room 807, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, Tel. 301-496-7030, will furnish substantive program information.

This notice is being published less than 15 days prior to the meeting due to the difficulty of coordinating the attendance of members because of conflicting schedules.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Numbers: 93.393, Cancer Cause and Prevention Research; 93.394, Cancer Detection and Diagnosis Research; 93.395, Cancer Treatment Research; 93.396, Cancer Biology Research; 93.397, Cancer Centers Support; 93.398, Cancer Research Manpower; 93.399, Cancer Control)

[FR Doc. 91-14819 Filed 6-19-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

Public Health Service

Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Scientific Integrity, Public Health Service

Pursuant to Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Scientific Integrity, Public Health Service, on July 15-16, 1991 at the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD. The meeting will take place July 15 from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and on July 16 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., Building 31, C Wing, Conference room 7. The meeting will be open to the public.

The Committee reviews and evaluates, on an ongoing basis, the efficacy of policies and procedures of the Department of Health and Human Services in detecting, deterring, investigating, and resolving allegations of scientific misconduct and makes recommendations to the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Health on improving these policies and procedures.

The purpose of the meeting will be to introduce the Committee to the structure and function of the PHS Scientific Integrity programs and to examine ongoing activities. The Committee members will also begin to formulate future plans for the Committee.

Henrietta D. Hyatt-Knorr, Executive Secretary, Advisory Committee on Scientific Integrity Review, Rockwall II, suite 1113, 5515 Security Lane, Rockville MD 20852, (301) 443-5300, will furnish the meeting agenda, a roster of the Committee members, and substantive program information upon request. Members of the public wishing to make presentations should contact the Executive Secretary and forward a copy of their presentation at least two weeks ahead of time. Depending on the number of presentations and other considerations, the Executive Secretary will allocate a time frame for each speaker.

Lyle W. Bivens,

Director, Office of Scientific Integrity Review.

[FR Doc. 91-14654 Filed 6-19-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-17-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of the Secretary

Central Arizona Project (CAP) Water Allocations and Water Service Contracting

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of proposal water reallocation decision for uncontracted CAP non-Indian agricultural water allocations and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this action is to provide public notice of the Department's proposes reallocation of currently uncontracted CAP non-Indian agricultural water allocations. Except as noted below, the Department proposed to reallocate 29.3 percent of CAP uncontracted non-Indian agricultural water allocations as recommended by the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) and to offer amendatory or new subcontracts for such water to non-Indian agricultural users. The contracting process which follows the final allocation decision will include consideration of a full range of contracting terms and conditions and will provide an opportunity for public review and comment. The Department will reserve for discretionary use any non-Indian agricultural allocations that are uncontracted after completion of the contracting process.

DATES: All written comments relevant to the proposed reallocation decision that are received on or before July 22, 1991, will be considered.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should contact Mr. Donald Walker, Contracts and Repayment Specialist, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240 (telephone: 202-208-5671) or Mr. Steve Hvinden, Regional Economist, Bureau of Reclamation, PO Box 427, Boulder City, Nevada 89005 (telephone 702-293-8651).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Previous Departmental **Federal Register** notices relating to CAP water allocations are as follows: 37 FR 28082, December 20, 1972; 40 FR 17297, April 18, 1975; 41 FR 45883, October 18, 1976; 45 FR 52938, August 8, 1980; 45 FR 81265, December 10, 1980; 46 FR 29544, June 2, 1981; 46 FR 60658, December 11, 1981; and 48 FR 12446, March 24, 1983. CAP water allocation decisions are made pursuant to the Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended and supplemented (32 Stat. 388, 43 U.S.C. 391), the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 1057, 43 U.S.C. 617), the Colorado River Basin Project Act of September 30, 1968 (82 Stat. 885, 43 U.S.C. 1501), the Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR part 1505), the Implementing Procedures of the Department of the Interior (516 DM 5.4), and in recognition of the Secretary's trust responsibility to the Indian tribes of central Arizona.

Forcing Event

Section 11(h) of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100-512) (102 Stat. 2559) provides that the Secretary must reallocate uncontracted non-Indian agricultural CAP water within 180 days of receiving ADWR's recommendations. The official date of receipt of ADWR's allocation recommendations was January 29, 1991, thereby establishing July 28, 1991, as the deadline for this reallocation decision.

Background

The CAP is a multi-purpose project which provides water for municipal and industrial (M&I), Indian, and non-Indian agricultural uses. The last allocations of CAP water, the conditions upon which those allocations were made, and the procedures for water service contracting were published in the **Federal Register** (48 FR 12446, March 24, 1983). That notice contained the Secretary's final decision, summarized CAP issues, and provided basic background information applicable to this proposed reallocation.

In the 1983 notice, the Secretary allocated 638,823 acre-feet of water per year to non-Indian M&I users and 309,828 acre-feet of water per year to Indian users. The non-Indian agricultural water users were to receive any CAP supply that remained after the non-Indian M&I and Indian entities used their entitlements. The supply allocated to each of the 23 non-Indian agricultural users was stated in terms of a percentage of the total non-Indian agricultural supply. The non-Indian agricultural allocation was based on a percentage which represented each allottee's portion of the total irrigated acreage, with an adjustment to reflect any other surface water supply available to the allottee.

Since the 1983 notice was published, the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) and the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) have been

entering into long-term CAP water service subcontracts with those entities receiving an allocation of CAP agricultural water. CAWCD is the entity which has contracted with Reclamation for repayment of the costs of the project. The combined entitlement for entities which have entered into CAP water service subcontracts subsequent to the 1983 notice represents 70.7 percent of the non-Indian agricultural supply. Eleven entities have declined their CAP water allocation for a total of 23.82 percent of the non-Indian agricultural supply. Two entities which were allocated the remaining 5.48 percent of the agricultural supply have not yet contracted for such water.

Water deliveries pursuant to the subcontracts will begin following Reclamation's issuance of a notice of completion for CAP. It is anticipated that such a notice will be issued sometime in late 1992. In the meantime, CAP water deliveries have been made and are being made through completed portions of the CAP aqueduct pursuant to interim water service contracts.

The 1983 notice provided for a reallocation of the CAP water after the initial round of water service contracting had been completed. An interest in proceeding with the reallocation has existed for several years. However, the Department and ADWR have refrained from proceeding with the reallocation until there was more certainty about the amount of allocations involved and until ongoing negotiations for Indian water rights settlements had been completed. The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988, in effect, compelled the Secretary to request ADWR in November of 1988 to make a recommended reallocation of uncontracted non-Indian CAP agricultural water to the Secretary. The amount of time that ADWR had to respond to the request was not specified. However, ADWR was required to complete its recommendation by January 7, 1991, by the decision of the Arizona Superior Court in the case, *Central Arizona Irrigation and Drainage District et al.* v. *Plummer*, No. CIV-38812.

In response to the request from Reclamation and in compliance with the Court order, ADWR recommended to the Secretary by its letter dated January 7, 1991, how the remaining 29.3 percent of the non-Indian agricultural supply should be reallocated. In arriving at its recommendations, ADWR conducted an extensive public input and review process which elicited numerous opinions, options, and alternatives. By letter dated January 15, 1991, ADWR supplemented its recommendations to the Secretary with a report explaining the methodologies used to calculate the water recommendations, discussing the factors considered in making the recommendations, and addressing issues and concerns raised by public comments. Some of these issues and concerns are discussed below.

ADWR's report submitted with the January 15, 1991, letter was fully considered and used in developing options for consideration. Anyone interested in receiving a copy of ADWR's letters dated January 7 and 15, 1991, and accompanying report, should refer to the "Addresses" section of this notice for a contact person.

Policy and Legal Issues

Issue 1. Reallocation of uncontracted non-Indian agricultural water allocations for use in central and southern Arizona Indian water rights settlements.

Discussion: Negotiated water rights settlements with Indian tribes have been and are being pursued by the United States for tribes in central and southern Arizona. Generally, the United States participates in settlements by making contributions of water and/or money. Potential water supplies for existing and future settlements are limited. Some parties view the uncontracted CAP agricultural water supply as a potential source of water for Indian water rights settlements.

The Department believes that there are barriers which prohibit the first round reallocation of non-Indian agricultural water for Indian water rights settlements. As noted in the "Forcing Event" section of this notice, subsection 11(h) of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 provides that "Within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall request the Arizona Department of Water Resources to recommend a reallocation of non-Indian agricultural CAP water that has been offered to but not contracted for by potential non-Indian agricultural subcontractors. Within one hundred and eighty days of receipt of such recommendation, the Secretary shall reallocate such water for non-Indian use, and the Secretary and CAWCD shall thereafter offer amendatory or new subcontracts to non-Indian agricultural users." A similar provision is included in existing CAP water service subcontracts with agricultural subcontractors. The subcontracts provide that "After consultation with the Arizona Department of Water Resources, the Secretary shall reallocate for non-Indian agricultural use all entitlements to Agricultural Water that were not contracted for by the entities to which such entitlements were first made available."

Issue 2. Impact of reallocation decisions on CAP cost allocation.

Discussion: CAWCD is the repayment entity for CAP through its repayment contract with the United States. CAWCD will rely on revenues received from the sale of power, ad valorem taxes, and revenues from its water service subcontractors to make its annual payments to the United States. The question arises as to how any reallocation decision will impact the CAP cost allocation.

If the reallocation decision only alters the distribution of uncontracted water allocations among the non-Indian agricultural entities, there would be no change in the amount of costs allocated to CAWCD. If some of the non-Indian agricultural allocations were allocated for Indian water rights settlement purposes, the CAP cost allocation would be affected.

Issue 3. Impact of reallocation decision on the repayment capabilities of CAP non-Indian irrigation districts.

Discussion: Existing CAP water entitlements for each irrigation district which contracts for CAP water will change. In almost all cases the quantities of CAP water available to each irrigation district will increase. This will affect the districts' operation and maintenance cost structure since the districts will probably use more CAP water and less ground water than would have been the case in the absence of the reallocation. If CAP water costs more than ground water, which is likely to be the case for most districts in the early years of CAP operations, the reallocation might have an adverse impact on the districts' ability to pay CAP water service charges and to repay the debt owed to the Federal Government for CAP distribution systems.

Issue 4. Local concerns addressed by ADWR.

Discussion: During its public involvement process, ADWR heard numerous local concerns, which are discussed in its January 15, 1991, reallocation report entitled "Recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior on Reallocation of Central Arizona Project Non-Indian Agricultural Water". These concerns, among others, included whether (1) new entities should be considered for an allocation, (2) entities outside of the CAWCD three-

county service area should be considered for an allocation, and (3) CAP water should be reallocated to the State active management areas (AMA) in the same proportion as in the 1983 allocation.

The Department does not believe that the reallocation must be limited to the existing subcontractors. With respect to whether CAP water can only be delivered for use within CAWCD's three-county service area (Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima Counties), CAWCD's repayment contract provides for delivery of CAP water outside of CAWCD's service area if the Contracting Officer approves such delivery. Therefore, the Department believes that CAP agricultural water can be allocated, as ADWR recommends, for use outside the three-county area.

Entities in the Tucson area have indicated that agricultural water allocations that were rejected in the original contracting process should be reallocated to the same AMA. These entities have indicated that the ADWR recommendations result in a gain to the other AMA's at the expense of the Tucson AMA.

The Department does not believe that the water allocation relationships that existed in the 1983 allocation must necessarily be preserved in the reallocation. Non-Indian agricultural supplies for CAP have been allocated and continue to be allocated on the basis of eligible acreage. Since some of the irrigation districts within the Tucson AMA rejected their CAP water allocations, there are fewer eligible lands within the Tucson AMA that can participate in the reallocation. The Department cannot require entities in the Tucson AMA to contract for CAP agricultural water. Allocation of CAP water on the basis of eligible acreage cannot be accomplished by adhering strictly to the water allocation relationships among AMA's that existed in the 1983 allocation.

Options

1. Reallocate in accordance with ADWR recommendations.

2. Reallocate to the 10 existing subcontractors, with the stipulation that any allocations not contracted for within 180 days of the reallocation decision shall revert to the Secretary for discretionary use.

3. Reallocate as recommended by ADWR, with the stipulation that any allocations not contracted within the timeframes recommended by ADWR shall revert to the Secretary for discretionary use.

Option 1. Reallocate in accordance with ADWR recommendations. The complete text of the ADWR recommendations is quoted below. Bracketed words are inserted for clarification purposes.

1. Entitlements contained in article 4.13(a) of all existing non-Indian agricultural subcontracts be adjusted pursuant to article 4.13(b) as follows:

Irrigation district (subcontractor)	Existing entitlement (percent)	Proposed new entitlement (percent)
Central Arizona IDD	18.01	22.74
Chandler Heights Citrus ID	0.28	0.30
Harquahala Valley ID	7.67	8.73
HoHoKam ID	6.36	6.97
Maricopa-Stanfield IDD	20.48	22.75
New Magma IDD	4.34	7.23
Queen Creek ID	4.83	4.83
Roosevelt Water CD	5.98	6.33
San Tan ID	0.77	0.77
Tonopah ID	1.98	1.98

2. Entitlements for entities which received original allocations [48 FR 12446, March 24, 1983] but the contracting deadlines have not been imposed [entities which have not entered into water service subcontracts] be adjusted as follows:

Subcontractor	Original entitlement (percent)	Adjusted entitlement (percent)
Farmers Investment Co. [FICO]	1.39	1.64
San Carlos IDD [SCIDD]	4.09	6.84

3. New subcontracts be offered with the indicated entitlements to:

Subcontractor	Entitlement (percent)
Arizona State Land Department:	
Lease #01-00694 (Picacho Pecans)	0.54
Lease #01-077685 (Aguirre)	0.11
McMullen Valley Water CDD [MVWCDD]	3.17
Roosevelt ID [RID]	5.0

4. No subcontract be offered to an entity in Recommendation No. 3 above unless within one year from [the Secretary's] decision on the allocation the entity provides the following:

a. Demonstration to the satisfaction of both the Secretary and Department [ADWR] that it is economically feasible to distribute CAP water for agricultural production to the eligible lands in the entity's leasehold or service area and there is no impediment to any necessary exchange agreements.

b. A commitment to relinquish any allocation of "Hoover B" electric power [Incremental capacity and energy resulting from the up-rating program of the Hoover Dam Power Plant pursuant to Pub. L. 98-381 (98 Stat. 1333)].

c. Demonstration to the satisfaction of the Secretary and the Department [ADWR] that there will be in place provisions to comply with section 304(c)(1) of Public Law 90-537 for any entity located outside of an existing Active Management Area or Irrigation Non-expansion Area.

5. A determination of eligible acres be made [by the Secretary] before a subcontract is offered to an entity in Recommendation No. 3 above and the allocation adjusted, if necessary, in a manner consistent with the methodology used by the Department [ADWR] in this recommended reallocation.

6. Once the record of decision is made [by the Secretary], the adjustments to the existing subcontractor's entitlements be completed in 6 months. New subcontracts should be executed within 6 months [with the allottees listed in item No. 3] after the requirements of Recommendation No. 4 have been completed.

7. If any of the allottees decides [sic] on a lesser entitlement than the amount recommended, or that it does not want to subcontract, then all remaining entities' entitlements should be increased [by the Secretary] in a manner consistent with the methodology used by the Department [ADWR] in this recommended reallocation.

Discussion: ADWR developed three criteria for determining whether an entity should be included in the reallocation. These criteria include the following: (1) The entity must have lands that are eligible to receive CAP agricultural water; (2) the entity must be located in an area experiencing a declining ground water table; and (3) the entity must currently be providing water for agricultural use.

In addition to the 10 entities that have signed CAP water service subcontracts, ADWR has recommended allocations to: (1) Three new entities (MVWCDD and the two State leases); (2) two entities included in the 1983 allocation (SCIDD and FICO) but which have not yet signed a CAP subcontract; and (3) one entity (RID) which had previously rejected a CAP subcontract but subsequently decided to seek an allocation during the reallocation recommendation process.

With one exception, all of the allottees would take direct delivery of CAP water. RID would benefit from the reallocation through an effluent exchange with the city of Phoenix. RID's CAP agricultural water would be delivered to Phoenix and Phoenix would

deliver treated effluent to RID for agricultural purposes. Under the State's recommendation, RID would have to document to the Secretary and ADWR that there is no impediment to implementing such an exchange as a prerequisite to receiving an offer of a CAP water service subcontract. The facilities to deliver effluent from Phoenix to RID will be constucted as part of an exchange agreement under the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988.

The State's recommendation would expand the eligible land base (418,890 acres) to receive CAP agricultural water, thereby increasing the possibility that Arizona will be able to use its full apportionment of Colorado River water. One of the primary purposes of CAP is to provide a means for the State to fully utilize such apportionment. The land base currently under subcontract may not be great enough to use all available CAP agricultural water in the early project years. Presently, the State does not have the capability to recharge large amounts of CAP water during the early years of the project.

Expanding the eligible land base increases Federal oversight required for administering the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982. However, these additional Federal costs are not expected to be substantial.

ADWR has recommended that MVWCDD receive a water allocation. The city of Phoenix owns most of the lands in the District. Phoenix has purchased the lands in MVWCDD as a water farm and intends to eventually transport ground water from such lands to the Phoenix service area. Phoenix plans to farm the land until such time as the ground water is needed within its service area. The use of CAP agricultural water on the MVWCDD lands will allow Phoenix to retain more ground water in the aquifer for future use in its service area.

An allocation to MVWCDD would require a high pump lift (approximately 600 feet) to convey CAP water to the District's lands. Nearly all of the CAP agricultural water for other CAP users will be delivered by gravity systems. Because of the high lift required for MVWCDD to utilize CAP water, the State has recommended that MVWCDD document that it has the financial capability to take and use CAP water for agricultural purposes before a subcontract can be offered to MVWCDD. The State has also recommended that the financial feasibility requirement be applied to RID and the two State leases.

ADWR has recommended that two other conditions be imposed on MVWCDD in order for MVWCDD to receive an offer of a CAP subcontract. The CAP authorizing legislation provides that subcontracts must require that adequate measures are in effect to control expansion of irrigation from aquifers in the subcontractor's service area. There is nothing under State law which would prevent MVWCDD from expanding its irrigation service area after it receives a CAP subcontract. The State has recommended that MVWCDD must satisfy the Department and ADWR that MVWCDD can meet the Federal requirement. ADWR has also recommended that MVWCDD must relinquish its allocation of Hoover B electric power as a condition of receiving a CAP water service subcontract. This condition would place MVWCDD on the same footing as the existing CAP water subcontractors, which were required to relinquish their entitlement to Hoover B power as a condition of receiving CAP water. Hoover B power is capacity and energy made available due to the up-rating of the power plant at Hoover Dam that was authorized by the Hoover Dam Power Plant Act of 1984 (Pub. L. 98-381, 98 Stat. 1333).

Under the CAP agricultural water service subcontracts, the agricultural water service subcontractors have the right to convert the agricultural entitlement to an M&I entitlement at the rate of 1 acre-foot per acre when the agricultural entitlement is no longer needed for agricultural purposes or when the eligible lands convert to M&I use. Any expansion of the CAP eligible acreage increases the potential for M&I conversions in the future. Since M&I water made available as a result of conversions has the same priority as the original 640,000 acre-feet of water that was allocated for M&I use, the allocation of agricultural water to new areas has the potential to further dilute the priority of the entire CAP M&I water supply during times of CAP water shortages.

Selection of this option would indicate that the Secretary had accepted the State's criteria and rationale for the reallocation. The Department has a history of giving deference to the State's recommendations regarding the use of Colorado River water by non-Indian entities.

Option 2. Reallocate uncontracted agricultural water allocations to the 10 existing subcontractors with the stipulation that any allocations not contracted for within 180 days of the reallocation decision shall revert to the Secretary for discretionary use. Water service contracts would be offered based on the percentages shown in the table below.

Irrigation district (Subcontractor)	Existing entitlement (Percent)	Proposed new entitlement (Percent)
Central Arizona IDD	18.01	27.67
Chandler Heights Citrus ID	0.28	0.36
Harquahala Valley ID	7.67	10.62
HoHoKam ID	6.36	8.48
Maricopa Stanfield IDD	20.48	27.67
New Magma IDD	4.34	8.78
Queen Creek ID	4.63	5.83
Roosevelt Water CD	5.96	7.70
San Tan ID	0.77	0.91
Tonopah ID	1.96	1.96

Discussion: Under this option, all CAP agricultural water allocations would be reallocated to existing subcontractors located in existing State-identified critical ground water basins.

The reservation feature of this option may provide a source of water for meeting the Secretary's obligation as trustee for Indian tribes. Litigation concerning Indian reserved water rights in central and southern Arizona has been proceeding for more than 15 years. Settlements have been reached in several cases, and negotiations are on-going for the San Carlos Apache Tribe and the Gila River Indian Community. The Secretary has not yet identified firm supplies of water to meet his obligations under existing water rights settlement acts, and must identify and secure additional blocks of water for pending settlements. The Secretary is committed to finding sources of water for existing Indian water rights settlements where sources of water have not been identified and in finding sources of water for use in pending Indian water rights settlements. This option would also be consistent with the Secretary's legal obligation to protect the Federal reserved rights of Indian tribes.

Option 3. Reallocate uncontracted agricultural water allocations as recommended by ADWR, with the stipulation that any allocations not contracted for within the timeframes recommended by ADWR shall revert to the Secretary for discretionary use.

Discussion: This option is a combination of options 1 and 2 above. By selecting this option, the Secretary would be adopting the State's criteria and rationale for the reallocation but would be retaining some flexibility for use of the non-Indian agricultural allocations in Indian water rights settlements and for other purposes in the event that some of the uncontracted allocations are not placed under

contract. Please refer to the discussion under options 1 and 2. This option would not fully accept the State's recommendation because it does not reallocate any agricultural allocations remaining after the contracting process to the remaining subcontractors.

Proposed Reallocation Decision

Option No. 3. The State has adopted reasonable criteria for developing its allocation recommendations, and the recommendations were developed through a process which solicited public input. Given the existing contracts and the legal requirements contained in section 11(h) of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Water Rights Settlement Act that the uncontracted water allocations must be allocated for non-Indian agricultural use, the Department believes that it is appropriate to defer to the State with respect to the allocation of the non-Indian agricultural water supply. The Department has a history of giving deference to the State's recommendations regarding the allocation of water among non-Indian entities and a policy of deferring to the State on water issues unless there is an overriding Federal interest. The Department believes, however, that it is appropriate that the Secretary retain some flexibility to use any allocations that become available following completion of the contracting program for use in Indian water rights settlements or for other purposes. With that understanding, the Department proposes to reallocate uncontracted CAP non-Indian agricultural water allocations and to proceed with water service contracting as recommended by ADWR.

Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)

Previous notices concerning compliance with NEPA in connection with CAP water allocations were published on June 2, 1981 [46 FR 29544]; December 4, 1981 [46 FR 59316]; December 11, 1981 [46 FR 60658]; and March 24, 1982 [47 FR 12689]. The Department has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) on the proposed reallocation decision and on alternative reallocation options. The draft EA is currently being circulated for public review and comment. Anyone interested in receiving a copy of the draft EA should contact Mr. Bruce Ellis, Chief, Environmental Division, Arizona Projects Office, Bureau of Reclamation, P.O. Box 9980, Phoenix, Arizona 85068 (telephone 602-870-6767).

Once the EA has been completed, the Department will determine whether to prepare a "Finding of No Significant Impact" or an environmental impact statement. Implementation of the reallocation decision will be subject to further compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Effect on Previous Decisions

When finalized, the proposed decision will supplement, and to the extent it is inconsistent therewith, supersede the non-Indian agricultural water allocation published by Secretary Watt on March 24, 1983.

Dated: June 17, 1991.

Manuel Lujan Jr.,

Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 91-14750 Filed 6-19-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-09-M

Bureau of Land Management

[AZ-930-01-4214-12; A-702, A-2695]

Termination of Multiple-Use Classification and Natural Area Designation; AZ

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Present action terminates the multiple-use classification and natural area designation on approximately 44 acres of public land and will allow for a land exchange for the enhancement of other Bureau programs. The subject area is in an area of potential development and no longer suitable for multiple-use management or natural area designation. Disposal of the property is in conformance with recommendations in the Arizona Strip Resource Management Plan.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 22, 1991.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Mezes, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona State Office, P.O. Box 16563, Phoenix, Arizona 85011, (602) 640-5509.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 20, 1967, and November 15, 1968, the land described below was included as a part of multiple-use classification actions segregating it from most forms of entry under the general land laws and the mining laws pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Act of September 19, 1964. On January 10, 1969, the area was designated a Class III natural environment area under the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation system of classification.

With the passage of the "Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984" on August 28, 1984, the Paria Canyon-Vermillion Cliffs area was designated as wilderness. With boundary adjustments allowed by the Wilderness Act, the subject area was eliminated from the wilderness designation. The lands retained its multiple-use classification and natural area designation. Lands affected by this action are located and identified as follows:

Gila and Salt River Meridian

T. 39 N., R. 7 E.,

Section 7, Lots 6 and 7, S½S½ (that portion between the wilderness boundary, Vermillion Cliffs Lodge and the private land belonging to the Badger Creek Homeowners lying west of Highway 89A).

The area contains approximately 44 acres in Coconino County.

1. The classification decisions dated June 20, 1967, and November 15, 1968, and the natural area designation dated January 10, 1969, as published in the **Federal Register** are hereby terminated in their entirety as they affect the above-described lands.

2. At 10 a.m. on June 20, 1991, the above-described land will be opened to operation of the public land laws, subject to valid existing rights and the provisions of applicable law.

3. At 10 a.m. on June 20, 1991, the above-described land will be opened to location and entry under the United States mining laws, subject to valid existing rights, the provision of existing withdrawals, any segregation of record and the requirements of applicable law. Appropriation of lands described in this order under the general mining laws prior to the date and time of restoration is unauthorized. Any such attempted appropriation, including attempted adverse possession under 30 U.S.C. 38, shall vest no rights against the United States. Acts required to establish a location and to initiate a right of possession are governed by State law where not in conflict with Federal law. The Bureau of Land Management will not intervene in disputes between rival locators over possessory rights since Congress has provided for such determinations in local courts.

Beaumont C. McClure,

Deputy State Director, Lands and Renewable Resources.

[FR Doc. 91-14718 Filed 6-19-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-M

[UT-050-01-4333-10]

Off-road Vehicle (ORV) Designation

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.