DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Office of the Secretary
Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Commission Meeting

AGENCY: Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces an upcoming meeting of the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Commission. Notice of this meeting is required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463).

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Thursday, November 9, 2006—1:30 p.m. to 4 p.m.

ADDRESSES: Emrick Technology Center, 2750 Hugh Moore Park Road, Easton, PA 18042.

The agenda for the meeting will focus on implementation of the Management Action Plan for the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor and State Heritage Park. The Commission was established to assist the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its political subdivisions in planning and implementing an integrated strategy for protecting and promoting cultural, historic and natural resources. The Commission reports to the Secretary of the Interior and to Congress.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Commission was established by Public Law 100–602, November 18, 1988 and extended through Public Law 105–355, November 13, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: C. Allen Sachse, Executive Director, Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Commission, 2750 Hugh Moore Park Road, Easton PA 18042, (610) 923–3548.
Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended. It documents the decision of the Service, based on the information contained in the San Diego Bay NWR Final CCP/EIS and the entire Administrative Record. The Service adopted and plans to implement Alternative C (Implement Habitat Enhancement and Restoration and Improve Existing Public Uses) for the Sweetwater Marsh Unit and Alternative D (Expand Habitat Management, Enhance Nesting Opportunities, Maximize Habitat Restoration, and Provide Additional Public Use Opportunities) for the South San Diego Bay Unit. These alternatives have been identified by the Service as the alternatives that would best achieve refuge purposes and contribute toward the mission of the NWRS, consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife science, conservation, legal mandates, and Service policies.

The selected alternatives recognize the need to provide high quality habitat for the Refuge’s federally listed species, while also maintaining, and in some cases enhancing, the habitats needed to support the overall biological diversity of the Refuge. The selected alternatives also include expanded opportunities for compatible public use including wildlife observation, environmental education, and interpretation; provisions to protect cultural resources; recommendations for addressing existing contaminant issues; and proposals for establishing partnerships to address issues such as water quality, the accumulation of discarded fishing line around the bay, and stewardship of Refuge resources.

Alternative C for the Sweetwater Marsh Unit would improve habitat quality and restore intertidal and upland habitats to support six federally listed species, along with the Refuge’s other plant and animal resources. The existing trail system on Gunpowder Point would be redesigned and new interpretive elements would be provided to better complement the existing environmental education programs supported by the Refuge.

Alternative D for the South San Diego Bay Unit would enhance nesting opportunities in and around the salt ponds for the California least tern, western snowy plover, and various other colonial seabirds; restore to native coastal habitats the former agricultural lands in the Otay River floodplain; restore 650 acres of commercial solar salt ponds to tidal influence to support intertidal mudflat and coastal salt marsh habitats; and manage the water and salinity levels in an additional 275 acres of salt ponds. Opportunities for wildlife observation, photography, and environmental interpretation would be expanded; a pedestrian pathway would be constructed along the southern end of the Refuge to improve wildlife observation opportunities for Refuge visitors; and the other public uses (i.e., fishing, environmental education, and boating) currently provided on the Refuge would be maintained.

The Service considered the environmental and relevant concerns presented by agencies, organizations, and individuals and believes that implementing Alternative C for the Sweetwater Marsh Unit and Alternative D for the South San Diego Bay Unit is the best way to achieve the vision and goals for the Refuge. The selected alternatives are also the most consistent with the purposes of the Refuge, the mission of the NWRS, the recovery actions proposed for those federally listed species that are supported by the Refuge, and the bird conservation recommendations relevant to this part of the Pacific Flyway. These alternatives recognize the need to restore habitat essential to the recovery of listed species, while also protecting those habitats and conditions that currently support a diverse and abundant array of migratory birds. The selected alternatives also balance the need to protect habitat with the need to provide the public with the opportunity to experience and enjoy the resources being protected.

Dated: October 18, 2006.

Steve Thompson,
Manager, California/Nevada Operations,
Sacramento, California.

[FR Doc. E6–18373 Filed 11–1–06; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Fish and Wildlife Service

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of record of decision.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce our decision and the availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act requirements (NEPA).

ADDRESSES: The ROD and Final EIS/CCP may be viewed at Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge Headquarters or at Refuge District Offices in Winona, Minnesota; La Crosse, Wisconsin; McGregor, Iowa; and Savanna, Illinois. You may obtain a copy of the ROD on the planning Web site at http://www.fws.gov/midwest/planning/uppermiss or by writing to: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Conservation Planning, Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Don Hultman, (507) 452–4232.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce our decision and the availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge in accordance with NEPA requirements (40 CFR 1506.6(b)). We completed a thorough analysis of the environmental, social, and economic considerations, which we included in the Final EIS/CCP. We released the Final EIS/CCP to the public and published a notice of availability in the Federal Register (71 FR 39125, July 11, 2006). The ROD documents the selection of Alternative E, the Preferred Alternative in the Final EIS/CCP, with one modification. The ROD was signed by the Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Midwest Region, on August 24, 2006.

The CCP for the Upper Mississippi River National Wildlife and Fish Refuge (Refuge) will guide the management and administration of the Refuge for the next 15 years. Alternative E, as described in the Final EIS, is the foundation for the CCP, with one modification. The modification designates 215 acres west of the Rieck’s Lake area of Pool 4, in the area between Highway 35 and the railroad tracks, as a No Hunting Zone to avoid impacts to persons using the Buffalo River Access, access to the main river, and anglers desiring to fish in the area.

Four alternatives and their consequences were developed for the Draft EIS and CCP. A fifth alternative, Alternative E, was developed based on extensive public input and comment, and was released as a Supplement to the Draft EIS (71 FR 2561, January 17, 2006).

Alternative A—No Action or Current Direction. Continue current level of