DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

U.S. Customs and Border Protection [1651–0103]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Passenger List/Crew List (CBP Form I–418)


ACTION: 60-day notice and request for comments; extension of an existing collection of information.

SUMMARY: U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) of the Department of Homeland Security will be submitting the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act: Passenger List/Crew List (Form I–418). CBP is proposing that this information collection be extended with no change to the burden hours or to the information collected. This document is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies.

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before July 25, 2016 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Attn: Tracey Denning, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade, 90 K Street NE., 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20229–1177.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information should be directed to Tracey Denning, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Regulations and Rulings, Office of Trade, 90 K Street NE., 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20229–1177, at 202–325–0265.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CBP invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13). The comments should address: (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimates of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden including the use of automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology; and (e) the annual cost burden to respondents or record keepers from the collection of information (total capital/startup costs and operations and maintenance costs). The comments that are submitted will be summarized and included in the CBP request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. In this document, CBP is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

Title: Passenger List/Crew List. OMB Number: 1651–0103.

Form Number: Form I–418.

Abstract: CBP Form I–418 is prescribed by CBP, for use by masters, owners, or agents of vessels in complying with Sections 231 and 251 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). This form is filled out upon arrival of any person by commercial vessel at any port within the United States from any place outside the United States. The master or commanding officer of the vessel is responsible for providing CBP officers at the port of arrival with lists or manifests of the persons on board such conveyances. CBP is currently working to allow for electronic submission of the information on CBP Form I–418. This form is provided for in 8 CFR 251.1 and 251.3. A copy of CBP Form I–418 can be found at https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/publications/forms?title=I-418&=Apply.

Current Actions: CBP proposes to extend the expiration date of this information collection with no change to the burden hours or to the information collected.

Type of Review: Extension (without change).

Affected Public: Businesses.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 85,000.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 25 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 35,360.

Dated: May 23, 2016.

Tracey Denning, Agency Clearance Officer, U.S. Customs and Border Protection.


DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service [FWS–R3–ES–2016–N085; FVESS942030000F2 14X FF03E0000]

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Enhancement of Survival Permit; Draft Mitchell’s Satyr Safe Harbor Agreement

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Receipt of application; request for comment.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), have received an application from the East Lansing Field Office Project Leader for an Enhancement of Survival Permit (permit) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA). The application includes a draft Safe Harbor Agreement to facilitate reintroduction and recovery of the Federally endangered Mitchell’s satyr butterfly on non-Federal land in Michigan and Indiana. We have made a preliminary determination that the Safe Harbor Agreement and permit application are eligible for a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The basis for this determination is contained in a low-effect screening form, which is available for public review. We are accepting comments on the permit application and draft Safe Harbor Agreement.

DATES: To ensure consideration, please send your written comments on or before June 27, 2016.


Submitting Comments: Send written comments via U.S. mail to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Ecological Services, 5600 American Blvd, West, Suite 990, Bloomington, MN 55437–1458; by facsimile to 612–713–
To enroll in the Safe Harbor Agreement, an eligible landowner would voluntarily work with the Project Leader at the East Lansing Field Office to develop a Mitchell’s satyr butterfly reintroduction plan for their property. Each reintroduction plan would identify a conservation zone, consisting mainly of suitable fen habitat for the Mitchell’s satyr butterfly, and where habitat management activities would occur. Each reintroduction plan would have a term of 10 to 20 years within the duration of the proposed Safe Harbor Agreement, which is 30 years.

**Species Information**

The Mitchell’s satyr butterfly population has been in serious decline for years. The species was once found in 30 locations across Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio, with several disjunct populations in New Jersey and possibly Maryland. Currently, Mitchell’s satyr butterflies occur at 10 sites in Michigan and 1 site in Indiana. Since the species was listed in 1991, additional populations have been discovered in Virginia, Alabama, and Mississippi; however, genetic studies are inconclusive on the taxonomic relationships of these southern populations to the Michigan and Indiana populations (Hamm 2012). The Service’s Recovery Plan for the Mitchell’s satyr butterfly calls for the establishment of 25 geographically distinct viable populations, including specific actions to facilitate propagation and reintroduction activities across its historic range.

**Next Steps**

We will evaluate the permit application, associated documents, and comments we receive to determine whether the permit application meets the requirements of the ESA, NEPA, and their implementing regulations. If we determine that all requirements are met, we will sign the proposed Safe Harbor Agreement and issue a permit under section 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA to the East Lansing Field Office Project Leader. We will make our final decision on the permit application until the end of the public comment period, and we will fully consider all comments we receive during the comment period.

**Public Availability of Comments**

Written comments we receive become part of the public record associated with this action. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that the entire comment, including your personal identifying information, may be made 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(c) of the ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 17.22 and 17.32), and NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) and its implementing regulations (40 CFR 1506.6; 43 CFR part 46).

Dated: May 6, 2016.

**ADDRESSES**

For further information contact: Barbara Hosler, East Lansing Field Office (see ADDRESSES); by telephone (517–351–6326) or barbara_hosler@fws.gov. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), please call the Federal Information Relay Service at 800–877–8339.

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:**

**Background Information**

Under a Safe Harbor Agreement, participating landowners voluntarily undertake conservation activities on their property to benefit species listed under the ESA (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). The Safe Harbor Agreement and associated permit authorize participating landowners to incidentally take Federally listed species that may result from implementation of conservation activities beneficial to the species. The Safe Harbor Agreement also provides participating landowners assurances that no further land, water, or resource-use restrictions, or additional commitments of land, water, or finances, would be imposed beyond those agreed to in the Safe Harbor Agreement, including the option to return their land to the baseline condition established at the time of the Safe Harbor Agreement. Application requirements and issuance criteria for enhancement of survival permits through Safe Harbor Agreements are found in Service regulations at 50 CFR 17.22 and 17.32.

**Mitchell’s Satyr Butterfly Draft Safe Harbor Agreement**

We have developed the Draft Safe Harbor Agreement to incentivize certain non-Federal landowners in Michigan and Indiana to volunteer their land for conservation activities beneficial to the Mitchell’s satyr butterfly. Under the proposed Safe Harbor Agreement, we would issue a permit to the East Lansing Field Office Project Leader, who would then convey the permits incidental take authorization and assurances to willing landowners through Certificates of Inclusion, for the purpose of facilitating recovery of the Mitchell’s satyr butterfly. Consistent with the Safe Harbor Policy (June 17, 1999, 64 FR 32717) and section 7 of the ESA, we would also provide neighboring landowners with incidental take authorization through the section 7 biological opinion, and assurances to those neighboring landowners who participate under the Safe Harbor Agreement.