

determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to a statutory formula based on the average yield of all outstanding marketable Treasury obligations of maturities of 15 or more years.

The Secretary of the Treasury (1) has determined, in accordance with the provisions of section 224, that the statutory maximum interest rate for the period beginning July 1, 2010, is $4\frac{1}{8}$ percent; and (2) has approved the establishment of the debenture interest rate by the Secretary of HUD at $4\frac{1}{8}$ percent for the 6-month period beginning July 1, 2010. This interest rate will be the rate borne by debentures issued with respect to any insured loan or mortgage (except for debentures issued pursuant to section 221(g)(4)) with insurance commitment or endorsement date (as applicable) within the latter 6 months of 2010.

For convenience of reference, HUD is publishing the following chart of debenture interest rates applicable to mortgages committed or endorsed since January 1, 1980:

Effective interest rate	On or after	Prior to
$9\frac{1}{2}$	Jan. 1, 1980	July 1, 1980
$9\frac{7}{8}$	July 1, 1980	Jan. 1, 1981
$11\frac{3}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1981	July 1, 1981
$12\frac{7}{8}$	July 1, 1981	Jan. 1, 1982
$12\frac{3}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1982	Jan. 1, 1983
$10\frac{1}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1983	July 1, 1983
$10\frac{3}{8}$	July 1, 1983	Jan. 1, 1984
$11\frac{1}{2}$	Jan. 1, 1984	July 1, 1984
$13\frac{3}{8}$	July 1, 1984	Jan. 1, 1985
$11\frac{5}{8}$	Jan. 1, 1985	July 1, 1985
$11\frac{1}{8}$	July 1, 1985	Jan. 1, 1986
$10\frac{1}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1986	July 1, 1986
$8\frac{1}{4}$	July 1, 1986	Jan. 1, 1987
8	Jan. 1, 1987	July 1, 1987
9	July 1, 1987	Jan. 1, 1988
$9\frac{1}{8}$	Jan. 1, 1988	July 1, 1988
$9\frac{3}{8}$	July 1, 1988	Jan. 1, 1989
$9\frac{1}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1989	July 1, 1989
9	July 1, 1989	Jan. 1, 1990
$8\frac{1}{8}$	Jan. 1, 1990	July 1, 1990
9	July 1, 1990	Jan. 1, 1991
$8\frac{3}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1991	July 1, 1991
$8\frac{1}{2}$	July 1, 1991	Jan. 1, 1992
8	Jan. 1, 1992	July 1, 1992
8	July 1, 1992	Jan. 1, 1993
$7\frac{3}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1993	July 1, 1993
7	July 1, 1993	Jan. 1, 1994
$6\frac{5}{8}$	Jan. 1, 1994	July 1, 1994
$7\frac{3}{4}$	July 1, 1994	Jan. 1, 1995
$8\frac{3}{8}$	Jan. 1, 1995	July 1, 1995
$7\frac{1}{4}$	July 1, 1995	Jan. 1, 1996
$6\frac{1}{2}$	Jan. 1, 1996	July 1, 1996
$7\frac{1}{4}$	July 1, 1996	Jan. 1, 1997
$6\frac{3}{4}$	Jan. 1, 1997	July 1, 1997
$7\frac{1}{8}$	July 1, 1997	Jan. 1, 1998
$6\frac{3}{8}$	Jan. 1, 1998	July 1, 1998
$6\frac{1}{8}$	July 1, 1998	Jan. 1, 1999
$5\frac{1}{2}$	Jan. 1, 1999	July 1, 1999
$6\frac{1}{8}$	July 1, 1999	Jan. 1, 2000
$6\frac{1}{2}$	Jan. 1, 2000	July 1, 2000
$6\frac{1}{2}$	July 1, 2000	Jan. 1, 2001

Effective interest rate	On or after	Prior to
6	Jan. 1, 2001	July 1, 2001
$5\frac{7}{8}$	July 1, 2001	Jan. 1, 2002
$5\frac{1}{4}$	Jan. 1, 2002	July 1, 2002
$5\frac{3}{4}$	July 1, 2002	Jan. 1, 2003
5	Jan. 1, 2003	July 1, 2003
$4\frac{1}{2}$	July 1, 2003	Jan. 1, 2004
$5\frac{1}{8}$	Jan. 1, 2004	July 1, 2004
$5\frac{1}{2}$	July 1, 2004	Jan. 1, 2005
$4\frac{7}{8}$	Jan. 1, 2005	July 1, 2005
$4\frac{1}{2}$	July 1, 2005	Jan. 1, 2006
$4\frac{7}{8}$	Jan. 1, 2006	July 1, 2006
$5\frac{3}{8}$	July 1, 2006	Jan. 1, 2007
$4\frac{3}{4}$	Jan. 1, 2007	July 1, 2007
5	July 1, 2007	Jan. 1, 2008
$4\frac{1}{2}$	Jan. 1, 2008	July 1, 2008
$4\frac{5}{8}$	July 1, 2008	Jan. 1, 2009
$4\frac{1}{8}$	Jan. 1, 2009	July 1, 2009
$4\frac{1}{8}$	July 1, 2009	Jan. 1, 2010
$4\frac{1}{8}$	Jan. 1, 2010	July 1, 2010
$4\frac{1}{8}$	July 1, 2010	Jan. 1, 2011

Section 215 of Division G, Title II of Public Law 108–199, enacted January 23, 2004 (HUD's 2004 Appropriations Act) amended section 224 of the Act, to change the debenture interest rate for purposes of calculating certain insurance claim payments made in cash. Therefore, for all claims paid in cash on mortgages insured under section 203 or 234 of the National Housing Act and endorsed for insurance after January 23, 2004, the debenture interest rate will be the monthly average yield, for the month in which the default on the mortgage occurred, on United States Treasury Securities adjusted to a constant maturity of 10 years, as found in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H–15. The Federal Housing Administration has codified this provision in HUD regulations at 24 CFR 203.405(b) and 24 CFR 203.479(b).

Section 221(g)(4) of the Act provides that debentures issued pursuant to that paragraph (with respect to the assignment of an insured mortgage to the Secretary) will bear interest at the “going Federal rate” in effect at the time the debentures are issued. The term “going Federal rate” is defined to mean the interest rate that the Secretary of the Treasury determines, pursuant to a statutory formula based on the average yield on all outstanding marketable Treasury obligations of 8- to 12-year maturities, for the 6-month periods of January through June and July through December of each year. Section 221(g)(4) is implemented in the HUD regulations at 24 CFR 221.255 and 24 CFR 221.790.

The Secretary of the Treasury has determined that the interest rate to be borne by debentures issued pursuant to section 221(g)(4) during the 6-month period beginning July 1, 2010, is $3\frac{3}{8}$ percent.

The subject matter of this notice falls within the categorical exemption from HUD's environmental clearance procedures set forth in 24 CFR 50.19(c)(6). For that reason, no environmental finding has been prepared for this notice.

Authority: Sections 211, 221, 224, National Housing Act, 12 U.S.C. 1715b, 1715l, 1715o; Section 7(d), Department of HUD Act, 42 U.S.C. 3535(d).

Dated: July 13, 2010.

David H. Stevens,

Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 2010–17440 Filed 7–15–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[F–35320–1; LLA965000–L14100000–KC0000–P]

Alaska Native Claims Selection

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of decision approving lands for conveyance.

SUMMARY: As required by 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will issue an appealable decision approving the conveyance of surface and subsurface estates for certain lands to Cook Inlet Region, Inc., pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and the Act of January 2, 1976. The lands are in the vicinity of Healy, Alaska, and are located in:

Fairbanks Meridian, Alaska

T. 10 S., R. 9 W.,
Sec. 5, protracted E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$.

Containing approximately 80 acres.

Notice of the decision will also be published four times in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner.

DATES: Any party claiming a property interest in the lands affected by the decision may appeal the decision within the following time limits:

1. Unknown parties, parties unable to be located after reasonable efforts have been expended to locate, parties who fail or refuse to sign their return receipt, and parties who receive a copy of the decision by regular mail which is not certified, return receipt requested, shall have until August 16, 2010 to file an appeal.

2. Parties receiving service of the decision by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal.

Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4, subpart E, shall be deemed to have waived their rights.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the decision may be obtained from: Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13 Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7504.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: The BLM by phone at 907-271-5960, by e-mail at ak.blm.conveyance@blm.gov, or by telecommunication device (TTD) through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

John Leaf,

Land Law Examiner, Land Transfer Adjudication II Branch.

[FR Doc. 2010-17238 Filed 7-15-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JA-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ General Management Plan; Ross Lake National Recreation Area, Skagit and Whatcom Counties, WA; 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 (40 CFR part 1500-1508), the National Park Service (NPS), Department of the Interior, has prepared a draft environmental impact statement for the proposed General Management Plan (GMP) for Ross Lake National Recreation Area (Ross Lake NRA) in Washington State. Ross Lake NRA is one of three units comprising the North Cascades National Park Service Complex. The draft GMP describes three "action" alternatives that respond to both NPS planning requirements and to the public's concerns and issues, identified during the scoping and public involvement process. Each alternative presents management strategies for resource protection and preservation, education and interpretation, visitor use and facilities, land protection and boundaries, and long-term operations and management of Ross Lake NRA.

The potential environmental consequences of all the alternatives, and mitigation strategies, are identified and analyzed in the DEIS. In addition to the "action" alternatives, a "no action" baseline alternative is considered, and the "environmentally preferred" course of action is identified. This GMP will replace portions of the 1988 North

Cascades NPS Complex GMP that provided early guidance for managing Ross Lake NRA.

Background: A Notice of Intent formally announcing preparation of the GMP and draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) was published in the **Federal Register** on October 30, 2006. The NPS also publicized the public scoping period and invited public comment through newsletters, press releases, correspondence, public workshops, informal meetings, and Web site announcements. Preliminary public outreach began in late September 2006 with release of an initial newsletter announcing onset of the planning process and soliciting feedback on issues to be addressed in the plan; the newsletter was mailed to approximately 350 individuals and entities on the mailing list.

An extensive public outreach effort was undertaken to elicit early public comment regarding issues and concerns, the nature and extent of potential environmental impacts, and possible alternatives that should be addressed in drafting the GMP. Agencies, organizations, governmental representatives, and tribal governments were sent letters of invitation to attend the public workshops or individual meetings. Press releases were distributed to local and regional news media. In addition, the conservation planning effort was launched on the <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/rola> and the <http://www.nps.gov/rola> Web sites to provide ready access to information about Ross Lake NRA and the GMP process. News articles featuring the public workshops were published in the local *Courier Times* and *East Skagit Community News* and announced on private and public radio stations. The public was invited to submit comments by regular mail, e-mail, fax, online, and at public workshops and individual meetings.

Seven public workshops were hosted in western Washington and southern British Columbia during October 2006; meetings began with a presentation of Ross Lake NRA and the GMP planning process, then transitioned into a facilitated group discussion format. Meetings were held in Washington State in Concrete, Marblemount, Sedro-Woolley, Seattle and Bellingham, and in Surrey and Chilliwack, British Columbia. A total of 63 people attended the meetings overall.

During the initial scoping period, correspondence was received from over 80 individuals and organizations that yielded over 750 specific comments. All comments received were carefully reviewed by the NPS interdisciplinary

planning team in preparing the DEIS/ GMP, and are preserved in the project administrative record.

The NPS conducted an additional round of public involvement at the draft alternatives phase to ensure full public awareness of the proposed range of alternatives. The primary purpose of this planning step was to understand the public's concerns and preferences with regard to the range of draft alternatives and to assist the planning team in refining the draft alternatives and selecting a preferred alternative. This effort was initiated in February 2008 when the NPS produced and mailed the Draft Alternatives Newsletter to approximately 450 contacts on Ross Lake NRA's mailing list (it was also announced on the project Web sites). The Newsletter fully outlined concepts and actions in the draft alternatives and proposed management zones, and contained a business reply questionnaire providing an option for the public to comment on the four draft alternatives. Press releases were prepared and mailed to local media in advance of the public meetings. A total of 32 written responses concerning the draft alternatives were received in the form of letters, e-mails, newsletter questionnaires, and internet comments. The NPS also hosted four public workshops in Concrete, Sedro-Woolley, Bellingham, and Seattle in February and March 2008. Seventy people participated in the public workshops and provided oral comments. In total 539 individual comments were received on the draft alternatives and covered a broad range of topics, issues, and recommendations for Ross Lake NRA.

Proposed Plan and Alternatives: *Alternative A* is the "no action" alternative and assumes that existing programming, facilities, staffing, and funding would generally continue at their current levels. This alternative serves as a baseline for comparison in evaluating the changes and impacts of the three "action" alternatives. This alternative emphasizes continued protection of the values of Ross Lake NRA without substantially increasing staff, programs, funding support, or facilities. Resource preservation and protection would continue to be high priority, and park staff would continue to work with neighboring agencies for collaborative ecosystem management. Management of visitor use and facilities would generally continue through existing levels and types of service and regulation. Additional visitor facilities, such as new buildings, structures, roads, parking areas, camping areas, and trails, would not be constructed. The park would react to catastrophic events and