

of acreage and Alternatives D and E opening the most. All alternatives meet the primary purposes of the Monument and the mission of the NWRs; therefore, each one has the potential to be selected for implementation. The draft Alternative E has been identified as the preferred alternative because it strikes a reasonable balance between resource protections and compatible, wildlife-dependent public use and access, while at the same time addressing relevant laws, policies, regulations, and other mandates, and locally identified significant issues.

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, is required by NEPA. It provides a baseline from which to compare the other alternatives. Under Alternative A, management practices already underway or funded would continue. Management would focus on protecting and enhancing biological and cultural resources, fire protection, fire rehabilitation, and maintenance of existing facilities. Land use designations that were in place at the time of Monument establishment would be maintained. Access for recreational, interpretive, and educational purposes would continue year-round in designated areas. The current primitive recreation opportunities would continue to be provided. The small environmental education program would continue, but could fluctuate without a stable staff base.

Alternative B focuses on protecting, conserving, and restoring the resources described in the Monument Proclamation; thousands of acres of the Monument could see some level of restoration activity on an annual basis. Avoiding impacts to resources would be a priority. Access for recreational, interpretive, and educational purposes would be expanded over current levels and would continue year-round in designated areas. The current primitive recreation opportunities would continue, with some additional facilities provided. New facilities could include wildlife observation sites and the construction of new trails. The small environmental education program would be slightly expanded.

Alternative C focuses on protecting and conserving the natural resources of the Monument by concentrating public use away from the Monument's interior to create and maintain large areas that are free of development, both for conservation purposes and to maintain natural landscapes and solitude opportunities. Visitors would be allowed access to significant portions of the Monument, but access points would be limited and concentrated in specific areas. Both primitive and developed

recreation opportunities would be provided, although ease of access would be constrained. New facilities could include camping sites for float boaters, improved boat launches, wildlife observation sites, and the construction of new trails in greater abundance than Alternative B. Educational and interpretive opportunities would be substantially enhanced over current levels. Through economies of scale, and limiting large-scale development, more resources would be available for habitat restoration activities than under any alternative except Alternative B.

Alternative D provides the highest level of public use and access, although protection of resources would still remain a priority. Alternative D would assume a greater acceptance of risk to natural and cultural resources through increased public use and access. Developed recreation opportunities and visitor facilities would be increased significantly from the current level, including the construction of campgrounds, boat launches, new access points, trails, and automobile tour routes. Educational and interpretive opportunities would be greatly expanded over current levels, and would be aimed at not just providing information about the Monument, but also protecting Monument resources. This increase in public amenities would likely mean a decrease in restoration activities, with a greater emphasis on protecting resources and habitats in their current conditions.

Alternative E, the Preferred Alternative, was developed by the Hanford Reach Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) based on the initial range of actions under Alternatives A, B, C, and D. The FAC selected elements from each of the other alternatives to develop this alternative. Access points would be concentrated, much the same as Alternative C, although development most closely matches that of Alternative D. Recreation opportunities and visitor facilities would be increased substantially from the current level, although not to the level of Alternative D. New amenities would include the construction of camp sites for float boaters, boat launches, trails, and new access points. Educational and interpretive opportunities would be greatly expanded over current levels, although not to the level of Alternative D. This increase in public amenities would also likely mean a decrease in restoration activities, with a greater emphasis on protecting resources and habitats in the condition they currently exist.

Alternative F was developed by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) by modifying Alternative B. Restoration, access, public use and other management actions closely resemble Alternative B. The primary difference between Alternatives B and F is that Alternative F controls and monitors all public use and access through a permit system for all open areas of the Monument. Some areas would also require user fees to help fund Monument programs.

#### Public Comments

Public comments are requested, considered, and incorporated throughout the planning process. After the review and comment period ends for this Draft CCP/EIS, comments will be analyzed by the Service and addressed in revised planning documents. All comments received from individuals, including names and addresses, become part of the official public record and may be released. Requests for release of comments received from the public will be handled in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, NEPA, and Service and DOI policies and procedures.

Dated: December 7, 2006.

**David J. Wesley,**

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

[FR Doc. E6-21261 Filed 12-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge and Wetland Management District

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

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

---

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces that a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for Lacreek National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge) and Wetland Management District (WMD) is available. This CCP describes how the Service intends to manage this Refuge and WMD for the next 15 years.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received at the postal or electronic address listed below on or before February 12, 2007.

**ADDRESSES:** A copy of the CCP or Summary may be obtained by writing to

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuge Planning, 134 Union Boulevard, Suite 300, Lakewood, CO 80228; or downloaded from <http://mountain-prairie.fws.gov/planning>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Michael Spratt, Planning Team Leader, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, telephone 303-236-4366; fax 303-236-4792; or e-mail: [Michael\\_spratt@fws.gov](mailto:Michael_spratt@fws.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** This Refuge was established in 1935 by President Franklin D. Roosevelt through Executive Order No. 7160 “\* \* \* as a refuge and breeding ground for migratory birds and other wildlife.” The Refuge lies in the Lake Creek Valley on the northern edge of the Nebraska Sandhills and includes 16,410 acres of native sandhills, sub-irrigated meadows, impounded fresh water marshes, and tall and mixed-grass prairie uplands.

The WMD was started as part of the Small Wetlands Acquisition Program, in the 1950s, to save wetlands from various threats, particularly draining. The passage of Public Law 85-585, in August of 1958, amended the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (Duck Stamp Act) of 1934, allowing for the acquisition of Waterfowl Production Areas and Easements for Waterfowl Management Rights (easements). The WMD is located in Stanley, Todd, Harding, Jackson, Jones, Lawrence, Lyman, Meade, Mellette, Fall River, Haakon, Custer, Pennington, Bennett, and Butte counties of South Dakota.

We announced the availability of the draft CCP and Environmental Assessment (EA) for a 30-day public review and comment period in the **Federal Register** on January 13, 2006 (71 FR 2264-2265). The Draft CCP was sent to more than 60 Tribal governments, State of Utah officials, state and federal congressional delegates, other federal agencies, city and county officials, public citizens, non-governmental organizations, private businesses and consulting companies, community colleges and universities, and public libraries. During the 30-day public review period, we received 18 written comments and held a public meeting in Martin, South Dakota. No substantive changes were made to the document based on public comments.

The Draft CCP/EA identified and evaluated three management alternatives for managing the Refuge and the WMD for the next 15 years. Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, would continue current management of the Refuge. Alternative B, Integrated Restoration, the Proposed

Action, would strive to restore ecological processes and achieve habitat conditions that require reduced management over time, recognizing the place of the refuge in the overall landscape and community. Alternative C, Comprehensive Grassland Restoration, would focus management on restoration of grassland habitat and its associated species. Based on this assessment and comments received, Alternative B was selected for implementation. We selected the preferred alternative (Alternative B) because it best meets the purposes for which the Refuge and the WMD were established, and is preferable to the “no action” alternative and Alternative C in light of physical, biological, economic, and social factors. The preferred alternative will continue to provide public access for wildlife-dependent recreation, environmental education, and interpretation.

As part of this plan, we developed a black-tailed prairie dog management plan for the Refuge. Management will include any activity conducted to control the size of prairie dog towns, maintain habitat suitability for black-tailed prairie dogs, and/or ensure the long-term viability of black-tailed prairie dogs at the Refuge, within a biologically and socially compatible zone over the next 15 years.

The Service is furnishing this notice to advise other agencies and the public of the availability of the Final CCP, to provide information on the desired conditions for the Refuge and the WMD, and to detail how the Service will implement management strategies. Based on the review and evaluation of the information contained in the environmental assessment, the Regional Director has determined that implementation of the Final CCP does not constitute a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act. Therefore, we will not prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

Dated: May 23, 2006.

**James J. Slack,**

*Deputy Regional Director, Region 6, Denver, CO.*

**Editorial Note:** This document was received by the Office of the Federal Register December 8, 2006.

[FR Doc. E6-21216 Filed 12-12-06; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Request for Comments on Land Acquisitions Information Collection

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed renewal of an information collection.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is seeking comments on the proposed renewal of the information collection, 25 CFR part 151 Land Acquisitions, OMB Control Number 1076-0100.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before February 12, 2007, to be assured of consideration.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments to Ben Burshia, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Real Estate Services, Office of the Deputy Bureau Director—Trust Services, Mail Stop 4639-MIB, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240-0001. Submission by facsimile should be sent to (202) 219-1065. Electronic submission of comments is not available at this time.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** You may request further information or obtain copies of the proposed information collection request from Ben Burshia at (202) 219-1195.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 provides an opportunity for interested parties to comment on proposed information collection requests. This collection covers 25 CFR part 151 as presently approved. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Real Estate Services, is proceeding with this public comment period as the first step in obtaining a normal information collection clearance from OMB. The request contains (1) type of review, (2) title, (3) summary of the collection, (4) respondents, (5) frequency of collection, (6) reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and (7) reason for response.

#### 25 CFR Part 151—Land Acquisitions

*Type of Review:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Title:* 25 CFR Part 151, Acquisition of Title to Land in Trust.

*Summary:* The Secretary of the Interior has statutory authority to acquire lands in trust status for individual Indians and federally recognized Indian tribes. The Secretary requests information in order to identify the party(ies) involved and a description of the land in question. Respondents are