72° 37′ 54″ West, a distance of 50.07 feet, and the point of beginning; and

TRACT 101–09—containing an area of 0.001 of an acre, more or less, situated in the City of Dayton, County of Montgomery, State of Ohio, and being part of Sanford Court of the City of Dayton and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a cut cross set at the Southwest Corner of said Lot Number 6315 also being the intersection of the east right-of-way line of South Williams Street (60.0 feet wide) and the north right-of-way line of Sanford Court (16.5 feet wide); Thence, North 72° 37′ 54″ East along the Northern right-of-way line of said Lot Number 6315, a distance of 97.46 feet to the point of beginning; Thence, North 72° 37′ 54″ East, a distance of 50.07 feet to an iron pin set; Thence, South 17° 33′ 36″ East, a distance of 8.25 feet to the centerline of Sanford Court; Thence, South 72° 37′ 54″ West, a distance of 50.07 feet to a point in the centerline of Sanford Court; Thence, North 16° 52′ 59″ West, a distance of 8.25 feet to an iron pin set, and the place of beginning.

The National Park Service has prepared a map bearing drawing number 362/80,009, dated July 19, 1999, which depicts the specific real property for inclusion within the historic park. Copies of this map are available at the following three locations: The Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Land Resources Division, 1849 ''C'' Street, NW, Room 2444, Washington, D.C. 20240; The National Park Service, Midwest Region Office, 1709 Jackson Street, Omaha, NE 68102; and Superintendent, Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historic Park, at the address given above.

Dated: November 24, 1999.

William W. Schenk,

Regional Director, Midwest Region.

[FR Doc. 00–16704 Filed 6–30–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Park Service Concession Contract Franchise Fees

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice Regarding Franchise Fee Determination

SUMMARY: On February 6, 1998, the National Park Service (NPS) published in the **Federal Register** a notice regarding the continuation of guidelines for determining franchise fees for NPS concession contracts. On November 13, 1998, Title IV of Public Law 105–391 amended NPS statutory authorities regarding concession contracts, including provisions concerning franchise fees. This notice provides the public with information as to NPS concession contract franchise fee determinations under the terms of Title IV of Public Law 105–391.

EFFECTIVE DATE: On or before August 2, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cindy Orlando, Concession Program Manager, National Park Service, 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: the February 6, 1998, **Federal Register** notice concerning NPS franchise fee determinations re-adopted those portions of the NPS concession contracting guidelines (NPS–48) that concern determinations of concession contract franchise fees, including determinations of franchise fees for new (or reviewed) concession contracts and possible adjustments to the franchise fees of existing concession contracts during their term. On April 17, 2000, NPS published in the **Federal Register** final new regulations for the NPS concession contracting program (36 CFR Part 51).

Title IV of Public Law 105–391 repealed the statutory authorities under which the franchise fee guidelines were developed. In addition, Section 407 of Public Law 105–391 established new statutory authorities and policies regarding NPS concession contract franchise fees. Title IV of Public Law 105–391 also included other provisions that have implications for concession contract franchise fees, including, without limitation, the establishment of leasehold surrender interest in certain capital improvements constructed pursuant to a concession contract.

Section 407(a) of Public Law 105–391 reads as follows:

> SEC. 407(a). A concession contract shall provide for payment to the government of a franchise fee or such other monetary consideration as determined by the Secretary, upon consideration of the probable value to the concessioner of the privileges granted by the particular contract involved. Such probable value shall be based upon a reasonable opportunity for net profit in relation to capital invested and the obligations of the contract. Consideration of revenue to the United States shall be subordinate to the objectives of protecting and preserving park areas and of providing necessary and appropriate services for visitors at reasonable rates.

In light of the enactment of Title IV of Public Law 105–391, NPS hereby withdraws Chapter 24, Section D (''Franchise Fee'') of NPS–48 as outdated. The terms and conditions of current concession contracts and permits remain in effect except as may otherwise be provided by Section 415(a) of Public Law 105–391.

Until such time as NPS may adopt more specific new franchise fee determination guidelines reflecting the terms and conditions of Title IV of Public Law 105–391, NPS will establish minimum franchise fees for new (or renewed) concession contracts on a case by case basis in accordance with the terms of Section 407(a) of Public Law 105–391 and will include the proposed minimum franchise fee in concession contract prospectuses issued pursuant to 36 CFR part 51. The establishment of minimum franchise fees will consider the probable value to the concessioner of the privileges to be granted by the new contract. This probable value will be based upon a reasonable opportunity for net profit in relation to capital invested and the obligations of the contract. Consideration of revenue to the United states shall be subordinate to the objectives of protecting and preserving park areas and of providing necessary and appropriate services for visitors at reasonable rates.

Dated: June 27, 2000.

Maureen Finnerty,

Associate Director, Park Operations and Education.

[FR Doc. 00–16783 Filed 6–30–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Comprehensive Management Plan; Merced Wild and Scenic River; Yosemite National Park; Madera and Mariposa Counties, California; Notice of Availability

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91–190, as amended), and the Council of Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500), the National Park Service, Department of the Interior has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement identifying and evaluating five alternatives for a Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan (Merced River Plan) for segments of the river within lands managed by the National Park Service at Yosemite National Park, California. Potential impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures, are assessed for each alternative. Responses to public comment are provided in the document.

When approved, the plan will guide management actions during the next 15–20 years which are necessary to protect and enhance the ''Outstandingly Remarkable Values'' (ORVs) for which the river was designated, pursuant to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1271).

Proposal: The proposed Merced River Plan (Alternative 2—Preferred) would provide management direction for the Merced Wild and Scenic River by establishing seven management elements: ORVs, boundaries, classifications, Section 7 determination, River Protection Overlay (RPO), management zoning, and research and monitoring. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires the first four elements; the final three elements were developed in the Merced River Plan to respond to the Act's requirement to protect and enhance ORVs. This plan modifies the ORVs, boundaries and classifications from the present situation to respond to public comment, to more accurately respond to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and to reflect updated information. The proposed alternative presents the management elements to guide future decision-making and management actions with the intent that natural processes will prevail.

Alternatives: In addition to the proposal, four other alternatives are identified and analyzed. Alternative 1 (''no action'') is a continuation of the existing situation, based on the ORVs, boundaries, and classifications as published in the 1996 Draft Yosemite Valley Housing Plan/Supplemental EIS. If approved, Alternative 1 will not implement the three management elements—establishment of a RPO, management zoning, and a research and monitoring program—that are not required by the Act. Nor would it present the specific Section 7 determination process outlined in the proposed action.

Alternative 3 differs from the proposed alternative (Alternative 2) with regard to the boundaries, classifications, and management zones. The effect of the differences would promote more resource protection, using a narrower corridor in east Yosemite Valley and in Wawona, within the river corridor than under Alternative 2.

Alternative 4 varies from Alternatives 2 and 3 by presenting yet another combination of boundaries, classifications and management zoning. Of the alternatives presented, Alternative 4 would present the most resource protection within the developed areas along the Merced River.

Alternative 5 presents the same boundaries and classifications as Alternative 4, but with zoning that would allow for more use and facilities in developed areas than that presented under any of the other action alternatives. In addition, there would be no river protection overlay under Alternative 5, reducing the ability to protect the areas immediately adjacent to the Merced.

Planning Background: The draft and final Merced River Plan/EIS were prepared pursuant to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and National Environmental Policy Act. A Scoping Notice was published in the **Federal Register** on June 11, 1999; and the Notice of Intent was published on August 23, 1999. An intensive scoping phase was undertaken during June and July 1999, which included a series of six public meetings. The invitation letter requesting input into the development of the draft Merced River Plan/EIS was sent to the park's general mailing list. In addition, the scoping effort was publicized via regional and local media and on the park's Webpage. As a result of this outreach, over 330 responses were received and used in the development of issues upon which preparation of the draft Merced River Plan/EIS was based. A summary of the scoping process is available on the park's Webpage (address noted below). On January 7, 2000, a Notice of Availability for the Draft Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan/EIS appeared in the **Federal Register**. A press briefing was held earlier the same week to raise public awareness of the plan. Over 9000 plans were mailed to each person or organization listed on the park's mailing list. A 70-day public comment period began on January 14, 2000 and ended on March 24, 2000. Fourteen public hearings were held throughout the state of California in January and February. Local press was notified days in advance of each meeting to help raise awareness of the meetings. Yosemite National Park management and planning officials attended all sessions to present the draft Merced River Plan/EIS, to receive oral and written comments, and to answer questions. More than 2300 comments were received by mail, fax, electronic mail, recorded testimony, and other means.

Distribution of MRP/Final EIS: A post-card was mailed to all individuals and organizations on the park's general mailing list to determine whether a printed copy or a CD-ROM version (or both) of the Merced River Plan/FEIS should be mailed to the respective address. Another option presented on the postcard was to receive nothing by mail, considering that the complete final plan will be available on the park's website (http://www.nps.gov/yose/planning). Still another option was to receive a ''user's guide'' after a Record of Decision is signed. In view of these options, the Merced River Plan/FEIS will be mailed, in format requested, until quantities are exhausted. Copies will also be available at park headquarters in Yosemite Valley, the Warehouse Building in El Portal, and at local and regional libraries (*i.e.*, San Francisco and Los Angeles).

Decision Process: Depending upon the response from other agencies, organizations and the general public, at this time it is anticipated that the notice of an approved Record of Decision would be published in the **Federal Register** not sooner than July 31, 2000 (nor would it be signed until at least 30 days have elapsed after publication by the EPA of the filing notice for the Final MRP/EIS). The official responsible for the decision is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region, National Park Service; the official responsible for implementation is the Superintendent, Yosemite National Park.

Dated: June 23, 2000.

Patricia L. Neubacher,

Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 00–16703 Filed 6–30–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before June 24, 2000. Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60 written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded to the National Register, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW, NC400, Washington, DC 20240. Written comments should be submitted by July 18, 2000.

Carol D. Shull,

Keeper of the National Register.

Arizona

Yavapai County
Toltec Lodge,
228 High St.,
Prescott, 00000812

Arkansas

Pulaski County