Investigation will reclassify its Seattle, Washington; New Orleans, Louisiana; Baltimore, Maryland; Tampa, Florida; and Detroit, Michigan regional offices as field offices. The Seattle, Washington, field office will be aligned under the newly reformed Denver, Colorado, regional office (Region 8). The New Orleans, Louisiana, field office and its former field offices will be aligned under the Fort Worth, Texas, regional office (Region 6) or the Atlanta, Georgia regional office (Region 4). The Baltimore, Maryland, field office and its former field offices will be aligned under the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania regional office (Region 4). The Tampa, Florida, field office and its former field offices will be aligned under the Atlanta, Georgia, regional office (Region 4). Additionally, as part of this reorganization the New York, New York, Regional Office (Region 2) will redistribute workload and personnel to address concerns in Long Island, New York and Central Islip, New York and will close two sub-field offices in New York. Region 4 will redistribute workload to address concerns in Jacksonville, Florida and Louisville, Kentucky where the offices are being closed. All other existing regional and field office jurisdictional boundaries will be unchanged, and the HUD/OIG Office of Audit will not participate in this reorganization. Additionally, the Office of Investigation’s headquarters organization will not be affected by this realignment.

Like all HUD/OIG Office of Investigation regional offices, each of the five identified regional offices is currently managed by a GS–15 1811 Special Agent-in-Charge (SAC). These SACs will be assigned as Deputy SACs (with no reduction in grade) to the appropriate regional office. Of note, there will be some attrition in this realignment and some positions will therefore be eliminated. The realignment ultimately will result in a net reduction of 6 FTEs.

C. Costs Versus Benefits

1. One-Time Costs

   (a) Personnel relocation cost ($0). It is not anticipated that there will be any personnel relocation costs associated with this reorganization.

   (b) Severance or unemployment compensation costs ($0). No severance costs are associated with this initiative as it does not contemplate the termination of any staff.

   (c) Purchase/movement of furniture and equipment ($0). Each of the field offices that are being evaluated for reclassification to regional office status already exist and are fully equipped. Additionally, the proposal does not contemplate the creation of new field offices or an increase in overall FTEs. Thus, no purchase or movement of furniture or equipment is involved.

   (d) Space alteration costs (de minimus). Some offices may require space alterations and telephone changes to accommodate any future changes of assigned staff. However, HUD/OIG estimates that any space alteration costs that result will be minimal because HUD/OIG has implemented and encouraged teleworking. Further, hoteling is an option available to HUD/OIG.

   No additional or supplemental funding is expected to the current appropriated budget. All costs will be maintained within the current budget.

2. Permanent Increases in Operating Costs

   The realignment will not result in any increase in operating costs.

   No additional or supplemental funding is expected.

3. Dollar Savings Resulting From Realignment of Offices

   Personnel Cost Savings. The realignment will ultimately result in a net reduction of 6 FTEs resulting in significant savings of well over $600,000.00 for personnel costs.

   Operating Costs Savings. The closure of the Louisville, Kentucky office will obviate the need to build out space for two agents. The agents are presently in leased space from another agency. The planned lease of office space and tenant finish and equipping that space is being avoided by closing the office in Louisville. Approximate savings will be $125,000.00–150,000.00 the first year and $12,000.00 per year thereafter.

D. Impact on Local Economies

   The planned reclassification of five regional offices is not expected to have any impact on the local economies of Seattle, Washington; New Orleans, Louisiana; Baltimore, Maryland; Tampa, Florida; or Detroit, Michigan, nor will there be any significant impact on Long Island, New York, Central Islip, New York or Jacksonville, Florida. For the realignment from regional to field offices, the plan does not involve terminating existing real estate leases prior to their expiration date, nor does it involve leasing addition real estate. Moreover, the plan does not contemplate appreciable relocation of staff to these large metropolitan areas. With regard to the offices that will be closed, these offices have been downsizing to allow management greater flexibility in positioning resources. The plan does involve terminating some existing real estate leases prior to their expiration date, with minimal costs associated with exercising early termination clauses which will be more than offset by future savings. Thus, any impact on the local economies in terms of housing, schools, public services, taxes, employment, and traffic congestion will be non-existent or insignificant at most.

E. Effect of the Reclassifications on the Availability, Accessibility, and Quality of Services Provided for Recipients of Those Services

   The plan was designed to improve the quality and level of service provided to stakeholders and affected clients nationwide. The regions will receive greater management emphasis than prior to the reclassification. Management will be enabled to interact with HUD management and clients and law enforcement partners more frequently and in greater scope than is now possible. More interaction and attention translates into more availability and accessibility of higher quality services.


   David A. Montoya,
   Inspector General.
Applicant’s Proposal

The applicant is requesting take of approximately 1.57 ac of occupied sand skink foraging and sheltering habitat incidental to construction of a commercial development, and seeks a 5-year permit. The 7.7-ac project is located on parcel #09–22–26–1100009000000 within Section 09, Township 22 South, Range 26 East, Lake County, Florida. The project includes construction of a commercial development and the associated infrastructure, and landscaping. The applicant proposes to mitigate for the take of the sand skink by the purchase of 3.14 mitigation credits within the Hatchesnka Ranch Conservation Bank.

Our Preliminary Determination

We have determined that the applicant’s proposal, including the proposed mitigation and minimization measures, would have minor or negligible effects on the species covered in the HCP. Therefore, we determined that the ITP is a “low-effect” project and qualifies for categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as provided by the Department of the Interior Manual (516 DM 2 Appendix 1 and 516 DM 6 Appendix 1). A low-effect HCP is one involving (1) Minor or negligible effects on federally listed or candidate species and their habitats, and (2) minor or negligible effects on other environmental values or resources.

Next Steps

We will evaluate the HCP and comments we receive to determine whether the ITP application meets the requirements of section 10(a) of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). If we determine that the application meets these requirements, we will issue ITP #TE65123A–0. We will also evaluate whether issuance of the section 10(a)(1)(B) ITP complies with section 7 of the Act by conducting an intra-Service section 7 consultation. We will use the results of this consultation, in combination with the above findings, in our final analysis to determine whether or not to issue the ITP. If the requirements are met, we will issue the permit to the applicant.

Public Comments

If you wish to comment on the permit application, HCP, and associated documents, you may submit comments via any of the methods in ADDRESSES.

Public Availability of Comments

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, 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

We provide this notice under Section 10 of the Act and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: March 16, 2012.

David L. Hankla,
Field Supervisor, Jacksonville Field Office, Southeast Region.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service


John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge at Tinicum, Delaware and Philadelphia Counties, PA; Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (we, the Service), announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment (CCP/EA) for John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) at Tinicum, located in Delaware and Philadelphia Counties, Pennsylvania, for public review and comment. The draft CCP/EA describes our proposal for managing the refuge for the next 15 years.

Also available for public review and comment are the draft findings of appropriateness and draft compatibility determinations for uses to be allowed upon initial completion of the plan, if alternative B is selected, and the draft habitat management plan. These are included as appendix B and appendix C, respectively, in the draft CCP/EA.

DATES: To ensure consideration, please send your comments no later than April 23, 2012. We will announce upcoming public meetings in local news media, via our project mailing list, and on our regional planning Web site: http://www.fws.gov/northeast/planning/John%20Heinz/ccphome.html.