

Rehabilitation projects, other than single room occupancy projects (SROs) under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 *et seq.*), that are eligible for renewal under section 524(b)(3) of MAHRA, the renewal rents are required to be set at the lesser of: (1) The existing rents under the expiring contract, as adjusted by the OCAF; (2) fair market rents (less any amounts allowed for tenant-purchased utilities); or (3) comparable market rents for the market area.

LIHPRHA (see, in particular, section 222(a)(2)(G)(i), 12 U.S.C. 4112(a)(2)(G) and the regulations at 24 CFR 248.145(a)(9)) requires that future rent adjustments for LIHPRHA projects be made by applying an annual factor to be determined by HUD to the portion of project rent attributable to operating expenses for the project and, where the owner is a priority purchaser, to the portion of project rent attributable to project oversight costs.

III. Findings and Certifications

Environmental Impact

This issuance sets forth rate determinations and related external administrative requirements and procedures that do not constitute a development decision affecting the physical condition of specific project areas or building sites. Accordingly, under 24 CFR 50.19(c)(6), this notice is categorically excluded from environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321).

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number for this program is 14.187.

Dated: October 28, 2008.

Brian D. Montgomery,

Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.

Appendix

Operating Cost Adjustment Factors for 2009

U.S. Average	4.3%
Alabama	3.0%
Alaska	12.4
Arizona	5.0
Arkansas	3.7
California	4.7
Colorado	3.7
Connecticut	5.7
Delaware	2.0
District of Columbia	5.7
Florida	4.9
Georgia	5.5
Hawaii	7.9%

U.S. Average	4.3%
Idaho	4.7%
Illinois	3.9
Indiana	6.1
Iowa	3.5
Kansas	6.1
Kentucky	4.9
Louisiana	5.7
Maine	5.0
Maryland	4.5
Massachusetts	3.7
Michigan	3.3
Minnesota	5.5
Mississippi	8.0
Missouri	3.7
Montana	4.3
Nebraska	4.4
Nevada	2.4
New Hampshire	3.3
New Jersey	2.7
New Mexico	6.1
New York	3.9
North Carolina	2.8
North Dakota	2.4
Ohio	3.8
Oklahoma	4.0
Oregon	7.9
Pacific Islands	7.9
Pennsylvania	5.2
Puerto Rico	2.9
Rhode Island	5.0
South Carolina	5.4
South Dakota	5.2
Tennessee	4.8
Texas	3.4
Utah	4.0
Vermont	2.8
Virgin Islands	0.0
Virginia	3.4
Washington	2.3
West Virginia	2.6
Wisconsin	3.9
Wyoming	3.5

[FR Doc. E8-26655 Filed 11-7-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-67-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Abbreviated Final Environmental Impact Statement/Comprehensive Management Plan; Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail, Hawaii County, HI; Notice of Availability

Summary: Pursuant to § 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ) (40 CFR Part 1500-1508), the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, has prepared an abbreviated final environmental impact statement for the proposed Comprehensive Management Plan for the Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail (NHT) located on the island of Hawaii. Three CMP alternatives are identified and analyzed relative both to NPS

planning requirements and to the public's concerns and issues identified during the scoping and public involvement process (in addition to a no-action alternative, an environmentally preferred alternative is also identified). Each alternative presents administrative, management, and partnership strategies for resource protection and preservation, education and interpretation, visitor uses and facilities, and long-term operations and management of the national trail. The potential environmental consequences of all the alternatives, and appropriate mitigation strategies, are identified and analyzed.

Background: On April 4, 2003, the **Federal Register** published the Notice of Intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the comprehensive management plan (CMP) for the Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail. The initial scoping phase was designed to proactively elicit public issues, concerns, and other relevant information deemed necessary to address during the overall planning. A total of 200 people representing the general public, private landowners, trail advocacy groups, Native Hawaiian organizations, and state, county, and federal agencies participated overall. Several public meetings around the island were hosted (about 25 comment forms were returned to the trail office). In addition, the NPS planning team met with numerous individuals, community groups, private landowners, and government agency representatives to understand their concerns and visions for the Ala Kahakai NHT. The scoping phase extended through June 28, 2003.

The NPS encouraged public involvement during two additional phases of the EIS process. In the second phase, the NPS engaged the public in developing preliminary alternatives intended to address the specific issues and concerns that surfaced during the public scoping. Nine public workshops were held around the island of Hawaii.

The third phase of involvement afforded the opportunity for public review of the Draft EIS/CMP, notice of which appeared in the **Federal Register** on October 26, 2007. Government entities and the public were invited to submit comments by regular mail, e-mail, fax, and online. In addition, the NPS held seven public meetings on the island of Hawaii in November 2007 to provide further opportunity to learn about the proposed plan and to offer comments; over 90 people attended these meetings. The formal comment period closed on December 31, 2007, although the NPS received several comments during the next two weeks.

Aside from approximately 83 individual statements recorded on the meeting flip charts and 21 comment sheets completed at the meetings, the NPS received 40 written communications. No comments received from interested individuals and groups, area residents and businesses, and public agencies required the NPS to add other alternatives, significantly alter existing alternatives, or make changes to the impact analysis of the effect of any alternative. Thus, an abbreviated format is used to fully document all responses to comments in the Final CMP/EIS in compliance with the CEQ implementing regulations (40 CFR 1503.4[c]) for the National Environmental Policy Act.

Proposed Plan and Alternatives:

Alternative A, the No Action

Alternative A, assumes that existing programs, facilities, staffing, and funding would generally continue at their current levels. The Ala Kahakai NHT would consist of trail segments within the four national parks through which it passes and only a few other segments (e.g., on state lands). As recommended in the Ala Kahakai National Trail Study and Environmental Impact Statement, January 1998, (Feasibility Study) on which national trail status was based, a continuous trail would be the goal but would not be implemented, even in the long-term. However, an auto tour would be completed that would lead visitors to 18 sites associated with the trail. Recreation along the trail and interpretation of its history would generally be limited to these sites.

Alternative B proposes the completion of a single continuous trail comprised of unaltered or verified ancient and historic portions of the ala loa (coastal trail around the island) linked as needed by later pre-1892 trails, pathways, and modern connector trails. Within the planning period of 15 years, the goal would be to complete the linear trail within the priority zone from Kawaihae through Pu'uuhonua o Honaunau National Park to Ho'okena and to protect other segments outside of that area as feasible. In the long-term, cultural and natural resources along the entire trail tread and agreed upon adjacent areas would be protected and interpreted to the public. The NPS would administer the trail, but management outside of the national parks would remain with the land managing agency or landowner. The NPS would offer technical assistance and limited financial assistance to these management partners. Partnerships with state and county agencies, community organizations, and private individuals would help protect trail resources and

provide appropriate trail user services. An auto tour would be completed as in *Alternative A*.

Alternative C, the NPS proposed action and the "environmentally preferred" alternative, is based on the traditional Hawaiian trail system in which multiple trail alignments within the ahupua'a (mountain to sea land division) are integral to land use and stewardship. The linear trail would be protected as in *Alternative B*, but on publicly-owned lands the Ala Kahakai NHT includes inland portions of ala loa or other historic trails that run lateral to the shoreline and would be connected to ancient or historic mauka-makai (mountain to sea) trails that would have traditionally been part of the ahupua'a system. As with *Alternative B*, during the 15-year planning period, the priority zone from Kawaihae to Pu'uuhonua o Honaunau National Park through Ho'okena would be the focus of administration and management, but sections outside of that zone would be protected as feasible. Through an agreement, the state of Hawaii could convey to the NPS a less-than-fee management interest in trail segments that are state-owned under the Highways Act of 1892 within the Ala Kahakai NHT corridor. The NPS would then be responsible for managing these segments and federal law would fully apply. However, in cooperation with the NPS, local communities of the ahupua'a would be encouraged to take responsibility for trail management using the traditional Hawaiian principles of land management and stewardship. The Ala Kahakai Trail Association would be expected to be robust enough play a major part in trail management, promotion, and funding. An auto tour would be completed similarly as in the other alternatives.

Copies: The abbreviated Final EIS/CMP is now available, and may be obtained by contacting the Superintendent, Ala Kahakai NHT, 73-4786 Kanalani Street, #14, Kailua-Kona, HI 96740 or by telephone at 808-326-6012. Copies of the Draft EIS/CMP are available, if needed. The Final EIS/CMP may also be reviewed electronically via the Web site <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/alka> or at area libraries.

Decision Process: Following the release of the abbreviated Final EIS/CMP, a Record of Decision will be prepared not sooner than 30 days after the EPA has published its notice of filing of the document in the **Federal Register**. Announcement of the approved CMP would be similarly published. As a delegated EIS, the official responsible for the final decision

is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region, National Park Service. Subsequently, the official responsible for implementing the approved CMP would be the Superintendent, Ala Kahakai National Historic Trail.

Dated: June 13, 2008.

Jonathan B. Jarvis,

Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

Editorial Note: This document was received in the Office of the Federal Register on November 11, 2008.

[FR Doc. E8-26702 Filed 11-7-08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the General Management Plan (GMP) for Fort Donelson National Battlefield, TN

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Director's Order Number 12 (Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decision-Making) the NPS is preparing an EIS for a GMP for Fort Donelson National Battlefield, Tennessee.

The GMP will prescribe the resource conditions and visitor experiences that are to be achieved and maintained in the national battlefield over the next 20 years. The clarification of what must be achieved according to law and policy will be based on review of the battlefield's purpose, significance, special mandates, and the body of laws and policies directing park management. Based on determinations of desired conditions, the GMP will outline the types of resource management activities, visitor activities, and development that would be appropriate in the future. A range of reasonable management alternatives will be developed through this planning process and will include, at a minimum, a no-action alternative and a preferred alternative.

Issues to be addressed will include but are not limited to the following: Management of Fort Henry and Fort Heiman properties and tracts adjacent to the boundary that were recently added to the national battlefield; potential impacts from outside development including the Highway 79 realignment; and the inventory and preservation of cultural and natural resources.

DATES: Comments should be submitted no later than 60 days after publication