

93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: December 23, 1999.

Anna Snouffer,

Acting Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 99–33914 Filed 12–29–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed Collection; Comment Request

In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 concerning opportunity for public comment on proposed collections of information, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration will publish periodic summaries of proposed

projects. To request more information on the proposed projects or to obtain a copy of the information collection plans, call the SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer on (301) 443–7978.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Proposed Project: Survey of Organized Consumer Self-Help Entities—New

The self-help movement in the United States has mushroomed, and increasingly serves mental health

consumers and family members as a complement to, or substitution for, traditional mental health services. The purposes of this project of SAMHSA's Center for Mental Health Services are to estimate the number of self-help entities nationwide and to describe their characteristics—structure, types of activities engaged in, approaches to well-being and recovery, resources, and linkages to other entities in the community, such as the mental health service delivery system. The survey will gather information from a sample of 3,000 mental health self-help entities run by and for recipients of mental health services and/or their family members. Data will be collected from three types of self-help entities: mutual support groups; self-help organizations; and, consumer-operated businesses and services. Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) will be used to conduct interviews with in-scope entities. The total response burden estimate is shown below.

Instrument	Number of respondents	Responses/ respondent	Average burden/ response (Hrs)	Total burden (Hrs)
Screener	7,600	1	.17	1,292
Questionnaire	3,000	1	.42	1,260
Total				2,552

Send comments to Nancy Pearce, SAMHSA Reports Clearance Officer, Room 16–105, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. Written comments should be received within 60 days of this notice.

Dated: December 23, 1999.

Richard Kopanda,

Executive Officer, SAMHSA.

[FR Doc. 99–33946 Filed 12–29–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4162–20–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–4432–N–52]

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: December 30, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Clifford Taffet, 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: December 22, 1999.

Fred Karnas, Jr.,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs Assistance Programs.

[FR Doc. 99–33671 Filed 12–29–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–29–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Migratory Bird Permits; Environmental Impact Statement on Resident Canada Goose Management; Notice

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meetings.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or we) is issuing this notice to invite public participation in the scoping process for preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for resident Canada goose management under the authority of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The EIS will consider a range of management alternatives for addressing expanding populations of locally-breeding Canada geese that are

increasingly posing threats to health and human safety and damaging personal and public property. This notice describes possible alternatives, invites further public participation in the scoping process, identifies the location, date, and time of public scoping meetings, and identifies to whom you may direct questions and comments.

DATES: You must submit written comments regarding EIS scoping by March 30, 2000, to the address below. Dates for nine public scoping meetings are identified in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

ADDRESSES: You should send written comments to the Chief, Office of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, ms 634—ARLSQ, 1849 C Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20240.

Alternately, you may submit comments electronically to the following address: canada_goose_eis@fws.gov. All comments received, including names and addresses, will become part of the public record. You may inspect comments during normal business hours in room 634—Arlington Square Building, 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jonathan Andrew, Chief, or Ron W. Kokel, Office of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, (703) 358-1714.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 19, 1999, we published a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS on resident Canada goose management (64 FR 45269). This action is in response to the growing numbers of Canada geese that nest and reside predominantly within the conterminous United States and our desire to examine alternative strategies to control and manage resident Canada geese that either pose a threat to health and human safety or cause damage to personal and public property.

Resident Canada Goose Populations

Numbers of Canada geese that nest and reside predominantly in the conterminous United States have increased tremendously in recent years. These geese are usually referred to as "resident" Canada geese. Recent surveys in the Atlantic, Mississippi, and Central Flyways (Wood *et al.*, 1994; Kelley *et al.*, 1998; Nelson and Oetting, 1998; Sheaffer and Malecki, 1998; Wilkins and Cooch, 1999) suggest that the resident breeding population now exceeds 1 million individuals in both the Atlantic (17 States) and Mississippi (14 States) Flyways. Available information shows that in the Atlantic Flyway, the resident population has increased an average of

14 percent per year since 1989. In the Mississippi Flyway, the resident population of Canada geese has increased at a rate of about 6 percent per year during the last 10 years. In the Central and Pacific Flyways, populations of resident Canada geese have similarly increased over the last few years. We are concerned about the rapid growth rate exhibited by these already large populations.

Because resident Canada geese live in temperate climates with relatively stable breeding habitat conditions and low numbers of predators, tolerate human and other disturbances, have a relative abundance of preferred habitat provided by current urban/suburban landscaping techniques, and fly relatively short distances to winter compared with other Canada goose populations, they exhibit a consistently high annual production and survival. Given these characteristics, the absence of waterfowl hunting in many of these areas, and free food handouts by some people, these urban/suburban resident Canada goose populations are increasingly coming into conflict with human activities in many parts of the country.

Conflicts between geese and people affect or damage several types of resources, including property, human health and safety, agriculture, and natural resources. Common problem areas include public parks, airports, public beaches and swimming facilities, water-treatment reservoirs, corporate business areas, golf courses, schools, college campuses, private lawns, amusement parks, cemeteries, hospitals, residential subdivisions, and along or between highways.

While short-term management strategies have helped alleviate some localized problems and conflicts, because of the unique locations where large numbers of these geese nest, feed, and reside, for long-term management of these birds we believe that new and innovative approaches and strategies for dealing with bird/human conflicts will be needed. In order to properly examine alternative strategies to control and manage resident Canada geese that either pose a threat to health and human safety or cause damage to personal and public property, the preparation of an EIS is necessary.

Alternatives

We are considering the following alternatives. After the scoping process, we will develop the alternatives to be included in the EIS and base them on the mission of the Service and comments received during scoping. We are soliciting your comments on issues,

alternatives, and impacts to be addressed in the EIS.

A. No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no additional regulatory methods or strategies would be authorized. We would continue the use of special hunting seasons, the issuance of depredation permits, and the issuance of special Canada goose permits. These permits would continue to be issued under existing regulations.

For each of the next 5 alternatives, as a baseline for comparison, we would continue the use of special hunting seasons, the issuance of depredation permits, and the issuance of special Canada goose permits. All of these permits would continue to be issued under existing regulations.

B. Increased Promotion of Non-lethal Control and Management

Under this alternative, we would actively promote the increased use of non-lethal management tools, such as habitat manipulation and management, harassment techniques, and trapping and relocation. While permits would continue to be issued under existing regulations, no additional regulatory methods or strategies would be introduced.

C. Nest and Egg Depredation Order

This alternative would provide a direct population control strategy for resident Canada goose breeding areas in the U.S. This alternative would establish a depredation order authorizing States to implement a program allowing the take of nests and eggs to stabilize resident Canada goose populations without threatening their long-term health. Monitoring and evaluation programs are in place, or would be required, to estimate population sizes and prevent populations from falling below either the lower management thresholds established by Flyway Councils, or individual State population objectives. Since the goal of this alternative would be to stabilize breeding populations, not direct reduction, no appreciable reduction in the numbers of adult Canada geese would likely occur.

D. Depredation Order for Health and Human Safety

This alternative would establish a depredation order authorizing States to establish and implement a program allowing the take of resident Canada goose adults, goslings, nests and eggs from populations posing threats to health and human safety. The intent of this alternative is to significantly reduce

or stabilize resident Canada goose populations at areas such as airports, water supply reservoirs, and other such areas, where there is a demonstrated threat to health and human safety, without threatening the population's long-term health. Monitoring and evaluation programs are in place, or would be required, to estimate population sizes and prevent populations from falling below either the lower management thresholds established by Flyway Councils, or individual State population objectives. Under this alternative, some appreciable localized reductions in the numbers of adult geese could occur.

E. Conservation Order

This alternative would authorize direct population control strategies such as nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, or other general population reduction strategies on resident Canada goose populations in the U.S. This alternative would establish a conservation order authorizing States to develop and implement a program allowing the take of geese posing threats to health and human safety and damaging personal and public property. The intent of this alternative is to significantly reduce or stabilize resident Canada goose populations at areas where conflicts are occurring without threatening the long-term health of the overall population. Monitoring and evaluation programs are in place, or would be required, to estimate population sizes and prevent populations from falling below either the lower management thresholds established by Flyway Councils, or individual State population objectives. State breeding populations would be monitored annually each spring to determine the maximum allowable take under the conservation order. Under this alternative, some appreciable localized reductions in the numbers of adult geese would likely occur and lesser overall population reductions could occur.

F. General Depredation Order

This alternative would authorize direct population control strategies such as nest and egg destruction, gosling and adult trapping and culling programs, or other general population reduction strategies on resident Canada goose populations in the U.S. This alternative would establish a depredation order allowing any authorized person to take geese posing threats to health and human safety and damaging personal and public property. The intent of this alternative is to significantly reduce resident Canada goose populations at

areas where conflicts are occurring. Monitoring and evaluation programs are in place, or would be required, to estimate population sizes and prevent populations from falling below either the lower management thresholds established by Flyway Councils, or individual State population objectives. Under this alternative, some appreciable localized reductions in the numbers of adult geese would likely occur and lesser overall population reductions could occur.

Issue Resolution and Environmental Review

The primary issue to be addressed during the scoping and planning process for the EIS is to determine which management alternatives for the control of resident Canada goose populations will be analyzed. We will prepare a discussion of the potential effect, by alternative, which will include the following areas:

- (1) Resident Canada goose populations and their habitats.
- (2) Human health and safety.
- (3) Public and private property damage and conflicts.
- (4) Sport hunting opportunities.
- (5) Socioeconomic effects.

We will conduct the environmental review of the management action in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, as appropriate. We are furnishing this Notice in accordance with 40 CFR 1501.7, to obtain suggestions and information from other agencies, tribes, and the public on the scope of issues to be addressed in the EIS. A draft EIS should be available to the public in the spring of 2000.

Public Scoping Meetings

Nine public scoping meetings will be held on the following dates at the indicated locations and times:

1. February 8, 2000; Nashville, Tennessee, at the Ellington Agricultural Center, Ed Jones Auditorium, 440 Hogan Road, 7 p.m.
2. February 9, 2000; Parsippany, New Jersey, at the Holiday Inn, 707 Route 46 East, 7 p.m.
3. February 10, 2000; Danbury, Connecticut, at the Holiday Inn, 80 Newtown Road, 7 p.m.
4. February 15, 2000; Palatine, Illinois, at the Holiday Inn Express, 1550 E. Dundee Road, 7 p.m.
5. February 17, 2000; Bellevue, Washington, at the DoubleTree Hotel, 300—112th Avenue S.E., 7 p.m.
6. February 22, 2000; Bloomington, Minnesota, at the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge Visitors Center, 3815 East 80th Street, 7 p.m.

7. February 23, 2000; Brookings, South Dakota, at South Dakota State University, Northern Plains Biostress Laboratory, Room 103, Junction of North Campus Drive and Rotunda Lane, 7 p.m.

8. February 28, 2000; Richmond, Virginia, at the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Headquarters, Board Room, 4000 West Broad Street, 7 p.m.

9. March 1, 2000; Denver, Colorado, at the Colorado Department of Wildlife, Northeast Region Service Center, Hunter Education Building, 6060 Broadway, 7 p.m.

At the scoping meetings, you may choose to submit oral and/or written comments. To facilitate planning, we request that those desiring to submit oral comments at meetings send us their name and the meeting location they plan on attending. You should send this information to the location indicated under the ADDRESSES caption. However, you are not required to submit your name prior to any particular meeting in order to present oral comments.

You may also submit written comments by either sending them to the location indicated under the ADDRESSES caption or sending them electronically to the following address: canada_gooseeis@fws.gov. All electronic comments should include a complete mailing address in order to receive a copy of the draft EIS. All comments must be submitted by March 30, 2000.

References Cited

- Kelly, J. R., D. F. Caithamer, and K. A. Wilkins. 1998. Waterfowl population status, 1998. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 33 pp. + app.
- Nelson, H. K. and R. B. Oetting. 1998. Giant Canada goose flocks in the United States. Pages 483–495 in D. H. Rusch, M. D. Samuel, D. D. Humburg, and B. D. Sullivan, eds. Biology and management of Canada geese. Proceedings of the International Canada Goose Symposium, Milwaukee, WI.
- Sheaffer, S. E. and R. A. Malecki. 1998. Status of Atlantic Flyway resident nesting Canada geese. Pages 29–34 in D. H. Rusch, M. D. Samuel, D. D. Humburg, and B. D. Sullivan, eds. Biology and management of Canada geese. Proceedings of the International Canada Goose Symposium, Milwaukee, WI.
- Wilkins, K. A., and E. G. Cooch. 1999. Waterfowl population status, 1999. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 33 pp. + appendices.
- Wood, J. C., D. H. Rusch, and M. Samuel. 1994. Results of the 1994 spring survey of giant Canada goose survey in the Mississippi Flyway. U.W. Co-op Unit. 9 pp. (mimeo).

Dated: December 23, 1999.

Thomas O. Melius,

Acting Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 99-33961 Filed 12-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[AZ-070-00-7122-00-56-36, SRP-00-06/07]

Temporary Closure of Selected Public Lands in La Paz County, AZ, During the Operation of the 2000 Whiplash Parker 400K/200K (kilometer) Desert Race(s)

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

SUMMARY: The Lake Havasu Field Office Manager announces the temporary closure of selected public lands under its administration in La Paz County, Arizona. This action is being taken to help ensure public safety and prevent unnecessary environmental degradation during the official permitted running of the 2000 Whiplash Parker 400K/200K Desert Race.

DATES: January 14, 2000, through January 16, 2000.

SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS: Specific restrictions and closure periods are as follows:

Designated Course

1. The portion of the race course comprised of BLM lands, roads and ways located 2 miles either side of:
 - (a) Shea Road from the eastern boundary of the Colorado River Indian Tribes Reservation to the junction with Swansea Road and 2 miles either side of Swansea Road from its junction with Shea Road to the eastern bank of the Central Arizona Project Canal.
 - (b) Swansea Road from its junction with Shea Road to the Four Corners intersection.
 - (c) The unpaved road that runs from "Midway", north to Mineral Wash and then west to the CAP Canal is closed to public use from 6 a.m. Friday morning, January 14, 2000 to 6 p.m. Sunday, January 16, 2000.
2. The entire designated race course is closed to all vehicles except authorized and emergency vehicles.
3. Vehicle parking or stopping in areas affected by the closure is prohibited except in the designated spectator areas. Emergency parking for brief periods of time is permitted on roads open for public use.
4. Spectator viewing (on public land) is limited to the designated spectator

areas located South and North of Shea Road, as signed app. 8 miles east of Parker, Arizona.

5. The following regulations will be in effect for the duration of the closure:

Unless otherwise authorized, no person shall:

- a. Camp in any area outside of the designated spectator areas.
- b. Enter any portion of the race course or any wash located within the race course, including all portions of Osborne Wash.
- c. Spectate or otherwise be located outside of the designated spectator areas.
- d. Cut or collect firewood of any kind, including dead and down wood or other vegetative material.
- e. Firearms must be unloaded and cased, and are not to be used during the closure.
- f. Fireworks are prohibited.
- g. Operate any vehicle (other than registered event vehicles), including an off-highway vehicle (OHV), which is not legally registered for street and highway operation, including operation of such a vehicle in spectator viewing areas, along the race course, and in designated pit areas.
- h. Park any vehicle in violation of posted restrictions, or in such a manner as to obstruct or impede normal or emergency traffic movement or the parking of other vehicles, create a safety hazard, or endanger any person, property or feature. Vehicles so parked are subject to citation, removal and impoundment at the owner's expense.
- i. Take any vehicle through, around or beyond a restrictive sign, recognizable barricade, fence, or traffic control barrier.
- j. Fail to keep their site free of trash and litter during the period of occupancy or fail to remove all personal equipment, trash, and litter upon departure.
- k. Violate quiet hours by causing an unreasonable noise as determined by the authorized officer between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. Mountain Standard Time.
- l. Allow any pet or other animal in their care to be unrestrained at any time. Signs and maps directing the public to the designated spectator areas will be provided by the Bureau of Land Management and/or the event sponsor. The above restrictions do not apply to emergency vehicles and vehicles owned by the United States, the State of Arizona or to La Paz County. Vehicles under permit for operation by event participants must follow the race permit stipulations. Operators of permitted vehicles shall maintain a maximum speed limit of 35 mph on all La Paz

County and BLM roads and ways. Authority for closure of public lands is found in 43 CFR Part 8340, Subpart 8341; 43 CFR 8360, Subpart 8364.1, and 43 CFR Part 8372. Persons who violate its closure order are subject to arrest and, upon conviction, may be fined not more than \$100,000 and/or imprisoned for not more than 12 months.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bryan Pittman, District Law Enforcement Ranger, or Myron McCoy, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Lake Havasu Field Office, 2610 Sweetwater Avenue, Lake Havasu City, Arizona 86406, (520) 505-1200.

Dated: December 23, 1999.

Donald Ellsworth,

Field Manager, Lake Havasu Field Office.

[FR Doc. 99-33947 Filed 12-29-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[MT-020-1010-AA]

Notice of Meeting

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Montana, Billings and Miles City Field Offices, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Eastern Montana Resource Advisory Council will have a meeting January 27, 2000 at the BLM—Montana State Office Conference Room, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana starting at 8:00 a.m. Primary agenda topics include the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial Celebration, continued discussion on access, and an update on the draft off-highway vehicle environmental impact statement.

The meeting is open to the public and the public comment period is set for 11:00 a.m. on January 27. The public may make oral statements before the Council or file written statements for the Council to consider. Depending on the number of persons wishing to make an oral statement, a per person time limit may be established. Summary minutes of the meeting will be available for public inspection and copying during regular business hours.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Marilyn Krause, Public Affairs Specialist, Miles City Field Office, 111 Garryowen Road, Miles City, Montana 59301, telephone (406) 233-2831.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of the Council is to advise the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with