Email: Tradeevents@dhs.gov
Include the docket number in the subject line of the message.
Fax: (202) 325–4290.
Mail: Ms. Wanda Tate, Office of Trade Relations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Room 3.5.A, Washington, DC 20229.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the words “Department of Homeland Security” and the docket number for this action. Comments received will be posted without alteration at http://www.regulations.gov, including any personal information provided. Do not submit personal information to this docket.

Docket: For access to the docket or to read background documents or comments, go to http://www.regulations.gov and search for Docket Number USCBP–2015–0019. To submit a comment, see the link on the Regulations.gov Web site for “How do I submit a comment?” located on the right hand side of the main site page.

There will be multiple public comment periods held during the meeting on July 29, 2015. Speakers are requested to limit their comments to two (2) minutes or less to facilitate greater participation. Contact the individual listed below to register as a speaker. Please note that the public comment period for speakers may end before the time indicated on the schedule that is posted on the CBP Web page, http://www.cbp.gov/trade/stakeholder-engagement/coac at the time of the meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Wanda Tate, Office of Trade Relations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 1300 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Room 3.5.A, Washington, DC 20229; telephone (202) 344–1440; facsimile (202) 325–4290.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice of this meeting is given under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix. The Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (COAC) provides advice to the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) on matters pertaining to the commercial operations of CBP and related functions within Department of Homeland Security and the Department of the Treasury.

Agenda

The Advisory Committee on Commercial Operations to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (COAC) will hear from the following subcommittees on the topics listed below and then will review, deliberate, provide observations, and formulate recommendations on how to proceed on those topics:

1. The One U.S. Government Subcommittee will discuss the Automated Commercial Environment (ACE), Single Window working group recommendations and provide input on Trade Readiness and Partner Government Agencies’ readiness for the upcoming November 1, 2015 ACE implementation of Single Window.

2. The Exports Subcommittee will address policy and a strategic approach regarding exports. The Option 4 and Air Manifest working groups will provide recommendations.

3. The Trade Enforcement and Revenue Collection Subcommittee will discuss the establishment of the 14th Term Antidumping and Countervailing Duty and Intellectual Property Rights working groups and provide recommendations.

4. The Trade Modernization Subcommittee will discuss operational uniformity of Centers of Excellence and Expertise (CEE) with a goal of developing recommendations for the creation of service levels for various Center activities. The subcommittee will report plans for engaging CBP on international trade agreements, simplification of CBP processes, the role of various international trade entities and the development of private and public sector trade expertise.

5. The Trusted Trader Subcommittee will start work once the Trusted Trader pilot has advanced to the implementation phase for testing CBP and Partner Government Agency trade benefits. The subcommittee will explore certifying trusted products through the supply chain.

6. The Global Supply Chain Subcommittee will discuss the feasibility, benefits and risks of using Electronic Cargo Security Devices. The subcommittee will report on long term development of recommendations regarding Customs and Border Protection’s development of automation and regulations governing the commodities being moved by pipelines. Further discussion will involve the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism Program as it pertains to the ocean mode of transportation, results of various pre-inspection pilots at land ports of entry and the Air Cargo Advance Screening.

phone (see below). Please address written comments to Stephen P. Henry, Field Supervisor, Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2493 Portola Road, Suite B, Ventura, California 93003, (805) 644–1766. Comments may also be sent by facsimile to (805) 644–3958.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Lena Chang, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, at the above address or by calling (805) 644–1766.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Smith’s blue butterfly was listed as endangered by the Service on June 1, 1976. Section 9 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and its implementing regulations prohibit the “take” of fish or wildlife species listed as endangered or threatened. “Take” is defined under the Act to include the following activities: “[T]o harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct” (16 U.S.C. 1532); however, under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act, we may issue permits to authorize incidental take of listed species. “Incidental Take” is defined by the Act as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Regulations governing incidental take permits for threatened and endangered species are, respectively, in the Code of Federal Regulations at 50 CFR 17.32 and 17.22.

Issuance of an incidental take permit also must not jeopardize the existence of federally listed fish, wildlife, or plant species. However, take of listed plants is not prohibited under the Act unless such take would violate State law. As such, take of plants cannot be authorized under an incidental take permit. Plant species may be included on a permit in recognition of the conservation benefits provided them under a habitat conservation plan. All species included in the incidental take permit would receive assurances under our “No Surprises” regulations (50 CFR 17.22(b)(5) and 17.32(b)(5)). In addition to meeting other criteria, actions undertaken through implementation of the HCP must not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plant or animal species.

The Point Sur Lighthouse and Light Station are located on the Big Sur Coast in Monterey County, California at the Point Sur State Historic Park (PSSHP), located approximately 135 miles south of San Francisco and 23 miles south of the City of Monterey via California State Highway 1. This lighthouse has been in continuous operation since 1889 and is accessible by a paved service road that leads to the top of Moro Rock at Point Sur and crosses five timber bridges in need of maintenance and repair. The PSSHP consists of four parcels managed by the CDPR. Collectively, these four parcels measure approximately 72 acres. Surveys for both the larval and adult life stages of the Smith blue butterfly have been performed at PSSHP. Despite an intensive search effort, no life stages were observed; however, weather conditions may have hindered the surveys. Smith’s blue butterfly life stages have been observed within dispersal distance of PSSHP and habitat at PSSHP is present; therefore, the Smith’s blue butterfly is assumed present at the site. The proposed HCP and associated incidental take permit would authorize take of the Smith’s blue butterfly. This take would be incidental to the CDPR’s proposed replacement and repair of the five bridges, installation of permanent erosion control mats, and storm drain improvements, as well as future routine maintenance activities for the access road and its associated ditches. It would also cover revegetation activities that would occur at the bridge repair sites and other locations adjacent to the service road as well as at the dunes mitigation site located east and northeast of the base of Moro Rock. Impacts to Smith’s blue butterfly from project-related activities will be primarily limited to small work areas associated with repairs to the five bridges and maintenance improvements. Additional impacts would occur due to storm water improvements and periodic routine road and ditch maintenance. The total area of impact on Smith’s blue butterfly habitat would be approximately 10,196 square feet (0.2341 acre). The CDPR proposes to implement general and specific conservation measures designed to avoid or minimize take of Smith’s blue butterfly. To mitigate for unavoidable impacts, the CDPR proposes to restore 3.6 acres of northern foredunes at the dunes mitigation site near the base of Moro Rock. Management goals include removal and control of invasive vegetation, erosion control; restoration of the northern foredune habitat including revegetation of Smith’s blue butterfly seaflick buckwheat (Eriogonum parvifolium) habitat at a 3:1 ratio; and revegetation of other dune plants endemic to the dunes at PSSHP. Two alternatives to the proposed action are considered in the HCP. Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed project would not occur and an incidental take permit would not be issued by the Service. Two of the access bridges to the Point Sur Lighthouse would remain closed to all vehicular traffic. The conditions of the remaining bridges would continue to deteriorate, and existing erosion and storm water issues would not be corrected. Conservation measures described in the HCP would not be implemented and the restoration of the 3.6-acre dune mitigation site would not occur; therefore, the No Action Alternative is considered to have less conservation value to the covered species than the proposed project and accompanying HCP. Under the Redesigned Project Alternative, the areas of impact would be reduced at the five impact areas located along the access roads, which would likely result in reduced take of Smith’s blue butterfly; however, smaller work areas would not allow the CDPR to properly repair the five timber bridges and correct the erosion and storm water issues.

We are requesting comments on our preliminary determination that the CDPR’s proposed project will have minor or negligible effects on the Smith’s blue butterfly and that the plan qualifies as a low-effect HCP as defined by our Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook (Service 1996). We base our determinations on three criteria: (1) Implementation of the proposed project as described in the HCP would result in minor or negligible effects on federally listed, proposed, and/or candidate species and their habitats; (2) implementation of the HCP would result in minor negligible effects on other environmental values or resources; and (3) HCP impacts, considered together with those of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in cumulatively significant effects. In our analysis of these criteria, we have made a preliminary determination that the approval of the HCP and issuance of an incidental take permit qualify for categorical exclusions under the NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), as provided by the Department of Interior Manual (316 DM 2 Appendix 2 and 516 DM 8); however, based upon our review of public comments that we receive in response to this notice, this preliminary determination may be revised.

Next Steps

We will evaluate the permit application, including the plan and comments we receive, to determine whether the application meets the requirements of section 10 of the Act. We will also evaluate whether issuance of the section 10(a)(1)(B) permit would
comply with section 7 of the Act by conducting intra-Service section 7 consultation for the plan. We will use the result of this consultation, in combination with the above findings, in our final analysis to determine whether or not to issue the permit. If the requirements are met, we will issue a permit to the applicant for the incidental take of the Smith’s blue butterfly. We will make the final permit decision no sooner than 30 days after the date of this notice.

Public Review

We provide this notice under section 10(c) of the Act and the NEPA public involvement regulations (40 CFR 1500.1(b), 1500.2(d), and 1506.6). We are requesting comments on our determination that the applicant’s proposal will have a minor or negligible effect on the Smith’s blue butterfly and that the plan qualifies as a “low-effect” HCP as defined by our 1996 Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook.

Public Comments

If you wish to comment on the permit applications, plans, and associated documents, you may submit comments by any one of the methods in ADDRESSES.

Public Availability of Comments

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 view, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority

We provide this notice under section 10 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Dated: July 2, 2015.

Stephen P. Henry,
Field Supervisor, Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office, Ventura, California.

[FR Doc. 2015–16765 Filed 7–6–15; 8:45 am]
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James River National Wildlife Refuge, Prince George County, VA; Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Finding of No Significant Impact for Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of the final comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) and finding of no significant impact (FONSI) for James River National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), located in Prince George County, Virginia. The CCP will guide refuge management for the next 15 years.

ADDRESSES: You may view or obtain copies of the final CCP and FONSI by any of the following methods. You may request a hard copy or a CD-ROM.


Email: Send requests to EasternVirginiaRiversNWR@fws.gov

Please include “James River CCP” in the subject line of your email.

U.S. Mail: Andy Hofmann, Refuge Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 1030, Warsaw, VA 22572.


In-Person Viewing or Pickup: Call Andy Hofmann, Refuge Manager, at 804–333–1470, extension 112, during regular business hours. For more information on locations for viewing documents, see “Public Availability of Documents” under SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andy Hofmann, Refuge Manager, at 804–333–1470, extension 112 (phone) or EasternVirginiaRiversNWR@fws.gov (email) (please put “James River NWR” in the subject line).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we finalize the CCP process for James River NWR. We started this process through a notice in the Federal Register on January 11, 2012 (77 FR 1716). We released a draft CCP and environmental assessment (EA) to the public and requested comments in a notice in the Federal Register on October 22, 2014 (79 FR 63161).

We have selected alternative B for implementation, as it is described in the final CCP for James River NWR. We announce our decision and the availability of the FONSI for the final CCP in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1506.6(b)) requirements. We completed an analysis of impacts on the human environment in the draft CCP and EA. We made minor changes and clarifications to the final CCP, where appropriate, to address public comments we received on the draft CCP and EA. A summary of the public comments, and our responses to them, is included as Appendix F in the final CCP.

The 4,324-acre James River NWR lies in the Chesapeake Bay watershed and is located along the James River in Prince George County, Virginia, approximately 8 miles southeast of the city of Hopewell, and 30 miles southeast of Richmond. The refuge was established in 1991 under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1534) to protect nationally significant nesting and roosting habitat for the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus).

Background

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668ee) (Refuge Administration Act), as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, requires us to develop a CCP for each refuge. The purpose for developing a CCP is to provide refuge managers with a 15-year plan for achieving refuge purposes and contributing to 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 and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years in accordance with the Refuge Administration Act.

Selected Alternative

Alternative B combines the actions we believe would best achieve the refuge’s purposes, vision, and goals, and respond to public issues. The basis of our decision is detailed in the FONSI (Appendix G in the final CCP). Under alternative B, we would emphasize the