SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 14, 2004 (69 FR 26941), HUD published its Fiscal Year (FY) 2004, Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), Policy Requirements and General Section to the SuperNOFA for HUD’s Discretionary Grant Programs. On May 28, 2004 (69 FR 30697), and on June 22, 2004 (69 FR 34878), respectively, HUD published a technical correction for several of the programs included in the SuperNOFA. This notice published in today’s Federal Register corrects the omission of Portland, Oregon as an Enterprise Community (EC) from the list in Appendix E of the May 14, 2004, document. Further, this document corrects the statement in the May 14, 2004, document with respect to the determination of the project rental assistance contract (PRAC) contract authority for both the Section 202 and the Section 811 programs. Additionally, this document makes a correction to an erroneous reference to the application due date published in the June 22, 2004, document with respect to the Public Housing Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Program Resident Service Delivery Models-Family. Accordingly, this document makes the following corrections:

Notice of HUD’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2004, Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), Policy Requirements and General Section to the SuperNOFA for HUD’s Discretionary Programs

Appendix E, beginning on page 27010 of the May 14, 2004, NOFA, contains the List of EZs, ECs, Urban Enhanced Enterprise Communities, and Renewal Communities (List). Portland, Oregon was inadvertently omitted from the List. In the June 22, 2004, document, HUD advised that it was modifying the List and would publish a modification to the List on its Web site. Today’s document makes a further modification to the List by adding Portland as a designated EC to the List. HUD will publish the modified List on its Web site at http://www.hud.gov/offices/adm/grants/fundsavail.cfm.

Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program (Section 202 Program)

On page 27711 of the May 14, 2004, NOFA under section I.C.2. captioned “PRAC Funds,” HUD mistakenly described the determination of the PRAC contract authority as “by multiplying the number of revenue units for elderly persons by the appropriate operating cost standard.” The PRAC budget authority is determined by multiplying the number of revenue units for elderly persons by the appropriate operating cost standard by 5 (years). The operating cost standards will be published by Notice.

Section 811 Program of Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities (Section 811 Program)

On page 27755 of the May 14, 2004, NOFA under section I.D.2. captioned “PRAC Funds,” HUD mistakenly described the determination of the PRAC contract authority as “by multiplying the number of units for residents with disabilities in an independent living project or the number of residents with disabilities in a group home by the appropriate operating cost standard and then multiplying the result by 12 (months).” The underscored phrase, “and then multiplying the result by 12 (months).” adds an additional step in the calculation that is incorrect. This document corrects the description of the determination of the PRAC contract by removing the underscored language from section I.C.2. As corrected, section I.C.2. now reads as follows:

2. PRAC Funds. The PRAC contract authority is determined by multiplying the number of revenue units for elderly persons by the appropriate operating cost standard. The PRAC budget authority is determined by multiplying the PRAC contract authority by 5 (years). The operating cost standards will be published by Notice.

Public Housing Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program

On page 34879, column 3 of the June 22, 2004, document under the caption Public Housing Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program, it is erroneously stated that the “application due date for Resident Service Delivery Models-Family is extended to August 3, 2004.” In fact, the application due date is August 24, 2004, as extended and correctly stated under DATES in columns 1 and 2 of page 34878.
strategy for achieving refuge purposes and contributing toward the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System, consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife science, conservation, legal mandates, and Service policies. In addition to outlining broad management direction on conserving wildlife and their habitats, the CCP identifies wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public, including opportunities for hunting, 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 Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321-4370d).

**Background:** Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge was established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (MBCA) by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. The stated purpose is “... for use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds.” 16 U.S.C. 715d (Migratory Bird Act)

Significant issues addressed in the Draft CCP/EA include: habitat and wildlife management, ecological integrity, visitor services, cultural resources, and partnerships. The Service developed three alternatives for management of the Refuge. Alternative A—No Action; Alternative B—Restoration; Alternative C—Enhanced Habitat Management and Public Use. All three alternatives outline specific management objectives and strategies related to wildlife and habitat management, ecological integrity, visitor services, cultural resources, and partnerships.

Alternative A—No Action (Current Management) focuses on managing water in nine marsh units to meet the life cycle needs of waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds. The marsh units are currently rotated through a 5-year drawdown schedule according to the Marsh Management Plan approved in 1991. In addition, the units drawn down each year are burned according to a prescribed fire plan approved in August 2002. Visitation to Fish Springs currently ranges between 2000 and 3100 visitors each year. Up to 40 percent of the Refuge is open for duck and coot hunting each year. Waterfowl hunting remains the greatest recreational interest. Continuing to provide educational and interpretive opportunities for visitors will enhance understanding and appreciation of the wildlife and cultural resources represented on the Refuge. Efforts to inventory and analyze unmapped cultural resource sites and fully understand known sites will continue. Continuing to foster and increase opportunities for participation in conservation initiatives, such as the Eastern Bonneville partnership, will help the Refuge maximize its contribution to natural resource conservation.

Alternative B—Restoration, will restore, maintain and enhance the Refuge’s original hydrological system and high-desert shrubland habitat to a condition resembling their historic nature prior to Refuge development. Marsh restoration will ensure that habitat that is critical to maintain the flora and fauna that historically inhabited the Refuge is provided. Marsh restoration will call for the removal of all dikes and water control structures. High-desert shrubland will be restored to its historic native composition benefiting those species dependent on this habitat type, such as kit fox, Bonneville pocket gopher, loggerhead shrike, black-throated sparrow, and neotropical migrants. Visitor services will change slightly under the restoration alternative, with more emphasis placed on non-consumptive uses, such as environmental education, interpretation, wildlife observation and photography. The shift in visitor services is due mainly to the removal of water control structures (i.e. dikes and roads) which will limit vehicle access. The current hunting program will continue with the addition of a goose hunt. Access to hunting areas will be provided via boat and/or foot passage, promoting a remote hunting experience. Restoration and subsequent monitoring of the marsh ecosystem will provide expanded opportunities for interpretation and environmental education.

Alternative C—Enhanced Habitat Management and Visitor Services, the Service’s Preferred Action, emphasizes the utilization of Fish Springs NWR by a diversity of migratory birds. Marshes will continue to be managed for waterfowl, shorebirds, and water birds. Current marsh water management will continue, with few minor modifications to improve foraging and nesting habitat for shorebirds and water birds. High-desert shrublands will be restored to historic native composition, thereby benefiting those species dependent on this habitat type, such as kit fox, Bonneville pocket gopher, loggerhead shrike, black-throated sparrow, and neotropical migrants. One of the five major thermal springs that arise from a fault line at the base of the east slope of the Fish Springs Range will be restored to its historic natural condition providing habitat that is critical to maintain the flora and fauna that historically inhabited the Refuge. Restoration and subsequent monitoring of the marsh ecosystem will provide expanded opportunities for interpretation and environmental education. Increased efforts in visitor services and the addition of a goose hunt to the current hunting program will attract more visitors to the Refuge. The Refuge will maintain an auto-tour route which traverses a cross section of the habitats and provides opportunity for wildlife viewing and photography. The construction of an interpretive boardwalk and an observation platform will further enhance wildlife viewing and photography.

The review and comment period is 30 calendar days commencing with publication of this Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. After the review and comment period for this Draft CCP/EA, all comments will be analyzed and considered by the Service. All comments received from individuals on the Environmental Assessment become part of the official public record. Requests for such comments will be handled in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, the Council on Environmental Quality’s NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6(f)) and other Service and Departmental policies and procedures.


John A. Blankenship,
Deputy Regional Director, Region 6.

[FR Doc. 04–16409 Filed 7–19–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Receipt of an Application for an Incidental Take Permit for Construction of a Single-Family Home in Brevard County, FL

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: David Sime (Applicant) requests an incidental take permit (ITP) pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), as amended (Act). The Applicant anticipates taking about 0.33 acre of Florida scrub-jay (Aphelocoma coerulescens) (scrub-jay) foraging, sheltering, and possibly nesting habitat,