

to be added to the Sabinoso Wilderness under the provisions of Section 6 (a) of the Wilderness Act of 1964 (Act), which will provide for public access to the wilderness for the first time. The Rimrock Rose Ranch previously served as base property for the two livestock grazing allotments (00735 and 00736) within or near Sabinoso Wilderness, and as part of the conditions of the donation, provided for under Section 6 (a) of the Act, the property cannot be used for purposes of livestock grazing. Furthermore, the ranch property offered for donation contains important riparian resources critical for supporting a diverse population of aquatic and terrestrial wildlife species in this arid environment where riparian resources are scarce. The long history of grazing practices on the ranch property has substantially compromised the riparian resources and their function. To protect and restore riparian resources, as well as to conform to current BLM management prescriptions for the area, livestock grazing is proposed to be eliminated from the two livestock grazing allotments because of their dependence on these riparian areas as a supplemental water source and for purposes of trailing. The proposal also includes the purchase of the remaining approximate 600 acres of the Rimrock Rose Ranch not offered as part of the donation. The purpose of the public scoping process is to determine relevant issues that will influence the scope of the environmental analysis, including alternatives, and guide the planning process. Preliminary issues for the plan amendment area have been identified by BLM personnel and include potential impacts to wilderness quality; riparian resources; cultural resources; livestock grazing; and opportunities for recreation. You may submit comments on issues and planning criteria in writing to the BLM at any public scoping meeting, or you may submit them to the BLM using one of the methods listed in the "ADDRESSES" section above. To be most helpful, you should submit comments by the close of the 30-day scoping period.

The BLM will utilize and coordinate the NEPA scoping process to help fulfill the public involvement process under the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. 306108) as provided in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). The information about historic and cultural resources within the area potentially affected by the proposed action will assist the BLM in identifying and evaluating impacts to such resources.

The BLM will consult with Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis in accordance with Executive

Order 13175 and other policies. Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets and potential impacts to cultural resources, will be given due consideration. Federal, State, and local agencies, along with tribes and other stakeholders that may be interested in or affected by the proposed action that the BLM is evaluating, are invited to participate in the scoping process and, if eligible, may request or be requested by the BLM to participate in the development of the environmental analysis as a cooperating agency.

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. The BLM will evaluate identified issues to be addressed in the plan, and will place them into one of three categories:

1. Issues to be resolved in the plan amendment;
2. Issues to be resolved through policy or administrative action; or
3. Issues beyond the scope of this plan amendment.

The BLM will provide an explanation in the draft RMP amendment/draft EA as to why an issue was placed in category two or three. The public is also encouraged to help identify any management questions and concerns that should be addressed in the plan. The BLM will work collaboratively with interested parties to identify the management decisions that are best suited to local, regional, and national needs and concerns. The BLM will use an interdisciplinary approach to develop the plan amendment in order to consider the variety of resource issues and concerns identified. Specialists with expertise in the following disciplines will be involved in the planning process: Rangeland management, riparian resources, wilderness, outdoor recreation, archaeology, visual resources, and realty.

Authority: 40 CFR 1501.7 and 43 CFR 1610.2

Jim Stovall,

Acting Associate State Director, BLM New Mexico.

[FR Doc. 2016-13273 Filed 6-3-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-FB-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Indian Gaming Commission

Renewals of Information Collections Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

AGENCY: National Indian Gaming Commission, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of request for comments.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC or Commission) is seeking comments on the renewal of information collections for the following activities: (i) Compliance and enforcement actions under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act as authorized by Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 3141-0001; (ii) approval of tribal ordinances, and background investigation and issuance of licenses as authorized by OMB Control Number 3141-0003; (iii) National Environmental Policy Act submissions as authorized by OMB Control Number 3141-0006; and (iv) issuance to tribes of certificates of self-regulation for Class II gaming as authorized by OMB Control Number 3141-0008. These information collections all expire on October 31, 2016.

DATES: Submit comments on or before August 5, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Comments can be mailed, faxed, or emailed to the attention of: Tim Osumi, National Indian Gaming Commission, 1849 C Street NW., MS 1621, Washington, DC 20240. Comments may be faxed to (202) 632-7066 and may be sent electronically to info@nigc.gov, subject: PRA renewals.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Osumi at (202) 632-7054; fax (202) 632-7066 (not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Request for Comments

You are invited to comment on these collections concerning: (i) Whether the collections of information are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (ii) the accuracy of the agency's estimates of the burdens (including the hours and cost) of the proposed collections of information, including the validity of the methodologies and assumptions used; (iii) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (iv) ways to minimize the burdens of the information collections on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate

automated, electronic, mechanical, or other collection techniques or forms of information technology. Please note that an agency may not conduct or sponsor and an individual need not respond to, a collection of information unless it has a valid OMB Control Number.

It is the Commission's policy to make all comments available to the public for review at the location listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. 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 may ask in your comment that the Commission withhold your personal identifying information from public review, the Commission cannot guarantee that it will be able to do so.

II. Data

Title: Indian Gaming Compliance and Enforcement.

OMB Control Number: 3141-0001.

Brief Description of Collection: The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA or the Act), 25 U.S.C. 2701 *et seq.*, governs the regulation of gaming on Indian lands. Although IGRA places primary responsibility with the tribes for regulating their gaming activities, § 2706(b) directs the Commission to monitor gaming conducted on Indian lands on a continuing basis. Amongst other actions necessary to carry out the Commission's statutory duties, the Act authorizes the Commission to access and inspect all papers, books, and records relating to gross revenues of a gaming operation. The Act also requires tribes to provide the Commission with annual independent audits of their gaming operations, including audits of all contracts in excess of \$25,000. 25 U.S.C. 2710(b)(2)(C), (D); 2710(d)(1)(A)(ii). In accordance with these statutory mandates, Commission regulations require Indian gaming operations to keep and maintain permanent financial records, and to submit to the Commission independent audits of their gaming operations on an annual basis. This information collection is mandatory and allows the Commission to fulfill its statutory responsibilities under IGRA to regulate gaming on Indian lands.

Respondents: Indian tribal gaming operations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 898.

Estimated Annual Responses: 898.

Estimated Time per Response: Depending on the type of information collection, the range of time can vary

from 20.5 burden hours to 1506.75 burden hours for one item.

Frequency of Responses: 1 per year.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours on Respondents: 878,274.

Estimated Total Non-hour Cost Burden: \$47,948,291.

Title: Approval of Class II and Class III Ordinances, Background Investigations, and Gaming Licenses.

OMB Control Number: 3141-0003.

Brief Description of Collection: The Act sets standards for the regulation of gaming on Indian lands, including requirements for the approval or disapproval of tribal gaming ordinances. Section 2705(a)(3) requires the NIGC Chair to review all Class II and Class III tribal gaming ordinances. In accordance with this statutory provision, Commission regulations require tribes to submit: (i) a copy of the gaming ordinance, or amendment thereof, to be approved, including a copy of the authorizing resolution by which it was enacted by the tribal government, and a request for approval of the ordinance or resolution; (ii) designation of an agent for service of process; (iii) a description of procedures the tribe will employ in conducting background investigations on primary management officials (PMOs) and key employees; (iv) a description of procedures the tribe will use to issue licenses to PMOs and key employees; (v) copies of all gaming regulations; (vi) a copy of any applicable tribal-state compact; (vii) a description of dispute resolution procedures for disputes arising between the gaming public and the tribe or management contractor; and (viii) identification of the law enforcement agency that will take fingerprints and a description of the procedures for conducting criminal history checks. The Commission also requires a tribal ordinance to provide that the tribe will perform background investigations and issue licenses for PMOs and key employees according to requirements that are as stringent as those contained in Commission regulations. The NIGC Chair will use the information collected to approve or disapprove the ordinance or amendment thereof.

Commission regulations also require tribes to perform background investigations and issue licenses for PMOs and key employees using certain information provided by applicants, such as names, addresses, previous employment records, previous relationships with either Indian tribes or the gaming industry, licensing related to those relationships, any convictions, and any other information that a tribe feels is relevant to the employment of the individuals being investigated.

Tribes are then required to keep complete application files. Tribes are also required to create and keep investigative reports, and to submit to the Commission notices of results (licensing eligibility determinations) on PMOs and key employees. Tribes must notify the Commission if they issue or do not issue licenses to PMOs and key employees, and if they revoke said licenses. The Commission uses this information to review the eligibility and suitability determinations that tribes make and advises them if it disagrees with any particular determination. These information collections are mandatory and allow the Commission to carry out its statutory duties.

Respondents: Indian tribal gaming operations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1,580.

Estimated Annual Responses: 193,745.

Estimated Time per Response: Depending on the type of information collection, the range of time can vary from 1.0 burden hour to 1,419 burden hours for one item.

Frequency of Response: Varies.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours on Respondents: 1,392,405.

Estimated Total Non-hour Cost Burden: \$3,333,573.

Title: NEPA Compliance.

OMB Control Number: 3141-0006.

Brief Description of Collection: The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to analyze proposed major federal actions that significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The Commission has identified one type of action that it undertakes that requires review under NEPA—approving third-party management contracts for the operation of gaming activity under IGRA. Depending on the nature of the subject contract and other circumstances, approval of such management contracts may be categorically excluded from NEPA, may require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA), or may require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In any case, the proponents of a management contract will be expected to submit information to the Commission and assist in the development of the required NEPA documentation.

Respondents: Tribal governing bodies, management companies.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 3.

Estimated Annual Responses: 3.

Estimated Time per Response: Depending on whether the response is an EA or an EIS, the range of time can

vary from 2.5 burden hours to 12.0 burden hours for one item.

Frequency of Response: Varies.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours on Respondents: 26.5.

Estimated Total Non-hour Cost Burden: \$14,846,686.

Title: Issuance of Certificates of Self-Regulation to Tribes for Class II Gaming. *OMB Control Number:* 3141-0008.

Brief Description of Collection: The Act allows any Indian tribe that has conducted Class II gaming for at least three years to petition the Commission for a certificate of self-regulation for its Class II gaming operation(s). The Commission will issue the certificate if it determines that the tribe has conducted its gaming activities in a manner that has: resulted in an effective and honest accounting of all revenues; a reputation for safe, fair, and honest operation of the gaming activities; and an enterprise free of evidence of criminal or dishonest activity. The tribe must also have adopted and implemented proper accounting, licensing, and enforcement systems, and conducted the gaming operation on a fiscally or economically sound basis. Commission regulations require a tribe interested in receiving a certificate to file with the Commission a petition generally describing the tribe's gaming operations, its regulatory process, its uses of net gaming revenue, and its accounting and recordkeeping systems. The tribe must also provide copies of various documents in support of the petition. Tribes who have been issued a certificate of self-regulation are required to submit to the Commission certain information on an annual basis, including information that establishes that the tribe continuously meets the regulatory eligibility and approval requirements and supporting documentation that explains how tribal gaming revenues were used in accordance with the requirements in 25 U.S.C. 2710(b)(2)(B). Submission of the petition and supporting documentation is voluntary. The Commission will use the information submitted by the tribe in determining whether to issue the certificate of self-regulation. Once a certificate of self-regulation has been issued, the submission of certain other information is mandatory.

Respondents: Tribal governments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 8.

Estimated Annual Responses: 8.

Estimated Time per Response:

Depending on the information collection, the range of time can vary from 0.75 burden hour to 1,940 burden hours for one item.

Frequency of Responses: Varies.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours on Respondents: 4,088.

Estimated Total Non-hour Cost Burden: \$172,450.

Dated: May 24, 2016.

Shannon O'Loughlin,
Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2016-13276 Filed 6-3-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-MWR-ISRO-20587; PPMWROW3/PPMSPD1Y.YM0000]

Amended Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement To Address the Presence of Wolves at Isle Royale National Park

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Amended Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The National Park Service (NPS) is amending its July 10, 2015, Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and Management Plan for Moose, Wolves, and Vegetation for Isle Royale National Park, Michigan (Isle Royale). The NPS is revising the scope of the EIS to focus on the question of whether to bring wolves to Isle Royale in the near term, and if so, how to do so. This amended NOI describes a range of alternatives for bringing wolves to the Island.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347; 40 CFR parts 1500-1508; 43 CFR part 46.

DATES: The public scoping comment period will conclude 30 days following the date this NOI is published in the **Federal Register**. All comments must be postmarked or transmitted by this date.

ADDRESSES: Information, including a copy of the new public scoping brochure, is available for public review online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/ISROwolves>. Limited copies of the brochure will also be available at Isle Royale National Park, 800 East Lakeshore Drive, Houghton, Michigan and by request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent Phyllis Green, Isle Royale National Park, ISRO Wolves, 800 East Lakeshore Drive, Houghton, Michigan 49931-1896, or by telephone at (906) 482-0984.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Although wolves have not always been part of the Isle Royale ecosystem, they have been present for more than 65 years, and have played a key role in the ecosystem, affecting the moose population and

other species during that time. The average wolf population on the island over the past 65 years has been about 22, but there have been as many as 50 wolves on the Island and as few as three. Over the past five years the population has declined steeply, which has given rise to the need to determine whether the NPS should bring additional wolves to the island. There were three wolves documented on the Island as of March 2015 and only two wolves have been confirmed as of February 2016. At this time, natural recovery of the population is unlikely. The potential absence of wolves raises concerns about possible effects to Isle Royale's current ecosystem, including effects to both the moose population and Isle Royale's forest/vegetation communities.

The NPS published a NOI to prepare an EIS and Management Plan for Moose, Wolves, and Vegetation for Isle Royale National Park on July 10, 2015, (80 FR 39796), and held scoping meetings July 27-30, 2015. However, based on the public comments we received and additional internal deliberations, the NPS has determined that it will revise and narrow the scope of this EIS to focus on the question of whether to bring wolves to Isle Royale in the near term, and if so, how to do so.

The revised purpose of the plan is to determine whether and how to bring wolves to Isle Royale to function as the apex predator in the near term within a changing and dynamic island ecosystem. The NPS will evaluate alternative approaches for bringing wolves to Isle Royale, as well as the alternative of not bringing wolves to Isle Royale (the no-action alternative), which remains a viable option. Following this evaluation and additional input from you on the EIS, an alternative will be selected for implementation and documented in a record of decision. Based on the revised purpose statement, the NPS is now considering the following alternatives.

Under Alternative A, the no-action alternative, the NPS would not intervene and would continue current management. Wolves may come and go through natural migration, although the current population of wolves may die out. Under Alternative B, the NPS would bring wolves to Isle Royale as a one-time event within a defined period of time (e.g., over a 36 month period) to increase the longevity of the wolf population on the island. This action would occur as soon as possible following a signed record of decision. Under Alternative C, the NPS would bring wolves to Isle Royale as often as needed in order to maintain a