there are some minor differences from both, hence the necessity to do a three-way document that will comply with CEQA, TRPA and NEPA. TRPA has its own procedures and Code of Ordinances because it is exempt from CEQA and California land use laws.

Questions may be directed to the individual named in this notice under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: October 13, 2005.

**Pamela H. Patenaude,**

*Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.*

[FR Doc. E5-5841 Filed 10-20-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-27-P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4980-N-42]

#### Federal Property Suitable as Facilities To Assist the Homeless

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This Notice identifies unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus Federal property reviewed by HUD for suitability for possible use to assist the homeless.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 21, 2005.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Kathy Ezzell, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Room 7262, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Washington,

DC 20410; telephone (202) 708-1234; TTY number for the hearing- and speech-impaired (202) 708-2565, (these telephone numbers are not toll-free), or call the toll-free Title V information line at 1-800-927-7588.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In accordance with the December 12, 1988 court order in *National Coalition for the Homeless v. Veterans Administration*, No. 88-2503-OG (D.D.C.), HUD publishes a Notice, on a weekly basis, identifying unutilized, underutilized, excess and surplus Federal buildings and real property that HUD has reviewed for suitability for use to assist the homeless. Today's Notice is for the purpose of announcing that no additional properties have been determined suitable or unsuitable this week.

Dated: October 13, 2005.

**Mark R. Johnston,**

*Director, Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs.*

[FR Doc. 05-20873 Filed 10-20-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-29-M**

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR-4728-N-05]

#### Notice of Certain Operating Cost Adjustment Factors for 2006

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

**ACTION:** Publication of the 2006 Operating Cost Adjustment Factors (OCAFs) for Section 8 rent adjustments at contract renewal under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (MAHRA), as amended by the Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act of 1999, and under the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990 (LIHPRA) Projects assisted with Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments.

**SUMMARY:** This notice establishes annual factors used in calculating rent adjustments under section 524 of the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 (MAHRA) as amended by the Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act of 1999, and under the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990 (LIHPRA).

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 11, 2006.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Regina Aleksiewicz, Housing Project Manager, Office of Housing Assistance and Grant Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Multifamily Housing, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20410-8000; telephone (202) 708-3000; extension 2600 (This is not a toll-free number). Hearing or speech-impaired individuals may access this number via TTY by calling the toll-free Federal Information Relay Service at (800) 877-8339.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Operating Cost Adjustment Factors (OCAFs)**

Section 514(e)(2) of MAHRA, requires HUD to establish guidelines for rent adjustments based on an operating cost adjustment factor (OCAF). The legislation requiring HUD to establish OCAFs for LIHPRHA projects and projects with contract renewals under section 524 of MAHRA is similar in wording and intent. HUD has therefore developed a single factor to be applied uniformly to all projects utilizing OCAFs as the method by which rents are adjusted.

Additionally, section 524 of the Act gives HUD broad discretion in setting OCAFs—referring simply to “operating cost factors established by the Secretary.” The sole exception to this grant of authority is a specific requirement that application of an OCAF shall not result in a negative rent adjustment. OCAFs are to be applied uniformly to all projects utilizing OCAFs as the method by which rents are adjusted at the issuance of or during the term of any contract entered into pursuant to MAHRA. OCAFs are applied to project contract rent less debt service.

An analysis of cost data for FHA-insured projects showed that their operating expenses could be grouped into nine categories: Wages, employee benefits, property taxes, insurance, supplies and equipment, fuel oil, electricity, natural gas, and water and sewer. Based on an analysis of these data, HUD derived estimates of the percentage of routine operating costs that were attributable to each of these nine expense categories. Data for projects with unusually high or low expenses due to unusual circumstances were deleted from analysis.

States are the lowest level of geographical aggregation at which there are enough projects to permit statistical analysis. Additionally, no data were available for the Western Pacific Islands. Data for Hawaii was therefore used to generate OCAFs for these areas.

The best current measures of cost changes for the nine cost categories were selected. The only categories for which current data are available at the State level are for fuel oil, electricity, and natural gas. Current price change indices for the other six categories are only available at the national level. The Department had the choice of using dated State-level data or relatively current national data. It opted to use national data rather than data that would be two or more years older (*e.g.*, the most current local wage data are for 2003).

The OCAFs for 2006 differ from previous years' OCAFs in that they replace the overall Consumer Price Index change used as a surrogate for property tax increases with the Residential Property Tax Index from the Census Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES). Property taxes have started to increase faster than overall consumer prices, and the CES now provides statistically reliable data. State-level data are available from the Census Survey of Local and State Governments, but it includes tax revenues from non-residential sites, which are significant, and does not adjust for changes in the number and types of properties taxed.

The data sources for the nine cost indicators selected used were as follows:

*Labor Costs.* 3/2004 to 3/2005 Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), “Employment Cost Index, Private Sector Wages and Salaries Component at the National Level.”

*Employment Benefit Costs.* 3/2004 to 3/2005 Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) “Employment Cost Index, Employee Benefits at the National Level.”

*Property Taxes.* 2002–2003 Census Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES), “Residential Property Taxes.”

*Goods, Supplies, Equipment.* 3/2004 to 3/2005 Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) “Producer Price Index, Consumer Goods Less Food and Energy.”

*Insurance.* 3/2004 to 3/2005 Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) “Consumer Price Index, Tenant and Household Residential Insurance Index.”

*Fuel Oil.* Energy Information Agency, 2003 to 2004 consumption-weighted annual average State prices for #2 residential fuel oil (Department of Energy multi-state fuel oil grouping averages used for the States with too little fuel oil consumption to have values).

*Electricity.* Energy Information Agency, March 2004 “Electric Power Monthly” report, Table 5.6.B.

*Natural Gas.* Energy Information Agency, Natural Gas, Residential Energy Price, 2000–2004 annual cost in dollars

per 1,000 cubic feet (monthly data are so erratic that annual averages offer a more reliable measure).

*Water and Sewer.* 3/2004 to 3/2005 Consumer Price Index, “All Urban Consumers, Water and Sewer and Trash Collection Services.”

The sum of the nine cost components equals 100 percent of operating costs for purposes of OCAF calculations. To calculate the OCAFs, the selected inflation factors are multiplied by the relevant State-level operating cost percentages derived from the previously referenced analysis of FHA insured projects. For instance, if wages in Virginia comprised 50 percent of total operating cost expenses and wages increased by 4 percent from March 2004 to March 2005, the wage increase component of the Virginia OCAF for 2006 would be 2.0 percent ( $4\% \times 50\%$ ). This 2.0 percent would then be added to the increases for the other eight expense categories to calculate the 2006 OCAF for Virginia. These types of calculations were made for each State for each of the nine cost components, and are included as the Appendix to this Notice.

**II. MAHRA and LIHPRHA OCAF Procedures**

MAHRA, as amended by the Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act of 1999, created the Mark-to-Market Program to reduce the cost of Federal housing assistance, enhance HUD's administration of such assistance, and to ensure the continued affordability of units in certain multifamily housing projects. Section 524 of MAHRA authorizes renewal of Section 8 project-based assistance contracts for projects without Restructuring Plans under the Mark-to-Market Program, including renewals that are not eligible for Plans and those for which the owner does not request Plans. Renewals must be at rents not exceeding comparable market rents except for certain projects. For Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation projects, other than single room occupancy projects (SROs) under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney Act, 42 U.S.C. 11301 *et seq.*), that are eligible for renewal under section 524(b)(3) of MAHRA, the renewal rents are required to be set at the lesser of: (1) The existing rents under the expiring contract, as adjusted by the OCAF; (2) fair market rents (less any amounts allowed for tenant-purchased utilities); or (3) comparable market rents for the market area.

The Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident

Homeownership Act of 1990 ("LIHPHA") (see, in particular, section 222(a)(2)(G)(i) of LIHPHA, 12 U.S.C. 4112 (a)(2)(G)) and the regulations at 24 CFR 248.145(a)(9) requires that future rent adjustments for LIHPHA projects be made by applying an annual factor to be determined by the Secretary to the portion of project rent attributable to operating expenses for the project and, where the owner is a priority purchaser, to the portion of project rent attributable to project oversight costs.

### III. Findings and Certifications

#### *Environmental Impact*

This issuance sets forth rate determinations and related external administrative requirements and procedures that do not constitute a development decision affecting the physical condition of specific project areas or building sites. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(6), this notice is categorically excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321).

#### *Executive Order 13132, Federalism*

This notice does not have federalism implications and does not impose substantial direct compliance costs on state and local governments or preempt State law within the meaning of Executive Order 13132 (entitled "Federalism").

#### *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number*

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for this program is 14.187.

Dated: October 6, 2005.

**Frank L. Davis,**

*General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing.*

### APPENDIX

#### **Operating Cost Adjustment Factors for 2006 (percent)**

ALABAMA—3.3  
ALASKA—5.0  
ARIZONA—3.9  
ARKANSAS—3.6  
CALIFORNIA—3.0  
COLORADO—5.2  
CONNECTICUT—4.4  
DELAWARE—5.9  
DIST. OF COLUMBIA—3.6  
FLORIDA—3.6  
GEORGIA—3.9  
HAWAII—3.8  
IDAHO—3.8  
ILLINOIS—4.0  
INDIANA—4.0  
IOWA—5.5  
KANSAS—4.2  
KENTUCKY—4.2  
LOUISIANA—3.4

MAINE—3.9  
MARYLAND—4.1  
MASSACHUSETTS—5.2  
MICHIGAN—4.4  
MINNESOTA—4.2  
MISSISSIPPI—3.4  
MISSOURI—3.6  
MONTANA—5.4  
NEBRASKA—3.9  
NEVADA—3.8  
NEW HAMPSHIRE—5.7  
NEW JERSEY—4.1  
NEW MEXICO—3.5  
NEW YORK—4.5  
N. CAROLINA—3.4  
N. DAKOTA—3.9  
OHIO—3.9  
OKLAHOMA—3.7  
OREGON—3.5  
PENNSYLVANIA—4.2  
RHODE ISLAND—3.4  
S. CAROLINA—3.6  
S. DAKOTA—4.2  
TENNESSEE—3.4  
TEXAS—4.1  
UTAH—3.6  
VERMONT—4.0  
VIRGINIA—3.6  
WASHINGTON—3.5  
W. VIRGINIA—3.8  
WISCONSIN—4.2  
WYOMING—4.2  
PACIFIC ISLANDS—3.4  
PUERTO RICO—2.9  
VIRGIN ISLANDS—3.6  
U.S. AVERAGE—4.0  
[FR Doc. E5-5842 Filed 10-20-05; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 4210-27-P**

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

#### **Fish and Wildlife Service**

#### **Endangered Species Recovery Permits and Applications**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability and receipt of application.

**SUMMARY:** The following applicant has applied for a permit to conduct certain activities with endangered species pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(c) of the Act.

**DATES:** Written data or comments must be received November 21, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** Written data or comments should be submitted to the Assistant Regional Director-Ecological Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 25486, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225-0486.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Permit Application Number—TE-105504. Applicant—Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks. The applicant requests a permit to take the gray wolf

(*Canis lupus*) throughout locations in northern Montana where the species is listed as endangered. The applicant proposes to conduct research and monitoring of wolf populations, implement proactive strategies, and conduct, or direct, non-lethal and lethal control actions to reduce or resolve wolf-livestock and dog conflicts and human safety concerns, as is currently conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and in accordance with the 1999 Interim Wolf Control Plan. If the permit is issued, the applicant would assume responsibility from the Service for managing wolves in northwestern Montana. Take for control purposes would be consistent with the State Management Plan for wolves and the 1999 Interim Wolf Control Plan, which provide conditions on when wolf control is appropriate, including the following requirements—clear evidence that wolves were responsible for the livestock injury or death; reason to believe that additional losses would occur if the problem wolf or wolves were not controlled; that livestock grazing on Federal lands be in compliance with approved management plans and annual operating plans for allotments; and, that lethal control be authorized in writing prior to its implementation when possible. Non-lethal control would involve harassing wolves by using rubber bullets, projectile bean bags, or other scare tactics. These activities are aimed at enhancement of survival for the species in the wild. The Service has determined that a practical, responsive management program including control is essential to the wolf recovery effort (Service 1999). If issued, the permit would not affect ongoing wolf management in the remainder of the State of Montana conducted in accordance with the non-essential experimental population regulations found at 50 CFR 17.40(n). Additional information about wolf recovery and conservation in the northwestern United States, including control of problem wolves, can be found in various reports at <http://westerngraywolf.fws.gov/>.

#### *Availability of Documents:*

Documents and other information submitted with this permit are available for review, subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a) and Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552), by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents within 20 days of the date of publication of this notice to Kris Olsen, by mail (see **ADDRESSES**) or by telephone at 303-236-4256. A copy of the application is available for public