

TABLE C—INFLATION RATES (CURRENT AND LOCKED-IN)  
[Derived from BEA data]

| Calendar year | Implicit price deflator<br>for GDP<br>(base = 1996) | Implicit price deflator<br>for GDP<br>(base = 2000) | Current annual<br>inflation rate | Locked-in<br>annual<br>inflation rate |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1994 .....    | 96.01                                               | .....                                               | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 1995 .....    | 98.10                                               | .....                                               | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 1996 .....    | 100.00                                              | .....                                               | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 1997 .....    | 101.95                                              | .....                                               | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 1998 .....    | 103.20                                              | .....                                               | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 1999 .....    | 104.65                                              | .....                                               | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 2000 .....    | 107.04                                              | 100.00                                              | .....                            | .....                                 |
| 2001 .....    | .....                                               | 102.40                                              | 2.4                              | 2.2                                   |
| 2002 .....    | .....                                               | 104.19                                              | 1.7                              | 1.1                                   |
| 2003 .....    | .....                                               | 106.40                                              | 2.1                              | 1.7                                   |
| 2004 .....    | .....                                               | 109.46                                              | 2.9                              | 2.1                                   |
| 2005 .....    | .....                                               | 113.03                                              | 3.3                              | 2.8                                   |
| 2006 .....    | .....                                               | 116.68                                              | 3.2                              | 2.9                                   |
| 2007 .....    | .....                                               | 119.82                                              | 2.7                              | 2.7                                   |
| 2008 .....    | .....                                               | 122.42                                              | 2.2                              | 2.2                                   |

4. Because price thresholds are fixed for previous years, the current inflation rate displayed on the BEA Web site (see Table C above) may not correspond precisely to the rate MMS employed to calculate previous price thresholds. For example, the GDP deflator posted on the BEA Web site in March 2008 shows an inflation rate for 2004 of 2.9 percent. However, back in March 2005, when the 2004 price threshold was locked in, the BEA Web site showed an inflation rate of 2.1 percent, which MMS used in a change for the deepwater oil price threshold for most leases, as shown in the first column of the Deepwater Table on the Web site, from \$32.81/bbl in 2003 to \$33.50/bbl in 2004. The figures that were shown on the BEA Web site in March of each year were used to make the adjustments in the price thresholds from year to year. Rounding explains any remaining small differences between calculated locked-in inflation rates and those rates depicted on the MMS Web site. Therefore, to replicate the calculation for previous price thresholds, use the locked-in inflation rate. To replicate the calculation for the estimated price threshold, prior to March of the subsequent year, use the current inflation rate.

Dated: April 20, 2009.

**Chris C. Oynes,**

*Associate Director for Offshore Energy and Minerals Management.*

[FR Doc. E9-13094 Filed 6-3-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R4-ES-2009-N0089; 41910-1112-0000-F2]

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Permit(s); Road Construction and Associated Storm Water Retention Pond in Lake County, FL

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of receipt of application for an incidental take permit (ITP); availability of proposed low-effect habitat conservation plans (HCP); request for comment/information.

**SUMMARY:** We, the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of an incidental take permit (ITP) application and habitat conservation plan (HCP). Lake County Public Works (applicant) requests a 5-year ITP under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). The applicant anticipates taking approximately 0.19 acres (ac) of sand skink (*Neoseps reynoldsi*)—occupied habitat incidental to realignment of a county road (CR) and construction of a storm water retention pond in Lake County, Florida (project). The applicant's HCP describes the mitigation and minimization measures the applicant proposes to address the effects of the project to the sand skink.

**DATES:** We must receive any written comments on the ITP application and HCP on or before July 6, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** If you wish to review the application and HCP, you may write the Field Supervisor at our Jacksonville Field Office, 7915 Baymeadows Way,

Suite 200, Jacksonville, FL 32256, or make an appointment to visit during normal business hours. If you wish to comment, you may mail or hand deliver comments to the Jacksonville Field Office, or you may e-mail comments to [paula\\_sisson@fws.gov](mailto:paula_sisson@fws.gov). For more information on reviewing documents and public comments and submitting comments, see **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Paula Sisson, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Jacksonville Field Office (see **ADDRESSES**); telephone: 904-731-3134.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Public Availability of Comments**

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Please reference permit number TE211384-0 for Lake County Public Works in all requests or comments. If you do not receive a confirmation from us that we have received your e-mail message, contact us directly at the telephone number listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

##### **Background**

Due to the reduction in quality and acreage of xeric (bare, scrub-like areas with sandy soils, open canopies) upland communities, and the rapid development occurring in these areas, the sand skink is reportedly declining

throughout most of its range. By some estimates, as much as 90 percent of the scrub ecosystem has already been lost to residential development and conversion to agriculture, including citrus groves.

#### Applicant's Proposal

The applicant is requesting take of approximately 0.19 ac of occupied sand skink habitat incidental to the project. The 1.06-ac project is located east of State Road 455 within Section 17, Township 21 South, Range 26 East, Lake County, Florida. The proposed project currently includes realignment of a portion of CR 455 that does not meet government safety standards and will include construction of a stormwater retention pond to address runoff associated with the realigned roadway. The applicant proposes to mitigate for the take of the sand skink at a ratio of 2:1 based on Service Mitigation Guidelines. The applicant proposes to mitigate for 0.19 ac of impacts by purchasing 0.40 ac of occupied sand skink habitat in Polk County, Florida, within the boundaries of the Lake Wales Ridge.

We have determined that the applicant's proposal, including the proposed mitigation and minimization measures, would have minor or negligible effects on the species covered in the HCP. Therefore, we are making a preliminary determination that the ITP is a "low-effect" project and qualifies for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as provided by the Department of the Interior Manual (516 DM 2 Appendix 1 and 516 DM 6 Appendix 1). We may revise this preliminary determination based on our review of public comments we receive in response to this notice. A low-effect HCP is one involving: (1) Minor or negligible effects on federally listed or candidate species and their habitats, and (2) minor or negligible effects on other environmental values or resources.

We will evaluate the HCP and comments we receive to determine whether the ITP application meets the requirements of section 10(a) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). If we determine that the application meets those requirements, we will issue the ITP for incidental take of the sand skink. We will also evaluate whether issuance of the section 10(a)(1)(B) ITP complies with section 7 of the Act by conducting an intra-Service section 7 consultation. We will use the results of this consultation, in combination with the above findings, in our final analysis to determine whether or not to issue the ITP.

#### Authority

We provide this notice under Section 10 of the Act and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: May 28, 2009.

David L. Hankla,

Field Supervisor, Jacksonville Field Office.

[FR Doc. E9-13033 Filed 6-3-09; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

##### Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R4-R-2009-N0061; 40136-1265-0000-S3]

##### Banks Lake National Wildlife Refuge, Lanier County, GA

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability: draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment (Draft CCP/EA) for Banks Lake National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) for public review and comment. In this Draft CCP/EA, we describe the alternative we propose to use to manage this refuge for the 15 years following approval of the final CCP.

**DATES:** To ensure consideration, we must receive your written comments by July 6, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments, questions, and requests for information to: Ms. Laura Housh, Refuge Planner, Okefenokee NWR, Route 2, Box 3330, Folkston, GA 31537. The Draft CCP/EA is available on compact disk or in hard copy. The Draft CCP/EA may also be accessed and downloaded from the Service's Internet Site: <http://southeast.fws.gov/planning>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Laura Housh; telephone: 912/496-7366, ext. 244; fax: 912/496-3322; e-mail: [laura\\_housh@fws.gov](mailto:laura_housh@fws.gov).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Introduction

With this notice, we continue the CCP process for Banks Lake NWR. We started this process through a notice in the **Federal Register** on December 6, 2007 (72 FR 68892).

##### Background

The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C.

668dd-668ee) (Improvement Act), which amended the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, requires us to develop a CCP for each national wildlife refuge. The purpose for developing a CCP is to provide refuge managers with a 15-year strategy for achieving refuge purposes and contributing toward the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System, consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management, conservation, legal mandates, and our policies. In addition to outlining broad management direction on conserving wildlife and their habitats, CCPs identify wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public, including opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, wildlife photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years in accordance with the Improvement Act.

Banks Lake NWR is managed by staff of the Okefenokee NWR. The refuge, which is part of a larger blackwater system, was established in 1985 for the protection and conservation of this unique environment, as well as for migratory and resident wildlife. It totals approximately 3,559 acres.

Development of the CCP began in October 2007, with preplanning activities such as gathering data and information, meeting with Okefenokee NWR staff, and preparing for the public scoping phase of the planning process. A public scoping meeting was held on January 24, 2008, in Lakeland, Georgia. The following issues were identified by the public, intergovernmental partners, and the Service: (1) Threats to biodiversity, listed species, and migratory birds; (2) need for data and comprehensive habitat management; (3) impacts to water quantity and quality; (4) need for an updated acquisition boundary; (5) future land acquisition needs; (6) drainage easement protection; (7) lack of information on refuge cultural resources; (8) need for increased law enforcement; (9) need for increased public use opportunities; and (10) need for adequate resources.

##### CCP Alternatives, Including Our Proposed Alternative

We developed three alternatives for managing the refuge and chose Alternative B as the proposed alternative. A full description is in the Draft CCP/EA. We summarize each alternative below.

##### Alternative A—No Action Alternative

Federal- and State-listed species, incidental sightings of wood storks, and