

of management alternatives designed to address management challenges and issues raised during scoping concerning mineral leasing decisions in the area. The four alternatives are:

(1) Alternative A is the No Action alternative and represents the continuation of existing mineral leasing management (oil, gas, and potash). Alternative A allows for oil, gas, and potash leasing and development to occur on the same tracts of land where it is consistent with current leasing decisions in the RMPs.

(2) Alternative B provides for mineral leasing and development outside of areas that are protected for high scenic quality (including public lands visible from Arches and Canyonlands National Parks), high-use recreation areas, and other sensitive resources with stipulations that minimize surface disturbance and associated potential resource impacts. Mineral leasing decisions are divided into two options specified as Alternative B1 and Alternative B2. In Alternative B1, surface impacts would be minimized by separating new leasing of the two commodities (oil/gas and potash), limiting the density of mineral development, and locating potash processing facilities in areas identified with the least amount of sensitive resources. Potash leasing would involve a phased approach and would be prioritized within identified areas. Alternative B2 provides for only oil and gas leasing; no new potash leasing would occur. Alternative B2 would also minimize surface impacts by limiting the density of oil and gas development.

(3) Alternative C provides for only oil and gas leasing; no potash leasing would occur. This alternative affords the greatest protection to areas with high scenic quality, recreational uses, and special designations, the BLM-managed lands adjacent to Arches and Canyonlands National Parks, and other sensitive resources.

(4) Alternative D is the BLM's proposed plan and provides for both oil and gas leasing and potash leasing. Mineral development would be precluded in many areas with high scenic quality, in some high use recreation areas, specifically designated areas, and in other areas with sensitive resources. Outside of these areas, surface impacts would be minimized by separating leasing of the two commodities (oil/gas and potash), locating potash processing facilities in areas with the least amount of sensitive resources, and limiting the density of mineral development. Potash leasing would involve a phased approach and would be prioritized within identified

areas. The proposed plan would provide operational flexibility for mineral leasing and development through some specific exceptions and would close the BLM-managed lands adjacent to Arches and Canyonlands National Parks to mineral leasing and development. In the proposed plan, a controlled surface use stipulation requiring compensatory mitigation would be applied to sensitive resources where onsite mitigation alone may not be sufficient to adequately mitigate impacts. Best Management Practices (BMPs) have been developed that include components of the draft compensatory mitigation policy such as the priority for mitigating impacts, types of mitigation, long term durability, and monitoring. The BMPs also identify Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative projects as potential locations for compensatory mitigation outside the area of impact. Utah's Watershed Restoration Initiative is a partnership-driven effort which includes State and Federal agencies with a mission to conserve, restore, and manage ecosystems in priority areas across Utah. Comments on the MLP and Draft RMP Amendments/Draft EIS (MLP/DEIS) received from the public and internal BLM review were considered and incorporated, as appropriate, into the proposed plan amendments and Final EIS. Public comments resulted in the addition of clarifying text, but did not significantly change proposed land-use plan decisions. Adjustments and clarifications have also been made to the preferred alternative in the Draft EIS, which is now presented as the proposed plan in the Moab MLP/FEIS.

Instructions for filing a protest with the BLM Director regarding the Moab MLP/Proposed RMP Amendments/Final EIS may be found in the "Dear Reader" letter of the Moab MLP/Proposed RMP Amendments/Final EIS, and in the Federal regulations at 43 CFR 1610.5-2. All protests must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Emailed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular mail or overnight delivery postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the email as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct emails to protest@blm.gov.

Before including your phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal

identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10, 43 CFR 1610.2, 43 CFR 1610.5.

Jenna Whitlock,

Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. 2016-17592 Filed 7-25-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-DQ-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Indian Gaming Commission

Update to Notice of Availability of a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Jamul Indian Village Proposed Gaming Management Agreement, San Diego County, California

AGENCY: National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability (NOA).

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*, the NIGC, in cooperation with the Jamul Indian Village has prepared a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS) for the proposed Gaming Management Agreement (GMA) between the Jamul Indian Village (JIV) and San Diego Gaming Ventures (SDGV). If approved, the GMA would allow SDGV to assume responsibility for operation and management of the JIV Gaming Facility located in San Diego County, California. The Final SEIS addresses the effects of GMA approval and the No Action Alternative, which assumes no GMA, is approved. The SEIS also updates the environmental baseline given the time that has passed and the changes that have been made to the scope of the Proposed Action, which was originally addressed in the 2003 Final EIS.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information or to request a copy of the Final SEIS, please contact: Andrew Mendoza, Staff Attorney, National Indian Gaming Commission Office of the General Counsel 1849 C Street NW., Mail Stop #1621, Washington, DC 20240, Phone: 202-632-7003; Facsimile: 202-632-7066; email: Andrew.Mendoza@nigc.gov.

Availability of the Final SEIS: The Final SEIS is available for public review at the following locations:

The Rancho San Diego Public Library, 11555 Via Rancho San Diego, El Cajon,

CA 92019, telephone (619) 660-5370; and

The Jamul Indian Village Tribal Office, 14191 #16 Highway 94, Jamul, CA 91935, telephone (619) 669-4785.

Copies of the Final SEIS will also be available for download from the Tribe's Web site www.jamulindianvillage.com.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The JIV Reservation is located in the unincorporated portion of southwestern San Diego County approximately one mile south of the community of Jamul on approximately six-acres of land held in federal trust. State Route 94 (SR-94) provides regional access to the JIV from downtown San Diego, which is located approximately 20 miles to the west where it intersects with Highway 5. Local access to the JIV is provided directly from SR-94 via Daisy Drive. From the JIV, SR-94 travels briefly north and then west to Downtown San Diego, passing through the unincorporated communities of Jamul, Casa de Oro, Spring Valley and Lemon Grove.

In 2000, JIV proposed a fee-to-trust land acquisition, construction and operation of a gaming complex and approval of a gaming development and management agreement for operation of the JIV Gaming Facility. The proposal was evaluated in a Final EIS prepared in 2003. Since that time, several major items have been removed from JIV's overall development program and the Gaming Facility has been redesigned to fit entirely within the existing JIV Reservation. All environmental effects of the Gaming Facility redesign have been evaluated through preparation of a Final Tribal Environmental Evaluation, which was prepared in accordance with the 1999 Tribal/State Compact. No action is before the BIA due to no fee-to-trust component of the JIV proposal. An action from the NIGC is required; specifically, approval or disapproval of the GMA. That approval or disapproval is the Proposed Action evaluated in the Final SEIS.

In addition to the Proposed Action, the Final SEIS addresses the No Action Alternative, which assumes no approval of the GMA between JIV and SDGV. Under the No Action scenario, JIV would assume operation and management responsibilities of the Jamul Gaming Facility. The NIGC may, in its Record of Decision, select the No Action Alternative rather than the Proposed Action.

This Final SEIS updates environmental conditions in the affected area given the amount of time that has passed since the 2003 Final EIS. Environmental issues addressed within

the Final SEIS include land resources, water resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural/paleontological resources, socioeconomic conditions, transportation, land use, public services, hazardous materials, noise, and visual resources. The Final SEIS examines the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of each alternative on these resources. The NIGC published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the **Federal Register** on April 10, 2013, describing the Proposed Action, announcing the NIGC's intent to prepare a Draft SEIS for the Proposed Action, and inviting comments.

The Draft EIS Notice of Availability (NOA) was published in the **Federal Register** by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on April 8, 2016 and the Draft SEIS was made available to federal, Tribal, state, and local agencies and other interested parties for review and comment. The comment period was open for 45 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** and closed on May 23, 2016. A total of nine comment letters were received. All comments received by the NIGC were considered and addressed in the Final SEIS, however, no substantive changes were made.

The EPA published the NOA of the Final SEIS in the **Federal Register** on July 8, 2016. The Chairman of the NIGC will prepare and sign the record of decision (ROD) to announce his final decision on the GMA between the JIV and SDGV following the August 8, 2016 conclusion of the 30 day public comment and review period. Availability of the ROD will be announced to the media and the project mailing list, and the ROD itself will be made available online.

Submittal of Written Comments: You may mail or email, written comments to NIGC, Attn: Andrew Mendoza, Staff Attorney, c/o Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Mail Stop #1621, Washington, DC 20240 email: Andrew.Mendoza@nigc.gov. Please include your name, return address, and the caption: "Final SEIS Comments, Jamul Indian Village," on the first page of your written comments. In order to be fully considered, written comments on the Final SEIS must be postmarked by August 8, 2016.

Commenting individuals may request confidentiality. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your written comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. Anonymous comments will not, however, be considered. All submissions from

organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available to public in their entirety.

Authority: This notice is published in accordance with 25 U.S.C. 2711, section 1503.l of the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508), and the Department of the Interior regulations (43 CFR part 46), implementing the procedural requirements of NEPA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*)

Dated: July 20, 2016.

Michael Hoenig,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2016-17589 Filed 7-25-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-WASO-CR-HPS-21568;
PPWOCRADIO, PCU00RP14.R50000 (166)]

Information Collection Request Sent to the Office of Management and Budget for Approval; Historic Preservation Certification Application

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We (National Park Service, NPS) have sent an Information Collection Request (ICR) to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. We summarize the ICR below and describe the nature of the collection and the estimated burden and cost. This information collection is scheduled to expire on July 31, 2016. 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. However, under OMB regulations, we may continue to conduct or sponsor this information collection while it is pending at OMB.

DATES: You must submit comments on or before August 25, 2016.

ADDRESSES: Send your comments and suggestions on this information collection to the Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior at OMB-OIRA at (202) 395-5806 (fax) or OIRA_Submission@omb.eop.gov (email). Please provide a copy of your comments to the Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Mail Stop 242, Reston, VA 20192 (mail); or madonna_baucum@nps.gov (email). Please reference OMB Control Number