

the AFH with respect to another program participant.

Through these regulatory provisions, HUD sets out the standard for review of AFHs. HUD is further committed to providing technical assistance and examples that will help guide program participants as to what it means to have an AFH that is substantially incomplete or one that is inconsistent with fair housing or civil rights laws. HUD can, and will, provide a checklist to help program participants ensure they have responded to all required elements of the Assessment Tool.

*Issue: The certification statement for the Assessment Tool is too broad.* A commenter stated that it is unreasonable to require broad certification of AFFH compliance without providing program participants with the standards HUD will use to assess that compliance. Another commenter suggested that HUD revise the certification language to read, "All information provided by the signatory entity in this assessment is true, complete, and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief as of the date of this submission." The commenter stated that this will better facilitate submissions for program participants that will submit a single AFH on behalf of multiple agencies.

*HUD Response:* Several changes were made to both the certification language itself to align it with the certification provisions in the AFFH final rule and clarifying language was also added to the instructions accompanying the Assessment Tool that pertain to the certification. First, a new item was added to the certification, reflecting the AFFH final rule:

By this signature, I am authorized to certify on behalf of the program participant that the program participant will take meaningful actions to further the goals identified in its AFH conducted in accordance with the requirements in §§ 5.150 through 5.180 and 24 CFR 91.225(a)(1), 91.325(a)(1), 91.425(a)(1), 570.487(b)(1), 570.601, 903.7(o), and 903.15(d), as applicable.

Second, an instruction was added for the certification that states: "Please note, for a joint or regional AFH, each collaborating program participant must authorize a representative to sign the certification on the program participant's behalf. In a joint or regional AFH, when responding to each question, collaborating program participants may provide joint analyses and individual analyses. The authorized representative of each program participant certifies only to information the program participant provides individually or jointly in response to each question in the assessment. The authorized representative does not

certify for information applicable only to other collaborating program participants' analyses, if any." HUD believes this additional instruction will provide greater clarity and further encourage joint and regional AFH submissions.

As the AFFH final rule itself makes clear, joint and regional submitting agencies are both responsible for the joint portions of the Assessment, including joint goals, and for their own individual portions of the assessment, including their agencies' individual goals and priorities. They are therefore not responsible for other agencies' individual goals and priorities. As stated in § 5.156 (a)(3) of the AFFH final rule:

Collaborating program participants must designate, through express written consent, one participant as the lead entity to oversee the submission of the joint or regional AFH on behalf of all collaborating program participants. When collaborating to submit a joint or regional AFH, program participants may divide work as they choose, but all program participants are accountable for the analysis and any joint goals and priorities, and each collaborating program participant must sign the AFH submitted to HUD. Collaborating program participants are also accountable for their individual analysis, goals, and priorities to be included in the collaborative AFH.

HUD encourages program participants to enter into joint and regional collaborations. Doing so can have benefits for both the analysis of issues, which often cross-jurisdictional boundaries and for setting goals. HUD will work with all joint and regional participating entities to facilitate their cooperation and further clarify the roles and responsibilities of these agencies through additional technical assistance and guidance documents.

### III. Summary

In issuing this Final Assessment Tool, HUD has strived to reach the appropriate balance in having program participants produce a meaningful assessment of fair housing that carefully considers barriers to fair housing choice and accessing opportunity and how such barriers can be overcome in respective jurisdictions and regions without being unduly burdensome. HUD has further committed to addressing program participant burden by providing data, guidance, and technical assistance, and such assistance will occur throughout the AFH process.

Dated: December 22, 2015.

**Gustavo Velasquez,**

*Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity.*

[FR Doc. 2015-32680 Filed 12-30-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-67-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-NEF-FIIS-18941; PXXNR5E2150001]

#### Notice of Availability of the Final White-Tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Fire Island National Seashore, New York

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the Final White-tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Final Plan/EIS) for Fire Island National Seashore, New York. The Final Plan/EIS identifies Alternative D as the NPS preferred alternative. When approved, the management plan will guide management of white-tailed deer at Fire Island National Seashore through the use of integrated tools and strategies to control the deer population and support preservation of the natural and cultural landscape, protection and restoration of native vegetation and other natural and cultural resources.

**DATES:** The NPS will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) no sooner than 30 days following publication by the Environmental Protection Agency of a Notice of Availability of the Final Plan/EIS in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** The Final Plan/EIS is available electronically at <http://www.parkplanning.nps.gov/fiis>. A limited number of printed copies will be available upon request by contacting the Superintendent's office.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Morgan Elmer, NPS Denver Service Center, 303-969-2317, [Morgan\\_Elmer@nps.gov](mailto:Morgan_Elmer@nps.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Fire Island National Seashore (the Seashore), a unit of the National Park System, is located along the south shore of Long Island in Suffolk County, New York. The Seashore encompasses 19,579 acres of upland, tidal, and submerged lands along a 26-mile stretch of the 32-mile barrier island—part of a much larger system of barrier islands and bluffs stretching from New York City to the very eastern end of Long Island at

Montauk Point. The Seashore sustains a white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) population that has expanded since the late 1960s to the extent that impacts from high densities of deer have been, and continue to be, a complex issue for National Park Service (NPS) managers. As a result, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Seashore prepared a Draft White-tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Draft Plan/EIS) to develop a deer management strategy that supports preservation of the natural and cultural landscape through population management and the protection of native vegetation. The Draft Plan/EIS was prepared in cooperation with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYS-DEC) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (APHIS).

The NPS released the Draft Plan/EIS for public and agency review and comment beginning July 31, 2014 and ending October 10, 2014. The Draft Plan/EIS evaluated a no action alternative (A) and three action alternatives (B, C, and D). Each action alternative presented a different strategy to protect native plant communities and cultural plantings, promote forest regeneration, further reduce undesirable human-deer interactions, and reduce the deer population in the Seashore.

*Alternative A* would continue existing deer management and monitoring efforts throughout the Seashore. These actions include continued public education/interpretation efforts, vegetation monitoring, and deer population and behavior surveys.

*Alternative B* provides a nonlethal deer reduction option to implement nonsurgical reproductive control of does when an acceptable reproductive control agent is available that meets NPS established criteria. Large fence enclosures would also protect forested areas and vegetation to allow restoration of the maritime holly forest, other natural vegetation and the culturally important vegetation at the William Floyd Estate.

*Alternative C* provides a lethal deer reduction option through the use of sharpshooting with firearms, and possible capture and euthanasia to reduce deer populations to the target density and maintain that level.

*Alternative D*, identified as the NPS preferred alternative, provides a combined lethal and nonlethal deer reduction option through the use of sharpshooting with firearms, and possible capture and euthanasia to

reduce deer populations to a desirable level. Once the target density has been reached, use of nonsurgical reproductive control of does may be used to maintain that level when an acceptable reproductive control agent is available that meets NPS established criteria.

Comments were accepted on the Draft Plan/EIS during the 60-day public comment period. After reviewing and considering all comments received, the NPS has prepared this Final White-tailed Deer Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (Final Plan/EIS). The Final Plan/EIS identifies Alternative D as the NPS preferred alternative with no changes from the Draft Plan/EIS and presents the likely environmental consequences of implementing the preferred alternative, as well as the other alternatives considered. The Final Plan/EIS also discusses the comments received on the Draft Plan/EIS and responds to substantive comments.

Dated: August 5, 2015.

**Michael A. Caldwell,**

*Regional Director, Northeast Region, National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2015-32970 Filed 12-30-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-WV-P**

## JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

### Hearings of the Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure

**AGENCY:** Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Judicial Conference of the United States.

**ACTION:** Notice of cancellation of public hearing.

**SUMMARY:** The following public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure has been canceled: Bankruptcy Rules Hearing on January 22, 2016 in Washington, DC. Announcements for this meeting were previously published in 80 FR 48120, 80 FR 50324 and 80 FR 51604. The public hearing on proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure scheduled for January 29, 2016, in Pasadena, California, remains scheduled, subject to sufficient expressions of interest.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Rebecca A. Womeldorf, Rules Committee Secretary, Rules Committee Support Office, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, DC 20544, telephone (202) 502-1820.

Dated: December 28, 2015.

**Rebecca A. Womeldorf,**

*Rules Committee Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 2015-32923 Filed 12-30-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 2210-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Notice of Lodging of Proposed Consent Decrees Under the Clean Water Act

On December 23, 2015, the Department of Justice lodged two proposed consent decrees with the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico in the lawsuit entitled *United States v. The Municipality of San Juan, the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, the Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works, the Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico*, Civil Action No. 3:14-cv-1476-CCC.

One proposed consent decree resolves the United States' claims against the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources ("DNER") under the Clean Water Act ("CWA"), 33 U.S.C. 1251-1387, concerning CWA violations at three of its storm water pump stations located within San Juan. The proposed consent decree requires DNER to apply for a permit and implement a Storm Water Management Program, to undertake certain capital and operation improvements to its pump stations, and to provide financial support for investigations and work performed in the pump station service areas. The proposed consent decree resolves only the violations alleged against DNER in the Complaint through the date of lodging of the consent decree and does not resolve claims against the other Defendants. Due to financial challenges currently facing the Commonwealth, no civil penalties for past violations will be recovered under this consent decree.

The second proposed consent decree resolves the United States' claims against the Puerto Rico Department of Transportation and Public Works ("DTPW") and the Puerto Rico Highways and Transportation Authority ("HTA") under the CWA, concerning CWA violations throughout their storm sewer systems located within San Juan. The proposed consent decree provides for injunctive relief to be implemented in a two-stage, multi-phased approach including the study and repair of their MS4s, in addition to other infrastructure and operational improvements. The proposed consent decree resolves only