

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**Bureau of Land Management**

[LLNVB00000 L51010000.ER0000
LVRWF0900380 241A; 10-08807;
MO#4500014355; TAS: 14X5017]

**Notice of Availability of Draft
Environmental Impact Statement for
the Tonopah Solar Energy Crescent
Dunes Solar Energy Project, Nye
County, NV**

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management,
Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project, Nye County, Nevada, and by this Notice is announcing the opening of the comment period.

DATES: To ensure comments will be considered, the BLM must receive written comments on the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project Draft EIS within 45 days following the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. The BLM will announce future meetings or hearings and any other public involvement activities at least 15 days in advance through public notices, media news releases, and/or mailings.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project Draft EIS by any of the following methods:

- *E-mail:* crescent_dunes@blm.gov.
- *Fax:* 775-482-7810.
- *Mail:* Timothy Coward, Renewable Energy Project Manager, BLM Tonopah Field Office, P.O. Box 911, Tonopah, Nevada 89049.

Copies of the Draft EIS for the Crescent Dunes Solar Energy Project are available at the BLM Tonopah Field Office and at the Battle Mountain District Office, 50 Bastian Road, Battle Mountain, Nevada, or at the following Web site: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/battle_mountain_field.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Timothy Coward, (775) 482-7800, BLM Tonopah Field Office, 1553 South Main Street, P.O. Box 911, Tonopah, Nevada 89049; Timothy_Coward@blm.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Tonopah Solar Energy, LLC applied to the BLM for a 7,680-acre right-of-way (ROW) on public lands to construct a concentrated solar thermal power plant facility approximately 13 miles northwest of

Tonopah, Nye County, Nevada. The proposed project is not expected to use the total acres applied for in the ROW application. The project is located within the southern portion of the Big Smoky Valley, north of U.S. Highway 95/6 along the Gabbs Pole Line Road (State Highway 89). The facility is expected to operate for approximately 30 years. The proposed solar power project would use concentrated solar power technology, using heliostats or mirrors to focus sunlight on a receiver erected in the center of the solar field (the power tower or central receiver). A heat transfer fluid is heated as it passes through the receiver and is then circulated through a series of heat exchangers to generate high-pressure steam. The steam is used to power a conventional Rankine cycle steam turbine, which produces electricity. The exhaust steam from the turbine is condensed and returned via feedwater pumps to the heat exchangers where steam is regenerated. Hybrid cooling processes would be used for this project to minimize water use while continuing to maintain efficient power generation. The plant design would generate a nominal capacity of 100 megawatts.

The project's proposed facility design includes the heliostat fields, a 653-foot central receiver tower, a power block, buildings, a parking area, a laydown area, evaporating ponds, and an access road. A single overhead 230-kilovolt transmission line would connect the plant to the nearby Anaconda Moly substation.

The Draft EIS describes and analyzes the proposed project's site-specific impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, water resources, geological resources, hazardous materials handling, land use, noise, paleontological resources, public health, socioeconomic, soils, traffic and transportation, visual resources, wilderness characteristics, waste management, worker safety, and fire protection. The Draft EIS also describes facility design engineering, efficiency, reliability, transmission system engineering, and transmission line safety.

Three action alternatives were analyzed in addition to the No Action alternative: the Proposed Action Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. Alternative 2 is the BLM preferred alternative.

Scoping of the project occurred from November 24, 2009 through December 24, 2009. A total of 24 comments were received. Comments on cumulative impacts identified the affects to air quality to include criteria pollutant and "Dark Sky" attributes on the effects of

the viewshed, and the availability of water for current and future use. Other comments were that the proposed project is located in an area of pediment adjacent to 2 highly mineralized mountain ranges which have identified molybdenum and lithium deposits.

Maps of the proposed project area and the alternatives being analyzed in the Draft EIS are available at the BLM Tonopah Field Office, the Battle Mountain District Office, and at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/battle_mountain_field.html.

Please note that public comments and information submitted, including names, street addresses, and e-mail addresses of persons who submit comments, will be available for public review and disclosure at the above address during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail 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.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6 and 1506.10.

Thomas J. Seley,
Manager, Tonopah Field Office.

[FR Doc. 2010-21958 Filed 9-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**Bureau of Land Management**

[LLIDT01000.L16100000.DP0000.
LXSS081D0000]

**Notice of Availability of the Draft
Jarbidge Field Office Resource
Management Plan and Environmental
Impact Statement, Idaho**

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management,
Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Jarbidge Field Office planning area and by this

notice is announcing the opening of the comment period.

DATES: To ensure that comments will be considered, the BLM must receive written comments on the Draft RMP/Draft EIS within 90 days following the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its notice of the availability of the Draft RMP/Draft EIS in the **Federal Register**. The BLM will announce future meetings or hearings and any other public participation activities at least 15 days in advance through public notices, media releases, and/or mailings.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any of the following methods:

- *E-mail:* ID Jarbidge RMP@blm.gov.
- *Fax:* (208) 736-2375, Attention: Jarbidge Planning Team.

• *Mail:* Jarbidge Planning Team, BLM Jarbidge Field Office, 2536 Kimberly Road, Twin Falls, Idaho 83301.

Copies of the Jarbidge Draft RMP/Draft EIS are available in the Jarbidge Field Office at the above address or at the following Web site: http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/planning/jarbidge_resource.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Richard Vander Voet, Jarbidge Field Manager, or Aimee Betts, Jarbidge RMP Project Manager, telephone (208) 736-2350; address Jarbidge Field Office, 2536 Kimberly Road, Twin Falls, Idaho 83301.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft RMP/Draft EIS addresses public land and resources managed by the Jarbidge Field Office in parts of Elmore, Owyhee, and Twin Falls Counties in south-central Idaho and Elko County in northern Nevada. These lands and resources are currently managed under the 1987 Jarbidge RMP, as amended. The planning area extends from the Bruneau River on the west to Salmon Falls Creek on the east, and from the Snake River on the north to the northern boundaries of the BLM Elko Field Office and the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest on the south. Although these counties have a combined population of approximately 160,000, Indian Cove, Murphy Hot Springs, Three Creek, and Roseworth are the only communities in the planning area. All have populations of less than 100 people. The majority of the planning area supports sagebrush steppe and seeded grasslands.

The Jarbidge RMP addresses management on approximately 1.4 million acres of public land and 1.6 million acres of Federal mineral estate in the Jarbidge Field Office. Planning decisions in the RMP will only apply to the BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate in the planning area. The

Draft RMP/Draft EIS has been developed with broad public participation through a collaborative planning process in accordance with FLPMA and NEPA. Its purpose is to provide appropriate management direction for the Twin Falls District, Jarbidge Field Office that responds to the 2001 Land Use Plan Evaluation Report for the 1987 Jarbidge RMP, new information, changes in resource condition and user demands, and complies with a Stipulated Settlement Agreement

(*Western Watersheds Project v. K Lynn Bennett*, CV-04-181-S-BLW, under the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the District of Idaho), while maintaining consistency with FLPMA.

The Draft RMP/Draft EIS includes a series of management actions, within six management alternatives, designed to achieve or maintain desired future conditions that have been defined through the planning process for various concerns including, but not limited to: vegetation, livestock grazing, recreation, energy development, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

- The No Action Alternative represents continuation of existing management under current management goals, objectives, and direction specified in the 1987 Jarbidge RMP, as amended.
- Alternative I focuses on enhancing and sustaining existing and historic uses of the planning area.
- Alternative II focuses on increasing commercial uses throughout the planning area.
- Alternative III focuses on restoring the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function through intensive management of fuels and enhanced fire suppression capabilities throughout the planning area.
- Alternative IV focuses on actively restoring the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function through restoration projects and managing uses. Alternative IV has two sub-alternatives (Alternative IV-A and Alternative IV-B) that differ in the size of two proposed ACECs. Alternative IV-B is the Preferred Alternative.
- Alternative V focuses on the restoration of habitats toward historic vegetation communities.

The Preferred Alternative has been identified as described in 40 CFR 1502.14(e). However, identification of this alternative does not represent final agency direction, and the Proposed RMP may reflect changes or adjustments based on information received during public comment, new information, or changes in BLM policies or priorities. The Proposed RMP may include objectives and actions described as portions of other analyzed alternatives.

For this reason, the BLM invites and encourages comments on all objectives and actions described in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS.

Among the special designations under consideration within the range of alternatives, ACECs are proposed to protect certain resource values. There are three existing ACECs: Bruneau-Jarbidge, Salmon Falls Creek, and Sand Point; these ACEC designations would be carried forward in some alternatives, sometimes with changes in acreage.

Pertinent information regarding all proposed ACECs in the Preferred Alternative, including values, resource use limitations, and acreages are summarized below. Further information is available at the following Web site:

http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/planning/jarbidge_resource.html.

Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC (123,000 acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Botanical, Cultural, Fish, Scenic, Wildlife.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Livestock Grazing, Land Use Authorizations, Mineral Development.
- Other Restrictions: Managed as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class I.

Inside Desert ACEC (41,000 acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Botanical.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Livestock Grazing, Recreation, Land Tenure Transactions, Mineral Development.
- Other Restrictions: Locate staging areas for fire suppression and rehabilitation activities outside the ACEC.

Jarbidge Foothills ACEC (66,000 acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Botanical, Cultural, Fish, Wildlife.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Livestock Grazing, Mineral Development.
- Other Restrictions: Managed as VRM Class I and II.

Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC (1,000 acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Aquatic, Botanical.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Land Tenure Transactions, Mineral Development.

Sand Point ACEC (950 acres)

- Relevant and Important Values: Cultural, Geologic, Historic, Paleontological.
- Limitations on the Following Uses: Livestock Grazing, Land Use Authorizations, Mineral Development.

- Other Restrictions: Closed to fossil collection.

The following ACECs were proposed in alternatives other than the Preferred Alternative:

- Middle Snake ACEC for relevant and important botanical and fish values.
- Sagebrush Sea ACEC for relevant and important botanical, cultural, fish, and wildlife values.
- Salmon Falls ACEC for relevant and important botanical, fish, and scenic values

In addition, ACECs in the preferred alternative may also appear in other alternatives with different acreages and management prescriptions.

Please note that public comments and information submitted including names, street addresses, and e-mail addresses of persons who submit comments will be available for public review and disclosure at the above address during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail 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.

Following the public comment period, public comments will be used to prepare the Proposed Jarbidge RMP and Final EIS. The BLM will respond to each substantive comment by making appropriate revisions to the document or by explaining why a comment did not warrant a change. A Notice of the Availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be posted in the **Federal Register**.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6 and 1506.10; 43 CFR 1610.2.

Peter J. Ditton,

Acting Idaho State Director, Bureau of Land Management.

[FR Doc. 2010-21956 Filed 9-2-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service Concession Contracts; Implementation of Alternative Valuation Formula for Leasehold Surrender Interest Under the Signal Mountain Lodge and Leek's Marina Proposed Concession Contract, Grand Teton National Park

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Park Service (NPS), by notice in the **Federal Register** dated February 1, 2010, invited public comments on a proposed alternative formula for the valuation of leasehold surrender interest (LSI) to be included in its proposed concession contract GRTE003-11 for operation of the Signal Mountain Lodge and Leeks Marina at Grand Teton National Park (new contract). LSI, established in 1998 by the terms of Public Law 105-391 (1998 Act), is the compensable interest in applicable real property improvements on park area lands made by a concessioner pursuant to the terms of a NPS concession contract. Additional public comment was sought by a May 26, 2010, **Federal Register** notice. NPS, after consideration of the public comments received in response to both notices, has adopted a final LSI alternative for the new contract.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jo Pendry, Chief Commercial Services Program, 1201 Eye Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under Section 405(a)(3) of the 1998 Act, the standard formula for LSI value (standard LSI formula) for applicable capital improvements provided by a concessioner under a NPS concession contract is summarized as the initial construction cost of the related capital improvement, adjusted by the percentage increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) from the date of the approval of the substantial completion of the construction of the related capital improvement to the date of payment, less physical depreciation of the related capital improvement.

However, Section 405(a)(4) of the 1998 Act, starting in 2009, authorizes the inclusion of alternative LSI value formulas in NPS concession contracts estimated to have an LSI value in excess of \$10,000,000 (such as the new contract).

Under this authority, NPS, in the February 1, 2010, **Federal Register** notice, proposed an alternative LSI formula that in general called for the straight-line depreciation of LSI value on a 40-year basis. However, the alternative also provided that the installation (or replacement) of fixtures would not result in increased LSI value. Two public comments were received in response to this notice.

By notice in the **Federal Register** dated May 26, 2010, NPS sought additional public comment on the proposal. Two comments were received in response to this notice.

NPS, in consideration of the public comments made in response to both public notices, has re-examined the financial and other circumstances of the new contract and the proposed LSI alternative. This re-examination led to consideration and adoption of a final LSI alternative. The final LSI alternative continues the 40-year depreciation of the LSI value of eligible capital improvements but eliminates the exclusion of additional LSI value for new fixtures called for by the proposed LSI alternative. This change addresses a primary concern expressed by commenters, the elimination of LSI value in new fixtures. Under the final LSI alternative, the LSI value of all eligible capital improvements, including new fixtures, will be depreciated on a straight-line basis over a 40-year period. In addition, the monthly depreciation schedule called for by the proposed LSI alternative has been changed to an annual basis in the interest of simplicity. The final LSI alternative for the new contract is generally described as follows:

(a) The reduction of the initial LSI value under the new contract on an annual straight-line depreciation basis applying a 40-year recovery period regardless of asset class.

(b) The reduction of the leasehold surrender interest value in capital improvements (as defined in the new contract) constructed or installed during the term of the new contract based on straight line depreciation and also applying a 40-year recovery period (on an annual basis) with no asset class distinctions.

Determinations

NPS has determined, after review of the particular financial and other circumstances of the new contract and consideration of public comments, that use of the final LSI alternative, in comparison to the standard LSI formula, is necessary in order to provide a fair return to the Government and to foster competition for the new contract by providing a reasonable opportunity for profit to the new concessioner. NPS also considers that the final LSI alternative is consistent with the objectives of the 1998 Act, particularly, as discussed below, with respect to the fair return it will provide to the Government and the new concessioner and the enhanced competition for the new contract that it will foster. These determinations are required by the 1998 Act with respect to alternative LSI formulas that are not based on the depreciation rules of the Federal income tax laws and regulations that were in effect in 1998. Although this final LSI alternative is based on the