

number. The ICR documentation is available at <http://www.reginfo.gov>. Therefore, in preparation for OMB review and approval of the following information collection, TSA is soliciting comments to—

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed information requirement is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including using appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Information Collection Requirement

OMB Control Number 1652-0050; *Critical Facility Information of the Top 100 Most Critical Pipelines: The 9/11 Act* specifically tasked TSA to develop and implement a plan for inspecting critical facilities of the 100 most critical pipeline systems. (See sec. 1557 of the 9/11 Act (Pub. L. 110-53 codified at 6 U.S.C. 1207)). Pipeline operators determined their critical facilities based on guidance and criteria set forth in the TSA Pipeline Security Guidelines published in April 2011.

TSA intends to continue visiting critical pipeline facilities and collecting site-specific information from pipeline operators on facility security policies, procedures, and physical security measures. This collection is voluntary. TSA will collect information obtained during the visits using a Critical Facility Security Review (CFSR) Form. The CFSR differs from a Corporate Security Review (CSR) conducted by TSA in that a CSR looks at corporate or company-wide security management plans and practices while the CFSR will look at individual pipeline facility security measures and procedures.¹ TSA is seeking OMB approval to continue utilizing the CFSR document during critical facility reviews in order to collect facility security information. Information collected from the reviews will be analyzed and used to determine strengths and weaknesses at the nation's critical pipeline facilities, areas to target for risk reduction strategies, pipeline industry implementation of the voluntary guidelines, and the need for

regulations in accordance with the 9/11 Act provisions previously cited. TSA anticipates visiting 90 critical facilities each year.

TSA is also seeking OMB approval to continue its follow up procedure with pipeline operators on their implementation of security improvements and recommendations made during facility visits. During critical facility visits, TSA documents and provides recommendations to improve the security posture of the facility. TSA intends to continue to follow up with pipeline operators via email on their status toward implementation of the recommendations made during the critical facility visits. The follow up will be conducted between approximately 12 and 24 months after the facility visit.

TSA will use the information collected to determine to what extent the pipeline industry is implementing the 2011 guidance document and security improvement recommendations made during critical facility visits. The information provided by owners or operators for each information collection is Sensitive Security Information (SSI), and it will be protected in accordance with procedures meeting the transmission, handling, and storage requirements of SSI set forth in 49 CFR parts 15 and 1520.

The annual burden for the approval of the information collection related to the Critical Facility Review Form is estimated to be 360 hours. A maximum of 90 facility reviews will be conducted each year with each review taking approximately 4 hours (90 × 4).

The annual burden for the approval of the information collection related to the follow up on the recommendations made to facility operators is estimated to be 450 hours. TSA estimates each operator will spend approximately 5 hours to submit a response to TSA regarding its implementation of security recommendations made during critical facility visits. If a maximum of 90 critical facilities are reviewed each year, and TSA follows up with each facility operator between approximately 12 and 24 months following the visit, the total annual burden is 450 (90 × 5) hours.

The estimated number of respondents will be 90 for the critical facility review form and 90 for the recommendations follow-up, for a total of 180 respondents. The total estimated burden is 810 hours annually, 360 hours for the critical facility review form, plus 450 hours for the recommendations follow-up procedure.

Dated: May 8, 2014.

Christina Walsh,

TSA Paperwork Reduction Act Officer, Office of Information Technology.

[FR Doc. 2014-10997 Filed 5-13-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 9910-05-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R2-ES-2014-N004;
FXES11130100000C4-123-FF01E00000]

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 5-Year Status Reviews of Little Colorado Spinedace, Sentry Milk-Vetch, Siler Pincushion Cactus, Slender Rush-Pea, and Yuma Clapper Rail in the Southwest Region

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of reviews; request for information.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, are initiating 5-year status reviews under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), of the threatened Little Colorado spinedace (*Lepidomeda vittata*), endangered sentry milk-vetch (*Astragalus cremnophylax* var. *cremnophylax*), threatened Siler pincushion cactus (*Pediocactus* (= *Echinocactus*, = *Utahia*) *sileri*), endangered slender rush-pea (*Hoffmannseggia tenella*), and the endangered Yuma clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris yumanensis*). A 5-year review is based on the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of the review; therefore, we are requesting submission of any such information that has become available since our original listing of these five species or since the last 5-year review.

DATES: To ensure consideration, we are requesting submission of new information no later than July 14, 2014. However, we will continue to accept new information about any listed species at any time.

ADDRESSES: For how to submit information, see Request for Information and "How Do I Ask Questions or Provide Information?" in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information on a particular species, contact the appropriate person or office listed in the table in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

¹ See OMB Control No. 1652-0056 for the PRA approval of information collection for pipeline CSRs.

Why do we conduct a 5-year review?

Under the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), we maintain Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants (which we collectively refer to as the List) in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 50 CFR 17.11 (for animals) and 17.12 (for plants). Section 4(c)(2)(A) of the Act requires us to review each listed species' status at least once every 5 years. Our regulations at 50 CFR 424.21 require that we publish a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing those species under active review. For additional information about 5-year reviews, refer to our factsheet at <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/what-we-do/recovery-overview.html>.

What information do we consider in our review?

A 5-year review considers all new information available at the time of the review. For all five of these species, this will be the second 5-year review developed for each species. In conducting these reviews, we consider the best scientific and commercial data that have become available since the listing determination or most recent status review, such as:

(A) Species biology, including but not limited to population trends, distribution, abundance, demographics, and genetics;

(B) Habitat conditions, including but not limited to amount, distribution, and suitability;

(C) Conservation measures that have been implemented that benefit the species;

(D) Threat status and trends in relation to the five listing factors (as defined in section 4(a)(1) of the Act); and

(E) Other new information, data, or corrections, including but not limited to taxonomic or nomenclatural changes, identification of erroneous information contained in the List, and improved analytical methods.

Any new information will be considered during the 5-year review and will also be useful in evaluating the ongoing recovery programs for the species.

Which species are under review?

This notice announces our active review of the species listed in the table below.

Common name	Scientific name	Listing status	Where listed	Final listing rule (Federal Register citation and publication date)	Contact person, phone, email	Contact person's U.S. Mail address
Cactus, Siler pincushion.	<i>Pediocactus</i> (= <i>Echinocactus</i> , = <i>Utahia</i>) <i>sileri</i> .	Threatened	U.S.A. (AZ, UT)	44 FR 61786 November 26, 1979.	Field Supervisor, 602-242-0210 (phone); Steve_Spangle@fws.gov (email).	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Ecological Services Field Office, Attention 5-Year Review, 2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103, Phoenix, AZ 85021.
Milk-vetch, Sentry.	<i>Astragalus cremnophylax</i> var. <i>cremnophylax</i> .	Endangered	U.S.A. (AZ)	55 FR 50184 December 5, 1990.	Field Supervisor, 602-242-0210 (phone); Steve_Spangle@fws.gov (email).	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Ecological Services Field Office, Attention 5-Year Review, 2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103, Phoenix, AZ 85021.
Rail, Yuma Clapper.	<i>Rallus longirostris yumanensis</i>	Endangered	U.S.A (AZ, CA, NV).	32 FR 4001 March 11, 1967.	Field Supervisor, 602-242-0210 (phone); Steve_Spangle@fws.gov (email).	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Ecological Services Field Office, Attention 5-Year Review, 2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103, Phoenix, AZ 85021.
Rush-pea, Slender.	<i>Hoffmannseggia tenella</i>	Endangered	U.S.A. (TX)	50 FR 45614 November 1, 1985.	Field Supervisor, 281-286-8282 (phone); Edith_Ertling@fws.gov (email).	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Texas Coastal Ecological Services Field Office, Attention 5-Year Review, 17629 El Camino Real, Suite 211, Houston, TX 77058.
Spinedace, Little Colorado.	<i>Lepidomeda vittata</i>	Threatened	U.S.A. (AZ)	32 FR 4001 March 11, 1967.	Field Supervisor, 602-242-0210 (phone); Steve_Spangle@fws.gov (email).	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Ecological Services Field Office, Attention 5-Year Review, 2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103, Phoenix, AZ 85021.

Request for Information

To ensure that a 5-year review is complete and based on the best available scientific and commercial information, we request new information from all sources. See "What Information Do We Consider in Our Review?" for specific criteria. If you submit information, please support it with documentation such as maps, bibliographic references, methods used to gather and analyze the data, and/or copies of any pertinent publications,

reports, or letters by knowledgeable sources.

How do I ask questions or provide information?

If you wish to provide information for any species listed above, please submit your comments and materials to the appropriate contact in the table above. You may also direct questions to those contacts. Individuals who are hearing impaired or speech impaired may call the Federal Relay Service at 800-877-8339 for TTY assistance.

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.

Comments and materials received will be available for public inspection, by appointment, during normal business hours at the offices where the comments are submitted.

Completed and Active Reviews

A list of all completed and currently active 5-year reviews addressing species for which the Southwest Region of the Service has lead responsibility is available at http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/ElectronicLibrary_Main.cfm (under Select a Document Category, select 5-Year Review).

Authority

This document is published under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: May 7, 2014.

David Mendias,

*Acting Regional Director, Southwest Region,
U.S Fish and Wildlife Service.*

[FR Doc. 2014-10928 Filed 5-13-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R5-R-2013-N188; BAC-4311-K9-S3]

Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, Morris County, NJ; Draft 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 (Service), announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment (CCP/EA) for Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), located in Morris County, New Jersey, for public review and comment. The draft CCP/EA describes our proposal for managing the refuge for the next 15 years.

Also available for public review and comment are the draft findings of appropriateness and draft compatibility determinations for uses to be allowed upon initial completion of the plan, if alternative B is selected. These are included as appendix C in the draft CCP/EA.

DATES: To ensure consideration, please send your comments no later than June 30, 2014. We will announce upcoming public meetings in local news media, via our project mailing list, and on our Regional planning Web site: <http://>

[www.fws.gov/northeast/planning/
Great%20Swamp/ccphome.html](http://www.fws.gov/northeast/planning/Great%20Swamp/ccphome.html).

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments or requests for copies or more information by any of the following methods. You may request hard copies or a CD-ROM of the documents.

Email: northeastplanning@fws.gov. Please include "Great Swamp Draft CCP" in the subject line of the message.

Fax: Attention: Bill Perry, 413-253-8468.

U.S. Mail: Bill Perry, Natural Resource Planner, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 300 Westgate Center Drive, Hadley, MA 01035.

In-Person Drop-off, Viewing, or Pickup: Call 973-425-1222 extension 116 to make an appointment (necessary for view/pickup only) during regular business hours at Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge, 32 Pleasant Plains Road, Basking Ridge, NJ 07920. For more information on locations for viewing or obtaining documents, see "Public Availability of Documents" under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bill Koch, Refuge Manager, 973-425-1222 extension 156 (phone), or Bill Perry, Planning Team Leader, 413-253-8688 (phone), northeastplanning@fws.gov (email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we continue the CCP process for Great Swamp NWR. We started this process through a notice in the **Federal Register** (75 FR 41879) on July 19, 2010.

Great Swamp was established by an act of Congress on November 3, 1960, and formally dedicated in 1964, primarily under the authorities of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711) and the Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929 (U.S.C. 715-715s, 45 Stat. 1222) as amended, "for use as an inviolate sanctuary, or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds." The refuge currently encompasses 7,768 acres and has an approved acquisition boundary that would allow for refuge expansion to a maximum of 9,429 acres. Great Swamp NWR is located approximately 26 miles from New York City and is an area that is heavily suburbanized. The refuge provides vital brooding, nesting, feeding, and resting habitat for a variety of migratory bird species, including waterfowl. Although established primarily for migratory birds, the refuge's mosaic of forested wetlands, emergent wetlands, and various successional stages of upland vegetation

provides habitats for a diversity of wildlife species.

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, 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 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 in accordance with the Refuge Administration Act.

Public Outreach

We started pre-planning for the Great Swamp NWR CCP in 2008. In July 2010, we distributed our first newsletter and press release announcing our intent to prepare a CCP for the refuge. In July and August 2010, we had a formal public scoping period. The purpose of the public scoping period was to solicit comments from the community and other interested parties on the issues and impacts that should be evaluated in the draft CCP/EA. To help solicit public comments, we held two public meetings at the refuge during the formal public scoping period. Throughout the rest of the planning process, we have conducted additional outreach by participating in community meetings, events, and other public forums, and by requesting public input on managing the refuge and its programs. We received comments on topics such as refuge maintenance, public use and access, natural resource management, endangered and threatened species, hunting and animal welfare, and regional or global environmental issues, including water quality, air quality, and climate change. We have considered and evaluated all of the comments we received and addressed them in various ways in the alternatives presented in the draft CCP/EA.