IV. Positive Credit Subsidy Programs

Positive credit subsidy will no longer be required for loans under any of the active mortgage insurance programs for multifamily housing or health care facilities. Beginning on October 1, 2012, commitments issued for Section 223(d) operating loss loans for health care facilities and Section 241(a) supplemental loans to FHA-financed multifamily housing will be reported under the budget risk category of their respective, primary FHA mortgages, all of which will generate negative credit subsidy in FY 2013. In addition, the Department will suspend issuance and reissuance commitments under two other programs that had previously required positive credit: Section 221(d)(3) multifamily housing loans for projects with non-profit sponsors or for Section 223(d) operating loss loans to multifamily housing projects with a primary FHA mortgage.

Dated: August 9, 2012.

Carol Galante,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 2012–20045 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5613–N–06–A]

Privacy Act of 1974; New System of Records, Office of General Counsel E-Discovery Management System—Change in Final Effective Date

AGENCY: Office of the General Counsel, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice advises that HUD’s Office of General Counsel (OGC) is moving its final effective date of a new system of records for the OGC E-Discovery Management System until after the opportunity for further comment is provided to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For inquiries pertaining to Privacy Act records, contact Donna Robinson-Staton, Chief Privacy Officer, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW, Washington, DC 20410 (Attention: Capitol View Building, 4th Floor) telephone number (202) 402–8073 (this telephone number is not toll free). A telecommunications device for hearing- and speech-impaired persons (TTY) is available by calling the Federal Relay Service’s toll-free telephone number (800) 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552a), HUD published in the Federal Register on July 17, 2012, at 77 FR 41997, a notice that announced OGC’s intent to establish a new system of records for OGC’s E-Discovery Management System (EDMS), a system expected to improve significantly the efficiency of OGC’s processing of records during the preservation, discovery and processing of litigation requests when litigation is “reasonably anticipated” and dramatically reduce the time spent on document review and production process. OGC’s EDMS is in response to e-discovery preservation and production requirements in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The July 17, 2012, notice solicited public comment on the new record system for OGC–EDMS, which was detailed in the July 17, 2012, notice, for a period of 30 days. The notice advised that EDMS would carry a final effective date of August 16, 2012, unless HUD received comments which would result in a contrary determination. HUD anticipates receiving public comments prior to August 16, 2012, but even in the absence of comment, HUD determined, upon further review of the system, to make certain clarifications and solicit public comment for another 30-day period. Accordingly, following conclusion of the comment period on August 16, 2012, HUD will consider any public comments related to the July 17, 2012, notice, and subsequently publish another notice. The second notice to be published on the new record system for OGC–EDMS will make the clarifications that HUD believes need to be made, respond to any public comments received by August 16, 2012, make any additional changes that may be recommended by commenters and with which HUD agrees, and solicit public comment for an additional period of 30 days.


Dated August 10, 2012.

Camille E. Acevedo,
Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations.

[FR Doc. 2012–20042 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service


Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Bastrop, Fort Bend, Matagorda, and Wharton Counties, TX; Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.
SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) and an environmental assessment (EA) for public review and comment. The draft CCP/EA describes our proposal for managing the Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex for the next 15 years. The Complex, which includes Brazoria, San Bernard, and Big Boggy National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs), is located approximately 50 miles south of Houston, Texas.

DATES: To ensure consideration, please send your written comments by August 15, 2012. We will announce upcoming public meetings in local news media.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments or requests for copies or more information on the Draft CCP/EA by any of the methods listed below. You may request hard copies or a CD-ROM of the documents. Please contact Jennifer Sanchez, Project Leader, or Carol Torrez, Lead Planner/R2 NWRS NEPA Coordinator.

Email: carol_torrez@fws.gov. Include “TMC NWR Complex Draft CCP and EA” in the subject line of the message.

Fax: Attn: Carol Torrez, 505–248–6803.

U.S. Mail: Carol Torrez, Lead Planner/ NWRS NEPA Coordinator, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NWRS Division of Planning, P.O. Box 1306, Albuquerque, NM 87103.

In-Person Drop-off, Viewing, or Pickup: You may drop off comments during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at 500 Gold Street SW., 4th Floor, Room 4366, Albuquerque, NM 87102.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Sanchez, Project Leader, Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex, CCP—Project, 5247 CR 316, Brazoria, TX 77422; phone: 979–964–4011; fax: 979–964–4021.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we continue the CCP process for the Texas Mid-Coast NWR Complex. We started this process through a notice in the Federal Register (74 FR 29714; June 23, 2009). The Complex is located along the upper Texas Gulf Coast, approximately 50 miles south of Houston, Texas. It is comprised of three refuges: Brazoria NWR, which was established in 1966, and encompasses 44,414 acres; San Bernard NWR, which was established in 1968, and encompasses 52,400 acres; and Big Boggy NWR, which was established in 1983, and encompasses 4,526 acres. These lands provide a vital complex of salt and freshwater marshes, sloughs, ponds, coastal prairies, and bottomland hardwood forests that provide habitat for a wide variety of resident and migratory wildlife.

Background

The CCP Process

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 national wildlife refuge. The purpose for developing a CCP is 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, and 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 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.

Public Outreach

Formal scoping began with publication of a notice of intent to prepare a comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment (EA) in the Federal Register on June 23, 2009 (74 FR 29714). The Refuge solicited comments on issues and concerns to aid in CCP development through three open house meetings held in September 2009.

An ecoregion-wide coordination meeting was held at the Complex’s Discovery Center on December 2, 2009, to gain a better understanding of the issues within the Gulf Coast Prairies and Marshes Ecoregion, where the Complex is located, and to determine the Complex’s role in addressing issues impacting fish, wildlife, and their habitats within the larger landscape. In February 2010, the Complex met with representatives from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department to discuss their concerns regarding past management, future management, and issues common to both agencies.

Additional public scoping for the Land Protection Planning process was conducted in January 2012. Three open house meetings were held to provide information on the proposed expansion and respond to questions and concerns.

The feedback received at the conclusion of the public involvement period identified numerous concerns from a variety of stakeholders. These concerns were organized by five broad issue categories and one administrative category: Ecoregion, Habitat, Wildlife, Visitor Services, and Facilities/Infrastructure Management.

CCP Alternatives We Are Considering

During the public scoping process with which we started work on this draft CCP, we, other governmental partners, Tribes, and the public, raised multiple issues. Our draft CCP addresses them. A full description of each alternative is in the EA. To address these issues, we developed and evaluated the following alternatives, summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue topic</th>
<th>Alternative A—no action</th>
<th>Alternative B—proposed action</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecoregion Management Issue 1: Climate Change.</td>
<td>Supplement natural forest regeneration with restoration efforts; monitor carbon sequestration; conduct education programs; and use “green” technologies and building products on all new construction.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus increase restoration efforts; utilize exchange of carbon credits; gather baseline data on habitat composition/wildlife diversity; update refuge displays; and increase use of “green” technologies.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B plus increase restoration efforts above described levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoregion Management Issue 2: Erosion/Saltwater Intrusion.</td>
<td>Construct/Use a variety of structural and some restoration techniques at various locations.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus increase the types and amounts of structural and restoration techniques used.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus increase the types and amounts of structural and restoration techniques used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue topic</td>
<td>Alternative A—no action</td>
<td>Alternative B—proposed action</td>
<td>Alternative C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoregion Management Issue 1: Wildland Fire Use.</td>
<td>Follow direction of current Fire Management Plan (FMP).</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoregion Management Issue 2: Petroleum Development.</td>
<td>Work cooperatively with companies to minimize impacts to refugue resources.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoregion Management Issue 3: Land Conservation.</td>
<td>The Complex will continue to acquire lands under the 1997 Austin's Woods Conservation Plan until the 28,000-acre cap is reached.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 1: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Restoration and Management.</td>
<td>Cooperative haying conducted; wetland and farmland rehabilitation. Native prairie restoration.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A, plus increase acreage of haying, and increase number of rehabilitation projects. Increase prairie restoration.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B plus develop seed bank on prairie restoration areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 2: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Management of Invasive Species (Flora).</td>
<td>Mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire use allowed; grazing not allowed.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus increase the types and amounts of management prescriptions used, including limited livestock grazing.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B but diversify the types of management prescriptions used, including bison grazing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 3: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Prescribed Fire Use.</td>
<td>Allowed Complex-wide to improve habitats and reduce hazardous fuels.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 4: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Farming Program.</td>
<td>Cooperative farming and force account farming occur on all three refuges.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 5: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Water Management.</td>
<td>Restore prairie pothole hydrology as opportunity arises; use established wells to provide freshwater to moist soil units during drought periods; and purchase water from various water authorities annually.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus drill additional wells, and develop new/rehabilitate existing water control structures.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B plus increase water availability through the development of partnerships and purchase of water rights; expand wetlands; and rehabilitate marshes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 6: Bottomland Hardwood Forest—Restoration.</td>
<td>Allow natural regeneration; where appropriate add supplemental planting of hardwood species; treat invasive species.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 7: Bottomland Hardwood Forest—Water Management.</td>
<td>Restore previously drained wetlands.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Management Issue 8: Dune and Beach Management.</td>
<td>Management of beach resources has not been clearly defined due to recent silting in of Cedar Lakes Cut and trespass across upland vegetation on private land to access the Cut.</td>
<td>Cooperatively work with County and General Land Office (GLO) to provide additional protection on San Bernard Beach restricting type of access and activities by visitors that would be compatible with Refuge Purpose.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Management Issue 1: Threatened and Endangered Species.</td>
<td>Implement the Sea Turtle Recovery Plan.</td>
<td>Same as A, plus if reintroduction of APC and whooping crane occur, implement APC and whooping crane recovery plans.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Management Issue 2: Migratory Bird Species and Species of Special Management Concern.</td>
<td>Manage a variety of habitats for resting, feeding, and reproductive purposes.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Management Issue 3: Management of Invasive Species (Fauna).</td>
<td>Hunting and trapping used to control feral hogs. Baiting and broad scale treatments to control ants.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus release natural predators to control ants.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A, but diversify the types of management prescriptions used for each invasive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Services Issue 1: Hunting ...</td>
<td>Allowed in designated areas for waterfowl, youth deer/feral hog hunt on San Bernard NWR, and a youth feral hog hunt. One permit area and ATV use allowed in designated area for disabled hunters.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A plus provide a youth waterfowl hunt; revise the hunting schedule at two locations.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative B plus provide a population reduction deer hunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Services Issue 2: Fishing ...</td>
<td>Allowed on all navigable waters and from designated locations.</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A</td>
<td>Same as Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Availability of Documents

In addition to any methods in ADDRESSES, you can view or obtain documents at the following locations:

- **Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex Headquarters Office**, CR 316, Brazoria, TX, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.
- **At the following public libraries:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazoria County Library City of Lake Jackson Branch</td>
<td>250 Circle Way, Lake Jackson, TX 77566</td>
<td>979–297–1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazoria County Library West Columbia Branch</td>
<td>518 East Brazos, West Columbia, TX 77486</td>
<td>979–345–3394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City Public Library</td>
<td>1100 7th Street, Bay City, Texas 77414</td>
<td>979–245–6931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Submitting Comments/Issues for Comment

We consider comments substantive if they:

- **Question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental assessment (EA);**
- **Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EA;**
  and/or
- **Provide new or additional information relevant to the assessment.**

## Next Steps

After this comment period ends, we will analyze the comments and address them in the form of a final CCP and finding of no significant impact.
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 review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: July 26, 2012.

Joy E. Nicholopoulos,
Regional Director, Southwest Region.

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Wild Horse Eco-Sanctuary in Elko County, Nevada, and an Associated Resource Management Plan Amendment for the Wells Field Office

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Wells Field Office, Elko, Nevada, intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and an associated Resource Management Plan (RMP) amendment for a proposed privately operated wild horse eco-sanctuary afford the last public meeting, whichever is later. The BLM will provide additional opportunities for public participation as appropriate.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

1. You may submit comments on issues and planning criteria related to the EIS and RMP amendment by any of the following methods:
   - Email: EcoSanctuaryComments@blm.gov
   - Fax: 775-753-0255
   - Mail: Bureau of Land Management, Wild Horse Sanctuary RMP Amendment, Wells Field Office, 3900 E. Idaho Street, Elko, NV 89801

2. Preliminary planning criteria for the EIS will include:
   - (a) The Spruce Allotment east of Highway 93 will comply with Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) (43 U.S.C. 1701) and the BLM's land use planning regulations (36 CFR 1900).
   - (b) The proposed eco-sanctuary will substantially meet the objectives of existing wild horse herd management areas (HMAs) within or near the proposed eco-sanctuary and be designed to accommodate any significant wild horse population within the eco-sanctuary.
   - (c) The BLM will comply with FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1701) and the BLM's land use planning regulations (36 CFR 1900).
   - (d) The proposed eco-sanctuary will substantially manage wild horse populations within the eco-sanctuary.
   - (e) The proposed eco-sanctuary will substantially manage wild horse populations within the eco-sanctuary.

3. The EIS will comply with NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4632 et seq.) and its implementing regulations, as well as other Federal regulations.

4. Any amendment to the Wells RMP will comply with FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1701) and the BLM's land use planning regulations (36 CFR 1900).

5. Public participation will be encouraged throughout the process. The Wells Field Office managers and interdisciplinary team members will work cooperatively with the State of Nevada, tribal governments, county and municipal governments, other Federal agencies, local resource advisory councils, appellants, affected permittees, and any other interested groups, agencies, and individuals.

6. The EIS will comply with NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4632 et seq.) and its implementing regulations, as well as other Federal regulations.

7. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will be consulted under the National Historic Preservation Act (February 2012) and the State of Nevada Protocol Agreement between the BLM