kangaroo rat, Kern mallow and Hoover's eriastrum, the HCP involves implementation of measures to minimize effects to the environment by utilizing previously disturbed lands for construction related activities to the greatest extent practicable, and designating Habitat Management Lands to compensate for the loss of natural lands. Compensation ratios for permanently disturbed habitat areas will be 3:1 (3 acres will be preserved for every 1 acre permanently disturbed); for areas considered to be temporarily disturbed, a ratio of 1.1:1 will be used (1.1 acres will be preserved for every 1 acre temporarily disturbed). In addition, direct harassment of any covered species will be avoided to the greatest extent practicable.

The EA considers the environmental consequences of four alternatives. The no project alternative would result in no immediate environmental impacts. However, state and Federal agencies regulating oil and gas activities would still require a variety of abandonment activities to occur over time; these activities may result in take of listed species. Thus, this alternative may place ARCO in violation of state and/or Federal regulations while denying ARCO Western Energy the opportunity to develop, recover and maintain potential oil resources. For these reasons, this alternative was rejected. Alternative 1, the proposed action, was selected because: (1) It best satisfies the needs and purpose of the proposed project; (2) it is likely to result in a relatively low level of incidental take; (3) impacts are mitigated through the establishment of the Coles Levee Ecosystem Preserve and the use of take reduction methods; (4) funding is available for the project as designed; and (5) high quality compensation habitat is present on the Coles Levee Ecosystem Preserve. It is anticipated that up to 330 acres of endangered species habitat may be impacted by implementation of this alternative. Alternative 2 involves the full development of the Coles Levee area for oil production. It is anticipated that up to 3,000 acres of endangered species habitat may be impacted by implementation of this alternative. This alternative was rejected because: (1) The level of incidental take would likely be greater than under the preferred alternative; (2) the additional level of mitigation funding is not economically feasible; (3) this intensity of development is not appropriate at this site based on oil reserves and extraction techniques. Alternative 3 involves the development of oil production facilities

on an alternative site. This alternative is severely constrained by the lack of facilities on-site, the costs of constructing alternative facilities, land purchase, and the likelihood of any other areas suitable for oil production in this portion of California having similar endangered species concerns. It is anticipated that up to 10,000 acres of endangered species habitat may be impacted by implementation of this alternative. For these reasons this alternative was rejected.

The Service considers implementation of the proposed HCP in connection with a section 10(a)(1)(B) permit, to be an effective means to reconcile oil drilling activities with the section 9 listed species take prohibition and other conservation mandates under the Act.

This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(a) of the Act and National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) regulations (40 CFR 1506.6). The Service will evaluate the application, associated documents, and comments submitted thereon to determine whether the application meets the requirements of NEPA regulations and section 10(a) of the Act. If it is determined that the requirements are met, a permit will be issued for the incidental take of the listed species. The final NEPA and permit determination will be made no sooner than 30 days from the date of this notice.

Dated: December 5, 1995.

Thomas Dwyer,

Deputy Regional Director, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.

[FR Doc. 95–30058 Filed 12–8–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

National Park Service

Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore Advisory Commission Notice of Public Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act that a meeting of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and Point Reyes National Seashore Advisory Commission will be held at 7:30 p.m. (PST) on Wednesday, January 24, 1996 at GGNRA Park Headquarters, Building 201, Fort Mason, Bay and Franklin Streets, San Francisco, California to hear presentations on issues related to management of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and Point Reyes National Seashore. This meeting was previously scheduled for Wednesday, November 15, 1995, but due to the federal shutdown affecting

national parks that week, the meeting was rescheduled.

The Advisory Commission was established by Public Law 92–589 to provide for the free exchange of ideas between the National Park Service and the public and to facilitate the solicitation of advice or other counsel from members of the public on problems pertinent to the National Park Service systems in Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo Counties. Members of the Commission are as follows:

Mr. Richard Bartke, Chairman

Ms. Amy Meyer, Vice Chair

Ms. Naomi T. Gray

Dr. Howard Cogswell

Mr. Michael Alexander

Mr. Jerry Friedman

Ms. Lennie Roberts

Ms. Yvonne Lee

Ms. Sonia Bolaos

Mr. Trent Orr

Mr. Redmond Kernan

Ms. Jacqueline Young

Mr. Merritt Robinson

Mr. R. H. Sciaroni

Mr. John J. Spring

Dr. Edgar Wayburn Mr. Joseph Williams

Mr. Mel Lane

The main agenda item at this meeting will be a presentation of a GGNRA Staff Report on the Golden Gate Bridge Seismic Upgrade Project. A public hearing on this project was held on Wednesday, December 13, 1995 at the Board of Supervisors and Planning Chambers, Marin County Civic Center, San Rafael, California. An overview of the Golden Gate Bridge District Seismic Retrofit Project was presented to this Advisory Commission on August 16, 1995 by Merv Giacomini, District Engineer, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District. The major impacts to the park are anticipated to be on lands directly under the bridge, at Fort Point National Monument (requiring the Fort to close for several days a week during the one-year construction period), the Fort Scott area of the Presidio (which will be a staging area for construction work), and the north end of the bridge. Following approval of the Staff Report and approval of a Negative Declaration by the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District board, and a Finding of No Significant Impact by the Federal Highway Administration and the National Park Service, a permit for construction activities on GGNRA land will be issued by the National Park Service incorporating agreed upon mitigation.

Also on the agenda at this meeting will be briefings on the status of a park