Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping “Non-Hour Cost”

Burden: We have identified no ‘‘non-hour cost” burdens for this collection.

Public Disclosure Statement: The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, et seq.) provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Until OMB approves a collection of information, you are not obligated to respond.

Comments: Before submitting an ICR to OMB, PRA section 3506(c)(2)(A) requires each agency “* * * to provide notice * * * and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information.” * * *

Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Agencies must also estimate the “non-hour cost” burdens to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. Therefore, if you have costs to generate, maintain, and disclose this information, you should comment and provide your total capital and startup cost components or annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of service components. You should describe the methods you use to estimate major cost factors, including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, discount rate(s), and the period over which you incur costs. Capital and startup costs include, among other items, computers and software you purchase to prepare for collecting information, monitoring, and record storage facilities. You should not include estimates for equipment or services purchased: (i) Before October 1, 1995; (ii) to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; (iii) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; or (iv) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval. As a result of your comments, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB.

Public Comment Procedures: 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.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Arlene Bajusz (202) 208–7744.


William S. Hauser,
Acting Chief, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs.
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ENDANGERED AND THREATENED WILDLIFE AND PLANTS: ATTWATER’S PRAIRIE-CHICKEN (Tympanuchus cupido attwateri) RECOVERY PLAN, SECOND REVISION

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of document availability: revised recovery plan.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of the Attwater’s Prairie-Chicken (Tympanuchus cupido attwateri) Recovery Plan, Second Revision. A recovery plan was originally completed for the Attwater’s prairie-chicken in 1983 and revised in 1993.

ADDRESSES: An electronic copy of the recovery plan can be obtained from our website at http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/Library/. Copies of the recovery plan are also available by request. To obtain a copy, contact Terry Rossignol by U.S. mail at Attwater Prairie Chicken National Wildlife Refuge, P.O. Box 519, Eagle Lake, TX 77434; by phone at (979) 234–3021; or by e-mail at Terry.Rossignol@fws.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry Rossignol (see ADDRESSES).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), requires the development of recovery plans for listed species, unless such a plan would not promote the conservation of a particular species. Recovery plans help guide the recovery effort by describing actions considered necessary for the conservation of the species, and estimating time and costs for implementing the measures needed.
for recovery. A recovery plan was originally completed for the Attwater’s prairie-chicken in 1983 and revised in 1993, but the recommendations contained in those plans are outdated.

Section 4(f) of the Act requires that we provide public notice and an opportunity for public review and comment during recovery plan development. In fulfillment of this requirement, we made the draft second revision of the recovery plan for Attwater’s prairie-chicken available for public comment from November 19, 2007, through January 18, 2008 (November 19, 2007; 72 FR 65058). We also conducted peer review at this time. Based on this input, we revised and finalized the recovery plan, and summarized public comments in an appendix.

The Attwater’s prairie-chicken was listed as endangered with risk of extinction in 1967 (March 11, 1967; 32 FR 4001). This listing was “grandfathered” into the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The Attwater’s prairie-chicken represents the southernmost subspecies of Tympanuchus cupido and currently occurs in the wild at only three locations: The Attwater Prairie Chicken National Wildlife Refuge (Colorado County, Texas), the Texas City Prairie Preserve (Galveston County, Texas), and a private ranch in Goliad County, Texas. Annual counts are conducted every spring on the prairie-chicken’s booming grounds, and approximately 90 birds remained in these 3 populations as of March 2009. Counts for 2010 will be conducted in April. In addition, approximately 157 individuals were held in captivity at the Abilene Zoo (Abilene, Texas), Caldwell Zoo (Tyler, Texas), Fossil Rim Wildlife Center (Glen Rose, Texas), Houston Zoo (Houston, Texas), San Antonio Zoo (San Antonio, Texas), Sea World of Texas (San Antonio, Texas), and Texas A&M University (College Station, Texas) as of December 31, 2009.

Habitat destruction and degradation are the primary factors contributing to historic population declines. Current threats include extremely small populations, habitat and population fragmentation resulting in genetic isolation, diseases and parasites in both wild and captive settings, inability of captive breeding facilities to produce large numbers of captive-reared birds that are capable of survival and reproduction in wild habitats, and poor brood survival in wild populations. Attwater’s prairie-chicken recovery must be focused on three primary areas: (1) Habitat management, (2) captive and wild population management, and (3) public outreach.

Authority: The authority for this action is section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1533(f).

Dated: March 17, 2010.

Benjamin N. Tuggle,
Regional Director, Region 2.
[FR Doc. 2010–9605 Filed 4–23–10; 8:45 am]
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Coral Reef Restoration Plan, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Biscayne National Park, FL

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.


SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Coral Reef Restoration Plan for Biscayne National Park, Florida. The DEIS provides a systematic approach to addressing injuries to coral reefs caused by vessel groundings within Biscayne National Park.

DATES: The NPS will accept comments on the DEIS from the public for 60 days after the date the Environmental Protection Agency notices the availability of the DEIS in its regular Federal Register listing. A public meeting will be held during the review period to facilitate submission of public comment. Once scheduled, the meeting date will be announced via the Biscayne National Park website (http://www.nps.gov/bisc/), the NPS’s Planning Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site (http://parkplanning.nps.gov/bisc/), and a press release to area media.

ADDRESSES: The DEIS for the Coral Reef Restoration Plan will be available for public review online at the NPS’s PEPC Web site (http://parkplanning.nps.gov/bisc/), and in the office of Mark Lewis, Superintendent of Biscayne National Park, 9700 SW. 328th Street, Homestead, Florida 33033, 305–230–1144.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Many vessel groundings occur annually in Biscayne National Park, causing injuries to submerged resources. The goal of coral reef restoration actions in Biscayne National Park is to create a stable, self-sustaining reef environment of similar topography and surface complexity to that which existed prior to injury, such that natural recovery processes, enhanced through mitigation, if needed, will lead to a fully functioning coral reef community with near natural complexity, structure, and make-up of organisms. The DEIS provides a systematic approach to addressing injuries to coral reefs caused by vessel groundings within Biscayne National Park. It analyzes two alternatives, the No Action alternative (Alternative 1) and Restoration Using a Programmatic Approach (Alternative 2).

Alternative 1 would not change the existing approach to coral reef restoration planning and implementation, including NEPA compliance. Currently, Biscayne National Park resource managers evaluate the impacts of coral reef restoration actions and specific restoration methods when planning and implementing restoration at each grounding incident. In contrast, to address each coral injury under Alternative 2, the most appropriate restoration actions and specific restoration methods would be selected from a “toolbox” of methods that already have had their impacts evaluated programmatically. Under Alternative 2, 11 reasonable and common coral reef restoration actions were identified and evaluated for inclusion in the toolbox.

Alternative 2 (Restoration Using a Programmatic Approach) was identified as the NPS’s preferred alternative. The time required to evaluate environmental impacts of restoration actions after site-specific injuries would be minimized substantially under Alternative 2, resulting in fewer adverse effects and/or more beneficial effects to park resources.

If you wish to comment, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may comment via the Internet at http://parkplanning.nps.gov/bisc. You may also mail comments to Coral Reef Restoration Plan, Biscayne National Park, 9700 SW. 328th Street, Homestead, FL 33033. Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to Biscayne National Park, 9700 SW. 328th Street, Homestead, FL 33033. 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