

1980, Norfolk, VA 23501–1980, was rescinded, which placed it in the funding range. The grant award to EVMS was for the same amount it would have received had it been funded in FY 2010, but it used funds under the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011.

Dated: April 26, 2013.

**Matthew E. Ammon,**

*Deputy Director, Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control.*

[FR Doc. 2013–10412 Filed 5–1–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210–67–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS–R9–MB–2012–N094; FF09M29000–112–FXMB123209EAGL0L2]

**RIN 1018–AX53**

### Migratory Birds; Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance: Module 1—Land-Based Wind Energy, Version 2

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce that *Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance: Module 1—Land-based Wind Energy, Version 2* is available. The guidance provides recommendations for agency staff and developers to use an iterative process to avoid and minimize negative effects on eagles and their habitats resulting from the construction, operation, and maintenance of land-based, wind energy facilities in the United States.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Dr. George Allen, Division of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22203–1610, or 703–358–1825.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Service is charged with implementing many statutes that provide protection to bald and golden eagles, including the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) (16 U.S.C. 668–668c), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703–12), and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 U.S.C. 1531–44). Under these statutes, the Service implements permit programs for eagles as authorized by implementing regulations in title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). In 2009, the Service promulgated regulations in 50 CFR part 22 authorizing issuance of permits for nonpurposeful take of eagles

(74 FR 46836, September 11, 2009). On February 18, 2011, we issued a draft of *The Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance: Module 1—Land-based Wind Energy* for public comment (76 FR 9529). We received 124 comments by the end of the comment period on May 19, 2011.

We have considered the public comments received on the draft guidance and now issue the *Eagle Conservation Plan Guidance: Module 1—Land-based Wind Energy, Version 2* (ECPG) to assist potential permit applicants and to promote compliance with BGEPA with respect to such permits. The ECPG describes a process for wind energy developers, in coordination with the Service, to collect and analyze information that could support an application for a programmatic permit to authorize unintentional take of eagles at wind energy facilities. The ECPG provides recommendations for the development of eagle conservation plans (ECPs) to support issuance of eagle programmatic take permits for wind facilities.

Programmatic take permits will authorize limited nonpurposeful mortality and disturbance of eagles at wind facilities, provided that effective offsetting conservation measures that meet regulatory requirements are carried out. To comply with the permit regulations, conservation measures must avoid and minimize take of eagles to the maximum degree practicable, and, for programmatic permits necessary to authorize ongoing take of eagles, advanced conservation practices must be implemented, if available, such that any remaining take is unavoidable.

Further, for eagle management populations that the Service has determined cannot sustain additional mortality, any remaining take must be offset through compensatory mitigation such that the net effect on the eagle management population is, at a minimum, no net loss. The ECPG interprets and clarifies the permit requirements in the regulations at 50 CFR 22.26 and 22.27 and does not impose any binding requirements beyond those specified in the regulations.

The Service recommends that ECPs be developed in five successive stages. The process is intended to be a progressive, increasingly intensive look at potential effects of the development and operation of a particular site and design configuration to eagles. The objectives, recommended actions, and recommended data sources for each of the five stages in the ECP are described in the Stage Overview table in the guidance. The ECPG recommends that project developers or operators employ

specific procedures in their site assessments so the data can be combined with that from other facilities in a formal adaptive management process. This adaptive management process is designed to reduce uncertainty about the effects of wind facilities on eagles.

Project developers or operators are not required to use the recommended procedures in this ECPG. However, if different approaches are used, the developer or operator should coordinate with the Service in advance to ensure that approaches being considered will provide comparable data and meet the regulatory requirements. Additionally, Service review time for applications that employ different approaches will likely be longer than if the recommendations in the ECPG were followed.

The ECPG recommends that, at the end of each of the first four stages, project developers or operators determine, in consultation with the Service, which of the following categories the project, as planned, falls into: (1) High risk to eagles, with little opportunity to minimize effects; (2) high or moderate risk to eagles, but with an opportunity to minimize effects; or (3) minimal risk to eagles.

The ECPG is posted online at <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds>. You can request a printed copy of the guidance by writing to the address or calling the phone number listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated: April 24, 2013.

**Daniel M. Ashe,**

*Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

[FR Doc. 2013–10387 Filed 5–1–13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–55–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[LLCAD00000.L16100000.DS0000.LXSSB0010000]

### Amended Notice of Intent to Clarify the Scope of Analysis of the Environmental Document and Proposed Plan Amendment in the West Mojave Planning Area, to the Motorized Vehicle Access Element of the California Desert Conservation Area Plan, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, CA

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) announces its intent to clarify the scope of the *Notice of Intent to Prepare an*

*Environmental Document and Proposed Plan Amendment for the West Mojave (WEMO) Plan, Motorized Vehicle Access Element, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, CA*, which was published in the **Federal Register** on September 13, 2011 (76 FR 56466). By this notice, the BLM is announcing the beginning of a further, more focused scoping process to solicit public comments and identify issues related to the clarified scope of the West Mojave (WEMO) Route Network Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Plan Amendment as described under **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** below.

**DATES:** This notice initiates public scoping on the clarified scope of the WEMO Route Network Project EIS/plan amendment and concurrent travel management designation planning. Comments must be submitted in writing within 30 days from the publication date of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The BLM will provide additional opportunities for public participation as appropriate.

**ADDRESSES:** The public may submit comments on the modified scope of the analysis and related issues, by any of the following methods:

- *Email:* [cawemopa@blm.gov](mailto:cawemopa@blm.gov).
- *Web site:* [http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west\\_mojave\\_wemo](http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/fo/cdd/west_mojave_wemo).
- *Fax:* 951-697-5299.
- *Mail:* BLM California Desert District Office, 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, ATTN: West Mojave Route Network Project, Moreno Valley, CA 92553-9046

Documents relevant to this proposal may be examined at the California Desert District Office or Web site (address above), or the BLM's California State Office, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Edythe Seehafer, telephone 760-252-6021; address Bureau of Land Management, Barstow Field Office, 2601 Barstow Road, Barstow, CA 92311; email [cawemopa@blm.gov](mailto:cawemopa@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:** In January 2011, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California partially remanded the 2006 WEMO Plan Amendment Record of Decision (ROD) to the BLM and directed the BLM to

amend the California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan and reconsider route designation throughout the WEMO area, as well as other specified issues in the WEMO Plan (*Center for Biological Diversity v. US Bureau of Land Management* Order Re: Remedy (N.D. Cal. Jan 28, 2011)). By court order, the BLM must issue a revised decision by March 31, 2014. The September 13, 2011 Notice of Intent (NOI) invited comments on the proposed scope and content of the environmental document to address the court's issues related to the 2006 WEMO ROD.

The public scoping process for this action has been utilized to determine relevant issues, impacts, and possible alternatives that could influence the scope of the environmental analysis, and guide the entire process from plan decision-making to route designation review in order to comply with the court order. The BLM conducted two scoping meetings in Ridgecrest and Barstow, on September 27 and 29, 2011 respectively. The BLM asked for comments on the issues to be addressed, motor vehicle access amendment alternatives to be considered, decision criteria for route designation, the best approach to integrate recent BLM transportation management guidance into the document, and how to address both plan-level and implementation-level decisions. As a result of initial scoping, the BLM subsequently held eight working group meetings in February and March of 2012 to collect additional travel management input on issues related to planning and implementation for route designation in specific geographic subregions within the WEMO area.

The original NOI stated that the plan amendment would:

1. Update and amend the Motorized Vehicle Access Element of the CDCA Plan. The NOI requested input on those portions of the Element to be amended, including to reflect current management policy regarding access management. The plan amendment proposes to eliminate the "existing routes" language in the CDCA Plan. This language currently constrains the development of a travel network in the WEMO area.
2. Identify and analyze alternatives for amending the Motorized Vehicle Access Element of the CDCA Plan. The NOI indicated that subsequently, concurrently, or in a combination of both, additional environmental analysis would address current route designation within the WEMO sub-regional areas. This analysis would result in new decisions for each sub-regional area within the WEMO plan area that would

either retain or modify, in whole or in part, current route designations.

3. Identify processes, decision criteria, and related issues for designating travel routes within sub-regional areas of the WEMO plan area. The NOI identified preliminary decision criteria and requested input on issues and concerns, and best science and technology to establish viable networks within each subarea.

Clarifications to the original NOI as a result of scoping include the following:

1. The appropriate analytical document for the plan amendment has been determined to be an EIS.
2. This plan amendment also proposes to modify Stopping/Parking/Camping guidelines and other potential area-wide impact minimization strategies in addition to "existing routes" language.
3. The BLM has determined that it would be in the best interest of public land management to evaluate concurrently the plan amendments and the activity planning that would adopt route designations and implementation strategies.

4. In response to the court order BLM will establish a consistent baseline for route designation.

5. Consistent with current guidance, the plan amendment proposes to adopt Travel Management Areas and broad goals for these areas to provide the basis for concurrent travel management activity plans.

6. The activity plans will designate specific travel routes and trails within the travel management areas as part of the site-specific implementation planning, and will include consideration of both public (casual use) and other access needs and opportunities on public lands.

7. This document will amend the CDCA Plan Motor Vehicle Access Element as it pertains to the West Mojave Planning area. Amendment and activity plan changes will update and augment the 2006 West Mojave Plan, through the replacement of Section 2.2.6, updates of Planning and Regulatory Framework Section 3.1, Affected Environment Sections 3.5, affected impact analyses, strategies provided in the activity plans, and elsewhere as appropriate.

8. The BLM generally identified issues of concern in the original Notice. The following post-2006 ROD issues also will be considered: New critical habitat, designation of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail, new wilderness areas, consideration of lands with wilderness characteristics, changes to access from major rights-of-way and other large plan amendment proposals

and decisions, and the proposed transfer of management to the military of the Johnson Valley OHV Open Area. Several issues were specifically identified by the court which will be addressed in the document, including soils, unusual plant assemblages, riparian and water resources, cultural resources, grazing, air quality in open areas, cumulative effects, and mitigation. The BLM will evaluate identified issues to be addressed in the plan amendment, and will place them into one of three categories:

1. Issues to be resolved in the plan amendment and associated activity plans;
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 Scoping Report or the draft EIS as to why an issue was placed in category two or three. An updated inventory of lands with wilderness characteristics for public lands in the plan area will be completed for analysis in the EIS. The public is also encouraged to help identify any management questions and concerns that should be addressed in the clarified scope of 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.

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 1501.7, 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2.

**Thomas Pogacnik,**  
Deputy State Director.

[FR Doc. 2013-10374 Filed 5-1-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-40-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-WASO-PVE-UPARR-12049;  
PPWOSLAD00, PUA00UA08.GA0000]

### Proposed Information Collection; Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program Grants

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

**ACTION:** Notice; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** We (National Park Service, NPS) will ask the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to approve the information collection (IC) described below. As required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and as part of our continuing efforts to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, we invite the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on this IC. This IC is scheduled to expire on October 31, 2013. We may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**DATES:** To ensure that we are able to consider your comments on this IC, we must receive them by July 1, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Send your comments on the IC to Madonna L. Baucum, Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 1201 I Street NW., MS 1237, Washington, DC 20005 (mail); or [madonna\\_baucum@nps.gov](mailto:madonna_baucum@nps.gov) (email). Please include "1024-0048—Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program" in the subject line of your comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To request additional information about this IC, contact Elisabeth Fondriest, Recreation Grants Chief, State and Local Assistance Programs Division at 202-354-6916; or 1849 C Street NW., (2225), Washington, DC 20240 (mail); or [elisabeth\\_fondriest@nps.gov](mailto:elisabeth_fondriest@nps.gov) (email). Please include "1024-0048" in the subject line.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Abstract

The Urban Park and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) Act (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) was passed as Title X of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978. The UPARR Act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish a grant program to help economically distressed urban areas improve recreation opportunities for their residents.

We administer the UPARR program in accordance with regulations at 36 CFR 72 and the UPARR Grant Manual. These (1) Explain the policies to be followed for awarding grants; (2) list the requirements and criteria to be met for each type of grant and discretionary eligibility; (3) discuss fundable uses and limitations; (4) explain how proposals will be selected and funding; and (5) describe the application process and administrative procedures for awarding grants. The three types of grants available under the program are:

- Rehabilitation—renovate or redesign existing close-to-home recreation facilities.
- Innovation—specific activities that either increase recreation programs or improve the efficiency of the local government to operating existing programs.
- Planning—development of a Recovery Action Program plan.

The information collection requirements associated with the UPARR Program are currently approved under three OMB control numbers, all of which expire on October 31, 2013. During our review for this renewal, we identified some additional requirements that need OMB approval. In this revision of 1024-0048, we are including all of the information collection requirements for the UPARR Program. If OMB approves this revision, we will discontinue OMB Control Numbers 1024-0028 and 1024-0089. Congress has not appropriated funds for new UPARR grants since FY 2002. We are not currently accepting applications, and there are no open grants for which performance reports must be submitted. However, we still receive requests for conversion of properties improved or developed with UPARR grants through FY 2002 to other than public recreation uses. In anticipation of future funding, we are requesting OMB approval for the information collection requirements. With the exception of requests for conversions of use, we are estimating one response as a placeholder for each of the requirements. Following are the information collection requirements for the UPARR Program:

(1) *Recovery Action Program:* In accordance with 36 CFR 72.10-13, any eligible jurisdiction or discretionary applicant desiring to apply for a grant must develop and submit for NPS approval, a local Recovery Action Program (RAP). The RAP documents the recreation needs of the community and is linked to the objectives, needs, plans, and institutional arrangements of the community. The RAP consists of two sections, which are the Assessment and the Action Plan.

The Assessment describes the existing park and recreation system; issues and problems; goals and objectives. The Assessment summarizes the entire system including: operation and maintenance; employment and training; programs and services; rehabilitation of existing facilities; and the need for new facilities. The six parts of the Assessment include: Context; physical issues; rehabilitation issues; service issues; management issues; and conclusions, implications, and issues.