EIS based on public comments on the Draft RMP and Draft EIS in addition to cooperating agency reviews, resource advisory council reviews, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service consultation, and extensive internal BLM reviews. The BLM carefully considered and incorporated comments into the Proposed RMP as appropriate. Public comments assisted in the development of the Proposed RMP and resulted in the addition of clarifying text, but did not constitute a substantial change in the proposed land use plan decisions that would require a supplement to the Draft EIS.

The Proposed RMP and Final EIS describes and analyzes four management alternatives, each of which include objectives and management actions to address new management challenges and issues.

Alternative A is the no action alternative and is a continuation of the current management direction and prevailing conditions based on the existing 1987 Grand Junction Resource Area RMP and amendments.

Alternative B (The Proposed RMP) seeks to allocate public land resources among competing human interests and land uses, with the conservation of natural and cultural resource values. Alternative B carries forward the same theme it had in the Draft RMP and Draft EIS, but includes elements of the other alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMP and Draft EIS.

Alternative C emphasizes improving, rehabilitating and restoring resources; and sustaining the ecological integrity of habitats for all priority plant, wildlife and fish species, particularly the habitats needed to conserve and recover federally listed, proposed, or candidate threatened and endangered plant and animal species.

Alternative D emphasizes active management for natural resources, commodity production, and public use opportunities by allowing a mix of multiple use opportunities that target social and economic outcomes, while protecting land health. Management direction would recognize and expand existing uses, and accommodate new uses to the greatest extent possible.

The Proposed RMP would provide comprehensive, long-range decisions for the use and management of resources in the planning area administered by the Grand Junction Field Office, focusing on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

The Proposed RMP includes: Goals, objectives, management actions, allowable use and implementation decisions to ensure future BLM management in support of 13 areas of critical environmental concern, five special recreation management areas, six extensive recreation management areas, four wilderness study areas, one national trail management corridor, and one segment found suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Maps are included in the Proposed RMP/FEIS to illustrate the Proposed RMP as well as the other alternatives considered in the Final EIS. Through the Wild and Scenic River study process, the BLM inventoried 514 miles and 114 stream segments, found 415 miles and 100 stream segments ineligible, and found 99 miles and 14 stream segments eligible, of which 10.38 miles of 1 stream are identified as suitable in the Proposed RMP. Three areas covering 44,100 acres located in the southern portion of the field office would be managed to protect lands with wilderness characteristics. Protective management of the areas would vary; however, all of the areas would be managed as right-of-way exclusion, no leasing for fluid minerals, no surface occupancy (non-fluid minerals), closed to non-energy leasables, closed to mineral material disposal, and Visual Resource Management Class II.

While the RMP proposes some conservation management measures for the Greater Sage-grouse habitat, the Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment and EIS will fully analyze applicable Greater-Sage grouse conservation measures, consistent with BLM Instruction Memorandum No. 2012–044. The BLM expects to make a comprehensive set of decisions for managing Greater Sage-Grouse on lands administered by the Grand Junction Field Office in the Record of Decision for the Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment and EIS, which will update this proposed RMP.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the Proposed RMP and FEIS may be found in the ''Dear Reader'' Letter of the Grand Junction Field Office Proposed RMP and Final EIS, and 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 or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the emailed protest 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.* Unlike land use planning decisions, implementation decisions included in this Proposed RMP and Final EIS are not subject to protest under the BLM planning regulations. Implementation decisions are subject to an administrative review process through appeals to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Interior Board of Land Appeals, pursuant to 43 CFR part 4. Implementation decisions generally constitute the BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. Where implementation decisions are made as part of the land use planning process, they are still subject to the appeals process or other administrative review as prescribed by specific resource program regulations once the BLM resolves the protests to land use planning decisions and issues an Approved RMP and ROD. Implementation decisions made in the plan that may be appealed to the Office of Hearing and Appeals are identified in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. They will also be included in the ROD and Approved RMP.

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

Ruth Welch,

BLM Colorado State Director.

[FR Doc. 2015–08187 Filed 4–10–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–JB–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[15X.LLID9570000.L14400000.BJ0000.241A. 4500078174]

Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Filing of Plats of Surveys.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has officially filed the plats of survey of the lands described below in the BLM Idaho State Office, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., on the dates specified.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bureau of Land Management, 1387

South Vinnell Way, Boise, Idaho, 83709–1657.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This survey were executed at the request of the Bureau of Land Management to meet their administrative needs. The lands surveyed are: The plat constituting the entire survey record of the dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines, and a corrective dependent resurvey of a portion of metes-and-bounds survey No. 1, in sections 25, 26, 35, and 36, T. 4 S., R. 19 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 985, was accepted January 15, 2015.

The plat constituting the entire survey record of the dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of section 26, T. 5 S., R. 17 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1400, was accepted January 15, 2015.

The plats constituting the entire survey record of: The dependent resurvey of portions of the west boundary and subdivisional lines, T. 8 S., R. 3 W., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1367; the dependent resurvey of portions of the north boundary and subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of section 3, T. 9 S., R. 4 W., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1367; the dependent resurvey of portions of the south and west boundaries, and subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of sections 27 and 31, T. 9 S., R. 5 W., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1367; the dependent resurvey of portions of the north boundary, west boundary, and subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of sections 4 and 6, T. 10 S., R. 3 W., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1367; and the dependent resurvey of portions of the east and west boundaries, and subdivisional lines, and the subdivision of sections 1 and 3, T. 10 S., R. 5 W., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1367, were approved January 23, 2015.

These surveys were executed at the request of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to meet certain administrative and management purposes. The lands surveyed are: The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the east boundary, subdivisional lines, and subdivision of sections 11 and 14, and the subdivision of section 13, and further subdivision of sections 11 and 14, T. 34 N., R. 4 W., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1404, was accepted February 11, 2015.

The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the subdivisional lines and subdivision of section 26, and further subdivision of section 26, T. 33 N., R. 1 E., of the Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group Number 1403, was accepted February 19, 2015.

Stanley G. French,

Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.

[FR Doc. 2015–08249 Filed 4–9–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–GG–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS–WASO–D–COS–POL–18018; PWODIREP0] [PPMPSPD1Y.YM0000]

Notice of Amendment of the Site for the May 6–7, 2015, Meeting of the National Park System Advisory Board

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of change of meeting site.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix 1–16, and Part 65 of title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, notice is hereby given of the change in the site for the May 6–7, 2015, meeting of the National Park System Advisory Board.

DATES: The Board will meet on May 6–7, 2015.

ADDRESSES: The meeting site originally published on March 8, 2015, in the **Federal Register**, 80 FR 12519, has changed. The new meeting site will be the Crystal Sands Room of the Hampton Inn Pensacola Beach Gulf Front, 2 Via De Luna Drive, Pensacola Beach, Florida 32561, telephone (850) 932–6800.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Shirley Sears, National Park Service, telephone (202) 354–3955, email *Shirley_Sears@nps.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The board meeting will be open to the public. The order of the agenda may be changed, if necessary, to accommodate travel schedules or for other reasons. Space and facilities to accommodate the public are limited and attendees will be accommodated on a first-come basis. Anyone may file with the Board a written statement concerning matters to be discussed. The Board also will permit attendees to address the Board, but may restrict the length of the presentations, as necessary to allow the Board to complete its agenda within the allotted time. Before including your address, telephone 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 us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: April 7, 2015.

Alma Ripps,

Chief, Office of Policy.

[FR Doc. 2015–08266 Filed 4–9–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–EE–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS–PWR–PWRO–17665; PX.PR118981J.00.1]

Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Kalaupapa National Historical Park, Kalawao and Maui Counties, Hawaii

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The National Park Service announces the availability of a Draft General Management Plan (GMP)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Kalaupapa National Historical Park. The document identifies and analyzes four alternatives. Alternative A (no action alternative) assumes that programming, facilities, staffing, and funding would generally continue at their current levels to protect the values of Kalaupapa NHP in the near term. Alternative B focuses on maintaining Kalaupapa's spirit and character through limiting visitation. Visitor use would be highly structured, though limited opportunities would exist for public visitation and overnight use. The NPS would develop an extensive outreach program to share Kalaupapa's history with a wide audience at off-site locations. Alternative C (agency-preferred) emphasizes stewardship of Kalaupapa's lands in collaboration with the park's many partners. Kalaupapa's diverse resources would be managed to protect and maintain their character and historical significance. Visitation by the general public would be supported, provided, and integrated into park management. Visitor regulations would change, while continuing to limit the number of visitors per day through new mechanisms. Alternative D focuses on the personal connections to Kalaupapa through visitation by the general public. Resources would be managed for long-term preservation through NPS-led programs throughout the park. Alternative D offers visitors the greatest opportunities to explore areas on their own. Visitor regulations would be similar to Alternative C.