

Community	Community map repository address
City of Hepburn .....	Hepburn City Office, 501 Railroad Street, Clarinda, IA 51632.
City of Northboro .....	Clarinda City Building, 200 South 15th Street, Clarinda, IA 51632.
City of Shambaugh .....	City Hall, 307 Main Street, Shambaugh, IA 51651.
City of Shenandoah .....	City Hall, 500 West Clarinda Avenue, Shenandoah, IA 51601.
City of Yorktown .....	Clarinda City Building, 200 South 15th Street, Clarinda, IA 51632.
Unincorporated Areas of Page County .....	Clarinda City Building, 200 South 15th Street, Clarinda, IA 51632.

**St. Mary Parish, Louisiana and Incorporated Areas**

**Docket No.: FEMA-B-1543**

Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana .....	Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana, St. Mary Parish Courthouse, Planning and Zoning Office, 500 Main Street, 5th Floor, Franklin, LA 70538.
City of Franklin .....	City Hall, 300 Iberia Street, Franklin, LA 70538.
City of Morgan City .....	Planning and Zoning Department, 509 2nd Street, Morgan City, LA 70380.
City of Patterson .....	City Hall, 1314 Main Street, Patterson, LA 70392.
Town of Baldwin .....	Town Hall, 800 Main Street, Baldwin, LA 70514.
Town of Berwick .....	Town Hall, 3225 3rd Street, Berwick, LA 70342.
Unincorporated Areas of St. Mary Parish .....	St. Mary Parish Courthouse, Planning and Zoning Office, 500 Main Street, 5th Floor, Franklin, LA 70538.

**Olmsted County, Minnesota and Incorporated Areas**

**Docket Nos.: FEMA-B-1329 and FEMA-B-1557**

City of Chatfield .....	Municipal Offices, 21 Southeast 2nd Street, Chatfield, MN 55923.
City of Dover .....	City Hall, 218 North Chatfield Street, Dover, MN 55929.
City of Eyota .....	City Hall, 38 South Front Street Southwest, Eyota, MN 55934.
City of Pine Island .....	City Hall, 250 South Main Street, Pine Island, MN 55963.
City of Rochester .....	City Hall, 201 4th Street Southeast, Rochester, MN 55904.
City of Stewartville .....	City Hall, 105 East 1st Street, Stewartville, MN 55976.
Unincorporated Areas of Olmsted County .....	Olmsted County Government Center, 151 4th Street Southeast, Rochester, MN 55904.

**Roseau County, Minnesota and Incorporated Areas**

**Docket Nos.: FEMA-B-1310 and FEMA-B-1548**

City of Badger .....	City Hall, 111 North Main Street, Badger, MN 56714.
City of Greenbush .....	City Hall, 244 Main Street North, Greenbush, MN 56726.
City of Roseau .....	City Center, 121 Center Street East, Suite 202, Roseau, MN 56751.
City of Warroad .....	City Office, 121 Main Avenue Northeast, Warroad, MN 56763.
Unincorporated Areas of Roseau County .....	Roseau County Courthouse, 606 5th Avenue Southwest, Room 130, Roseau, MN 56751.

[FR Doc. 2017-01372 Filed 1-19-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 9110-12-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Fish and Wildlife Service**

[FWS-R6-MB-2017-N008; FF06M00000-XXX-FRMB48720660090]

**Availability of Record of Decision for Eagle Take Permits for the Chokecherry and Sierra Madre Phase I Wind Energy Project**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or USFWS), have prepared a record of decision (ROD) on the final environmental impact statement (Final EIS) for Eagle Take Permits for the Chokecherry and Sierra Madre Phase I Wind Energy Project (CCSM Phase I Project). The

ROD and Final EIS were prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, in response to an application from Power Company of Wyoming LLC (PCW) for eagle take permits (ETPs) pursuant to the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) and its implementing regulations. PCW has applied for both a standard and a programmatic ETP for the CCSM Phase I Project in Carbon County, Wyoming. The ROD is a concise statement of the purpose and need for the action, description of the project, the action alternatives considered, decisions made, and acceptable mitigation measures identified and committed to for avoiding or minimizing environmental impacts. The ROD also summarizes potential effects of the selected alternative, the public involvement process, and comments on the Final EIS.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the ROD are available at the Carbon County Library System at 215 West Buffalo Street,

Rawlins, Wyoming; the Saratoga Public Library at 503 West Elm Street, Saratoga, Wyoming; the USFWS Wyoming Ecological Services Office at 5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A, Cheyenne, Wyoming (contact Nathan Darnall to coordinate access, at [nathan\\_darnall@fws.gov](mailto:nathan_darnall@fws.gov) or 307-772-2374 ext. 246); and the USFWS Region 6 Office at 134 South Union Boulevard, Lakewood, Colorado (contact Louise Galiher to coordinate access, at [louise\\_galiher@fws.gov](mailto:louise_galiher@fws.gov) or 303-236-8677). The ROD, the Final EIS, the permit application and the supporting eagle conservation plan are also available electronically on the USFWS Web site at <https://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/wind/ChokecherrySierraMadre/index.html>.

You may contact us regarding the ROD via the following methods:

- **Email:** [CCSM\\_EIS@fws.gov](mailto:CCSM_EIS@fws.gov).
- **U.S. Mail:** Chokecherry and Sierra Madre EIS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region,

Attention: Louise Galiher, P.O. Box 25486 DFC, Denver, CO 80225.

• *Hand-Delivery/Courier:*

Chokecherry and Sierra Madre EIS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region, Attention: Louise Galiher, 134 Union Blvd., Lakewood, CO 80228.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Louise Galiher, at 303-236-8677 (phone) or [louise\\_galiher@fws.gov](mailto:louise_galiher@fws.gov) (email); or Clint Riley, at 303-236-5231 (phone) or [clint\\_riley@fws.gov](mailto:clint_riley@fws.gov) (email). Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf may call the Federal Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339 to contact the above individuals. The Federal Relay Service is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for you to leave a message or question with the above individuals. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), have prepared a ROD on the Final EIS under NEPA, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), in response to an application from PCW for ETPs pursuant to BGEPA, (16 U.S.C. 668-668c) and its implementing regulations. PCW has applied for both a standard and programmatic ETP for the CCSM Phase I Project in Carbon County, Wyoming.

**Public Coordination**

As noted in the notice of availability for the Final EIS (81 FR 89133, December 9, 2016), the public was notified of the intent to prepare an EIS, and was earlier notified of the availability of the Draft EIS for review and comment. The alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS were carried forward for full analysis in the Final EIS. Agencies, tribes, organizations, and interested parties provided comments on the Draft EIS via mail, email, and public meetings, and the Final EIS via mail and email.

**The Selected Alternative**

In the Final EIS, the Service analyzed four alternatives as described below. The Service identified the proposed action as the preferred alternative. In the ROD, the proposed action was identified as the selected alternative for implementation.

*Alternative 1: Proposed Action.*

Alternative 1 is for the Service to issue ETPs for the construction of the Phase I wind turbines and infrastructure components and for the operation of the Phase I CCSM project, based on the ETP applications submitted by PCW. The proposed action includes avoidance and minimization measures, best

management practices, and compensatory mitigation described in detail in the EIS and in PCW's application and ECP. As compensatory mitigation PCW has proposed to retrofit existing high-risk power poles, thereby reducing ongoing eagle mortality from electrocution.

**Other Alternatives Considered**

Four alternatives, including the proposed action, were analyzed in the Final EIS. The other three alternatives analyzed included:

*Alternative 2: Proposed Action with Different Mitigation.* Under Alternative 2, the Service would issue ETPs for the construction and operation of the Phase I CCSM Project as under Alternative 1, but would require PCW to implement a different form of compensatory mitigation than proposed in its ETP applications. We considered mitigation of older wind facilities, lead abatement, carcass removal, carcass avoidance, wind conservation easements, habitat enhancement (focusing on prey habitat), and rehabilitation of injured eagles as possible alternative forms of compensatory mitigation.

*Alternative 3: Issue ETPs for Only the Phase I of Sierra Madre Wind Development Area.* The Service received numerous comments during the scoping process requesting that we examine a different development scenario from that proposed by PCW. However, to issue an ETP, we must analyze a specific project and ECP to determine if it meets the requirements for an ETP. Alternative 3 represented an example of a different development scenario PCW could present in a new application if the Service were to determine that the Phase I CCSM Project would meet all the criteria for issuing an ETP, but not at the scale proposed. Alternative 3 was for the Service to issue ETPs for the construction of Phase I infrastructure and the construction and operation of wind turbines only in the Sierra Madre Wind Development Area (WDA) (298 turbines total). This alternative included avoidance and minimization measures, best management practices, and compensatory mitigation described in PCW's application as they apply to the Sierra Madre WDA.

*Alternative 4: No Action.* Under Alternative 4, the Service would deny PCW standard and programmatic ETPs for construction and operation of the Phase I CCSM Project. In addition to being a potential outcome of the permit review process, analysis of the No Action alternative is required by Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR 1502.14) and

provides a baseline against which to compare the environmental impacts of the proposed action and other reasonable alternatives. ETPs are not required in order for PCW to construct and operate the project; therefore, if we deny the ETPs, PCW may choose to construct and operate the Phase I CCSM Project without ETPs and without adhering to an ECP. Alternative 4 analyzed both a "No Build" scenario and a "Build Without ETPs" scenario.

**Environmentally Preferable Alternative**

After review of the programmatic ETP application and completion of the NEPA process, we determined that Alternative 3 (Issue ETPs for Only Phase I of Sierra Madre Wind Development Area) and the No Build option of Alternative 4 (No Action: Denial of ETPs) are the Environmentally Preferable Alternatives. Although Alternative 3 would result in lower eagle take and fewer environmental impacts than Alternative 1, we have not received a permit application for this or any other smaller subset of the CCSM Phase I Project. As described in the Final EIS, we considered Alternative 3 as an example of a different development scenario and stated that Alternative 3 would have been eligible for selection only if we were to determine that Alternative 1 did not meet regulatory criteria for a standard ETP and programmatic ETP. Because Alternative 1 did meet regulatory criteria, we did not select Alternative 3 for implementation.

Because the Alternative 4 No Build option would result in no construction or operation impacts from developing the proposed CCSM Phase I Project, including no take of eagles, we have identified the No Build option as an Environmentally Preferred Alternative. However, because we find that Alternative 1 meets permitting regulatory criteria, and have identified no other basis for denying the ETP applications, we are not selecting Alternative 4. In addition, the No Build option of Alternative 4 would be inconsistent with Secretarial Order 3285, which encourages development of renewable energy generation projects in the United States. We also note that Alternative 4 would deny the ETP applications, but would not necessarily result in the No Build scenario, and that if Alternative 4 would result in the CCSM Phase I Project being built without conservation measures that would otherwise be required by an ETP, it would not constitute an environmentally preferred alternative.

### Minimization of Impacts

The Final EIS addresses public concerns, potential impacts, and methods to minimize impacts. The Service considered that all identified practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental impacts associated with implementing the selected alternative will be utilized.

### Decision

The Service's decision is to implement Alternative 1: Proposed Action, and issue a standard and a programmatic eagle take permit for the CCSM Phase I Project.

This decision is based on the information contained in the Final EIS for Eagle Take Permits for the CCSM Phase I Project, which updated and supplemented the information contained in the Draft EIS.

### National Environmental Policy Act Compliance

Our decision of whether to issue standard and programmatic ETPs to PCW triggered compliance with NEPA. NEPA required the Service to analyze the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the CCSM Phase I Project before we made our decision, and to make our analysis available to the public. We prepared the Final EIS to inform the public of our proposed permit action, alternatives to that action, the environmental impacts of the alternatives, and measures to minimize adverse environmental effects.

### Authorities

This notice is published in accordance with NEPA; the CEQ's regulations for implementing NEPA, 40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508; and the Department of the Interior's NEPA regulations, 43 CFR part 46.

### Noreen Walsh,

*Regional Director, USFWS Mountain-Prairie Region.*

[FR Doc. 2017-01346 Filed 1-19-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333-15-P

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

[FWS-R4-FHC-2017-N003;  
FVHC98220410150-XXX-FF04G01000]

### Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill; Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group Final Restoration Plan #1: Restoration of Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats; Habitat Projects on Federally Managed Lands; and Birds

**AGENCY:** Department of the Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA), the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Consent Decree, and the Final Programmatic Damage Assessment Restoration Plan and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, the Federal and State natural resource trustee agencies for the Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group (Trustees) have approved the "Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group Final Restoration Plan #1: Restoration of Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats; Habitat Projects on Federally Managed Lands; and Birds" (Restoration Plan #1). The Trustees have selected to fund engineering and design activities for six projects intended to continue the process of restoring natural resources and services injured or lost as a result of the *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill, which occurred on or about April 20, 2010, in the Gulf of Mexico.

**ADDRESSES:** Obtaining Documents: You may download the "Louisiana Trustee Implementation Group Final Restoration Plan #1: Restoration of Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats, Habitat Projects on Federally Managed Lands; and Birds" at any of the following sites:

- <http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov>.
- <http://www.doi.gov/deepwaterhorizon>.
- <http://la-dwh.com>.

Alternatively, you may request a CD of the Final Restoration Plan # 1 (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). You may also view the document at any of the public facilities listed at <http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Liz Williams, at [LATIG@la.gov](mailto:LATIG@la.gov).

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Introduction

On or about April 20, 2010, the mobile offshore drilling unit *Deepwater Horizon*, which was being used to drill a well for BP Exploration and Production, Inc. (BP), in the Macondo prospect (Mississippi Canyon 252-MC252), experienced a significant explosion, fire, and subsequent sinking in the Gulf of Mexico, resulting in an unprecedented volume of oil and other discharges from the rig and from the wellhead on the seabed. The *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill is the largest oil spill in U.S. history, discharging millions of barrels of oil over a period of 87 days. In addition, well over 1 million gallons of dispersants were applied to the waters of the spill area in an attempt to disperse the spilled oil. An undetermined amount of natural gas

was also released into the environment as a result of the spill.

The *Deepwater Horizon* State and Federal natural resource trustees (Trustees) conducted the natural resource damage assessment (NRDA) for the *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill under the Oil Pollution Act 1990 (OPA; 33 U.S.C. 2701 *et seq.*). Pursuant to OPA, Federal and State agencies act as trustees on behalf of the public to assess natural resource injuries and losses and determine actions required to compensate the public for those injuries and losses. OPA further instructs the designated trustees to develop and implement a plan for the restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, or acquisition of the equivalent of the injured natural resources under their trusteeship, including the loss of use and services from those resources from the time of injury until the time of restoration to baseline (the resource quality and conditions that would exist if the spill had not occurred) is complete.

The Trustees are:

- U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), as represented by the National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management;
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Commerce;
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA);
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA);
- State of Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA), Oil Spill Coordinator's Office (LOSCO), Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ), Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF), and Department of Natural Resources (LDNR);
- State of Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality;
- State of Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and Geological Survey of Alabama;
- State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission; and
- For the State of Texas: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Texas General Land Office, and Texas Commission on Environmental Quality.

Upon completion of the NRDA, the Trustees reached and finalized a settlement of their natural resource damage claims with BP in a Consent Decree approved by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. Pursuant to that Consent Decree, restoration projects in Louisiana are now chosen and managed by the