significant mold present; contact Agriculture for more information.
Utah
Little Mountain Communication
40.53807749–109.6935286
Maeser UT 84078
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201520002
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 7–A–UT–0536–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency: GSA, Land
Holding Agency: Agriculture
Comments: off-site removal; 190 sq. ft.; 12+mos. vacant; radio tower, commercial;
contact Forest Service to gain access; comment; contact Agriculture for more information.

Vermont
Old Operators Quarters/USACE N
100 Reservoir Road
Springfield VT 05156
Landholding Agency: COE
Property Number: 31201520001
Status: Underutilized
Comments: off-site removal only; 50-60 yrs. old; 700 sq. ft.; storage; asbestos; no future
agency need; contact COE for more information.

Washington
Building 03932
Joint Base Lewis McChord
JBLM WA 98433
Landholding Agency: Army
Property Number: 21201520001
Status: Underutilized
Comments: off-site removal only; no future agency need; 120 sq. ft.; storage; 49+ yrs.;
significant repairs for restoration; contamination; contact Army for accessibility and removal requirements.

Land
Colorado
Grand Valley Project
39.25326873–108.843107271
Unincorporated CO 81524
Landholding Agency: GSA
Property Number: 54201520001
Status: Excess
GSA Number: 7–CO–0699–AA
Directions: Disposal Agency: GSA, Land
Holding Agency: Interior
Comments: 30.12 acres; agricultural; silage pits; contact Interior for more information.

Unsuitable Properties
Building
Massachusetts
Building 181
181 East Road
Otis ANGB MA 02542
Landholding Agency: Air Force
Property Number: 18201520001
Status: Excess
Comments: public access denied & no alternative method to gain access without compromising National Security.
Reasons: Secured Area

Directions: Building 120; 122; 153
Comments: public access denied & no alternative method to gain access w/out compromising National Security.; property located within an Airport Runway Clear Zone.
Reasons: Secured Area; Within airport runway clear zone

Alaska
Duplex Housing Units 100 & 102
Lots 3 & 4, Block 2, Bettles Airport Subdivision
Bettles AK 99755
Landholding Agency: Interior
Property Number: 61201520003
Status: Unutilized
Comments: Property located within an airport runway
Reasons: Within airport runway clear zone

Michigan
Mio 7 Winowiecki Consumers Cab
Huron Na’t Forest Old M–72
(Smith Bridge)
Grayling MI 49738
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201520003
Status: Unutilized
Comments: documented deficiencies: documentation provided represents a clear threat to personal safety; significant rot in floor/roof structure; relocation will most likely result in the roof collapsing.
Reasons: Extensive deterioration

Mio 7 Winowiecki Consumers Lea
Huron National Forest Old M–72
(Smith Bridge)
Grayling MI 49738
Landholding Agency: Agriculture
Property Number: 15201520004
Status: Unutilized
Comments: documented deficiencies: documentation provided represents a clear threat to personal safety; interior space of the structure cannot be made to comply w/ habitability requirements.
Reasons: Extensive deterioration

Washington
Navy Reserve Center-Building 7
5101 N. Assemble Street
Spokane WA 99205
Landholding Agency: Navy
Property Number: 77201520002
Status: Excess
Comments: Public access denied & no alternative method to gain access without compromising National Security.
Reasons: Secured Area

Land
Georgia
Proposed Photovoltaic (PV) Sit
Marine Corps Logistics Base
Albany GA 31704
Landholding Agency: Navy
Property Number: 77201520001
Status: Underutilized
Comments: Public access denied & no alternative method to gain access without compromising National Security.
Reasons: Secured Area
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BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Fish and Wildlife Service
Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Pacific Gas & Electric Company Eagle Conservation Plan

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement; notice of scoping meeting and request for comments.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), intend to prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for the Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E) Applicant proposed Eagle Conservation Plan (ECP) and request for a 30-year programmatic eagle take permit for take of bald eagles and golden eagles under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (Eagle Act). The ECP, which serves as the foundation of the permit application, is a comprehensive plan that addresses take of the eagles associated with PG&E’s existing infrastructure and operations and maintenance (O&M) activities throughout the Plan Area, which encompasses about two-thirds of the State of California. We provide this notice to (1) describe the proposed action; (2) advise other Federal and state agencies, potentially affected tribal interests, and the public of our intent to prepare an EIS; (3) announce the initiation of a 60-day public scoping period; and (4) obtain suggestions and information on the scope of issues and possible alternatives to be included in the EIS. We also announce plans for a public scoping meeting and the opening of a public comment period. We request data, comments, new information, or suggestions from the public, governmental agencies, the scientific community, tribes, industry, or any other interested party.

DATES: To ensure consideration, please send your written comments by June 30, 2015. A public scoping meeting will be held on May 21, 2015, at Red Lion Hotel Woodlake Conference Center, 500 Leisure Lane, Sacramento, CA 95815.

ADDRESSES: To request further information or submit written comments, please use one of the following methods, and note that your information request or comment is in reference to the PG&E Eagle Conservation Plan EIS:

• Email: [fw8_eagle_nepa@fws.gov]
Include “PG&E Eagle Conservation Plan EIS” in the subject line of the message.
The ECP is a comprehensive plan that addresses the take of bald eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) and golden eagles (Aquila chrysaetos) associated with PG&E’s existing infrastructure and operation and maintenance (O&M) activities throughout its ECP Plan Area (Plan Area).

The ECP is a comprehensive plan that addresses the take of bald eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) and golden eagles (Aquila chrysaetos) associated with PG&E’s existing infrastructure and operations and maintenance (O&M) activities

Introduction

The Service is considering an application from PG&E, under the Eagle Act, for a 30-year programmatic take permit for bald and golden eagles. PG&E has prepared an ECP, which addresses incidental take of bald and golden eagles from electrocution and collision with above-ground electric transmission and distribution lines (collectively power lines), as well as disturbance of nesting eagles during various operations and maintenance (O&M) activities within the Plan Area. The Plan Area encompasses PG&E’s Service Area including all electric and hydroelectric facilities located within the state of California. The ECP analyzes their system’s risk to eagles. It also identifies measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate eagle mortality associated with those activities. The Plan Area is within the following California Counties:

- Alameda
- Alpine
- Amador
- Butte
- Calaveras
- Colusa
- Contra Costa
- Del Norte
- El Dorado
- Fresno
- Glenn
- Humboldt
- Inyo
- Kern
- Kings
- Lake
- Lassen
- Los Angeles
- Madera
- Marin
- Mariposa
- Mendocino
- Merced
- Modoc
- Mono
- Monterey
- Napa
- Nevada
- Placer
- Plumas
- Sacramento
- San Benito
- San Bernardino
- San Francisco
- San Joaquin
- San Luis Obispo
- San Mateo
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Clara
- Santa Cruz
- Shasta
- Sierra
- Siskiyou
- Solano
- Sonoma
- Stanislaus
- Sutter
- Tehama
- Trinity
- Tulare
- Tuolumne
- Ventura
- Yolo
- Yuba

Background

Eagles are protected under the Eagle Act, which prohibits take and disturbance of individuals and nests. Take under the Eagle Act includes any actions that pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, destroy, molest, and disturb eagles. Disturb is further defined in 50 CFR 22.23 as “to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available (1) injury to an eagle, (2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or (3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior.”

Prior to 2009, permits for purposeful take of birds or body parts were limited to scientific (50 CFR 22.21), religious (50 CFR 22.22), or falconry (50 CFR 22.24) pursuits; for eagles causing serious injury to livestock or other wildlife (50 CFR 22.23); and for golden eagle nests that interfere with resource development or recovery operations (50 CFR 22.21–25). In 2009, we issued the Final Rule for Eagle Permits: Take Necessary to Protect Interests in Particular Localities (2009 Final Rule) on new permit regulations that allow take “for the protection of... other interests in any particular locality” and where the take is “associated with and not the purpose of an otherwise lawful activity...” (September 11, 2009; 74 FR 46836–46879). The 2009 Final Rule authorizes programmatic take (take that is recurring and not in a specific, identifiable timeframe and/or location) of eagles only if avoidance measures have been implemented to the maximum extent achievable. PG&E’s activities are programmatic and existed prior to the 2009 Final Rule. Considerations for issuing take permits...
include the health of the local and regional eagle populations, availability of suitable nesting and foraging habitat for any displaced eagles, and whether the take and associated mitigation provide a net benefit to eagles (74 FR 46836–46879). The programmatic take permit under the 2009 Final Rule was valid up to 5 years. In 2012, we proposed to extend the maximum term for programmatic take permits from 5 to 30 years (April 13, 2012; 77 FR 22267–22278), and in 2013, we issued a Final Rule to extend the maximum term for programmatic eagle permits to 30 years, subject to a recurring 5-year review process throughout the life of the permit (December 9, 2013; 78 FR 73704–78725).

PG&E’s power lines have resulted in eagle mortality due to electrocution and collision. Furthermore, infrastructure associated with electric and hydroelectric energy generation requires long-term O&M, pipeline, and utility line modernization and replacement to produce and deliver reliable and safe energy to PG&E customers. Some O&M activities occur in eagle nesting habitat where there is a potential to disturb nesting eagles.

Scope of EIS

PG&E’s ECP serves as the foundation of the permit application. As such, all alternatives considered in the EIS should conform to the permit issuance criteria for programmatic eagle take permit under the Eagle Act as required in 50 CFR 22.26(f)(1–6). The draft EIS will identify and analyze direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed action and alternatives to several resource areas, including biological resources, public utilities, air quality, noise, water resources, cultural resources, socioeconomics, and climate change. We will also consider evaluation of additional resource areas if issues of concern specific to the proposed action are identified during the public scoping process. The purpose of the public scoping process for the EIS is to determine the key issues that will influence the scope of the environmental analysis, including potential alternatives, and the extent to which those issues and impacts will be analyzed in the EIS. We will evaluate a minimum of three alternatives.

Applicant’s Proposal

PG&E has requested a programmatic eagle take permit for incidental take of bald and golden eagles associated with O&M activities in the Plan Area, as described in the ECP, for a term of 30 years. Specific activities covered under the ECP would include otherwise lawful activities that have the potential to kill eagles or disturb them to the extent that nests are abandoned or eagle productivity is decreased, as well as avoidance and minimization measures to reduce these impacts. The ECP describes:

1. Eagle collision with or electrocution by PG&E’s existing distribution and transmission lines and conductors within the Plan Area;
2. Operation and maintenance of PG&E’s electrical system, including inspection and patrols (aerial and ground), routine maintenance and repair, vegetation management (including tree pruning and removal with the right of way), and replacement or upgrades of existing power lines and infrastructure. This activity would apply to all power lines in the Plan Area (141,200 miles of distribution lines and 18,600 miles of transmission lines) and related infrastructure;
3. Operation and maintenance of PG&E’s hydroelectric system, including the associated electric system, recreation facility maintenance, log boom/buoy/safety marker maintenance, intake tunnel clearing, and repair of weirs and gates. This activity would apply to all facilities in the Plan Area, including 68 existing powerhouses, a pumped storage facility, and nearly 100 reservoirs;
4. Continued implementation of migratory bird and eagle take-reduction measures, including, but not limited to:
   a. Adoption of avian-safe construction design standards;
   b. Proactive and reactive bird-safe power pole retrofits;
   c. Bird nest protection best management practices during vegetation management activities and other routine or project work;
   d. Bird flight diverter effectiveness studies;
   e. Targeted management at hydroelectric facilities; and
   f. Pre-construction nesting bird surveys when required for project work.
5. Monitoring to validate the estimated amount of disturbance take and the number of fatalities associated with PG&E’s existing infrastructure and to evaluate the effectiveness of the conservation measures at reducing eagle take. Monitoring efforts would generally include:
   a. Monitoring of eagle nests located throughout PG&E’s hydroelectric system, as well as those discovered during inspections, patrols, and vegetation management activities; and
   b. Monitoring eagle fatalities during inspections, patrols, and vegetation management actions.

Public Comments

We request data, comments, new information, or suggestions from the public, other governmental agencies, the scientific community, Tribes, industry, or any other interested party on this notice. We will consider these comments in developing the draft EIS.

Public Availability of Comments

You may submit your comments and materials by one of the methods listed above in ADDRESSES. Before including your address, phone number, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—might 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.

Scoping Meetings

See DATES for the date(s) and time(s) of our public meeting(s). The primary purpose of these meetings and public comment period is to provide the public with a general understanding of the background of the proposed action and to solicit suggestions and information on the scope of issues and alternatives we should consider when drafting the EIS. Oral and written comments will be accepted at the meetings. An interpreter and/or court reporter will be present when deemed necessary. Comments can also be submitted by methods listed in the ADDRESSES section. Once the draft EIS and proposed ECP are complete and made available for review, there will be additional opportunity for public comment on the content of these documents.

Persons needing reasonable accommodations in order to attend and participate in the public meetings should contact the Pacific Southwest Region’s Migratory Bird Office using one of the methods listed above in ADDRESSES as soon as possible. In order to allow sufficient time to process requests, please make contact no later than one week before the public meeting. Information regarding this proposed action is available in alternative formats upon request.

Authority

We provide this notice under section 668a of the Eagle Act (16 U.S.C. 668–668c) and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1501.7, 40 CFR 1506.6, and 40 CFR 1508.22).
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Fish and Wildlife Service

Cat Island National Wildlife Refuge, Louisiana; Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; 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 Cat Island National Wildlife Refuge in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana, 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 1, 2015.

ADDRESSES: You may obtain a copy of the Draft CCP/EA by contacting Kent Ozment, Wildlife Refuge Specialist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lower Mississippi River Refuge Complex, 21 Pintail Ln., 89, Natchez, MS 39165. Alternatively, you may download the document from our Internet site at http://southeast.fws.gov/planning under “Draft CCP Documents.” Comments on the Draft CCP/EA may be submitted to the above postal address or by email to Kent Ozment at Kent_Ozment@fws.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kent Ozment, Natural Resource Planner, (601) 442–6696 or Kent_Ozment@fws.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: With this notice, we continue the CCP process for Cat Island National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) started through a notice in the Federal Register on October 22, 2013 (78 FR 62048). For more about the refuge and our CCP process, please see that notice.

Cat Island National Wildlife Refuge was established in October 2000, as the 526th refuge in the National Wildlife Refuge System. It is located in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana, near the town of St. Francisville, 25 miles north of Baton Rouge. The refuge currently encompasses 10,473 acres of bottomland hardwood forest, baldcypress-tupelo swamp, and shrub-scrub swamps. The Congressionally approved acquisition boundary encloses 36,500 acres.

Cat Island NWR is part of the Lower Mississippi River Ecosystem and is located on the southeastern edge of the Mississippi Alluvial Valley (MAV) Bird Conservation Region, which is incorporated into the Gulf Coastal Plans and Ozarks Landscape Conservation Cooperative. The refuge provides high-quality habitat for many species of waterfowl, Neotropical migratory songbirds, and resident game and fish, as well as threatened and endangered species and species of concern. The refuge contains a number of relict old-growth baldcypress trees, including the world’s largest known individual of this species.

Background

The CCP Process

The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Improvement Act), requires us to develop a CCP for each national wildlife refuge. CCPS are developed 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.


CCP Alternatives, Including Our Proposed Alternative (B)

We developed three alternatives for managing the refuge (Alternatives A, B, and C), with Alternative B as our proposed alternative. A full description of each alternative is in the Draft CCP/EA. We summarize each alternative below.

Alternative A: Current Management (No Action)

Under alternative A, Cat Island NWR would be managed as it has been in recent years. No new actions would be taken to manage Cat Island NWR, or improve or otherwise change the refuge’s habitats, wildlife, or public use. Programs that have been ongoing in the past would continue. Certain monitoring activities would continue, including periodic migratory bird surveys. Maintenance of roads and public-use facilities would continue as presently conducted. Habitats would continue to be mostly passively managed, with actions taken only to provide for public safety or to avoid or mitigate damage to refuge resources. Current partnerships with the West Feliciana Parish Tourist Commission, Louisiana Hiking Club, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, and others would continue as before. The refuge hunting, fishing, and non-consumptive uses would continue as presently constituted. Legal requirements for protection of natural and cultural resources would continue to be met. Acquisition of lands within the approved acquisition boundary would continue as before, contingent upon the availability of funding and appropriate lands offered by willing sellers. Law enforcement would continue to be a shared responsibility between the Service, the State of Louisiana, and the West Feliciana Parish Sheriff’s Office. The refuge would continue to be unstaffed, and funding for its operation would be restricted to funds generated by the sale of recreational use permits and occasional special project funding.

Alternative B: Active Resource Management (Proposed Alternative)

Under this alternative, the refuge’s natural resources would be managed to enhance habitats for priority species, including waterfowl and other migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, species of concern, and resident fish and wildlife. Additionally, consistent wildlife surveys would be conducted, using established protocols to establish baseline habitat conditions, estimate wildlife population indices, determine responses to management actions, and contribute to larger scale biological assessments. Invasive exotic and nuisance species would be actively managed to minimize their impacts on refuge resources. The refuge forests would be actively managed to enhance wildlife habitat. Aquatic habitats on the refuge would be inventoried and