

TABLE 2—SUMMARY OF 32 SPECIES IN CALIFORNIA AND NEVADA FOR WHICH 5-YEAR REVIEWS WERE COMPLETED BETWEEN APRIL 1, 2010 AND MARCH 16, 2011—Continued

Common name	Scientific name	Recommendation	Lead Fish and Wildlife Office	Contact
San Diego button celery .....	<i>Eryngium aristulatum</i> var. <i>parishii</i> .	No status change ....	Carlsbad .....	Bradd Baskerville-Bridges (760) 431-9440.
San Diego mesa mint .....	<i>Pogogyne abramsii</i> .....	No status change ....	Carlsbad .....	Bradd Baskerville-Bridges (760) 431-9440.
San Joaquin woolly-threads .....	<i>Monolopia</i> (=Lembertia) <i>congdonii</i> .	No status change ....	Sacramento .....	Josh Hull (916) 414-6600.
San Mateo thornmint .....	<i>Acanthomintha obovata</i> ssp. <i>duttonii</i> .	No status change ....	Sacramento .....	Josh Hull (916) 414-6600.
Santa Cruz Island malacothrix .....	<i>Malacothrix indecora</i> .....	No status change ....	Ventura .....	Connie Rutherford (805) 644-1766.
Slender-horned spineflower .....	<i>Dodecahema leptoceras</i> .....	No status change ....	Carlsbad .....	Bradd Baskerville-Bridges (760) 431-9440.
Slender-petaled mustard (thelypodium) .....	<i>Thelypodium stenopetalum</i> ...	No status change ....	Carlsbad .....	Bradd Baskerville-Bridges (760) 431-9440.
Sonoma spineflower .....	<i>Chorizanthe valida</i> .....	No status change ....	Sacramento .....	Josh Hull (916) 414-6600.
Tiburon jewelflower .....	<i>Streptanthus niger</i> .....	No status change ....	Sacramento .....	Josh Hull (916) 414-6600.
Ventura marsh milk-vetch .....	<i>Astragalus pycnostachyus</i> var. <i>lanosi</i> .	No status change ....	Ventura .....	Connie Rutherford (805) 644-1766.
White-rayed pentachaeta .....	<i>Pentachaeta bellidiflora</i> .....	No status change ....	Sacramento .....	Josh Hull (916) 414-6600.

**X. Authority**

We publish this notice under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Dated: May 18, 2011.

**Alexandra Pitts,**

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

[FR Doc. 2011-12861 Filed 5-24-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

[FWS-R1-R-2010-N125; 1265-0000-10137-S3]

**Willamette Valley National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Benton, Linn, Marion, and Polk Counties, OR**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability: draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan (DCCP) and environmental assessment (EA) for the Willamette Valley National Wildlife Refuge Complex (refuge complex) for

public review and comment. The refuge complex is made up of Ankeny, Baskett Slough, and William L. Finley National Wildlife Refuges (refuges), located in Benton, Linn, Marion, and Polk Counties, Oregon. In the DCCP and EA, we describe and evaluate alternatives, including our preferred alternative, for managing the refuge complex for the 15 years following approval of the final CCP.

**DATES:** To ensure consideration, we must receive your written comments by June 24, 2011.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, requests for more information, or requests for copies of the DCCP/EA, by any of the following methods:

*E-mail:*  
*FW1PlanningComments@fws.gov.*  
 Include "Willamette Valley NWRC DCCP/EA" in the subject line.

*Fax:* Attn: Doug Spencer, Project Leader, (541) 757-4450.

*U.S. Mail:* Doug Spencer, Project Leader, Willamette Valley National Wildlife Refuge Complex, 26208 Finley Refuge Road, Corvallis, OR 97333-9533.

*Web site:* <http://www.fws.gov/WillametteValley/complex/>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Doug Spencer, Project Leader, (541) 757-7236.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Introduction**

The complex includes three refuges: William L. Finley, Baskett Slough, and Ankeny. Together, the three refuges encompass approximately 11,110 acres in western Oregon. Habitats on the refuges include seasonal, semipermanent, and permanent wetlands; wet prairies, upland prairie/oak savannas, oak woodlands, mixed deciduous-coniferous forests, riparian, and riverine and stream habitats. Agricultural lands, the majority managed as grass fields, are also present on the refuges. The refuges were established under the Migratory Bird Conservation Act "for use as an inviolate sanctuary or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds . . . to conserve and protect migratory birds . . . and to restore or develop adequate wildlife habitat" with emphasis on protecting dusky Canada geese. In the last four decades, these refuges have provided not only an important wintering grounds for the dusky and thousands of other wintering geese and ducks—but have been recognized more recently as increasingly important areas for conservation of the remaining fragments of the native Valley habitats and biota. The refuges support key populations of federally listed species, including Oregon chub, Fender's blue butterfly, Bradshaw's desert-parsley, Kincaid's lupine, Nelson's checker-

mallow, and Willamette daisy, and provide migration habitat for listed Chinook salmon and steelhead. Several other rare species are also found on the refuges.

## 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 began public outreach by publishing a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** (73 FR 11137; February 29, 2008), announcing our intent to complete a CCP and EA and inviting public comments. In January 2008, we distributed Planning Update 1 to our mailing list and public outlets. On February 7 and 13, 2008, we held public scoping meetings in Salem and Corvallis, Oregon, respectively, to meet the public and identify issues for evaluation. The meetings were announced through local media outlets, on the refuges' Web site, and in Planning Update 1. In September 2008, we distributed Planning Update 2, which included a summary of the comments we received, a planning schedule, and a description of the CCP's scope. In September 2009, we distributed Planning Update 3; in it we summarized our preliminary draft alternatives, and invited public comments.

## DCCP/EA Alternatives We Are Considering

We identified and evaluated three alternatives for managing the refuges, including a No Action Alternative

(Alternative 1). Brief descriptions of the alternatives follow:

### *Alternative 1 (No Action)*

Under Alternative 1, the refuges would continue to maintain cultivated grass fields under a cooperative farming program to provide forage for wintering Canada geese. Other goose management activities, such as managing wetland habitats and providing sanctuary, would continue. The refuges would also continue to manage and enhance native habitats but no further habitat restoration work would occur. Endangered species management would continue. Existing public uses would continue with the current facilities and programs in place. No new public use facilities would be developed. The current areas closed to public access would remain in effect to provide sanctuary during the wintering waterfowl season. The refuges would not pursue any additional land protection measures under the no change alternative.

### *Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)*

Under Alternative 2, an emphasis on providing habitat for wintering geese would remain. Forage would continue to be provided primarily via cooperative farming. The refuges would pursue measures to help retain the services of cooperative farmers, such as providing enhanced irrigation capabilities; providing additional lure crops such as corn or other grains; the refuges taking over farming on certain high goose use fields; the Service offsetting a portion of the costs to cooperative farmers, *etc.* Wetland habitat management and restoration would also be intensified to improve habitat for geese and other wildlife.

Management and enhancement would continue in remnant native habitats and recently restored areas. In addition, approximately 479 additional acres on the three refuges would be restored to wetland, wet prairie, riparian, or upland prairie/oak savannah habitats over the next 15 years.

Threatened and endangered species management would continue to be a priority, guided by recovery plans where applicable. Existing populations of several threatened and endangered species would be strengthened, and several new populations would be established on the refuges.

Wildlife observation and interpretation would continue to be emphasized as the cornerstone of the public use program. Several new trails and observation facilities would be added. Additional interpretive signs and materials, including on-line materials,

would be developed. Major special events would occur at a frequency of about 3–4 per year, and monthly weekend interpretive programs would be developed.

Environmental education efforts would be expanded with an objective of reaching more students and schools, particularly at William L. Finley Refuge. Outdoor class shelters would be added. Funding would be sought to construct an Environmental Education Center, including indoor classroom facilities and a small exhibit area.

A new option to hunt antlerless deer would be added. In addition, new upland locations would be available for hunting during a portion of the shotgun season; this will require closure of two hiking trails for a week in November. The shotgun season would be shortened and shifted to later in the State season. A youth waterfowl hunt and a September goose hunt would be provided at Baskett Slough Refuge. Fishing would be promoted at the Willamette River by providing a canoe launch at Snag Boat Bend. The current area closed to public access would remain in effect to provide sanctuary during the wintering waterfowl season.

Together with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the refuges would develop an elk management plan after completion of the CCP. The refuges would continue to expand conservation partnerships, volunteer programs, and outreach to local communities. Proactive cultural resource management would occur by repairing/maintaining the historic structures on William L. Finley Refuge and by adding associated interpretive facilities.

This alternative also proposes protection, conservation, and management of additional lands within the Willamette Valley that could contribute to the refuges' purposes and goals by providing wintering habitat and forage for Canada geese; providing protection, enhancement, and restoration of native habitats and rare Willamette Valley species; and providing opportunity for additional wildlife-dependent public use. The refuges would undertake a subsequent land protection planning process to identify specific tracts of lands for these purposes.

### *Alternative 3*

This alternative involves a major shift in management for wintering Canada geese. Forage would be provided either through contract farming (paying farmers to grow crops on the refuges) and/or force account farming (refuge staff doing the farming). The refuges would only farm fields that have been

receiving moderate to high goose use. Refuge farming program costs would increase and goose use would likely decrease.

This alternative would create the opportunity to restore approximately 1,436 acres of cropland to native habitat since the amount of farmland would be reduced. However, the fields to be restored would likely lie fallow and could become weedy while awaiting staff time and funding for restoration.

Wildlife observation and interpretation would continue to be emphasized as the cornerstone of the public use program, but this alternative does little to expand these programs further. Interpretive signs would be developed or updated for existing facilities where needed, but major new developments and new interpretive methods would generally not occur. One or two special events would be held each year. The current area closed to public access on all three refuges would remain in effect to provide sanctuary during the wintering waterfowl season.

Deer hunting, threatened and endangered species management, environmental education, fishing, elk management, cultural resources, subsequent land protection planning, and conservation partnership activity would occur as under Alternative 2.

#### Public Availability of Documents

In addition to the information in **ADDRESSES**, you can view or obtain documents in the following ways: by calling the refuge complex at (541) 757-7236 or visiting our Web site at [http://www.fws.gov/WillametteValley/finley/refuge\\_planning.html](http://www.fws.gov/WillametteValley/finley/refuge_planning.html). Printed copies will be available for review at the following libraries:

- Corvallis-Benton County Public Library, 645 NW. Monroe Avenue, Corvallis, OR 97330, 541-766-6926.
- Albany Public Library, 2450 14th Avenue SE., Albany, OR 97231, 541-917-7580.
- Dallas Public Library, 950 Main Street, Dallas, OR 97338, 503-623-2633.
- Jefferson Public Library, 128 South Main Street, Jefferson, OR 97352, 541-327-3826.

#### Next Steps

After this comment period ends, we will analyze the comments and address them in the final CCP and decision document.

#### Public Availability of Comments

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that

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

Dated: April 28, 2011.

**Robyn Thorson,**

*Regional Director, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.*

[FR Doc. 2011-12964 Filed 5-24-11; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

**[FWS-R3-ES-2011-N096; 30120-1112-000-F2]**

#### Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for a Proposed Habitat Conservation Plan and Incidental Take Permit

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

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

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), advise the public that we intend to prepare a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) to evaluate the impacts of several alternatives relating to the proposed issuance of an Endangered Species Act Permit to Fowler Ridge Wind Farm LLC, Fowler Ridge Wind Farm II LLC, Fowler Ridge Wind Farm III LLC, and Fowler Ridge Wind Farm IV LLC (Applicant) for incidental take of the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), a Federal endangered species, from activities associated with the operation of Fowler Ridge Wind Farm in Benton County, Indiana. We also announce a public comment period.

**DATES:** The public scoping period begins with publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** and will continue through June 23, 2011. The Service will consider all comments defining the scope of the EIS that are received or postmarked by this date. Comments received or postmarked after this date will be considered to the extent practicable. The Service will conduct a public scoping meeting in Fowler, IN, on June 7, 2011. The scoping meeting will provide the public with an opportunity to present comments, ask questions, and discuss issues with Service staff regarding the EIS.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by U.S. mail or hand-delivery to Mr. Scott Pruitt, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 621 South Walker St.,

Bloomington, Indiana, 47403; *electronic mail:* [FowlerRidgeHCP@fws.gov](mailto:FowlerRidgeHCP@fws.gov); or *fax:* (812) 334-4273 (*Attention:* Scott Pruitt).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Scott Pruitt at (812) 334-4261.

Individuals who are hearing-impaired or speech-impaired may call the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8337 for TTY assistance.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We publish this notice in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), and its implementing regulations (40 CFR 1501.7, 1506.6, and 1508.22), and Section 10(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (the Act), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1539(c)). We intend to gather the information necessary to determine impacts and alternatives to support a decision regarding the potential issuance of an incidental take permit to the Applicant, and the implementation of the supporting draft habitat conservation plan (HCP). We intend to prepare an EIS to evaluate the impacts of several alternatives relating to the proposed issuance of an incidental take permit (ITP) under the Act. The applicant proposes to apply for an incidental take permit through development and implementation of an HCP. The proposed HCP will cover take of the Indiana bat that is incidental to activities associated with the operation of Fowler Ridge Wind Farm, and will include measures necessary to minimize and mitigate impacts to the Indiana bat and its habitat to the maximum extent practicable.

#### Request for Information

The Service requests data, comments, new information, or suggestions from the public, other concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, Tribes, industry, or any other interested party on this notice. These comments will be considered in the development of a draft EIS, in the development of a draft HCP by the applicant, and in the determination of whether to issue an ITP. We particularly seek comments concerning:

- (1) Biological information concerning the Indiana bat;
- (2) Relevant data concerning wind power and bat interactions;
- (3) Additional information concerning the range, distribution, population size, and population trends of the Indiana bat;
- (4) Current or planned activities in the subject area and their possible impacts on the Indiana bat;
- (5) Any information identified in the aforementioned as it relates to other bat