

involvement for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f), as provided for in 36 CFR 800.2(d)(3). Ongoing consultation with American Indian tribes will continue in accordance with policy. Tribal concerns, including impacts on Indian trust assets, will be given due consideration. Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as other stakeholders interested or affected by the decisions on this proposed Project, are invited to respond to this notice.

BLM Land-use Plan Amendments and the Protest Process: Depending on the route alternative, potential LUPAs proposed by the BLM are needed for the portions of the proposed Project crossing public land that do not conform to the respective land use plan. These include the following:

- Converting utility corridors from underground use only to allow aboveground utilities;
- Modifying BLM visual resource management classifications; and
- Widening portions of a utility corridor designated in a land-use plan to include the Project ROW.

The BLM is proposing seven LUPAs where the Agency Preferred Alternative route is not in conformance with the existing land-use plans.

All proposed LUPAs would comply with applicable Federal laws and regulations and can apply only to Federal lands and mineral estate administered by the BLM.

- Rawlins Resource Management Plan (RMP): One amendment for visual resource management
- Little Snake RMP: One amendment for visual resource management
- Pony Express RMP (Salt Lake Field Office): One amendment to establish a new utility corridor
- Price RMP: One amendment to *widen a portion of an existing utility corridor*
- Vernal RMP: Three amendments for visual resource management

Instructions for filing a protest with the BLM Director regarding the proposed land-use plan amendments may be found in the "Dear Reader" letter of the 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 mail or overnight delivery postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the email 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](mailto:protest@blm.gov).

Before including your phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask the BLM 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.

**Larry Claypool,**

*Acting Wyoming State Director.*

[FR Doc. 2016-11371 Filed 5-12-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-22-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[LLNVW0000.L5110000.GN0000.  
LVEMF1402860.14X; MO# 4500089716]

### Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan, Pershing County, NV

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan and by this notice is announcing its availability.

**DATES:** The BLM will not issue a final decision on the proposal for a minimum of 30 days after the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan EIS are available for public inspection at the Winnemucca District BLM, 5100 E. Winnemucca Blvd., Winnemucca, NV. Interested persons may also review the Final EIS on the Internet at <http://on.doi.gov/1d5pLxR>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Kathleen Rehberg, Project Lead, telephone 775-623-1500; address BLM Winnemucca District, Humboldt River Field Office, 5100 E. Winnemucca

Blvd., Winnemucca, NV 89445; email [krehberg@blm.gov](mailto:krehberg@blm.gov). Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The applicant, Coeur Rochester, Inc. (CRI), has requested an expansion of its operations at the existing Coeur Rochester Mine, which is located approximately 18 miles northeast of Lovelock, Nevada, in the Humboldt Range, Pershing County. The mine is currently authorized to disturb up to 1,939 acres (approximately 187 acres of private land and 1,752 acres of public land), which was permitted under a series of Environmental Assessments (EA N26-86-002P, February 1986; EA NV-020-99-12, February 1999; EA NV-020-01-06, December 2000; EA NV-020-01-06, February 2002; EA NV-020-03-13, August 2003; DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2010-0010-EA, October 2010).

The Draft EIS analyzed the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed changes to CRI's current operations presented under this Plan of Operations (Plan) modification, which includes a total of 254.5 acres of new disturbance proposed on public land, and a reduction of approved disturbance acres of 23.3 acres on private land.

The Draft EIS analyzed three alternatives: (1) The Proposed Action; (2) Permanent Management of Potentially Acid Generating (PAG) Material Outside of the Rochester Pit Alternative; and (3) The No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action would include a change to the Plan boundary designed to include existing claims and newly acquired private lands within the boundary. However, all of the proposed disturbance to public land would be within the existing approved Plan boundary. The project includes the following:

- An approximately 67-acre expansion to the existing Stage IV Heap Leach Pad (HLP);
- An increase of the allowable maximum Stage IV HLP stacking height from 330 feet to 400 feet;
- Construction of a 124-acre Stage V HLP with associated ponds and tank;
- Relocation of a portion of the American Canyon public access road and establishment of an associated right-of-way (ROW);
- Relocation of a portion of the paved Rochester main access road ROW;

- Realignment of the Stage IV haul road and construction of secondary access roads;
- Relocation of existing power lines consistent with the proposed ROW realignments and HLP construction;
- Relocation of the electrical building, core shed, and production well PW-2a;
- Excavation of new borrow areas and construction of one new growth medium stockpile;
- Installation of the Stage IV HLP conveyor system, associated load out points, ore stockpiles, maintenance road, and utility corridor, including process solutions and fresh water supply pipelines; and
- Changes to closure activities for existing facilities including: altering the open pit safety berm sizes; HLP interim fluid management plans; HLP cover designs; the installation of evaporation cells; and long-term drawdown management.

Under the Permanent Management of PAG Material Outside of the Rochester Pit Alternative, which is the BLM preferred alternative, the proposed activities listed in the Proposed Action would be the same, with the exception of the permanent location of the PAG material. In this alternative the material would be permanently relocated outside of the existing pit.

Under the No-Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the proposed Plan modification and there would be no expansion. CRI would continue mining activities under its previously approved plan of operation.

Three other alternatives were considered, but eliminated: (1) Pit Backfill Elevation Alternative; (2) Alternate Location for Stage V HLP Alternative; and (3) Close a Portion of American Canyon Road to Public Access Alternative.

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS for the Proposed Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan was published in the **Federal Register** on August 21, 2015 (80 FR 50864). Two open house public meetings were held during the comment period. One hundred and forty two (142) comment letters were received during a 45-day period; however, 135 of those did not contain any substantive comments. The majority of the comments was in support of the project and centered on the local and economic benefits. There were seven comment letters that contained substantive comments, which included concerns about impacts to special status species, especially Preble's shrew, post-closure monitoring and mitigation activities, impacts to water and air, climate

change, and recommendations on the preferred alternative and cultural mitigation. These comments were considered and addressed in Appendix A (Response to Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement) of the Final EIS.

On September 21, 2015, during the public scoping of this Draft EIS, the *Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Great Basin Region, including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah* (Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment) was signed. For consistency with the Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment, the BLM compared the maps and habitat categories in that document to the initial habitat maps from BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2012-044 (December 27, 2011) that were used in the development of the Draft EIS for the Proposed Coeur Rochester Mine Plan of Operations Amendment 10 and Closure Plan. According to the new map, approximately 20 acres of proposed disturbance from the Coeur Rochester project would be in General Habitat (versus 168 acres of Preliminary General Habitat analyzed in this Draft EIS) with the remainder now in an Other Habitat category. In other words, the new map in the Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment shows less General Habitat within the proposed disturbance area than was analyzed in this Draft EIS under previous guidelines. The analysis and resulting mitigation for Greater Sage-Grouse outlined in Chapter 6 (Mitigation and Monitoring) of this Final EIS are thus consistent with the guidelines outlined in the Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment, Appendix F (Regional Mitigation Strategy) and Appendix I (Avoid, Minimize, and Apply Compensatory Mitigation Flowchart.) The preferred alternative includes over 330 acres of mitigation in Sagebrush Focal Areas and prime habitat located in National Conservation Areas and wilderness areas, which would result in a net conservation gain to Sage-grouse, as well as benefit other species.

Comments on the Draft EIS received from the public and internal BLM review were considered and incorporated as appropriate into the Final EIS. Public comments resulted in the addition of clarifying text, but did not significantly change the analysis. Following a 30-day availability and review period, a Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued. The decision reached in the ROD is subject to appeal

to the Interior Board of Land Appeals. The 30-day appeal period begins with the issuance of the ROD.

**Authority:** 40 CFR 1506.6, 40 CFR 1506.10.

**Steve Sappington,**

*Field Manager, Humboldt River Field Office.*

[FR Doc. 2016-11287 Filed 5-12-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-SERO-RTCA-20896;  
PPMPSD1T.Y00000] [PPSESERO10]

### Cancellation of June 1, 2016, Meeting of the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee

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

**ACTION:** Cancellation of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, (5 U.S.C. Appendix 1-16), that the June 1, 2016, meeting of the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee previously announced in the **Federal Register**, Vol. 81, February 2, 2016, pp. 5481, is cancelled.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jaime Doubek-Racine, Community Planner and Designated Federal Official, Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, Florida Field Office, Southeast Region, 5342 Clark Road, PMB #123, Sarasota, Florida 34233, or via telephone (941) 685-5912.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee was established by Public Law 106-299 to assist in the development of the comprehensive management plan for the Wekiva River System and provide advice to the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out management responsibilities of the Secretary under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274).

Dated: May 3, 2016.

**Alma Rippis,**

*Chief, Office of Policy.*

[FR Doc. 2016-11377 Filed 5-12-16; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-EE-P**