the proposal by name and/or OMB control number and should be sent to: Lillian Deitzer, Reports Management Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 4178, Washington, DC 20410 or Lillian.L.Deziter@hud.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jade Banks, Senior Policy Advisor, Office of Labor Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street, SW., Room 2102, Washington, DC 20410 or Jade.M.Banks@hud.gov; telephone (202) 402–5475 (this is not a toll-free number) for additional information.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department is submitting 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).

This Notice is soliciting comments from members of the public and affected agencies concerning the proposed collection of information to: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection 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 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:


OMB Control Number, if applicable: 2501–0021.

Description of need for this information and proposed use: HUD, and State, local, and Tribal agencies administering HUD-assisted programs must enforce Federal labor standards requirements, including the payment of prevailing wage rates to laborers and mechanics employed on HUD-assisted construction and maintenance work that is covered by these requirements. Enforcement activities include securing funds to ensure the payment of wage restitution that has been or may be found due to laborers and mechanics who were employed on HUD-assisted projects, and the payment of liquidated damages that may be assessed for violations of Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (CWHSSA) overtime violations. Ultimately, these funds are deposited to an account in the U.S. Treasury. If the labor standards discrepancies are resolved, HUD refunds associated amounts to the depositor. As underpaid laborers and mechanics are located, HUD sends wage restitution payments to the affected workers. Liquidated damages assessed for CWHSSA overtime violations are retained by HUD.

In order to make refunds and wage restitution payments, HUD must verify the identity of the payee to ensure that the refund is made to the correct depositor or wage restitution to the correct worker before payment is made. In order to complete these verifications, HUD will request information such as the depositor’s or payee’s tax identification number (i.e., employer identification number or Social Security Number); the project name or number; and/or the worker’s employer’s name.

All refunds from labor standards deposit accounts are made, electronically. Depositors entitled to a refund must notify HUD the name, address, and the account information for the banking institution to which the depositor wants the refund sent. Wage restitution payments may be made by check or electronically, at the payee’s choice. HUD must collect either the payee’s mailing address, so that a check may be sent to them, or banking information for an electronic payment.

Agency form numbers: HUD–4734, Labor Standards Deposit Voucher. This form is completed by HUD staff after depositor or payee verification and the collection of payment processing information, i.e., banking details or mailing address.

Members of affected public: Developers and prime contractors engaged on HUD-assisted construction or maintenance work subject to Federal labor standards requirements; construction and maintenance laborers and mechanics employed on HUD-assisted projects subject to Federal labor standards requirements that are entitled to wage restitution.

Estimation of the total number of hours needed to prepare the information collection including number of respondents, frequency of responses, and hours of response: The estimated number of respondents is 50 per year. The estimated number of hours needed per respondent is .1 hours. The total public burden is estimated to be 5 hours per year. Payees do not need to complete a form; the information may be collected by HUD in person, by telephone, or in writing, at the payee’s option.

Status: Extension of a currently approved collection.


Dated: December 8, 2009.

Waite H. Madison,
Director, Office of Labor Relations.
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be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Permit No. TE–148556
Applicant: Deborah M. Van Dooremolen, Las Vegas, Nevada. The applicant requests an amendment to an existing permit (April 9, 2007; 72 FR 17576) to take (harass by survey) the southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax trailli extimus) in conjunction with surveys in Clark County, Nevada, for the purpose of enhancing its survival.

Permit No. TE–231424
Applicant: Seth A. Shanahan, Las Vegas, Nevada. The applicant requests a permit to take (harass by survey) the southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax trailli extimus) and Yuma clapper rail (Rallus longirostris yumanensis) in conjunction with surveys in Clark County, Nevada, for the purpose of enhancing their survival.

Permit No. TE–231425
Applicant: Robert C. Fletcher, San Diego, California. The applicant requests a permit to take (survey by pursuit) the Quino checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha quino) in conjunction with surveys throughout the range of the species in California for the purpose of enhancing its survival.

Permit No. TE–231427
Applicant: John R. Ivanov, Pasadena, California. The applicant requests a permit to take (harass by survey and monitor nests) the southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax trailli extimus) and least Bell’s vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus) in conjunction with surveys and population monitoring throughout the range of each species in California for the purpose of enhancing their survival.

Permit No. TE–170381
Applicant: Bill Stagnaro, San Francisco, California. The applicant requests an amendment to an existing permit (February 13, 2008; 73 FR 8344) to take (harass by survey) the light-footed clapper rail (Rallus longirostris levipes), the California clapper rail (Rallus longirostris obsoletus), and the Yuma clapper rail (Rallus longirostris yumanensis) in conjunction with surveys throughout the range of the species in California, Nevada, Arizona, and Utah for the purpose of enhancing their survival.

Permit No. TE–802089
Applicant: Patricia Tatarian, Santa Rosa, California. The applicant requests an amendment to an existing permit (November 7, 2002; 67 FR 67863) to take (attack radio transmitters, radio track, release, collect voucher specimens; and construct, place, and monitor artificial egg laying structures in the wild) the California tiger salamander (Ambystoma californiense) in conjunction with research, surveys, and population monitoring activities throughout the range of the species in California for the purpose of enhancing its survival.

Permit No. TE–231612
Applicant: James M. Steele, Clearlake Oaks, California. The applicant requests a permit to take (survey, capture, handle, translocate, and release) the San Francisco garter snake (Thamnophis sirtalis) in conjunction with surveys and habitat enhancement activities in San Mateo County, California, for the purpose of enhancing its survival.

Permit No. TE–012973
Applicant: ECORP Consulting Incorporated, Rocklin, California. The applicant requests an amendment to an existing permit issued on June 14, 1999, to take (capture, collect, and kill) the Conservancy fairy shrimp (Branchionecta conservatio), the longhorn fairy shrimp (Branchionecta longiantenna), the Riverside fairy shrimp (Streptocephalus wootoni), the San Diego fairy shrimp (Branchionecta sandiegensis), and the vernal pool tadpole shrimp (Lepidurus packardi) in conjunction with surveys throughout the range of each species in California. The applicant is requesting to take (collect soil containing Federally listed fairy shrimp cysts of the above-mentioned species, translocate, and inoculate cysts into restored vernal pools) in conjunction with vernal pool restoration and population enhancement activities throughout the range of each species in California for the purpose of enhancing their survival.

Permit No. TE–233367
Applicant: Laura E. Gorman, Redondo Beach, California. The applicant requests a permit to take (survey by pursuit) the Quino checkerspot butterfly (Euphydryas editha quino) in conjunction with surveys throughout the range of the species in California for the purpose of enhancing its survival.

Permit No. TE–233373
Applicant: Mary Anne Flett, Pt. Reyes Station, California. The applicant requests a permit to take (harass by survey) the California clapper rail (Rallus longirostris obsoletus) in conjunction with surveys and population monitoring studies in Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma Counties, California, for the purpose of enhancing its survival.

We invite public review and comment on each of these recovery permit applications. Comments and materials we receive will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the address listed in the ADDRESSES section of this notice.
SUMMARY: Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the Record of Decision for the Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/EIS) for Fort Stanwix National Monument, New York. The Regional Director, Northeast Region, has approved the Record of Decision for the GMP/EIS, selecting Alternative 2—Preferred Action, which was described as the preferred alternative in the Final GMP/EIS which was issued for the required 30-day no action period beginning on July 31, 2009 and ending August 31, 2009. The Record of Decision includes a description of the background of the project, a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, findings on impairment of park resources and values, a description of the environmentally preferred alternative, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, and an overview of public and agency involvement in the decision-making process. As soon as practicable, the NPS will begin to implement the selected alternative.

Copies of the Record of Decision may be downloaded from the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site (http://parkplanning.nps.gov/fost/) or a hardcopy may be obtained from the contact listed below.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Fort Stanwix National Monument has needed a General Management Plan (GMP) since it has been reliant on a 1967 Master Plan and a 1974 Development Concept Plan. The Fort Stanwix National Monument GMP describes and explains the resource conditions that should exist and the visitor experiences that should be available at Fort Stanwix National Monument. The GMP provides a consistent framework for coordinating and integrating all subsequent planning and management decisions concerning the park.

The selected alternative, Alternative 2, the Preferred Action, would broaden interpretation to emphasize the role of Fort Stanwix in the greater Northern Frontier and Mohawk Valley regional context; expand its interpretation of the Six Nations Confederacy; and, within available funding and authority, foster programmatic coordination as well as technical assistance to thematically related sites within the Northern Frontier and Mohawk Valley. Fort Stanwix National Monument would also use existing authorities to increase its capacity to pursue community outreach and regional partnership initiatives, particularly in seeking hike and bike trail linkages or shuttle vehicle connections with related sites. Efforts would be made to modify a limited part of the lawn area near the reconstructed fort to establish landscape conditions, using native grasses and other vegetation more evocative (not a reconstruction) of the historic meadow landscape while still maintaining sufficient lawn area to support community events. Certain fort structures that have not been reconstructed due to fiscal constraints and that are important to interpreting the history at Fort Stanwix, such as the Ravelin, may be reconstructed if it is feasible, fully funded by outside sources, and meets with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment for Historic Structures and applicable Section 106 compliance requirements. Vacated fort spaces would be adapted for public use, relying on enhanced interpretation to educate visitors and provide for the essential comprehension of the fort’s original appearance.

In addition to the selected alternative, a No Action alternative was presented and analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The No Action alternative describes current management practices and conditions at Fort Stanwix National Monument with no major new actions. Current management directions, practices, and conditions would continue largely unchanged. This alternative has an interpretive focus on the siege of Fort Stanwix during the Revolutionary War. The issues explored through the GMP/EIS planning process include protection of cultural resources, visitor services, partnership opportunities, carrying capacity, and the lack of a properly defined boundary. The planning team established a set of criteria and goals against which each alternative was compared to determine which alternative best fulfilled the purpose and objectives of the GMP.

Resource Preservation Goals
• NPS addresses planning issues associated with cultural resource management of the fort structure, grounds, collections, and archaeological resources. NPS should establish cultural landscape conditions to make it more evocative of historic era while maintaining sufficient lawn area to support community events.

Visitor Experience Goals
• Visitors understand the history of Fort Stanwix during the 18th century, particularly the events that occurred there during the American Revolutionary War in 1777. Visitors also understand the significance of treaties negotiated at Fort Stanwix between 1768 and 1790 with Indian Tribes.
• The visitor experience fully reflects the park’s purpose, significance and themes. This includes enhancing the visitor experiencing and interpreting the regional historical context of Fort Stanwix to include Oriskany Battlefield, Northern Frontier, and Mohawk Valley.
• Interpretation in broadened to emphasize the role of Fort Stanwix in the greater Northern Frontier and Mohawk Valley regional context and expanding interpretation of the Six, Nations Confederacy.
• Interpretive media, exhibits, wayside exhibits, and other programs are updated to enhance visitor understanding of interpretive stories.

Transportation Goals
• Fort Stanwix National Monument works with local authorities to improve traffic conditions and improve pedestrian, bicycle, and shuttle vehicle linkages with related sites, including the Oriskany Battlefield.

Park Administration Goals
• Administrative, interpretive, maintenance, and other staff, as well as facilities and other infrastructure, sustain the programs and operations of the Fort Stanwix National Monument and accomplish the NPS mission.