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 Bureau of Land Management by phone at 907–271–5960, or by e-mail at ak.blm.conveyance@ak.blm.gov. Persons who use a telecommunication device (TTD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8330, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to contact the Bureau of Land Management.

Hillary Woods,
Land Law Examiner, Land Transfer Adjudication I.

[FR Doc. E9–10130 Filed 5–1–09; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–JA–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Fish and Wildlife Service


Ernest F. Hollings ACE Basin National Wildlife Refuge, Charleston, Beaufort, Colleton, and Hampton Counties, SC

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

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

SUMMARY: We, the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment (Draft CCP/EA) for Ernest F. Hollings ACE Basin National Wildlife Refuge (ACE Basin 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 June 3, 2009.

ADDRESSES: Send comments, questions, and requests for information to: Mr. Van Fischer, Natural Resource Planner, South Carolina Lowcountry Refuge Complex, 5801 Highway 17 North, Awendaw, SC 29429. A copy of the Draft CCP/EA is available on both compact disc and hard copy, and it may be accessed and downloaded from the Service’s Internet site: http://southeast.fws.gov/planning.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Van Fischer, Natural Resource Planner; telephone: 843/928–3264; e-mail: van_fischer@fws.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we continue the CCP process for ACE Basin NWR. We started the process through a notice in the Federal Register on January 3, 2007 (72 FR 141).

Background

The CCP Process

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 plan 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.

ACE Basin NWR was established on September 20, 1990, and was renamed the Ernest F. Hollings ACE Basin National Wildlife Refuge on May 16, 2005. The refuge is a partner in the ACE Basin Task Force, a coalition consisting of the Service, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, Ducks Unlimited, The Nature Conservancy, The Low Country Open Land Trust, Mead Westvaco, and private landowners. The refuge’s two separate units (Edisto Unit and Combahee Unit) are further broken down into sub-units, with the Edisto Unit containing the Barrelville, Grove, and Jehossee sub-units, and the Combahee Unit containing the Bonny Hall, Combahee Fields, and Yemassee sub-units. The refuge is divided into nine management units or compartments, ranging in size from 350 to 3,355 acres. Compartment boundaries are established along geographic features that can be easily identified on the ground (i.e., rivers, roads, and trails).

Serving as a basis for each alternative, goals and sets of objectives were developed to help fulfill the purposes of the refuge and the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System. These alternatives represent different approaches to managing the refuge, while still meeting purposes and goals. Plans will be revised at least every 15 years, or earlier, if monitoring indicates management changes are warranted.

CCP Alternatives, Including Our Proposed Alternative

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

Alternative A: Continuation of Current Refuge Management (No Action)

This alternative represents no change from current management of the refuge and provides a baseline. Management emphasis would continue to focus on maintaining existing managed wetlands for wintering waterfowl, shorebirds, and wading birds. Primary activities include managing wetland impoundments (primarily historically created “rice fields”), managing old farm fields in a grassland/scrub/shrub mosaic for neotropical migratory birds, basic species monitoring, wood duck banding, and managing moist soil for waterfowl. Alternative A represents the anticipated conditions of the refuge for the next 15 years, assuming current funding, staffing, policies, programs, and activities continue. The other two alternatives are compared to this alternative in order to evaluate differences in future conditions compared to baseline management.

This alternative reflects actions that include managing habitat for resident and wintering waterfowl, nesting bald eagles, foraging wood storks, and over-wintering whooping cranes (experimental flock). Further, it reflects actions for maintaining upland and wetland forests; for repairing wetland impoundment control structures (aluminum flash board risers and wooden “rice trunks”), dikes, and internal drainage ditches and canals; for managing habitat for neotropical migratory birds; and for providing wildlife-dependent recreation opportunities. Species monitoring would be limited due to staffing constraints, volunteer assistance, and
limited research interest. Habitat management actions would primarily benefit waterfowl, wading birds, shorebirds, and grassland-associated passerine birds; however, there is limited active management of other species and habitats.

Management coordination would occur between the refuge and the state. Coordination would be limited because of staffing constraints and remain focused on waterfowl management and grassland habitat management, hunting, and fishing. Hunting and fishing would be allowed on the refuge provided that state regulations were followed. Wildlife-dependent uses are allowed on the refuge with all areas open to the public, although some areas are only seasonally open.

The refuge would remain staffed at current levels with periodic interns. Researchers would be accommodated when projects benefit the refuge.

**Alternative B: Protection of Trust Resources and State-Listed Species**

Alternative B places refuge management emphasis on the protection of trust resources (migratory birds and threatened and endangered species), as well as several state-listed species.

This alternative expands on Alternative A, with a greater amount of active habitat management on the refuge. The focus of this alternative is to enhance and expand suitable habitat under species-specific management, targeted to attract greater numbers of wintering waterfowl and breeding areas for resident wood ducks. The acreage of managed wetlands (enhanced moist-soil management practices) and greentree reservoirs would be increased to accommodate larger waterfowl numbers. Some open fields and scrub/shrub areas on the refuge would be more intensively managed to increase populations of neotropical migratory and breeding songbirds to higher levels than under Alternative A, but limited to maintaining existing areas suitable for these migratory species. There would be an increased effort to control invasive exotic plants.

This alternative proposes to increase monitoring efforts to focus primarily on threatened and endangered species (e.g., wood storks), waterfowl, and other migratory birds, with less effort to address other non-migratory resident species. Under Alternative A, monitoring would focus almost entirely on waterfowl, but does include other species as resources permit. This alternative would provide extensive waterfowl and endangered species monitoring with little additional effort for monitoring other species. Monitoring efforts would only occur based on available staffing, additional volunteers, and academic research.

Wildlife-dependent uses of the refuge would continue. Hunting and fishing would continue to be allowed and environmental education and interpretation would be enhanced.

**Alternative C: Wildlife and Habitat Diversity (Proposed Alternative)**

This alternative expands on Alternative A, with a greater amount of effort to manage the refuge to increase overall wildlife and habitat diversity. Although waterfowl, threatened and endangered species, and other migratory birds would remain a focus of management, wetland habitat manipulations would also consider the needs of multiple species, such as marsh and wading birds. Management of upland forests and fields for neotropical migratory birds would be more actively managed than under Alternative B. Landscape level consideration of habitat management would include a diversity of open fields, upland and wetland forests, and additional managed wetlands. Upland loblolly pine plantations (relic industrial forest) would be heavily thinned to encourage multi-strata vegetation composition and hardwood interspersion. More xeric loblolly pine plantations would be converted to longleaf pine savannas and subjected to frequent growing season prescribed fires to favor warm season grasses and forbs, and the potential reintroduction of red cockaded woodpeckers in the ACE Basin Project Area. Multiple species consideration would include species and habitats identified by the South Atlantic Migratory Bird Initiative and the State’s Strategic Conservation Plan.

Greater emphasis would be placed on recruiting and training volunteers to facilitate the accomplishment of maintenance programs and other refuge objectives. Refuge biological programs would actively seek funding and researchers to study primarily management-oriented needs. The staff would place greater emphasis on developing and maintaining active partnerships, including seeking grants to assist the refuge in reaching primary objectives.

**Next Step**

After the comment period ends, we will analyze the comments and address them.

**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.

**Authority:** This notice is published under the authority of the National Wildlife Refuge...
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Cape Cod National Seashore, South Wellfleet, MA; Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission Two Hundredth Sixty-Eighth Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463, 86 Stat. 770, 5 U.S.C. App 1, Section 10), that a meeting of the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission will be held on June 19, 2009.

The Commission was reestablished pursuant to Public Law 87–126 as amended by Public Law 105–57. The purpose of the Commission is to consult with the Secretary of the Interior, or her designee, with respect to matters relating to the development of Cape Cod National Seashore, and with respect to carrying out the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of the Act establishing the Seashore. The Commission members will meet at 1 p.m. in the meeting room at Headquarters, 99 Marconi Station, Wellfleet, Massachusetts for the regular business meeting to discuss the following:

1. Adoption of Agenda.
2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings (September 22, 2008/December 1, 2008).
3. Reports of Officers.
4. Reports of Subcommittees.
6. Old Business.
8. Date and agenda for next meeting.

The meeting is open to the public. It is expected that 15 persons will be able to attend the meeting in addition to Commission members.

Interested persons may make oral/written presentations to the Commission during the business meeting or file written statements. Such requests should be made to the park superintendent prior to the meeting. Further information concerning the meeting may be obtained from the Superintendent, Cape Cod National Seashore, 99 Marconi Site Road, Wellfleet, MA 02667.

Dated: April 8, 2009.

George E. Price, Jr.,
Superintendent.

[citing notice providing a means for public comment]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations and Related Actions

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing or related actions in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before April 18, 2009. Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60 written comments concerning the significance of these properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation may be forwarded by United States Postal Service, to the National Park Service, 1201 Eye St., NW., 2280, Washington, DC 20240; by all other carriers, National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 1201 Eye St., NW., 2280, Washington, DC 20005; or by fax, 202–371–6447. Written or faxed comments should be submitted by May 19, 2009.

J. Paul Loether,
Chief, National Register of Historic Places/National Historic Landmarks Program.

ARKANSAS

Calhoun County
Hampton Cemetery, S. of the jct of US 278 W. and 1st St., Hampton, 09000340

Faulkner County
Oak Grove Cemetery Historic Section, E. Bruce St., approx. .3 mi. E. of the jct of Harkrider St. and Bruce St., Conway, 09000341

CONNECTICUT

Fairfield County
Wall Street Historic District, Roughtly bounded by Commerce, Knight, and Wall Sts., W. and Mott Aves., Norwalk, 09000342

HARTFORD

South Glastonbury Historic District Boundary Increase, 999–1417 and 1032–1420 Main St.; 6,7 Chestnut Hill Rd., Glastonbury, 09000343

FLORIDA

Duval County
Cummer Gardens, 829 Riverside Ave., Jacksonville, 09000345

Lake County
Witherspoon Lodge No. 111 Free and Accepted Masons (F&AM), (Mount Dora, FL) 1410 N. Clayton St., Mount Dora, 09000346

ILLINOIS

Cook County

KANSAS

Crawford County
S–W Supply Company, 215 E. Prairie, Girard, 09000348

Douglas County
Ecumenical Christian Ministries Building, 1204 Oread Ave., Lawrence, 09000350

Jackson County
Holton Bath House and Swimming Pool, (New Deal—Era Resources of Kansas MPS) 711 Nebraska Ave., Holton, 09000351

Sedgwick County
Old Mission Mausoleum, 3414 E. 21st St., Wichita, 09000352

Wabaunsee County
Alma Downtown Historic District, Missouri St., 2nd to 5th, Alma, 09000354

MASSACHUSETTS

Plymouth County
WPA Field House and Pump Station, 7–19 Henry Turner Bailey Rd., Scituate, 09000355

MISSISSIPPI

Sunflower County
Indianaola Historic District, Roughly bounded by Percy St. on the N., Front to Adair on the W. to Roosevelt, Roosevelt E. to Front Extended and N., Indianaola, 09000356

OKLAHOMA

Ottawa County
Miami Downtown Historic District, Roughly 100 block of N. Main, 000 block of S. Main, 000 blocks of Central Ave. and 000 block of SE. A St., Miami, 09000357

Tulsa County
Atlas Life Building, 415 S. Boston Ave., Tulsa, 09000358