

"The use of Nitroxides in the prophylactic and therapeutic treatment of cancer due to genetic defects" and corresponding foreign patent applications to Varian Biosynergy, Inc., having a place of business in Palo Alto, California. The patent rights in these inventions have been assigned to the United States of America.

The contemplated exclusive license may be limited to use of topical or local tissue application of compounds disclosed and claimed in the invention for the protection of normal tissue against radiation damage caused by radiation therapy of diseased tissue.

**DATES:** Only written comments and/or applications for a license which are received by the NIH Office of Technology Transfer on or before May 8, 2000, will be considered.

**ADDRESSES:** Requests for a copy of the patent application, inquiries, comments and other materials relating to the contemplated license should be directed to: Norbert J. Pontzer, J.D., Ph.D., Technology Licensing Specialist, Office of Technology Transfer, National Institutes of Health, 6011 Executive Boulevard, Suite 325, Rockville, MD 20852-3804; Telephone: (301) 496-7736, ext. 284; Facsimile: (301) 402-0220; E-mail: np59n@nih.gov. A signed Confidential Disclosure Agreement will be required to receive copies of the patent application.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Effective radioprotective drugs could significantly improve the therapeutic ratio of radiation therapy by protecting normal tissues and allowing greater doses of radiation to be delivered to the tumor. One approach to avoid protecting the tumor is local application of the radioprotective drugs to adjacent health tissue. The patent applications claim a new class of metal independent nitroxide compounds that appear capable of protecting tissue against radiation damage if clinically useful, non-toxic formulations that deliver sufficient local tissue concentrations can be developed.

The prospective exclusive license will be royalty-bearing and will comply with the terms and conditions of 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.7. The prospective exclusive license may be granted unless, within 90 days from the date of this published Notice, NIH receives written evidence and argument that establishes that the grant of the license would not be consistent with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 209 and 37 CFR 404.7.

Properly filed competing applications for a license filed in response to this notice will be treated as objections to the contemplating license. Comments

and objections submitted in response to this notice will not be made available for public inspection, and, to the extent permitted by law, will not be released under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552.

Dated: January 31, 2000.

**Jack Spiegel,**

*Director, Division of Technology Development and Transfer, Office of Technology Transfer.*

[FR Doc. 00-2632 Filed 2-4-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4140-01-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### **Office of the Assistant Secretary—Water and Science; Central Utah Project Completion Act; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment for the Conversion of a Portion of Strawberry Valley Project Water From Irrigation to Municipal and Industrial Use**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary—Water and Science, Department of the Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Assessment for the conversion of a portion of Strawberry Valley Project (SVP) water from irrigation to other beneficial uses including municipal and industrial (M&I) use.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Department of the Interior, Central Utah Project Completion Act Office will prepare an Environmental Assessment on the conversion of SVP water from agricultural to municipal and industrial use.

The SVP, authorized December 15, 1905, is one of the earliest Reclamation Projects. The SVP water from the Colorado River Basin is stored in the enlarged Strawberry Reservoir. The SVP water is then conveyed through the Diamond Fork System into the Great Basin where it is delivered through natural stream courses to the Spanish Fork River diversion structure and into the Strawberry Power Canal. The SVP service area is located in south Utah County, Utah. The Strawberry Water Users Association is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the SVP and contractually uses Central Utah Project (CUP) facilities to store and convey SVP water.

Suburban development in the SVP service area has resulted in agricultural land being taken out of production, annexed into the cities, and developed into residential areas. Under the authority of the Water for Miscellaneous Purposes Act of 1920 (43 U.S.C. 521),

the Secretary of the Interior has authority to approve converting a portion of the SVP water from irrigation to M&I use. This conversion will: (1) authorize the conversion of SVP water from irrigation to M&I use; (2) ensure the orderly marketing of CUP and SVP M&I water; (3) provide an adequate water supply to the cities; (4) generate revenue to fund the rehabilitation of SVP facilities; and (5) eliminate unauthorized use of SVP water within the service area. Of the total SVP annual average water supply of about 71,000 acre-feet, approximately 10,200 acre-feet has already been converted and an additional 1,800 acre-feet will be converted from irrigation to M&I use in the foreseeable future with the opportunity to gradually convert additional amounts as growth continues in the area.

The Environmental Assessment will identify potential effects of the proposed action and determine whether those effects are significant. Alternatives identified at this time include the proposed action and the no action alternatives. Issues to be analyzed include impacts on wildlife, cultural resources, special status plants and animals, and water resources.

**DATES:** Public scoping comments relating to issues and potential additional alternatives will be accepted for 30 days following the publication of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Scoping comments should be sent to: Program Coordinator, CUP Completion Act Office, Department of the Interior, 302 East 1860 South, Provo UT 84606-6154.

Comments, including names and street addresses of respondents will be available for public review at the CUP Completion Act Office and will be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). They may be published as part of the Environmental Assessment and other related documents.

Dated: February 1, 2000.

**Ronald Johnston,**

*CUP Program Director, Department of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. 00-2640 Filed 2-4-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-RK-U**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### **Bureau of Indian Affairs**

#### **Proposed Finding Against Federal Acknowledgment of the Steilacoom Tribe of Indians**

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to 25 CFR 83.10(h), notice is hereby given that the Assistant Secretary proposes to determine that the Steilacoom Tribe of Indians, c/o Mrs. Joan Ortez, P.O. Box 419, Steilacoom, Washington 98388 does not exist as an Indian tribe within the meaning of Federal law. This notice is based on a determination that the tribe does not satisfy all of the criteria set forth in 25 CFR 83.7 and, therefore, does not meet the requirements for a government-to-government relationship with the United States.

**DATES:** As provided by 25 CFR 83.10(i), any individual or organization wishing to challenge the proposed finding may submit factual or legal arguments and evidence to rebut the evidence relied upon. This material must be submitted within 180 calendar days from the date of publication of this notice. As stated in the regulations, 25 CFR 83.10(i), interested and informed parties who submit arguments and evidence to the Assistant Secretary must also provide copies of their submissions to the petitioner. Names and addresses of commenters on the proposed finding are generally available under the Freedom of Information Act.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the proposed finding and/or requests for a copy of the report of evidence should be addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240, Attention: Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, Mail Stop 4660—MIB.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** R. Lee Fleming, Chief, Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, (202) 208-3592.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This notice is published in the exercise of authority delegated by the Secretary of the Interior to the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs by 209 DM 8.

The Steilacoom Tribe of Indians (STI) asserted that it was eligible for consideration under 25 CFR 83.8 as the continuation of the Steilacoom band which signed the Treaty of Medicine Creek on December 24, 1854, and that the Steilacoom were recognized as a tribe by the Federal Government in the 1930's. The evidence did not show that the STI descends from the "Steilacoom" group which was a party to the treaty. In addition, the evidence demonstrated that the Steilacoom organizations of the 1920's and 1930's were dealt with only for the purpose of prosecuting claims against the Federal Government. Therefore, because the petitioner did not provide substantial evidence of

unambiguous prior Federal acknowledgment, the STI petition has been evaluated under the provisions of 25 CFR 83.7. The STI meets criteria 83.7(d), 83.7(f), and 83.7(g), but does not meet 83.7(a), 83.7(b), 83.7(c), and 83.7(e).

Criterion 83.7(a) requires that the petitioner have been identified as an American Indian entity on a substantially continuous basis since 1900. For the period from 1900 through 1925, the evidence did not show any external identifications of an existing Steilacoom Indian entity. In 1925, seven people described in BIA minutes as "Steilacoom Indians" attended a claims meeting. The claims group appeared in BIA records through the late 1930's. There was also an effort in the later 1930's to organize a Steilacoom Tribe of Public Domain Indians of Washington under the IRA. There were no Federal identifications of any Steilacoom entity between 1941 and 1951. Federal identifications of the claims organization resumed in 1951 and continued until the final judgment award in 1974. In 1953, it was included on the list of groups with which the BIA discussed proposed termination legislation.

In 1952, a longtime local resident of the Steilacoom, Washington, area, testified on behalf of the claims organization that she could still identify a Steilacoom tribe. During the 1950's and 1960's, the State of Washington Department of Fisheries recognized the BIA "blue cards" issued to persons listed on the rolls of claims organizations. On this basis, an official of the Washington State Game Department stated in 1971 that he considered the STI as a bonafide tribe representing a continuation of the historical Steilacoom band.

The evidence in the record for this proposed finding did not include any other identifications of an existing Steilacoom entity in local newspapers, by local or regional historians, or in scholarly works for the period prior to the 1970's. In February 1974, the Steilacoom Indian Tribe incorporated within the State of Washington as a nonprofit organization. From 1974 to the present, the Steilacoom Tribe of Indians has regularly been identified as a non-recognized Indian tribe by Federal and State agencies, in newspaper articles, by local historians, and by scholars.

The evidence was not adequate to demonstrate that STI has been identified as an American Indian entity on a substantially continuous basis for the entire period since 1900. The STI does not meet criterion 83.7(a).

Criterion 83.7(b) requires that a predominant portion of the petitioning community comprise a distinct community and have existed as a community from historical times until the present. The petitioner did not demonstrate any of the five forms of evidence listed under 83.7(b)(2) at any point in time since the beginning of sustained contact with non-Indian settlers.

Section 83.7(b)(1)(iii) states that a petitioner may show significant rates of informal social interaction which exist broadly among the members of a group. In order for this to occur, there must first be a group. The evidence showed that the ancestors of the current STI membership did not, historically, constitute a group whose history could be traced through time and place. The petitioner's ancestors in the 19th century consisted of several different categories of unconnected people (see discussion below under criterion 83.7(e)).

The evidence did not demonstrate that persons from any one of these different categories regularly interacted either with persons from other categories or with persons identified in the historical record as Steilacoom Indians (83.7(b)(1)(ii)). The petitioner did not show significant rates of marriage within the group at any time since record keeping began in the mid-19th century (83.7(b)(1)(i)). From first sustained contact with non-Indians until the present, the ancestral families and current members of the STI have intermarried primarily with non-Indians.

There was no evidence that there was a significant degree of shared or cooperative labor or other economic activity among STI ancestral families in the past (83.7(b)(1)(iv)). Participation by STI members in commercial fishing in the 1970's was by invitation of federally acknowledged tribes, and did not involve a significant degree of shared or cooperative labor among the STI membership. For the modern period, the evidence showed that there was intra family social and economic interaction, but little interfamily association. The petition contained no evidence of patterns of institutionalized discrimination or other social distinctions by nonmember either in the past or in the present (83.7(b)(1)(v)). There was no evidence that the ancestral families or current members of the STI had any shared sacred or ritual activity, or cultural patterns, that encompassed most of the groups (83.7(b)(1)(vi) and (vii)).

Section 83.7(b)(1)(viii) lists one possible form of evidence for

community as: "[t]he persistence of a named, collective Indian identity continuously over a period of more than 50 years, notwithstanding changes in name." There was no named, collective identity between 1854 and 1925. At different times during the 1925–1941 period, two Steilacoom claims organizations existed. There are no membership lists of these organizations. Therefore, it was not possible to determine to what extent, if any, the petitioner's ancestors identified with either or both, or to what extent the membership of the earlier period overlapped with that of the post-1951 group, the petitioner. Regardless, these organizations did not continue for a period of 50 years. There was an approximate 65 percent overlap between the 1950's lists and the lists for the group from the mid-1970's to the present. The STI incorporated in 1974 and has existed continuously since that date. The identity asserted by the formal organization of a group is entitled to weight as representing the views of the membership. However, the existence of a formal organization is not in itself sufficient evidence to show collective group identity.

The evidence in the record was not sufficient to demonstrate the existence of community from historical times to the present. The STI does not meet criterion 83.7(b).

Criterion 83.7(c) requires that the petitioner has maintained political influence or authority over its members as an autonomous entity from historical times until the present. The evidence in the record does not show the post-treaty existence of an autonomous Steilacoom band. The STI petition did not present the types of evidence described under 83.7(c)(2). The evidence in the record under 83.7(c)(1) did not demonstrate the exercise of political authority of influence over the petitioner's ancestors as a group, whether as members of a "Steilacoom" entity or any other entity. The individual extended ancestral families of the modern STI, throughout the second half of the 19th century and first quarter of the 20th century were not connected with one another in such a way as to permit any kind of bilateral political relationship.

Because there was no identifiable entity in the later 19th and early 20th centuries, there were no identifiable group leaders or governing bodies prior to 1925. In so far as the petition mentioned individual 19th century Steilacoom Indians as leaders, there was no evidence that most STI ancestral families associated with them. In so far as it mentioned identified STI ancestors as leaders, there was no evidence that

their influence extended beyond their own family line.

There was very little evidence concerning mobilization of resources from members of family lines ancestral to the STI for any common purposes from the mid-19th century until the formation of the Steilacoom claims organization in 1925. Since the membership of the Steilacoom claims organization in the 1920's and 1930's is unknown, there was no evidence to show the level of support provided by its members even for this limited function. There was no data indicating that there were any common purposes among the STI ancestral families other than the prosecution of claims prior to the development of concern over fishing rights in the 1950's.

For the modern period, approximately 30 out of 612 members attend meetings. Other STI activities such as work toward Federal acknowledgment and representational and educational activities directed at the wider community have been conducted primarily by a small group of members. There was very little evidence concerning communication between leaders and members and the minutes provided little data concerning internal conflicts, if any, and their resolution. The STI does not meet criterion 83.7(c).

Criterion 83.7(d) requires that the petitioner provide copies of the group's current constitution and by-laws. The STI meets criterion 83.7(d).

Criterion 83.7(e) states that the petitioner's membership must consist of individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous political entity. Of the 612 STI members, only three from one nuclear family have been documented as descendants of persons who, in the 19th century and first quarter of the 20th century, were identified as Steilacoom Indians. The 91 per cent of the current STI members for whom the petitioner submitted data descend primarily from two other categories of Indian ancestors.

Just under two-thirds descend from Indian women who, between 1839 and 1870, married men who had recently come to the region of Fort Nisqually in Pierce County and Cowlitz Prairie in Lewis County, most as employees of the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC). The petition asserted that these Indian women were Steilacoom and that they maintained their Steilacoom tribal affiliation. Contemporary records did not verify this assertion. Their children and grandchildren described them variously as Nisqually, Puyallup, Cowlitz, Clallam, Chimacum, Quinault,

Duwamish, Skokobish, Yakima, and Snohomish in affidavits made between 1910 and 1918. None of these affidavits described an ancestress as Steilacoom.

The other one-third of the STI members with documented Indian ancestry trace their lineage to Canadian Indian tribes through Red River metis families from Manitoba. The petition asserted that these Red River families were adopted, sometimes by way of intermarriage, into a continuously existing Steilacoom tribe during the second half of the 19th century. However, the few documented intermarriages did not take place between Red River immigrants and Steilacoom Indians. Rather, they took place between Red River immigrants and the non-Steilacoom Indian/HBC descendant families described above.

The identified STI ancestral family lines can all be documented to the mid-19th century, but the limited documentation available concerning the claims organization did not indicate that a significant proportion of the families were associated with the Steilacoom claims organization of the 1920's and 1930's. The family lines adopted into the STI in the 1950's included families whose Indian ancestry was Cowlitz, Cowlitz/Quinault, Lummi, Red River, and Colville, and who were previously unconnected with one another. Thus, although the petitioner's membership consists of Indian descendants, it does not consist of "individuals who descend from a historical Indian tribe or from historical Indian tribes which combined and functioned as a single autonomous entity." The STI does not meet criterion 83.7(e).

Criterion 83.7(f) states that the petitioner's membership must be composed principally of persons who are not members of any acknowledged North American Indian tribe. The STI meets criterion 83.7(f).

Criterion 83.7(g) states that neither the petitioner nor its members can have been the subject of congressional legislation that has expressly terminated or forbidden the Federal relationship. The STI meets criterion 83.7(g).

Based on this preliminary factual determination, the Steilacoom Tribe of Indians should not be granted Federal acknowledgment under 25 CFR Part 83.

As provided by 25 CFR 83.10(h) of the revised regulations, a report summarizing the evidence, reasoning, and analyses that are the basis for the proposed decision will be provided to the petitioner and other interested parties, and is available to other parties upon written request. Comments on the proposed finding and/or requests for a copy of the report of evidence should be

addressed to the Office of the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240, Attention: Branch of Acknowledgment and Research, Mail Stop 4660—MIB. Comments on the proposed finding should be submitted within 180 calendar days from the date of publication of this notice. Third party comments must be provided to the petitioner as well as to the Federal Government. After the close of the 180-day comment period, the petitioner has 60 calendar days to respond to third-party comments.

After the expiration of the comment and response periods described above, the BIA will consult with the petitioner concerning establishment of a time frame for preparation of the final determination. After consideration of the written arguments and evidence rebutting the proposed finding and within 60 days after beginning preparation of the final determination, the Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs will publish the final determination of the petitioner's status in the **Federal Register** as provided in 25 CFR 83.10(1).

Dated: January 14, 2000.

**Kevin Gover,**

*Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 00-2635 Filed 2-4-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-02-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[CO-220-1020XQ]

#### Call for Nominations for Northwest and Front Range Resource Advisory Councils (Colorado)

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

**ACTION:** Call for nominations.

**SUMMARY:** The purpose of this notice is to solicit nominations from the public to fill positions which have recently been vacated on two Colorado, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Resource Advisory Councils.

These councils provide advice and recommendations to BLM on management of the public lands. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) directs the Secretary of the Interior to involve the public in planning and issues related to management of lands administered by BLM. Under Section 309 of FLPMA the Secretary has selected 15 member citizen-based advisory councils that are established and authorized consistent

with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). As required by the FACA, Resource Advisory Council members appointed to the council will reflect a balanced membership representative of the various interests concerned with the management of public lands and users of the public lands.

The position to be filled on the Northwest Resource Advisory Council is Public-at-Large in Group 3.

The position on the Front Range Resource Advisory Council which is being filled is also Public-at-Large in Group 3. Nominees must be residents of Colorado. All nominations must be accompanied by letters of reference from represented interests or organizations, a completed Nomination/Background Information Form, as well as any other information that speaks to the nominee's qualifications.

**DATES:** Completed Nomination/Background Information Forms and any other necessary information should be received in the appropriate office on or before March 23, 2000.

**ADDRESSES:** For more information and a Nomination/Background Information Form, contact the appropriate BLM office:

Northwest Resource Advisory Council—Bureau of Land Management, Northwest Center, Attn: RAC Nomination, 2815 H Road, Grand Junction, Colorado 81506.

Front Range Resource Advisory Council—Bureau of Land Management, Front Range Center, Attn: RAC Nomination, 3170 East Main Street, Canon City, Colorado 81212.

Completed Nomination/Background Forms should be returned to the appropriate address listed above.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ken Smith (719) 269-8553; for information about the Front Range Resource Advisory Council or Lynn Barclay (970) 826-5096 for information about the Northwest Resource Advisory Council.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Individuals may nominate themselves or others. Nominees will be evaluated based on their education, training, and experience of the issues and knowledge of the geographical area of the Council. Nominees should have demonstrated a commitment to collaborative resource decision making.

Dated: January 29, 2000.

**John Carochi,**

*Acting Front Range Center Manager.*

[FR Doc. 00-2701 Filed 2-4-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-JB-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[CA-320-1820-XQ]

#### Notice of Resource Advisory Council Meeting

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management Northeast California Resource Advisory Council, Susanville, California.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the authorities in the Federal Advisory Committees Act (Public Law 92-463) and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (Public Law 94-579), the U. S. Bureau of Land Management's Northeast California Resource Advisory Council will meet Friday, March 10, 2000, at the Bureau of Land Management's Eagle Lake Field Office, 2950 Riverside Drive, Susanville, CA.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting begins at 8 a.m. in the Eagle Lake Field Office Conference Room. Agenda items include an update on Grass Banking, a status report on a proposal to list the sage grouse under the Endangered Species Act, and a report from the council's off highway vehicle working group. The council will also hear reports on the status of a proposal to designate a National Conservation Area is parts of the Black Rock Desert and High Rock Canyon, and other proposals for special area designations. Time will be set aside on the agenda for public comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Contact BLM Alturas Field Manager Tim Burke at (530) 257-4666.

**Joseph J. Fontana,**

*Public Affairs Officer.*

[FR Doc. 00-2683 Filed 2-4-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-40-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[CO-700-00-0777-XQ-1784]

#### Southwest Resource Advisory Council Meeting

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

**ACTION:** Notice; Southwest Resource Advisory Council Meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Southwest Resource Advisory Council (Southwest RAC) will meet in March, 2000 in Paonia, CO.

**DATES:** The meeting will be held on Thursday, March 9, 2000.