

describe how the agency intends to manage the refuge over the next 15 years.

**DATES:** Comments on the Draft CCP/EA must be received on or before July 10, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Draft CCP are available on compact disk or hard copy; you may obtain a copy by writing to: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Conservation Planning, Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111 or you may access and download a copy via the planning Web site at <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/planning/mingo/index.html>.

All comments should be addressed to Mingo National Wildlife Refuge, Attention: CCP Comment, 24279 State Highway 51, Puxico, MO 63960, or direct e-mail to [r3planning@fws.gov](mailto:r3planning@fws.gov). Comments may also be submitted through the Service's regional Web site at <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/planning/>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen Burchett at (573) 222-3589.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Established in 1944 under authority of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the 21,592-acre Mingo NWR serves as a resting and wintering area for migratory waterfowl. A shallow basin, the Refuge lies in an abandoned channel of the Mississippi River bordered on the west by the Ozark Plateau and on the east by Crowley's Ridge. The Refuge contains approximately 15,000 acres of bottomland hardwood forest, 5,000 acres of marsh and water, 1,100 acres of cropland and moist soil units, and nearly 500 acres of grassy openings. During fall and spring migration, the Refuge wetlands support thousands of waterfowl.

The EA evaluates four different approaches, or alternatives, to the future management of Mingo NWR, and two alternatives for Pilot Knob and Ozark Cavefish NWRs. The plan also identifies wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public.

The preferred alternative for Mingo includes increased opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, environmental education and interpretation. It would continue with improvements to the drainage system, slightly increase the amount of bottomland forest, and maintain a variety of open habitats.

The preferred alternative for Pilot Knob includes increased community outreach to improve communication with local residents, guided public access to the summit of Pilot Knob, and increased law enforcement.

The preferred alternative for Ozark Cavefish includes opening the Refuge to compatible wildlife dependent public uses, working with surrounding land owners to improve water quality, and developing a formal agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for the cooperative management of this remote site and their adjacent property.

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee *et seq.*), requires the Service to develop a CCP for each National Wildlife Refuge. The purpose in developing a CCP is to provide refuge managers with a 15-year strategy for achieving refuge purposes and contributing toward the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System, consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management, conservation, legal mandates, and Service policies. In addition to outlining broad management direction for conserving wildlife and their habitats, the CCP identifies wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public, including opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update these CCPs at least every 15 years in accordance with the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4370d).

Dated: April 5, 2006.

**Charles M. Wooley,**

*Acting Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota.*

[FR Doc. E6-8119 Filed 5-25-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Record of Decision for the Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for Driftless Area National Wildlife Refuge in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of record of decision.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announces the decision and availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) and

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Driftless Area National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) in accordance with 40 CFR 1506.6(b). A thorough analysis of the environmental, social, and economic considerations was completed and included in the Final CCP/EIS. The Final CCP/EIS was released to the public and a Notice of Availability was published in the **Federal Register**, 71 FR 5874, February 3, 2006. The ROD documents the selection of Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative in the Final CCP/EIS. The ROD was signed by the Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Midwest Region, on April 18, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** The ROD and Final CCP/EIS may be viewed at Driftless Area National Wildlife Refuge Headquarters. You may obtain a copy of the ROD at the planning Web site at <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/planning/DriftlessArea> or by writing to the following address: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Conservation Planning, Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Cathy Henry at (563) 873-3423.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The CCP/EIS for the Driftless Area National Wildlife Refuge will provide management guidance for conservation of Refuge resources and public use activities during the next 15 years. Three alternatives and their consequences were described in detail in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement. Under all alternatives recovery plans for the Iowa Pleistocene snail and the Northern monkshood would be updated, cultural resources would be protected, and the Refuge's Fire Management Plan would guide prescribed fire and wildfire suppression.

**Alternative A—No Action.** Present management practices would continue under this Alternative. The No Action alternative is a status quo alternative where current conditions and trends continue. The alternative served as the baseline to compare and contrast with the other alternatives.

Acquisition efforts would not occur under this alternative because there would be no approved expanded acquisition boundary.

**Alternative B—Habitat Protection Emphasis.** Under this alternative the primary focus of Refuge activities would be on the permanent protection of endangered species habitat through land acquisition and minimal physical disturbance of endangered species habitat. The expanded acquisition area

for the Refuge would include a total of 6,000 acres in 22 counties in four states as described in a Land Protection Plan (Appendix J of the Final EIS). The 3,400 acres specified in this alternative is the estimated acreage that would be protected within the 15-year life of the CCP given anticipated levels of willing sellers, funding, and Refuge personnel.

*Alternative C—Habitat Protection, Increased Management, and Integrated Wildlife-dependent Recreation (Preferred Alternative).* Under this alternative the focus would be on the permanent protection of endangered species habitat and additional algific slopes through land acquisition and active management of endangered species habitat. New information and threats increase the need for active management. Fewer acres acquired in this alternative would allow limited Refuge resources to address all impacts to the habitat. The total expanded acquisition area for the Refuge would include 6,000 acres in 22 counties in four states as described in a Land Protection Plan (Appendix J of the Final EIS). The 2,275 acres specified in this alternative is a realistic estimate of the acreage that would be protected within the 15-year life of the CCP given anticipated levels of willing sellers, funding, and the need to accomplish other Refuge objectives in this alternative. The Service has selected Alternative C, the Preferred Alternative, for the Refuge. Alternative C addresses the key issues identified during the planning process and will best achieve the purposes and goals of the Refuge as well as the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System. This decision includes adoption of Comprehensive Conservation Plan Chapters (Appendix A), and the Land Protection Plan (Appendix J of the Final CCP/EIS). Implementation of the CCP will occur over the next 15 years and will depend on future staffing levels, funding, and willing sellers.

*The Service's Basis for the Decision:* Alternative C is the most environmentally preferable alternative. Alternative C is likely to lead to the delisting of the Iowa Pleistocene snail and significant progress in the recovery of Northern monkshood and Leedy's roseroot, as well as beneficial effects for other trust species. Algific talus slopes are more likely to benefit under the management proposed in Alternative C than the other alternatives. Alternative C is also expected to lead to more public support and more public opportunities than the other alternatives. Alternative A was not selected because it would not lead to reaching recovery goals or delisting of species. Alternative B was

not selected because minimal management would likely lead to negative effects on algific talus slopes and delisting of species might not occur. The rationale for choosing the selected alternative as the best alternative for the CCP/EIS is based on the impact of this alternative on the issues and concerns that surfaced during the planning process. The environmental impacts of the three alternatives were analyzed as to how they would impact: (1) Habitat management; (2) visitor services; (3) refuge expansion; and (4) species assessments. Because all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been incorporated into the preferred alternative, no mitigation measures have been identified.

Dated: May 1, 2006.

**Charles M. Wooley,**

*Acting Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota.*

[FR Doc. E6-8124 Filed 5-25-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Submission of Information Collection to the Office of Management and Budget for Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, this notice announces that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is submitting the information collections titled Tribal Colleges and Universities Annual Report Form, 25 CFR 41.9, OMB Control No. 1076-0105, and the Tribal Colleges and Universities Grant Application Form, 25 CFR 41.8, OMB Control No. 1076-0018, to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

**DATES:** Submit written comments on or before June 26, 2006.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent directly to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, by e-mail to [OIRA\\_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov](mailto:OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov) or by facsimile to (202) 395-6566.

Please send a copy of your comments to Kevin Skenandore, Acting Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs, 1849 C Street, NW., Mail Stop 3609-MIB, Washington, DC 20240-0001. You may

also send comments via facsimile to 202-208-3271.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** You may request further information or obtain copies of the information collections request submission from Keith Neves, (202) 208-3601 or Chris Redman, (202) 208-4397, Education Planning Specialists.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Each tribal college and university receiving financial assistance under the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act of 1978 (Act) is required by the Act, and by 25 CFR Part 41, to provide an accounting of amounts and purposes for which financial assistance was expended for the preceding academic year. A request for comments on this information collection request was published in the **Federal Register** on January 3, 2006 (71 FR 126). No comments were received regarding these information collection forms.

#### Request for Comments

You are invited to comment on the following items to the Desk Officer at OMB at the citation in the **ADDRESSES** section:

(a) The necessity of this information collection for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(b) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (hours and cost) of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(c) Ways we could enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(d) Ways we could minimize the burden of the collection of the information on the respondents, such as through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Please note that an agency may not sponsor or request, and an individual need not respond to, a collection of information unless it has a valid OMB Control Number.

OMB is required to make a decision concerning this information collection request between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, a comment will receive the best consideration by OMB if it is submitted early during this comment period.

In this notice, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is soliciting comments to the following information collection: