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I. Abstract

The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.) and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq., except 777e–1) provide authority for Federal assistance to the States for management and restoration of fish and wildlife. These Acts and our regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 50 CFR part 80, subpart D, require that States, territories, and the District of Columbia annually certify their hunting and fishing license sales. States, territories, and the District of Columbia that receive grants under these Acts use FWS Forms 3–154a (Part I—Certification) and 3–154b (Part II—Summary of Hunting and Sport Fishing Licenses Issued) to certify the number and amount of hunting and fishing license sales. We use the information collected to apportion and distribute funds according to the formula specified in each Act.

II. Data

| OMB Control Number: 1018–0007. |
| Title: Annual Certification of Hunting and Sport Fishing Licenses Issued, 50 CFR part 80, subpart D. |
| Service Form Number(s): 3–154a, 3–154b. |
| Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection. |
| Description of Respondents: States, territories (Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, and American Samoa), and District of Columbia. |
| Respondent’s Obligation: Required to obtain or retain a benefit. |
| Frequency of Collection: Annually. |
| Estimated Annual Number of Respondents: 56. |
| Estimated Total Annual Responses: 112. |
| Estimated Time per Response: Average of 12 hours for FWS Form 3–154a and 20 hours for FWS Form 3–154b. |
| Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 1,792. |

III. Comments

We invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request to OMB to approve this IC. 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.


Tina A. Campbell,
Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
**Abstract:** In January 2012, we requested that OMB approve, on an emergency basis, our request to collect information associated with the Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines (Guidelines). We asked for emergency approval because of the potential negative effects that proposed wind energy facilities may have on wildlife and their habitat. OMB approved our request and assigned OMB Control No. 1018–0148, which expires September 30, 2012. We are asking OMB to extend the approval for this information collection for 3 years.

As wind energy production increased, both developers and wildlife agencies recognized the need for a system to evaluate and address the potential negative impacts of wind energy projects on species of concern. These voluntary Guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy) provide a structured, scientific process for addressing wildlife conservation concerns at all stages of land-based wind energy development. They also promote effective communication among wind energy developers and Federal, State, tribal, and local conservation agencies. When used in concert with appropriate regulatory tools, the Guidelines will be the best practical approach for conserving species of concern.

The Guidelines discuss various risks to “species of concern” from wind energy projects, including collisions with wind turbines and associated infrastructure; loss and degradation of habitat from turbines and infrastructure; fragmentation of large habitat blocks into smaller segments that may not support sensitive species; displacement and behavioral changes; and indirect effects such as increased predator populations or introduction of invasive plants. The Guidelines assist developers in identifying species of concern that may potentially be affected by proposed projects, including, but not limited to: Migratory birds; Bats; Bald and golden eagles and other birds of prey; Prairie and sage grouse; and Listed, proposed, or candidate endangered and threatened species.

The Guidelines follow a tiered approach. The wind energy developer begins at Tier 1 or Tier 2, which entails gathering of existing data to help identify any potential risks to wildlife and their habitats at proposed wind energy project sites. The developer then proceeds through subsequent tiers, as appropriate, to collect information in increasing detail until the level of risk is adequately ascertained and a decision on whether or not to develop the site can be made. Many projects may not proceed beyond Tier 1 or 2, when developers become aware of potential barriers, including high risks to wildlife. Developers would only have an interest in adhering to the Guidelines for those projects that proceed beyond Tier 1 or 2.

At each tier level, wind energy developers and operators should retain documentation to provide to the Service. Such documentation may include copies of correspondence with the Service, results of pre- and post-construction studies conducted at project sites, bird and bat conservation strategies, or any other record that supports a developer’s adherence to the Guidelines. The extent of the documentation will depend on the conditions of the site being developed. Sites with greater risk of impacts to wildlife and habitats will likely involve more extensive communication with the Service and longer durations of pre- and post-construction studies than sites with little risk.

Distributed or community-scale wind energy projects are unlikely to have significant adverse impacts to wildlife and their habitats. The Guidelines recommend that developers of these small-scale projects do the desktop analysis described in Tier 1 or Tier 2 using publicly available information to determine whether they should communicate with the Service. Since such project designs usually include a single turbine associated with existing development, conducting a Tier 1 or Tier 2 analysis for distributed or community-scale wind energy projects should incur limited nonhour burden costs. These analyses are conducted using readily available existing information, so the nature of these costs may include travel to project sites. For such projects, if there is no potential risk identified, a developer will have no need to communicate with the Service regarding the project or to conduct studies described in Tiers 3, 4, and 5.

Adherence to the Guidelines is voluntary. Following the Guidelines does not relieve any individual, company, or agency of the responsibility to comply with applicable laws and regulations. Developers of wind energy projects have a responsibility to comply with the law; for example, they must obtain incidental take authorization for species protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA).

**Comments:** On April 2, 2012, we published in the Federal Register (77 FR 19683) a notice of our intent to request that OMB renew approval for this information collection. In that...
notice, we solicited comments for 60 days, ending on June 1, 2012. We received one comment regarding permits for the take of migratory birds, but the comment did not address the information collection requirements. We did not make any changes to the information collection.

We again invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. 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 OMB in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that it will be done.


Tina A. Campbell,
Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
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SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) and environmental assessment (EA) for the Hamden Slough National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge, NWR) for public review and comment. In this draft CCP/EA we describe how we propose to manage the refuge for the next 15 years.

DATES: To ensure consideration, we must receive your written comments by September 28, 2012. We will hold open house-style meetings during the comment period to receive comments and provide information on the draft plan. In addition, we will use special mailings, newspaper articles, Internet postings, and other media announcements to inform people of opportunities for input.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments or requests for more information by any one of the following methods:

- Email: r3planning@fws.gov. Include “Hamden Slough Draft CCP/EA” in the subject line of the message.
- Fax: Attention: Refuge Manager, Hamden Slough NWR, 218–847–4156.
- U.S. Mail: Attention: Ryan Frohling, Refuge Manager, Hamden Slough NWR (managed by Detroit Lakes Wetland Management District), 26624 N. Tower Road, Detroit Lakes, MN 56501.
- In-Person Drop Off: You may drop off comments during regular business hours at the above addresses.

You will find the draft CCP/EA, as well as information about the planning process and a summary of the CCP, on the planning Web site: http://www.fws.gov/midwest/planning/hamdenslough/index.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ryan Frohling, 218–847–4431.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we continue the CCP process for Hamden Slough National Wildlife Refuge, which we began by publishing a notice of intent in the Federal Register (75 FR 7289) on February 18, 2010. For more about the initial process and the history of this refuge, see that notice.

Background

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668ee) (Administration Act), requires us to develop a CCP for each national wildlife refuge. The purpose in developing a CCP is to provide refuge managers with a 15-year strategy for achieving refuge purposes and contributing toward the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS), consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management, conservation, legal mandates, and Service policies. In addition to outlining broad management direction for conserving wildlife and their habitats, CCPS identify wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public, including opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years in accordance with the Administration Act.

Each unit of the NWRS was established for specific purposes. We use these purposes as the foundation for developing and prioritizing the management goals and objectives for each refuge within the NWRS mission, and to determine how the public can use each refuge. The planning process is a way for us and the public to evaluate management goals and objectives that will ensure the best possible approach to wildlife, plant, and habitat conservation, while providing for wildlife-dependent recreation opportunities that are compatible with each refuge’s establishing purposes and the mission of the NWRS.

Additional Information

The draft CCP/EA may be found at http://www.fws.gov/midwest/planning/hamdenslough/index.html. That document incorporates an EA, prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (43 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The draft CCP/EA includes detailed information about the planning process, refuge, issues, and management alternatives considered and proposed. The EA includes discussions of three alternative refuge management options. The Service’s preferred alternative is reflected in the draft CCP.

The alternatives analyzed in detail include:

- Alternative A: Current Management (No Action)—This alternative reflects the current management direction of Hamden Slough NWR. It provides the baseline against which to compare other alternatives. For NEPA purposes, this is referred to as the “No Action” alternative.
- Alternative B: Wetland Focus—This alternative would focus on increasing the quantity and quality of habitat for waterfowl. Acquisition and full restoration of Pierce Lake would be emphasized over the next 15 years. The hydrologic regime would better emulate natural seasonal and long-term variability. More diverse, sustainable vegetation patterns would be restored on Refuge wetlands.
- Alternative C: Wetland and Prairie Focus (Preferred Alternative)—This alternative would focus on increasing the quantity and quality of habitat for wetland and grassland birds. Acquisition and full restoration of...