

species. We also take into account the efforts being made by other entities. States or other entities often formalize conservation efforts in conservation agreements, conservation plans, management plans, or similar documents. The conservation efforts recommended or called for in such documents could prevent some species from becoming so imperiled that they meet the definition of a threatened or endangered species under the ESA.

The Policy for Evaluation of Conservation Efforts When Making Listing Decisions (PECE) (68 FR 15100, March 28, 2003) encourages the development of conservation agreements/plans and provides certainty about the standard that an individual conservation effort must meet in order for us to consider whether it contributes to forming a basis for making a decision about the listing of a species. PECE applies to “formalized conservation efforts” that have not been implemented or have been implemented but have not yet demonstrated if they are effective at the time of a listing decision.

Under PECE, formalized conservation efforts are defined as conservation efforts (specific actions, activities, or programs designed to eliminate or reduce threats or otherwise improve the status of a species) identified in a conservation agreement, conservation plan, management plan, or similar document. To assist us in evaluating a formalized conservation effort under PECE, we collect information such as conservation plans, monitoring results, and progress reports. The development of such agreements/plans is voluntary. There is no requirement that the individual conservation efforts included in such documents be designed to meet the standard in PECE. The PECE policy is posted on our Candidate Conservation Web site at <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/PECE-final.pdf>.

Comments Received and Our Responses

Comments: On June 19, 2015, we published in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 35391) a notice of our intent to request that OMB renew authority for this information collection. In that notice, we solicited public comments for 60 days, ending August 18, 2015. We did not receive any comments.

Request for Public Comments

We again invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;

- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. 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 OMB in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that it will be done.

Dated: August 24, 2015.

Tina A. Campbell,

Chief, Division of Policy, Performance, and Management Programs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2015–21253 Filed 8–26–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

**[FWS–R6–R–2015–N128;
FXRS1265066CCP0–156–FF06R06000]**

Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge, Adams County, CO; Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; final environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability of a final environmental impact statement (EIS) for the comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) for the Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge (refuge) in Adams County, Colorado. In the final environmental impact Statement we describe alternatives, including our preferred alternative, to manage the refuge for the 15 years following approval of the final CCP.

ADDRESSES: You may request copies or more information by one of the following methods. You may request hard copies or a CD-ROM of the documents.

Email: rockymountainarsenal@fws.gov. Include “Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge final EIS” in the subject line of the message.

U.S. Mail: Bernardo Garza, Planning Team Leader, Branch of Refuge Planning, P.O. Box 25486, Denver Federal Center, Denver, CO 80225–0486.

Fax: Attn: Bernardo Garza, Planning Team Leader, 303–236–4792.

To view comments on the final CCP–EIS from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), or for information on EPA’s role in the EIS process, see EPA’s Role in the EIS Process under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bernardo Garza, Planning Team Leader, 303–236–4377 (phone) or bernardo_garza@fws.gov (email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we announce the availability of the final EIS for the refuge. We started this process through a notice in the **Federal Register** (78 FR 48183; August 7, 2013). Following a lengthy scoping and alternatives development period, we published a second notice in the **Federal Register** (80 FR 26084; May 6, 2015) announcing the availability of the draft CCP and draft EIS and our intention to hold public meetings, and requested comments. In addition, EPA published a notice announcing the draft CCP and EIS (80 FR 27950; May 15, 2015), as required under section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*). We now announce the final EIS. Under the Clean Air Act, EPA also will announce the final EIS via the **Federal Register**. This notice complies with our CCP policy to advise other Federal and State agencies, Tribes, and the public of the availability of the final EIS for this refuge.

EPA’s Role in the EIS Process

The EPA is charged under section 309 of the Clean Air Act to review all Federal agencies’ EISs and to comment on the adequacy and the acceptability of the environmental impacts of proposed actions in the EISs.

EPA also serves as the repository (EIS database) for EISs prepared by Federal agencies and provides notice of their availability in the **Federal Register**. The EIS database provides information about EISs prepared by Federal agencies, as well as EPA’s comments concerning the EISs. All EISs are filed with EPA, which publishes a notice of availability on Fridays in the **Federal Register**.

The notice of availability is the start of the 45-day public comment period for draft EISs, and the start of the 30-day “wait period” for final EISs, during which agencies are generally required to wait 30 days before making a decision on a proposed action. For more

information, see <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/eisdata.html>. You may search for EPA comments on EISs, along with EISs themselves, at <https://cdxnodengn.epa.gov/cdx-enepa-public/action/eis/search>.

About the Refuge

In 1992 Congress passed the act that established the refuge to (1) conserve and enhance populations of fish, wildlife, and plants within the refuge, including populations of waterfowl, raptors, passerines, and marsh and water birds; (2) conserve species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act and species that are candidates for such listing; (3) provide maximum fish and wildlife-oriented public uses at levels compatible with the conservation and enhancement of wildlife and wildlife habitat; (4) provide opportunities for compatible scientific research; (5) provide opportunities for compatible environmental and land use education; (6) conserve and enhance the land and water of the refuge in a manner that will conserve and enhance the natural diversity of fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats; (7) protect and enhance the quality of aquatic habitat within the refuge; and (8) fulfill international treaty obligations of the United States with respect to fish and wildlife and their habitats. The refuge is surrounded by the cities of Commerce City and Denver, along the Colorado Front Range. It encompasses nearly 16,000 acres and is home to more than 468 plant species and 350 wildlife species, including bison, deer, a wide variety of resident and migratory birds and raptors, amphibians, reptiles, fishes, and insects. The refuge's habitats include short and mixed grass prairie, interspersed with native shrubs, riparian corridors, lacustrine habitats on the refuge reservoirs, and woodlands planted by settlers around historic homesteads.

Background

The CCP Process

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668ee) (Administration Act) 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 (NWRS), consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management, conservation, legal

mandates, and our 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, where appropriate, opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years as necessary in accordance with the Administration Act.

Public Outreach

We started the public outreach process in June 2013. At that time and throughout the process, we requested public comments and considered them in numerous ways. Public outreach has included holding eight public meetings, mailing planning updates, maintaining a project Web site, and publishing press releases. We have considered and evaluated all the comments we have received throughout this process.

CCP Alternatives We Considered

During the public scoping process with which we started work on the draft CCP and draft EIS, we, our Federal and State partners, and the public identified several issues. Our final EIS addresses both the scoping comments and the comments we received on the draft CCP and draft EIS. A full description of each alternative is in the final EIS. Alternative C, Urban Refuge, was selected as the preferred alternative. To address these issues, we developed and evaluated the following alternatives, summarized below.

Alternative A: No Action

Alternative A is the no-action alternative, which represents the current management of the refuge. This alternative provides the baseline against which to compare the other alternatives. Under this alternative, management activity conducted by the Service would remain the same. The Service would not develop any new management, restoration, or education programs at the refuge. Current habitat and wildlife practices would not be expanded or changed. Funding and staff levels would remain the same, with little change in overall trends. Programs would follow the same direction, emphasis, and intensity as they do now. We would continue implementing the habitat restoration and management objectives set in the refuge's habitat management plan and other approved plans to provide for a wide variety of resident and migratory species.

Alternative B: Traditional Refuge

This alternative focuses on providing traditional refuge visitor uses and conveying the importance of conservation, wildlife protection, and the purposes of the Refuge System. Access to the refuge would remain more limited than in alternatives C and D. Wildlife-dependent recreation and community outreach would be minimally expanded. We would continue to manage the refuge's habitat and wildlife as in Alternative A, and would reintroduce to the refuge black-footed ferrets, and self-sustaining populations of greater prairie-chicken and sharp-tailed grouse. We would maintain the same levels of access and transportation as under Alternative A, but would enhance the main refuge entrance, improve visitor services facilities, and seek to improve trail accessibility.

Alternative C: Urban Refuge (Preferred Alternative)

The emphasis of this alternative is to increase the visibility of the refuge within the Denver metropolitan area and to welcome many more nontraditional visitors to the refuge. Through an expanded visitor services program, an abundance of instructional programming, and widespread outreach, we would endeavor to connect more people with nature and wildlife. In this alternative, the refuge would be made more accessible to outlying communities with the opening of additional access points and the development of enhanced transportation system. We would work with nontraditional users' trusted avenues of communication to increase outreach success. We would expand our conservation education in surrounding communities and schools, develop youth-specific outreach, and employ social marketing to broaden our agency's reach. We would manage the refuge's habitat and wildlife as in Alternative B, but the reintroduction of greater prairie-chicken and sharp-tailed grouse would be attempted regardless of whether these species' populations are likely to become self-sustaining.

Alternative D: Gateway Refuge

The emphasis of this alternative is to work with partners to increase the visibility of the refuge, the Refuge System, and other public lands in the area. There will be less visitor services programming at the refuge and efforts to engage with the public will be extended to off-site locations. We would work with Denver International Airport to improve physical connections between

the refuge and the airport. The trail system within the refuge would be more extensive than under Alternative C. Working with our partners, we would manage access to the perimeter trail and promote trail linkages to the Rocky Mountain Greenway Trail and other regional trails. We would manage the refuge's habitat and wildlife as in Alternative B and we would work with neighboring landowners and state agencies to extend the range of native species.

Comments

We solicited comments on the draft CCP and draft EIS from May 6, 2015,

through July 6, 2015. During the comment period, we thoroughly evaluated and considered all the comments we received verbally or via letters, email, and electronic forms from the public. Our responses to comments are included in the final EIS.

Changes to the Final EIS

We made the following changes in the final EIS from the draft CCP and draft EIS:

- Several comments pointed out the need to increase the number of law enforcement officers in the refuge to better cope with the increased visitation and new access to the refuge. Thus the

Final EIS reflects our desire to seek more than one full-time law enforcement officer for the refuge under Alternatives C and D.

- As necessary, we updated maps, corrected errors, and provided additional clarification throughout the final EIS.

Public Availability of Documents

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

- Our Web site: <http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/planning/ccp/co/rkm/rkm.html>.
- Public libraries:

Library	Address	Phone number
Aurora Central Public Library	14949 E Alameda Parkway, Aurora, CO 80012	(303) 739-6600.
Commerce City Public Library	7185 Monaco Street, Commerce City, CO 80022	(303) 287-0063.
Denver Central Library	10 W Fourteenth Avenue, Denver, CO 80204	(720) 865-1111.
Montbello Public Library	12955 Albrook Drive, Denver, CO 80239	(720) 865-0200.
Rangeview Library District	327 E Bridge Street, Brighton, CO 80601	(303) 405-3230.

Next Steps

We will document the final decision in a record of decision, which will be published in the **Federal Register** after a 30-day "wait period" that begins when EPA announces this final EIS. For more information, see EPA's Role in the EIS Process.

Dated: August 3, 2015.

Matt Hogan,

Acting Regional Director, Mountain-Prairie Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 2015-21234 Filed 8-26-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLNV952000

L14400000.BJ0000.LXSSF2210000.241A; 13-08807; MO# 4500082763; TAS: 15X1109]

Filing of Plats of Survey; NV

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to inform the public and interested State and local government officials of the filing of Plats of Survey in Nevada.

DATES: Unless otherwise stated filing is effective at 10:00 a.m. on the dates indicated below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael O. Harmening, Chief, Branch of Geographic Sciences, Bureau of Land Management, Nevada State Office, 1340 Financial Blvd., Reno, NV 89502-7147, phone: 775-861-6490. 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:

1. The Plat of Survey of the following described lands was officially filed at the BLM Nevada State Office, Reno, Nevada on April 17, 2015.

The plat, in 2 sheets, representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the north boundary and a portion of the subdivisional lines, the subdivision of section 2 and metes-and-bounds surveys in section 2, Township 4 South, Range 60 East, of the Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada, under Group No. 914, was accepted April 16, 2015. This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

2. The Plat of Survey of the following described lands was officially filed at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Nevada State Office, Reno, Nevada on June 4, 2015:

The plat, in 1 sheet, representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the south boundary and a portion of the subdivisional lines, the subdivision of sections 35 and 36, and a metes-and-bounds survey of the centerline of Nevada State Route 318 through a portion of section 35, Township 3 South, Range 60 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada, under Group No.

929, was accepted June 2, 2015. This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

3. The Plat of Survey of the following described lands was officially filed at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Nevada State Office, Reno, Nevada on June 4, 2015:

The plat, in 1 sheet, representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the east boundary, a portion of the north boundary and a portion of the subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of section 1, Township 4 South, Range 60 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada, under Group No. 929, was accepted June 2, 2015. This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

4. The Plat of Survey of the following described lands was officially filed at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Nevada State Office, Reno, Nevada on June 25, 2015:

The plat, in 3 sheets, representing the dependent resurvey of a portion of the south boundary, a portion of the subdivisional lines, and portions of Mineral Survey Nos. 4892 and 4893, and a metes-and-bounds survey in sections 35 and 36, Township 13 North, Range 26 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada, under Group No. 941, was accepted June 12, 2015. This survey was executed to facilitate the conveyance of certain public land to the municipality of Yerington, Nevada, as authorized by Public Law 113-291.

5. The Plat of Survey of the following described lands was officially filed at