

EIS process, the BLM incorporated detailed analysis of environmental impacts into our decision-making processes and disclosed these expected impacts to the public. As scientific information has continued to evolve, the BLM has closely reviewed and considered any changes from such science to expected environmental impacts, both at the land use plan scale and in site-specific analyses. To address public comments raised during the supplemental EIS process, the BLM convened a team of biologists and land use planners to evaluate scientific literature provided to the agency. The BLM found that the most up-to-date Greater Sage-Grouse science and other information has incrementally increased, and built upon, the knowledgebase of Greater Sage-Grouse management evaluated by the BLM most recently in its 2019 land use plan amendments, but does not change the scope or direction of the BLM's management; however, new science does suggest adaptations to management may be warranted at site-specific scales.

(3) Cumulative Effects Analysis: The BLM considered cumulative impacts on a rangewide basis, organizing that analysis at the geographic scale of each Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) management zone, in order to consider impacts at biologically meaningful scales. In the 2019 planning process, the BLM incorporated by reference cumulative effects analysis conducted in the 2015 planning process and other environmental impact statements. Since the nature and context of the cumulative effects scenario has not appreciably changed since 2015, and the 2015 analysis covered the entire range of the Greater Sage-Grouse, the BLM's consideration of cumulative effects in the 2015 planning process adequately addresses most, if not all, of the planning decisions made through the 2019 planning process.

While the 2019 planning process largely incorporated by reference the analysis from the 2015 planning process, and updated it where needed to account for current conditions, the 2020 supplemental EIS process elaborated on this information in greater detail and updated the analysis to ensure that the BLM appropriately evaluated cumulative effects at biologically meaningful scales.

(4) BLM's Approach to Compensatory Mitigation: In the 2019 planning process, the BLM requested public comments on a number of issues, including the BLM's approach to

compensatory mitigation. As part of the 2015 Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments, the BLM selected a net conservation gain standard in its approach to compensatory mitigation, which the 2019 land use plan amendments modified to align with the BLM's 2018 policy on compensatory mitigation. Through the 2020 supplemental EIS process, the BLM requested further comments about the BLM's approach to compensatory mitigation. After reviewing the comments that the BLM received about compensatory mitigation, the BLM determined that its environmental analysis supporting the 2019 land use plan amendments was sound. The public has now had substantial opportunities to consider and comment on the BLM's approach to compensatory mitigation at the land use planning level, including the approach taken in the 2019 land use plan amendments.

Based on the final supplemental EIS, the BLM has determined that its decade-long planning and NEPA processes have sufficiently addressed Greater Sage-Grouse habitat conservation and no new land use planning process to consider additional alternatives or new information is warranted. This determination is not a new planning decision. Instead, it is a determination not to amend the applicable land use plans. Thus, it is not subject to appeal or protest. The BLM's decision remains as identified in the 2019 Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment for Greater Sage-Grouse conservation in Utah.

(Authority: 40 CFR 1505.2; 40 CFR 1506.6; References to the CEQ regulations are to the regulations in effect prior to September 14, 2020. The revised CEQ regulations effective September 14, 2020, are not cited because this supplemental EIS process began prior to that date.)

**Gregory Sheehan,**  
BLM Utah State Director.

[FR Doc. 2021-00665 Filed 1-13-21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-DQ-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

**[NPS-WASO-D-COS-POL-30716;  
PPWODIREP0; PPMPAS1Y.YP0000]**

### National Park System Advisory Board; Charter Renewal

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Charter renewal.

**SUMMARY:** The Secretary of the Interior intends to renew the National Park System Advisory Board, in accordance with section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This action is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of statutory duties imposed upon the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joshua Winchell, Staff Director and Designated Federal Officer for the National Park System Advisory Board, Office of Policy, National Park Service, 202-513-7053.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Board is authorized by 54 U.S.C. 102303 (part of the 1935 Historic Sites, Buildings and Antiquities Act) and has been in existence almost continuously since 1935. Pursuant to 54 U.S.C. 102303, the legislative authorization for the Board expired January 1, 2010. However, due to the importance of the issues on which the Board advises, the Secretary of the Interior exercised the authority contained in 54 U.S.C. 100906 to re-establish and continue the Board as a discretionary committee from January 1, 2010, until such time as it may be legislatively reauthorized.

The advice and recommendations provided by the Board fulfill an important need within the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service, and it is necessary to re-establish the Board to ensure its work is not disrupted. The Board's members are balanced to represent a cross-section of disciplines and expertise relevant to the National Park Service mission. The renewal of the Board comports with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended.

**Certification:** I hereby certify that the renewal of the National Park System Advisory Board is necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the Department of the Interior by the National Park Service Organic Act (54 U.S.C. 100101(a) *et seq.*), and other statutes relating to the administration of the National Park Service.

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. Appendix 2

Dated: November 18, 2020.

**David L. Bernhardt,**

*Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. 2021-00750 Filed 1-13-21; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-52-P**