

U.S. Coast Guard Group Hampton Roads  
Portsmouth VA 23703–  
Landholding Agency: DOT  
Property Number: 879710003  
Status: Unutilized  
Reason: Secured Area  
West Virginia  
Flight Service Station  
Morgantown Airport  
Morgantown Co: Monongahelia WV 26505–  
Landholding Agency: GSA  
Property Number: 549710011  
Status: Surplus  
Reason: Within airport runway clear zone  
GSA Number: 4–U–WV–527

*Land (by State)*

Georgia

Former Honor Farm No. 1  
McDonough Blvd. & Thomasville Blvd.  
Atlanta Co: Fulton GA 30315–  
Landholding Agency: GSA  
Property Number: 549710010  
Status: Surplus  
Reason: Within 2000 ft. of flammable or  
explosive material  
GSA Number: 4–GR(1)–GA–530A&B

Kentucky

2.15 Acres  
Owensboro Moorings  
Owensboro Co: Daviess KY 42301–  
Landholding Agency: GSA  
Property Number: 549710015  
Status: Excess  
Reason: Within 2000 ft. of flammable or  
explosive material; Floodway  
GSA Number: 4–U–KY–605

[FR Doc. 97–7571 Filed 3–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–29–M

**[Docket No. FR–4156–C–03]**

**Notice of Annual Factors for  
Determining Public Housing Agency  
Administrative Fees for the Section 8  
Rental Voucher, Rental Certificate and  
Moderate Rehabilitation Programs;  
Correction**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant  
Secretary for Public and Indian  
Housing, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice; Correction.

**SUMMARY:** On March 3, 1997 (62 FR 9488) and republished on March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11526) because of a error in the formatting of the administrative fees, the Department published a Notice that announced the monthly per unit fee amounts for use in determining the on-going administrative fee for public housing agencies and Indian housing authorities (HAs) administering the rental voucher, rental certificate and moderate rehabilitation programs (including Single Room Occupancy and Shelter Plus Care) during Federal Fiscal Year 1997.

The purpose of this document is to correct an erroneous OMB control

number that was printed in each document.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The effective dates listed on March 3, 1997 (62 FR 9488) and on March 12, 1997 (62 FR 11526) remain unchanged and still apply.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gerald J. Benoit, Director, Operations Division, Office of Rental Assistance, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, room 4220, 451 Seventh Street, SW, Washington, DC 20410–8000, telephone number (202) 708–0477. Hearing- or speech-impaired individuals may call TTY number (202) 708–4594. (These numbers are not toll-free.)

**Correction**

Accordingly, in FR Doc. 97–5014, a Notice published on March 3, 1997 at 62 FR 9488, and in FR Doc. 97–5925, a Notice published on March 12, 1997 at 62 FR 11526, the following corrections are made:

1. On page 9488, in the preamble, in the first column under the heading **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, under the subheading “Paperwork Reduction Act Statement”, the OMB control number “2502–0348” is corrected to read “2577–0149”.

2. On page 11526, in the preamble, in the first column under the heading **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**, under the subheading “Paperwork Reduction Act Statement”, the OMB control number “2502–0348” is corrected to read “2577–0149”.

Dated: March 24, 1997.

**Camille E. Acevedo,**  
*Assistant General Counsel for Regulations.*  
[FR Doc. 97–7863 Filed 3–27–97; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4210–33–P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

**Availability of the Final Environmental  
Impact Report/Statement for Issuance  
of Take Authorizations for Threatened  
and Endangered Species Due to Urban  
Growth Within the Multiple Species  
Conservation Program Planning Area  
in San Diego County, California**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** This notice advises the public of the availability of the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement on the proposed issuance of incidental take permits for up to 85 species within

the Multiple Species Conservation Program planning area in San Diego County, California. In conjunction with this regional program, the City of San Diego has applied to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for an incidental take permit; other jurisdictions may apply as well. Publication of the Record of Decision and issuance of a permit to the City of San Diego will occur no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice. This notice is provided pursuant to regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. **ADDRESSES:** The documents discussed herein are available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours, at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Carlsbad Field Office, 2730 Loker Avenue West, Carlsbad, California 92008; at the City of San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Department, 600 B Street, Fifth Floor, San Diego, California 92101; and at public libraries throughout greater San Diego.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Sherry Barrett or Ms. Nancy Gilbert, Fish and Wildlife Biologists, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at the above Carlsbad address; telephone (760) 431–9440.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Availability of Documents**

Copies of the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement and the responses to comments can be obtained by contacting the Carlsbad Field Office (see **ADDRESSES**). The responses to comments address revisions that were made to the recirculated draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement, draft Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, draft City of San Diego Subarea Plan, and draft City of San Diego and model Implementation Agreements. The responses to comments also address revisions that will be made to the other draft subarea plans prior to their approval under the Multiple Species Conservation Program. The complete application file may be viewed during normal business hours, by appointment, at the Carlsbad Field Office (see **ADDRESSES**). Copies of the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement and responses to comments are also available for review at the City of San Diego Metropolitan Wastewater Department (see **ADDRESSES**) and public libraries in the greater San Diego area. All individuals who requested a copy of, or commented on, the draft documents either have been sent copies of the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement and responses to comments, or an Executive Summary, or

have been sent a letter announcing availability of these documents.

### Background

Under section 9 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended, and its implementing regulations, wildlife listed as threatened or endangered are protected from "taking." The Act defines take, in part, as killing, harming, or harassing listed wildlife. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) regulations further define harm to include significant habitat modification that results in death or injury of listed wildlife (50 CFR 17.3). Under section 10 of the Act, the Service may issue permits to take listed wildlife if such taking is incidental to, and not the purpose of, otherwise lawful activities, provided that an approved habitat conservation plan has been prepared. Among other criteria, issuance of such permits must not jeopardize the existence of listed species, both plant and animal. Regulations governing permits are in 50 CFR 17.22 and 17.32.

On December 10, 1993, the Service issued a final special rule for the coastal California gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila californica californica*), pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act (58 FR 65088). Incidental take of the gnatcatcher is allowed under the special rule if such take results from activities conducted under a plan prepared pursuant to the Natural Community Conservation Planning Act of 1991, and the associated Process Guidelines and the Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Conservation Guidelines. The special rule also requires Federal approval of the joint Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan. The Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan is a joint Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan.

On August 18, 1996, the City of San Diego submitted an application for a 50-year incidental take permit to the Service. The application included the regional Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, draft City of San Diego Subarea Plan, and a City of San Diego Implementing Agreement based upon a model Implementing Agreement for the entire program. Draft subarea plans were also included for the County of San Diego, Otay Water District, and cities of Chula Vista, Coronado, Del Mar, and Santee. These jurisdictions and the Otay Water District may apply for permits in the future in conjunction with the regional Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan. Should these jurisdictions apply for individual permits, the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement would be used to

support their State and Federal environmental documentation requirements.

Under the proposed action, incidental take permits would be issued by the Service subject to the terms and conditions of the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, Subarea Plans, and individual Implementing Agreements. The proposed permits would authorize the incidental take of up to 85 species, now or in the future, including 13 listed animal species: the threatened coastal California gnatcatcher, western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*), bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), and red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytoni*); and the endangered Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus wootoni*), San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegonensis*), California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*), American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*), light-footed clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes*), California least tern (*Sterna antillarum*), southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii eximius*), least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), and southwestern arroyo toad (*Bufo microscaphus californicus*). Unlisted species would be named on permits, with incidental take becoming effective concurrent with listing, should they be listed in the future. Plants also would be named on permits, to the extent that their take is prohibited under the Endangered Species Act.

Consistent with the Department of the Interior's "No Surprises" policy, the plan proponents also request assurances of no further land or financial compensation for the 85 species covered by the plan: 13 listed animals, 7 listed plants, 7 plant species proposed for listing, and 58 other plant and animal species within the planning area. The Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan is designed to conserve all 85 species according to standards required for species listed under the Endangered Species Act.

Although the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan has focused on coastal sage scrub habitat, in keeping with the legislative intent of the California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act of 1991 to protect multiple habitat types, the plan proponents propose to conserve 23 additional vegetation types. Species not covered by the plan could be amended to the permit in the future, provided adequate conservation was provided and following a public review process. For vegetation communities that are sufficiently conserved by the plan, the Service and California Department of

Fish and Game (together referred to as wildlife agencies) would provide (using all of their legal authorities and subject to the availability of appropriated funds) for the conservation and management of habitat for an uncovered species at a level which would allow the species to be amended to the permit should the species become listed. For vegetation communities that are significantly conserved by the plan, the wildlife agencies and permittees would contribute in partnership toward conservation and management needed to amend such species to the permit. Seventeen of the 24 vegetation types are sufficiently or significantly conserved by the plan.

The Multiple Species Conservation Program planning area (excluding military land) encompasses approximately 554,300 acres (900 square miles), of which about 297,600 acres (54 percent) remain as natural habitats that are subject to intense development pressure. Take would be authorized on approximately 173,700 acres of vacant land, of which 130,000 acres is habitat and 43,700 acres is disturbed or agricultural land.

The plan proponents propose to avoid and minimize take through local land-use regulation, environmental review, and resource protection guidelines that limit encroachment onto sensitive biological resources. Unavoidable take would be mitigated by establishing a preserve of approximately 171,900 acres within the boundaries of a Multiple Habitat Planning Area containing 24 vegetation communities. Lands would be acquired from willing sellers. Preserve lands that are publicly owned would be managed according to comprehensive long-term management plans that would address issues such as fire management, grazing management, control of predators and exotic species, recreation/public access management, and vegetative restoration and reintroduction.

The preserve would be assembled incrementally in conjunction with development. All private and public development projects that impact habitats of covered species would individually fund their own mitigation actions to protect other habitats in the preserve. Participating local governments would manage existing public lands in conformance with the plan. Local jurisdictions also would acquire and manage 13,000 acres of additional lands (a small percentage of the preserve) through a regional funding source that must be approved by the voters. To complement the preserve, and help assure that regional ecosystem management goals are met, the Federal

and State governments would conserve and manage 36,510 acres of existing lands and acquire and manage 13,500 additional acres as part of the preserve.

Under the proposed action, section 10(a)(1)(B) permits would be issued by the Service subject to the terms and conditions of the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, Subarea Plans, and Implementing Agreements. The proposed permits would authorize the incidental take of 85 species, as described above. Should take authorizations be approved in conjunction with the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, each jurisdiction would then exercise its land-use review and approval powers in accordance with its Implementing Agreement, Subarea Plan and the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan. The five percent limit on interim loss of coastal sage scrub while plans are being developed, imposed as part of the Natural Community Conservation Planning Program and special section 4(d) rule for the Coastal California gnatcatcher, would be replaced by the conditions of each jurisdiction's permit and Implementing Agreement.

#### **Development of the Final Environmental Impact Report/Statement**

To assure compliance with the purpose and intent of the National Environmental Policy Act and the California Environmental Quality Act, the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement was developed cooperatively by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Carlsbad Field Office (lead Federal agency) and the City of San Diego (lead local agency). On March 6, 1995, the Service published in the **Federal Register** a Notice of Intent to prepare a joint Environmental Impact Report/Statement (60 FR 12246). This notice also advertised a joint public scoping meeting, held March 15, 1995. The scoping process was initiated in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act to solicit comments from a variety of Federal, State, and local entities on issues/alternatives to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report/Statement. On May 12, 1995, a Notice of Availability of the draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement was published in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 25734). The initial 45-day comment period was extended to 60 days (60 FR 32990). Public comments resulted in changes to the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, necessitating new analyses in the draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement. On August 30, 1996, a Notice of Availability of the

recirculated draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement, and notice of receipt of an application from the City of San Diego for an incidental take permit associated with the Multiple Species Conservation Program was published in the **Federal Register** (61 FR 45983). In response to requests for extensions, this 45-day comment period also was extended to 60 days (61 FR 54675).

The Service received 119 letters of comment on the permit application and recirculated draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement. Issues included: (1) Species analysis approach, (2) adequacy of preserve design and linkages, (3) species and habitat assurances, (4) biological monitoring criteria and performance measures, (5) agricultural, grazing, and mining issues, (7) requests for specific changes to subarea plans, (8) alternatives, (9) revisions to the draft Implementing Agreement, (10) economic impacts, and (11) length, complexity, and organization of the documents, among other issues. Copies of all comments received and responses to those comments are available for public review (see **ADDRESSES**). The recirculated draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement, draft Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan, draft City of San Diego Subarea Plan, and draft City of San Diego and model Implementation Agreements have been revised, where appropriate, based on public comments. Subarea Plans for the other jurisdictions and the Otay Water District will be revised prior to approval under the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan. No new issues or additional significant impacts were identified as a result of public comment on the draft recirculated Environmental Impact Report/Statement.

#### **Alternatives Analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Report/Statement**

Due to the scale of the Multiple Species Conservation Planning Program, the lead agencies assessed various preserve configuration alternatives. Five alternatives were advanced for detailed analysis in the final Environmental Impact Report/Statement: (1) Proposed project alternative (approve and implement the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan that would establish a preserve within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area), (2) no project/no action alternative, (3) coastal sage scrub alternative, (4) biologically preferred alternative, and (5) public lands alternative. Each alternative was evaluated for its potential to result in significant adverse environmental impacts and the adequacy or

inadequacy of the proposed measures to avoid, minimize, and substantially reduce and mitigate such negative effects.

The preferred action of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is approval of the Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan and issuance of incidental take permits with the mitigating, minimizing, and monitoring measures outlined in the proposed project alternative. (See Background section for a description of this alternative.)

Under the no action or no project alternative, the regional Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan would not be implemented. Jurisdictions would either avoid take of listed species within the planning area or apply for individual permits under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, on a project-by-project basis. Existing land use and environmental regulations would apply to all projects proposed within the planning area. Existing regulatory practices require mitigation for impacts to sensitive species and habitats resulting in lands being set aside for open-space preservation. Analyses indicate that the amount of land potentially conserved within the Multiple Species Conservation Program planning area under the no action alternative would be similar to that conserved under the proposed action (Multiple Habitat Planning Area). However, under the no action alternative, greater habitat fragmentation would likely occur because the lands set aside for open-space preservation would not be assembled in coordination with a regional preserve design.

The coastal sage scrub alternative would conserve 84,900 acres and 26 species. This alternative would include 21 vegetation types, providing adequate protection for 2 types, neither of which is rare.

The biologically preferred alternative would conserve 167,000 acres and 73 species. This alternative would include 24 vegetation types, adequately protecting 9. Of these 9 vegetation types, 7 are considered rare.

The public lands alternative would conserve 147,000 acres and 35 species. This alternative would include 24 vegetation types and adequately protect 6, all 6 of which are rare.

The underlying goal of the proposed project alternative is to implement ecosystem-based conservation measures aimed at the protection of multiple species and multiple vegetation types on a regional scale, while accommodating compatible development. The Multiple Species Conservation Program Plan would result

in the implementation of a comprehensive preserve strategy for coastal sage scrub and related vegetation types in the subregion, that is expected to provide long-term benefits to the coastal California gnatcatcher and 84 other covered species and their habitats. The Service intends to approve the Multiple Species Conservation Plan, the City of San Diego Subarea plan, and issue an incidental take permit to the City of San Diego. Should the other plan proponents submit permit applications, these applications would be announced in the **Federal Register** in the future.

This notice is provided pursuant to regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1506.6). Publication of the Record of Decision and issuance of a permit to the City of San Diego will occur no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice.

Dated: March 24, 1997.

**Thomas J. Dwyer,**

*Acting Regional Director, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.*

[FR Doc. 97-7908 Filed 3-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## Bureau of Land Management

[NV-930-1430-01; N-50568]

### Legal Description of Lands Transferred Pursuant to the National Forest and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1988; Correction

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Correction.

**SUMMARY:** This action corrects an error in the land description published as FR Doc. 89-27518 in the **Federal Register**, 54 FR 48659-48664, November 24, 1989, of the public lands transferred to the Forest Service pursuant to Public Law 100-550, October 28, 1988.

On page 48660, column 2, line 22 from the bottom of the column, which reads "Sec. 10, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;" is hereby corrected to read "Sec. 10, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;"

**William K. Stowers,**

*Lands Team Lead.*

[FR Doc. 97-7891 Filed 3-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P

[ID-990-1020-01]

### Resource Advisory Council; Meeting Location and Time

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and the Federal Advisory

Committee Act of 1972 (FACA), 5 U.S.C., the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) council meeting of the Upper Snake River Districts Resource Advisory Council will be held as indicated below. The agenda includes a discussion from the "Wayne Elmore" team and a field tour to view riparian areas. All meetings are open to the public. The public may present written comments to the council. Each formal council meeting will have a time allocated for hearing public comments. The public comment period for the council meeting is listed below. Depending on the number of persons wishing to comment, and time available, the time for individual oral comments may be limited. Individuals who plan to attend and need further information about the meetings, or need special assistance such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should contact Debra Kovar at the Shoshone Resource Area Office, P.O. Box 2-B, Shoshone, ID 83352, (208) 886-7201.

**DATE AND TIME:** Date is April 23, 1997, starts at 8:00 a.m. at the Lincoln Inn in Gooding, Idaho. Public comments from 10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m. on April 23, 1997.

**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 the management of the public lands.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Debra Kovar, Shoshone Resource Area Office, P.O. Box 2-B, Shoshone, ID 83352, (208) 886-7201.

Dated: March 19, 1997.

**Howard Hedrick,**

*Acting District Manager.*

[FR Doc. 97-7894 Filed 3-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-P

[UT-040-1430-01; UTU-52877]

### Notice of Realty Action; Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act Classification; Utah

**SUMMARY:** The following public lands, located near the city of St. George in Washington County, Utah, have been examined and found suitable for classification for lease or conveyance to the Washington County Water Conservancy District under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.):

**Salt Lake Meridian, Utah**

T. 41 S., R. 14 W.,

Sec. 23, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;  
Sec. 24, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;  
Sec. 25, Lots 3 through 6, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;  
Sec. 26, Lots 17, 20 and 21;  
Sec. 34, Lots 3 and 4, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;  
Sec. 35, Lots 5 through 9, 12 (TRACT 37), 13, and 16 through 18, W $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;  
T. 42 S., R. 14 W.,  
Sec. 3, Lots 17 and 19;  
containing 880.26 acres, more or less.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Washington County Water Conservancy District proposes to incorporate and manage these public lands as part of the Quail Creek Recreation Area. These lands are not needed for Federal purposes. Leasing or conveying title to these public lands is consistent with current BLM land use planning and would be in the public interest.

The lease or patent, when issued, would be subject to the following terms, and conditions:

Reservations to the United States:

1. Provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act and all applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior.
2. A right-of-way for ditches and canals constructed by the authority of the United States.
3. All minerals shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the minerals.
4. U.S. Geological Survey's stream gauging station authorizing under right-of-way reservation, serial number UTU-71170.

Subject to the following third party rights-of-way (R/W) grants:

1. Washington County Water Conservancy District's Quail Creek Reservoir dam, main access and spillway roads and power lines authorized under R/W grant, serial number UTU-51374.
2. Washington County Water Conservancy District's utility corridor authorized under R/W grant, serial number UTU-55675.
3. St. George City Corporation's water treatment facility and pipeline authorized under R/W grant, serial number UTU-60051.
4. Utah Department of Transportation's Quail Creek access road authorized under R/W grant, serial number UTU-68590.