managing the Refuge for the next 15 years.

Under Alternative A (No Action), management would continue unchanged. Alternative B (the Selected Alternative) would standardize the wildlife monitoring and surveying program; develop a habitat management plan including an adaptive vegetation management plan; assess contaminants and disease; pursue climate change modeling; identify additional habitat for boundary expansion; continue planning and redesign of a breeding pond; assess the need and plan for new breeding ponds; develop habitat, mosquito, and water management plans, and a visitor services plan; improve energy efficiency; develop a trail system; expand the in-class environmental education program to other schools; and expand on-site restoration education. Alternative C includes all actions in Alternative B, and would expand natural resource surveys, expand control of additional priority invasive vegetation, identify buffer habitat for boundary expansion and acquisition, remove invasive wildlife, reintroduce native plants historically found on the Refuge, improve trail access, and improve outreach to the community. We received 10 letters on the Draft CCP and EA during the review and comment period. Comments focused on mosquito control and listed species management. We incorporated comments we received into the CCP when appropriate, and we responded to the comments in an appendix to the CCP. In the FONSI, we selected Alternative B for implementation. The FONSI documents our decision and is based on the information and analysis contained in the EA.

Under the selected alternative, the Refuge will achieve an optimal balance of biological resource objectives and visitor services opportunities. Habitat management and associated biological resource monitoring will be improved. Visitor services opportunities will focus on quality wildlife-dependent recreation with expanded environmental education opportunities. In addition, interpretation, wildlife observation, and photography programs will be improved and/or expanded.

The selected alternative best meets the Refuges’ purposes, vision, and goals; contributes to the Refuge System mission; addresses the significant issues and relevant mandates; and is consistent with principles of sound fish and wildlife management. Based on the associated environmental assessment, this alternative is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts and therefore does not require an environmental impact statement.

Dated: March 7, 2011.
Alexandra Pitts,
Acting Regional Director, Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento, California.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Land Management
[AA–6690–A2; LLAK965000–L14100000–KC0000–P]
Alaska Native Claims Selection
AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.
ACTION: Notice of decision approving lands for conveyance.

SUMMARY: As required by 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will issue an appealable decision to Pedro Bay Corporation. The decision approves the surface estate in the lands described below for conveyance pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The subsurface estate in these lands will be conveyed to Bristol Bay Native Corporation when the surface estate is conveyed to Pedro Bay Corporation. The lands are in the vicinity of Pedro Bay, Alaska, and are located in:

Seward Meridian, Alaska

T. 4 S., R. 30 W., Sec. 14, lots 2. Containing 409.69 acres.
T. 5 S., R. 30 W., Sec. 2, lots 4, 5, and 6; Sec. 21, lots 2, 3, and 4; Sec. 34, lots 2 and 3. Containing 13.41 acres. Aggregating 423.10 acres.

Notice of the decision will also be published four times in the Bristol Bay Times.

DATES: Any party claiming a property interest in the lands affected by the decision may appeal the decision within the following time limits:
1. Unknown parties, parties unable to be located after reasonable efforts have been expended to locate, parties who fail or refuse to sign their return receipt, and parties who receive a copy of the decision by regular mail which is not certified, return receipt requested, shall have until April 11, 2011 to file an appeal.
2. Parties receiving service of the decision by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal.

Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4, subpart E, shall be deemed to have waived their rights.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the decision may be obtained from: Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513–7504.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The BLM by phone at 907–271–5960, by e-mail at ak.blm.conveyance@blm.gov, or by telecommunication device (TTD) through the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Jason Robinson,
Land Law Examiner, Land Transfer Adjudication II Branch.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Land Management
[AA–6666–B; LLAK965000–L14100000–KC0000–P]
Alaska Native Claims Selection
AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.
ACTION: Notice of decision approving lands for conveyance.

SUMMARY: As required by 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will issue an appealable decision to Ah’tna, Incorporated, Successor in Interest to Gakona Corporation. The decision approves the conveyance of surface estate in the lands described below pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The subsurface estate in these lands will be conveyed to Ah’tna, Incorporated when the surface estate is conveyed to Ah’tna, Incorporated. The lands are in the vicinity of Gakona, Alaska, and are located in:

Copper River Meridian, Alaska

T. 8 N., R. 3 E., Sec. 22. Containing approximately 316 acres.

Notice of the decision will also be published four times in the Anchorage Daily News.

DATES: Any party claiming a property interest in the lands affected by the decision may appeal the decision within the following time limits:
1. Unknown parties, parties unable to be located after reasonable efforts have been expended to locate, parties who
fail or refuse to sign their return receipt, and parties who receive a copy of the decision by regular mail which is not certified, return receipt requested, shall have until April 11, 2011 to file an appeal.

2. Parties receiving service of the decision by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal.

3. Notices of appeal transmitted by electronic means, such as facsimile or e-mail, will not be accepted as timely filed.

Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4, subpart E, shall be deemed to have waived their rights.

ADDRESS: A copy of the decision may be obtained from: Bureau of Land Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513–7504.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kyle Free, Bureau of Land Management, Pocatello Field Office, 4350 Cliffs Drive, Pocatello, Idaho 83204, phone (208) 478–6368, fax (208) 478–6376.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Final EIS was prepared to provide decision-makers and the public with an evaluation of significant environmental impacts resulting from the proposed action and from all reasonable alternatives. P4 Production, LLC (P4), a subsidiary of Monsanto Company, holds mineral leases issued by the United States, granting them exclusive rights to develop phosphate minerals in the Blackfoot Bridge area. P4 submitted a Mine and Reclamation Plan (MRP) to the BLM for the development of a phosphate mine on existing Federal leases and an application to modify these leases to increase their size. Prior to mining under the proposed MRP P4 must receive BLM approval and obtain additional Federal and state permits.

The BLM has prepared a Final EIS to evaluate effects of the Blackfoot Bridge Mine upon the human environment, including the potential effects of selenium and other contaminants associated with other phosphate mines in the region. The Final EIS also considers appropriate mitigation measures. The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires the BLM to evaluate the MRP, considering the no action alternative and other reasonable alternatives, before issuing decisions on the development of the phosphate leases and modification of the existing leases.

The BLM is also required by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and 43 CFR Part 3590, to evaluate the MRP from P4 to determine if the plan will achieve the ultimate maximum recovery of phosphate ore reserves contained within Federal Phosphate Leases I–05613 and I–013709.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required to evaluate and respond to P4’s application for a permit under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which is needed to implement the MRP. The USACE is informing the public of this application through a 30-day Public Notice for Application for Permit that will run concurrently with this Notice of Availability. The Final EIS provides the analysis upon which the BLM and other involved agencies can base their decisions.

The Proposed Action consists of P4’s Plan to develop the Blackfoot Bridge Mine using open pit mining methods to extract phosphate ore. The ore would be hauled about 8 miles to P4’s existing Soda Springs elemental phosphorus plant. The mine would consist of three separate mine pits, the North, Mid, and South Pits. Mining would begin in the Mid Pit, followed by the North Pit and then the South Pit. Mining of the North Pit and portions of the Mid Pit are predicted to extend below groundwater level and would require the mine to pump water during portions of the 17-year mine life. All overburden would either be used to backfill the mine pits or be placed in the external East Overburden Pile (EOP) or Northwest Overburden Pile (NWOP). Other mine-related facilities would include an ore stockpile, a truck loading facility, an equipment yard, a water management system, topsoil stockpiles, roads, and sediment control structures.

Approximately 739 acres of surface are expected to be disturbed over the life of the project, with about 674 acres (91 percent) planned to be re-vegetated. Nine percent of the mine site would involve residual highwalls that cannot be re-vegetated. About 90 percent of the disturbance would occur on privately owned surface controlled by P4 and about 10 percent would occur on BLM managed surface lands.

As phosphate mining has developed in southeast Idaho, increasing concern for surface and groundwater contamination has led to the development of various best management practices to control potential selenium migration from the mines. Placing an impermeable or low-permeability cover over external overburden piles and pit backfilled areas is a preferred way to reduce infiltration into the materials to reduce the potential leaching of selenium into the environment.

As part of the Final EIS analysis, groundwater modeling has been used to estimate the potential effects of the proposed action on water resources in the project area. Model results indicate that the Proposed Action, as designed, has the potential to release selenium concentrations to groundwater and surface water in excess of applicable water quality standards. Alternative waste rock capping designs (Alternatives 1A and 1B) were developed to reduce the amount of water that would contact the backfilled pits and external overburden piles. This