avoidance areas for new ROWs and communication and other towers; protect Native American traditional and cultural sites and uses; retain all public lands in ACECs in Federal ownership; prioritize acquisition of private lands in ACECs over easements; minimize herbicide use; close ACECs to oil, gas and geothermal leasing; allow locatable and nonlocatable mineral development in nonhabitat areas; prohibit use of helicopters within the ACEC to manage wild horse populations.

The GRSG ACECs in Alternative F include: Bates Mountain, Cortez range, Fish Creek Mountains, Little Fish Lake Valley, Monitor, Monitor Valley, Reese River, Roberts Mountain and Telegraph Mountain, totaling approximately 1.4 million acres. The following management prescriptions would apply to these areas: Close the areas to cross country vehicle travel; limit motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes and prohibit new routes within 4 miles of leks or within PPMAs; seasonally prohibit camping and nonmotorized recreation within 4 miles of active leks; allow only Special Recreation Permits that have demonstrated beneficial or neutral effects on PPMAs; include exclusion areas for new ROWs in PPMAs; include avoidance areas for new ROWs in PPMA and Preliminary General Management Areas (PGMA); retain PPMA in the ACECs in Federal ownership; prioritize acquisition of private lands in ACECs over easements; allow for vegetative management to be consistent with composition and structure in achieving habitat objectives; allow for seasonal and timing restrictions in livestock grazing within ACECs; permanently retire grazing permits as opportunity arises; manage riparian areas and wetlands to meet proper functioning condition and maintain a component of perennial forbs with diverse species richness and productivity relative to site potential; prohibit new water developments for diversion from springs or seeps within PPMA and PGMAs; close to oil, gas, geothermal leasing within PPMA and within 4 miles of active leks; allow geophysical exploration outside PPMA using helicopter-portable drilling methods only and in accordance with seasonal timing and other restrictions; not use Categorical Exclusion to resolve Section 390 resource conflicts in PPMA and design and implement fuels treatments with emphasis on protecting existing sagebrush ecosystem.

Copies of the Nevada and Northeastern California Sub-region Greater Sage-Grouse Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS are available at the following BLM and USFS offices throughout the subregion:

**Nevada**
- BLM State Office, 1340 Financial Blvd., Reno
- BLM Winnemucca District Office, 5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd., Winnemucca
- BLM Ely District Office, 702 North Industrial Way, HC 33 Box 33500, Ely
- BLM Elko District Office, 3900 E. Idaho Street, Elko
- BLM Carson City District Office, 5665 Morgan Mill Road, Carson City
- Battle Mountain District Office, 50 Bastian Road, Battle Mountain
- Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, 1200 Franklin Way, Sparks

**California**
- BLM State Office, 2800 Cottage Way, Suite W–1623, Sacramento
- Alturas Field Office, 708 W. 12th Street, Alturas
- Eagle Lake Field Office, 2950 Riverside Drive, Susanville
- Surprise Field Office, 602 Cressler Street, Cedarville

Please note that public comments and information submitted, including names, street addresses and email 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, 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.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2.

**Amy Luders,**
BLM Nevada State Director.
[FR Doc. 2013–26261 Filed 10–31–13; 8:45 am]
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**Notice of Availability of the Idaho and Southwestern Montana Greater Sage-Grouse Draft Land Use Plan Amendments and Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance 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) and the Forest Service (USFS) have prepared a Draft Land Use Plan (LUP) Amendments and Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for managing Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) in the Idaho and Southwestern Montana sub-region, and by this notice are announcing the opening of the comment period.

**DATES:** To ensure that comments will be considered, the BLM and the USFS must receive written comments on the Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS within 90 days following the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes notice of the Draft LUP Amendments/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 related to the Idaho and Southwestern Montana Greater Sage-Grouse Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS by any of the following methods:
- **Email:** blm_id_swmt_sagegrouse_eis@blm.gov.
- **Fax:** 208–373–3805.
- **Mail:** BLM—Greater Sage-grouse EIS, 1387 S. Vinnell Way, Boise ID 83709.


**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brent Ralston, the Idaho and Southwestern Montana Sub Regional Project Lead, telephone 208–373–3812; see address above; email bralston@blm.gov. Persons who use a
telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The BLM and the Forest Service prepared the Idaho and Southwestern Montana Greater Sage-Grouse Draft LUP Amendments and Draft EIS to address a range of alternatives focused on specific conservation measures across the Idaho and Southwestern Montana range of the GRSG. This Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS is one of 15 separate planning efforts that are being undertaken as part of the BLM and Forest Service National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS proposes to amend the LUPs for field offices on BLM and National Forest lands within the Idaho and southwest Montana sub-region boundaries. The current management decisions for resources are described in the following resource management plans (RMPs)/land resource management plans (LRMPs):

- Bruneau Management Framework Plan (MFP)
- Burley FO, ID 1985 Cassia Resource Management Plan (RMP)
- Burley FO, ID 1982 Twin Falls MFP
- Challis FO, ID 1999 Challis RMP
- Dillon FO, MT 2006 Dillon RMP
- Four Rivers FO, ID 1988 Cascade RMP
- Four Rivers FO, ID 1983 Kuna RMP
- Four Rivers FO, ID 2008 Snake River
- Birds of Prey National Conservation Area (NCA) RMP
- Jarbidge FO, ID 1987 Jarbidge RMP
- Owyhee FO, ID 1999 Owyhee RMP
- Pocatello FO, ID 2012 Pocatello RMP
- Salmon FO, ID 1987 Lemhi RMP
- Shoshone FO, ID 2006 Craters of the Moon National Monument RMP
- Shoshone FO, ID 1975 Magic MFP
- Shoshone FO, ID 1981 Sun Valley MFP
- Shoshone Field Office (FO), ID 1980
- Bennett Hills/Timmerman Hills MFP
- Shoshone and Burley FOS, ID 1985
- Monument RMP
- Upper Snake FO, ID 1981 Little Lost-Birch Creek MFP
- Upper Snake FO, ID 1985 Medicine Lodge RMP
- Upper Snake FO, ID 1981 Big Desert MFP
- Upper Snake FO, ID 1983 Big Lost MFP
- Forest Service
- Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest (NF) Plan
- Boise NF, ID 2003 Boise NF Plan

Caribou-Targhee NF, ID 2002 Curlew National Grassland Management Plan
Caribou-Targhee NF, ID 2003 Caribou NF Revised Forest Plan
Caribou-Targhee NF, ID 1997 Targhee NF Plan
Salmon-Challis NF, ID 1987 Challis NF Plan
Salmon-Challis NF, ID 1988 Salmon NF Plan
Sawtooth NF, ID, UT 2003 Sawtooth NF Revised Forest Plan

The planning area includes approximately 49.1 million acres of BLM, National Park Service, USFS, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, State, local, and private lands located in Idaho and Southwestern Montana, in 34 counties: Ada, Adams, Bear Lake, Bingham, Blaine, Bonneville, Butte, Camas, Caribou, Cassia, Clark, Custer, Elmore, Fremont, Gem, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lemhi, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Oneida Owyhee, Payette, Power, Twin Falls, Washington, Montana (MT), Beaverhead Deer Lodge (MT), Gallatin (MT), Madison (MT), Silver Bow (MT), and Box Elder (UT). Within the decision area, the BLM and the Forest Service administer approximately 12.7 million acres of public lands and 17.4 million acres of National Forest System Land, providing approximately 12.7 and 1.9 million acres of GRSG habitat, respectively. Surface management decisions made as a result of this Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS will apply only to BLM and USFS-administered lands in the decision area. The decision area for most program decisions is defined as those BLM and USFS-administered lands and Federal mineral estate within two categories of habitat:

- Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH)—Areas identified as having the highest conservation value to maintaining sustainable GRSG populations; include breeding, late brood-rearing and winter concentration areas.
- Preliminary General Habitat (PGH)—Areas of seasonal or year-round habitat outside of priority habitat.

In addition, one alternative considered identifies off-highway vehicle decisions for all Idaho BLM-administered lands within the planning area. The formal public scoping process for the LUP Amendments/EIS began on December 9, 2011, with the publication of a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register (76 FR 77008), and ended on March 23, 2012. The BLM held six public scoping open houses in January and February to get public comments. The BLM used public scoping comments to help identify planning issues that directed the formulation of alternatives and framed the scope of analysis in the Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS. The scoping process was also used to introduce the public to preliminary planning criteria, which set limits on the scope of the Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS.

Major issues considered in the Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS include special status species management (GRSG specifically), wildfire, invasive species, infrastructure and human disturbance. The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS evaluates six alternatives in detail, including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and five action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, E and F). Alternatives D and E have been identified as co-Preferred Alternatives for the purposes of public comment and review. Identification of these alternatives, however, does not represent final agency direction, and the Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may reflect changes or adjustments from information received during public comment, from new information, or from changes in BLM policies or priorities. The Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may include objectives and actions described in the other analyzed alternatives as well. Alternative A would retain the current management goals, objectives, and direction specified in the current LUPs for each field office and National Forest. Alternative B includes conservation measures from the Sage-Grouse National Technical Team Report. Alternative C includes conservation measures submitted to the BLM by conservation groups. Alternative D includes the Idaho and Southwestern Montana subregional alternative formulated by the BLM and USFS. Alternative E was taken from alternatives developed by the Idaho and Utah Governor’s Offices. Alternative F includes measures submitted to the BLM by various conservation groups.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and USFS Zoological Areas are among the special designations under consideration within the range of alternatives. ACECs have been proposed in Alternatives C and F to protect GRSG habitat. There are 53 existing ACECs within the planning area containing approximately 325,000 acres of GRSG habitat. None of these ACECs have been identified as having greater Sage-Grouse as a relevant and important value. The existing ACEC designations would be carried forward in alternatives B, D and E without change. The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS includes special status species management (GRSG specifically), wildfire, invasive species, infrastructure and human disturbance.

The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS evaluates six alternatives in detail, including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and five action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, E and F). Alternatives D and E have been identified as co-Preferred Alternatives for the purposes of public comment and review. Identification of these alternatives, however, does not represent final agency direction, and the Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may reflect changes or adjustments from information received during public comment, from new information, or from changes in BLM policies or priorities. The Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may include objectives and actions described in the other analyzed alternatives as well. Alternative A would retain the current management goals, objectives, and direction specified in the current LUPs for each field office and National Forest. Alternative B includes conservation measures from the Sage-Grouse National Technical Team Report. Alternative C includes conservation measures submitted to the BLM by conservation groups. Alternative D includes the Idaho and Southwestern Montana subregional alternative formulated by the BLM and USFS. Alternative E was taken from alternatives developed by the Idaho and Utah Governor’s Offices. Alternative F includes measures submitted to the BLM by various conservation groups.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and USFS Zoological Areas are among the special designations under consideration within the range of alternatives. ACECs have been proposed in Alternatives C and F to protect GRSG habitat. There are 53 existing ACECs within the planning area containing approximately 325,000 acres of GRSG habitat. None of these ACECs have been identified as having greater Sage-Grouse as a relevant and important value. The existing ACEC designations would be carried forward in alternatives B, D and E without change. The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS includes special status species management (GRSG specifically), wildfire, invasive species, infrastructure and human disturbance.

The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS evaluates six alternatives in detail, including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and five action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, E and F). Alternatives D and E have been identified as co-Preferred Alternatives for the purposes of public comment and review. Identification of these alternatives, however, does not represent final agency direction, and the Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may reflect changes or adjustments from information received during public comment, from new information, or from changes in BLM policies or priorities. The Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may include objectives and actions described in the other analyzed alternatives as well. Alternative A would retain the current management goals, objectives, and direction specified in the current LUPs for each field office and National Forest. Alternative B includes conservation measures from the Sage-Grouse National Technical Team Report. Alternative C includes conservation measures submitted to the BLM by conservation groups. Alternative D includes the Idaho and Southwestern Montana subregional alternative formulated by the BLM and USFS. Alternative E was taken from alternatives developed by the Idaho and Utah Governor’s Offices. Alternative F includes measures submitted to the BLM by various conservation groups.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and USFS Zoological Areas are among the special designations under consideration within the range of alternatives. ACECs have been proposed in Alternatives C and F to protect GRSG habitat. There are 53 existing ACECs within the planning area containing approximately 325,000 acres of GRSG habitat. None of these ACECs have been identified as having greater Sage-Grouse as a relevant and important value. The existing ACEC designations would be carried forward in alternatives B, D and E without change. The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS includes special status species management (GRSG specifically), wildfire, invasive species, infrastructure and human disturbance.

The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS evaluates six alternatives in detail, including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and five action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, D, E and F). Alternatives D and E have been identified as co-Preferred Alternatives for the purposes of public comment and review. Identification of these alternatives, however, does not represent final agency direction, and the Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may reflect changes or adjustments from information received during public comment, from new information, or from changes in BLM policies or priorities. The Proposed LUP Amendments/Final EIS may include objectives and actions described in the other analyzed alternatives as well. Alternative A would retain the current management goals, objectives, and direction specified in the current LUPs for each field office and National Forest. Alternative B includes conservation measures from the Sage-Grouse National Technical Team Report. Alternative C includes conservation measures submitted to the BLM by conservation groups. Alternative D includes the Idaho and Southwestern Montana subregional alternative formulated by the BLM and USFS. Alternative E was taken from alternatives developed by the Idaho and Utah Governor’s Offices. Alternative F includes measures submitted to the BLM by various conservation groups.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and USFS Zoological Areas are among the special designations under consideration within the range of alternatives. ACECs have been proposed in Alternatives C and F to protect GRSG habitat. There are 53 existing ACECs within the planning area containing approximately 325,000 acres of GRSG habitat. None of these ACECs have been identified as having greater Sage-Grouse as a relevant and important value. The existing ACEC designations would be carried forward in alternatives B, D and E without change. The Draft LUP Amendments/Draft EIS includes special status species management (GRSG specifically), wildfire, invasive species, infrastructure and human disturbance.
Alternative C includes a proposal for four new ACECs encompassing approximately 4.2 million acres. Alternative F includes two proposals for new ACECs: (1) 17 new ACECs and 12 Zoological Areas encompassing 11.1 million acres; and (2) 18 new ACECs and 12 USFS Zoological Areas encompassing 2.5 million acres. These proposed ACECs/Zoological Areas would include the following resource use limitations if they were formally designated:

Closed to fluid mineral leasing; designated as a right-of-way exclusion area; closed to livestock grazing; allow vegetation treatments only for the benefit of GRSC; and recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.

Pertinent information regarding all proposed ACECs including values, resource use limitations, and acreages are available at the following Web site: http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/prog/nepa_register/sage-grouse_rmp_revision.html. There are no new ACECs proposed within either of the co-Preferred Alternatives. Please note that public comments and information submitted including names, street addresses and email 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, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, 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 comments 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, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2.

Timothy M. Murphy,
Acting BLM Idaho State Director.

Jamie E. Connell,
BLM Montana State Director.

[FR Doc. 2013–26260 Filed 10–31–13; 8:45 a.m.]
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DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of Filing of Plats of Survey; Colorado

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Filing of Plats of Survey; Colorado.

SUMMARY: On Thursday, October 6, 2011, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Colorado State Office, published a Notice of Stay of Filing of Plats, in the Federal Register (76 FR 62088) to inform the public of a stay on the proposed filing of the dependent resurvey and surveys in Township 9 South, Range 93 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado, accepted on August 5, 2010, pending consideration of the protest and/or appeal that was filed.

With the settlement agreement of September 26, 2013, the BLM Colorado State Office is publishing this notice to inform the public of the intent to officially file the survey plat and afford a proper period of time to protest this action prior to the plat filing. During this time, the plat will be available for review in the BLM Colorado State Office.

DATES: Unless there are protests of this action, the filing of the plat described in this notice will happen on December 2, 2013.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randy Bloom, Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Colorado. (303) 239–3856.

Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

Randy Bloom,
Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Colorado.

[FR Doc. 2013–26260 Filed 10–31–13; 8:45 am]
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DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

Request for Comments on the Annual Progress Report on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017

AGENCY: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), Interior.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: BOEM requests comments on the Annual Progress Report (Report) on the OCS Oil and Gas Leasing Program 2012–2017 (Five Year Program). The Annual Progress Report is available for review at: www.boem.gov/Five-Year-Program-Annual-Progress-Report/. Information on the Five Year Program is available online at http://www.boem.gov/Oil-and-Gas-Energy-Program/Leasing/Five-Year-Program/2012–2017/Five-Year-Program.aspx. The Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) published the Five Year Program in June 2012, and the program became final on August 27, 2012, after the required 60-day congressional review period. Section 18(e) of the OCS Lands Act (Act) states that “the Secretary shall review the leasing program approved under this section at least once each year. He [or she] may revise and reapprove such program, at any time, and such revision and reapproval, except in the case of a revision which is not significant, shall be in the same manner as originally developed.” Historically, the annual review has been an internal process in which BOEM reports to the Secretary any information or events that might result in consideration of a revision to the Program. However, in the decision document for the Five Year Program (available by clicking on “Proposed Final Program Decision Document” at the above web address), the Department of the Interior stated its commitment to “publish an annual progress report on the Five Year Program that includes an opportunity for stakeholders and the public to comment on the program’s implementation.” Pursuant to this commitment, the Annual Progress Report (Report) provides the public an overview of the activities that have occurred during the previous year. The Report includes the following information:

• Statistics of sales that have occurred in the previous year, including the number and location of lease blocks and the dollars collected on high bids;
• a tracking table of all relevant deferrals and mitigations;

[FR Doc. 2013–26060 Filed 10–31–13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–10–P