

comments, of the following collection of information on September 7, 2017, 82 FR 42356.

Comments Invited

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The ICR documentation will be available at <http://www.reginfo.gov> upon its submission to OMB. Therefore, in preparation for OMB review and approval of the following information collection, TSA is soliciting comments to—

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed information requirement is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including using appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Consistent with the requirements of Executive Order (E.O.) 13771, Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs, and E.O. 13777, Enforcing the Regulatory Reform Agenda, TSA is also requesting comments on the extent to which this request for information could be modified to reduce the burden on respondents.

Information Collection Requirement

Title: Airport Security Part 1542.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

OMB Control Number: 1652-0002.

Forms(s): NA.

Affected Public: Airport operators.

Abstract: The information collection is used to determine compliance with 49 CFR part 1542 and to ensure passenger safety and security by monitoring airport operator security procedures. The following information collections and other recordkeeping requirements with which respondent covered airport operators must comply fall under this OMB control number: (1) Development of an Airport Security Program (ASP) and submission to TSA; (2) as applicable, development of airport operator requested or TSA-required ASP amendments, submission to TSA, and implementation; (3) collection of data necessary to complete a criminal history

records check (CHRC) for those individuals with unescorted access authority to a Security Identification Display Area (SIDA); (4) submission to TSA of identifying information about individuals to whom the airport operator has issued identification media, such as name, address, and country of birth, in order for TSA to conduct a Security Threat Assessment (STA); (5) information collection and recordkeeping requirements associated with airport operator compliance with Security Directives (SDs) issued pursuant to the regulation; and (6) watch list matching of individuals subject to TSA's regulatory requirements against government watch lists.

TSA is revising this information collection by modifying the type of information collected. TSA previously collected information relating to a since-discontinued requirement that airport operators verify the employment histories of certain applicants, TSA has relieved the airport operators of this burden.

Number of Respondents: 438.

Estimated Annual Burden Hours: An estimated 1,786,924 hours annually.¹

Dated: May 1, 2018.

Christina A. Walsh,

TSA Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Office of Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 2018-09626 Filed 5-4-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9110-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R3-ES-2018-N011;
FVHC98210305860-XXX-FF03E14000]

Draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Cardinal Valley Natural Habitat Restoration Project, Oronogo-Duenweg Mining Belt Superfund Site, Missouri

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, the natural resource Trustees for the Tri-State Mining District (TSMD) site announce the availability for public comment of a Draft Restoration Plan and

Environmental Assessment (Draft RP/EA) for TSMD natural resource damage restoration. The Draft RP/EA presents a restoration project the Trustees are proposing to implement to restore natural resources and services injured by hazardous substances released in and around the TSMD site.

DATES: Written comments must be received by June 6, 2018.

ADDRESSES: *Submitting Comments:* Send written comments to one of the following addresses:

- *U.S. mail:* Scott Hamilton; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Missouri Ecological Services Field Office, 101 Park DeVille Dr., Suite A, Columbia, MO 65203; or

- *Email:* scott_hamilton@fws.gov; put "TSMD RP/EA" in the email subject line.

Obtaining the Draft Restoration Plan/Environmental Assessment: The Draft RP/EA is available for download from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Midwest Region Natural Resource Damage Assessment website, at: <https://www.fws.gov/midwest/es/ec/nrda/motristate/index.html>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Hamilton, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, at 573-234-2132, extension 122 (phone) or scott_hamilton@fws.gov (email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

The U.S. Department of the Interior (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) and the State of Missouri (Missouri Department of Natural Resources) are natural resource trustees (Trustees) for natural resources and services injured by hazardous substances at the Tri-State Mining District (TSMD) site, located in southwest Missouri. The Trustees have prepared a Draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (Draft RP/EA) to restore injured natural resources and services at the TSMD site pursuant to both the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act natural resource damages assessment and restoration (NRDAR) regulations at 43 CFR part 11 and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and its implementing regulations at 40 CFR parts 1500-1508. NEPA requires Federal agencies to conduct environmental reviews of proposed actions to consider the potential impacts on the environment.

Draft Restoration Plan Alternatives

Consistent with the U.S. Department of the Interior NRDAR regulations and

¹ Since the publication of the 60-day notice, the estimate has been updated from 1,618,268 to 1,786,924 annual burden hours

NEPA, the Trustees evaluated a suite of five alternatives for conducting the type and scale of restoration sufficient to compensate the public for natural resource injuries and service losses. Based on selection factors, including location, technical feasibility, cost effectiveness, provision of natural resource services similar to those lost due to contamination, and net environmental consequences, the Trustees have identified a preferred alternative. Under this preferred alternative, the Trustees would use a combination of biosolids, manure, and woody material to return soil fertility to areas where remedial work removed mine waste and contaminated soil, leaving behind degraded soils and residual metals. Following application of soil amendments, native seed would be applied to the landscape in an attempt to restore prairie habitat and associated natural resource services. Prescribed fire, mowing, and other weed management techniques would be used to maintain desirable habitat conditions. Conservation easements would be placed on restoration parcels, and areas would be managed for wildlife habitat and limited recreation.

Public Comments

Comments are specifically requested regarding the alternatives, proposed restoration techniques and projects, scope of analysis, and assessment of impacts. Please see the **ADDRESSES** section for how to submit information.

Before including your address, phone number, email 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.

Authority

The authority of this action is the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the implementing NRDAR regulations found at 43 CFR part 11.

Dated: February 16, 2018.

Charles Wooley,

*Acting Regional Director, Midwest Region,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

[FR Doc. 2018-09599 Filed 5-4-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R1-ES-2018-N031; FXES111301
00000C4-189-FF01E00000]

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Initiation of 5-Year Status Reviews for 156 Species in Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, Palau, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of reviews; request for information.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), are initiating 5-year status reviews for 156 species in Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, Palau, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). A 5-year review is based on the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of the review; therefore, we are requesting submission of any new information on these species that has become available since the last review.

DATES: To ensure consideration in our reviews, we are requesting submission of new information no later than July 6, 2018. However, we will continue to accept new information about any species at any time.

ADDRESSES: Submit information on the Hutton tui chub and Nelson's checker-mallow (of Oregon and Washington) via U.S. mail to Field Supervisor, Attention: 5-Year Review, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office, 2600 SE 98th Ave., Suite 100, Portland, OR 97266.

Submit information on any of the 154 species in Hawaii, Palau, Guam, or the Northern Mariana Islands via U.S. mail to Field Supervisor, Attention: 5-Year Review; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, 300 Ala Moana Blvd., Room 3-122 Honolulu, HI 96850; or by email to pifwo_admin@fws.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For Hutton tui chub and Nelson's checker-mallow (of Oregon and Washington), contact Michele Zwartjes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office, at 503-231-6179.

For the 154 species in Hawaii, Palau, Guam, or the Northern Mariana Islands, contact Gregory Koob, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Islands Fish and Wildlife Office, at 808-792-9400.

Individuals who are hearing impaired or speech impaired may call the Federal Relay Service at 800-877-8339 for TTY assistance.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Why do we conduct 5-year reviews?

Under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), we maintain lists of endangered and threatened wildlife and plant species (referred to as the List) in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 50 CFR 17.11 (for wildlife) and 17.12 (for plants). Section 4(c)(2) of the Act requires us to review each listed species' status at least once every 5 years. For additional information about 5-year reviews, refer to our factsheet at <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/recovery-overview.html>.

What information do we consider in our review?

A 5-year review considers all new information available at the time of the review. In conducting these reviews, we consider the best scientific and commercial data that have become available since the listing determination or most recent status review, such as:

(A) Species biology, including but not limited to population trends, distribution, abundance, demographics, and genetics;

(B) Habitat conditions, including but not limited to amount, distribution, and suitability;

(C) Conservation measures that have been implemented that benefit the species;

(D) Threat status and trends in relation to the five listing factors (as defined in section 4(a)(1) of the Act); and

(E) Other new information, data, or corrections, including but not limited to taxonomic or nomenclatural changes, identification of erroneous information contained in the List, and improved analytical methods.

Any new information will be considered during the 5-year review and will also be useful in evaluating the ongoing recovery programs for these species.

Which species are under review?

This notice announces our active review of the 156 species listed in the table below.