Appendix X2 Addendum into the Compact.

Dated: May 29, 2015.

Kevin K. Washburn,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs. [FR Doc. 2015–13712 Filed 6–3–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4337–15–P

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

# **Bureau of Land Management**

#### [LLES956000-L14400000-BJ0000]

#### Eastern States: Filing of Plat of Survey

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

**ACTION:** Notice of filing of plat of survey; Arkansas.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will file the plat of survey of the lands described below in the BLM-Eastern States office in Washington, DC, 30 calendar days from the date of publication in the **Federal Register**.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Bureau of Land Management-Eastern States, 20 M St. SE., Suite 950, Washington, DC 20003 Attn: Cadastral Survey.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The survey was requested by the U.S. Forest Service. The lands surveyed are:

#### Fifth Principal Meridian, Arkansas

T. 11 N., R. 22 W.

The plat of survey represents the dependent resurvey of a portion of the south boundary of Township 12 North, Range 22 West; the east boundary of Township 11 North, Range 23 West; the south boundary (Standard Parallel North), the east boundary, a portion of the subdivisional lines, the survey of the subdivisional lines, the survey of the subdivision of certain sections, the survey of certain U.S. Forest Service tracts, and exceptions to certain U.S. Forest Service tracts of Township 11 North, Range 22 West, of the Fifth Principal Meridian, in the State of Arkansas, and was accepted April 30, 2015.

We will place a copy of the plat described in the open files. It will be available to the public as a matter of information.

If BLM receives a protest against the survey, as shown on the plat, prior to the date of the official filing, we will stay the filing pending our consideration of the protest.

We will not officially file the plat until the day after we have accepted or dismissed all protests and they have become final, including decisions on appeals. Dated: May 29, 2015. **Dominica Van Koten,**  *Chief Cadastral Surveyor.* [FR Doc. 2015–13709 Filed 6–3–15; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 4310–GJ–P** 

# NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

# 2015 Final Fee Rate and Fingerprint Fees

**AGENCY:** National Indian Gaming Commission.

# ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given, pursuant to 25 CFR 514.2, that the National Indian Gaming Commission has adopted its 2015 final annual fee rates of 0.00% for tier 1 and 0.065% (.00065) for tier 2. These rates shall apply to all assessable gross revenues from each gaming operation under the jurisdiction of the Commission. If a tribe has a certificate of self-regulation under 25 CFR part 518, the 2015 final fee rate on Class II revenues shall be 0.0325% (.000325) which is one-half of the annual fee rate. The final fee rates being adopted here are effective June 1, 2015 and will remain in effect until new rates are adopted.

Pursuant to 25 CFR 514.16, the National Indian Gaming Commission has also adopted its fingerprint processing fees of \$21 per card, which is the same as the fingerprint fees announced in March 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvonne Lee, National Indian Gaming Commission, C/O Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Mail Stop #1621, Washington, DC 20240; telephone (202) 632–7003; fax (202) 632–7066.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) established the National Indian Gaming Commission, which is charged with regulating gaming on Indian lands.

Commission regulations (25 CFR 514) provide for a system of fee assessment and payment that is self-administered by gaming operations. Pursuant to those regulations, the Commission is required to adopt and communicate assessment rates and the gaming operations are required to apply those rates to their revenues, compute the fees to be paid, report the revenues, and remit the fees to the Commission. All gaming operations within the jurisdiction of the Commission are required to selfadminister the provisions of these regulations, and report and pay any fees that are due to the Commission.

Pursuant to 25 CFR 514, the Commission must also review annually the costs involved in processing fingerprint cards and set a fee based on fees charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and costs incurred by the Commission. Commission costs include Commission personnel, supplies, equipment costs, and postage to submit the results to the requesting tribe. Based on that review, the 2015 fingerprint processing fee will remain the same at \$21 per card.

Dated: May 29, 2015.

Jonodev Chaudhuri,

Chairman.

Dated: May 29, 2015.

#### Daniel Little,

Associate Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 2015–13636 Filed 6–3–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7565–01–P

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

#### National Park Service

[NPS-SER-BISC-0017910; PPSESEROC3, PMP00UP05.YP0000]

#### Final General Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Biscayne National Park, Florida

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior. **ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan (Final EIS/GMP) for Biscayne National Park, Florida (national park). Consistent with NPS laws, regulations, and policies and the purpose of the national park, the Final EIS/GMP will guide the management of the area over the next 15 to 20 years.

DATES: The NPS will execute a Record of Decision (ROD) no sooner than 30 days following publication by the Environmental Protection Agency of its Notice of Availability of the Final EIS/GMP in the Federal Register. **ADDRESSES:** Electronic copies of the Final EIS/GMP will be available online at http://parkplanning.nps.gov/BISC. To request a copy, contact Morgan Elmer, National Park Service, 12795 W. Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, Colorado 80225-0287, telephone (303) 969-2317. A limited number of compact disks and printed copies of the Final EIS/GMP will be made available at Biscayne National Park Headquarters, 9700 SW. 328 Street, Homestead, Florida 33033-5634.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Carlstrom, Superintendent, Biscayne National Park, 9700 SW. 328 Street, Homestead, Florida 33033–5634; telephone (786) 335–3646.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Final EIS/GMP responds to, and incorporates agency and public comments received on the Draft EIS/GMP and Supplemental Draft EIS/GMP. The Draft EIS/GMP was available for public review from August 19, 2011, through October 31, 2011, and the Supplemental Draft EIS/GMP was available for public review from November 14, 2013, through February 20, 2014.

Regarding the Draft EIS/GMP, the NPS published newsletters and held multiple rounds of public meetings between 2001 and 2011 to keep people informed and involved in the planning process. The public was asked to provide comments throughout the development of the draft plan through three primary avenues participation in public meetings, responses to newsletters, and comments on the NPS planning Web site. During the August 2011, public comment period, approximately 18,000 comments were received.

Due to concerns raised on the Draft EIS/GMP, the NPS undertook an evaluation process to consider a number of management actions that could be enacted to better achieve its objective of providing a diversified visitor use experience. Several public meetings were held and additional consultations were conducted with federal and state authorities, resulting in the release of the Supplemental Draft EIS/GMP. Approximately 14,000 pieces of correspondence were received on the Supplemental Draft EIS/GMP, containing approximately 1,800 comments. The NPS responses to substantive agency and public comments are provided in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS/GMP, Consultation and Coordination section.

Presented in the Final EIS/GMP is the final NPS preferred alternative (alternative 8) as well as alternatives 1 through 5 from the 2011 Draft Plan and alternatives 6 and 7 from the 2013 Supplemental Plan.

• Alternative 1 (no action) consists of existing park management and trends and serves as a basis for comparison in evaluating the other alternatives.

• Alternative 2 would emphasize the recreational use of the park while providing resource protection as governed by law, policy, or resource sensitivity. This concept would be accomplished by providing a high level of services, facilities, and access to specific areas of the park.

• Alternative 3 would allow all visitors a full range of visitor

experiences throughout most of the park and would use a permit system to authorize a limited number of visitors to access some areas of the park. Management actions would provide strong natural and cultural resource protection and diverse visitor experiences.

• Alternative 4 would emphasize strong natural and cultural resource protection while providing a diversity of visitor experiences. Some areas would be reserved for focused types of visitor use. A key component of this alternative was a marine reserve zone where fishing would be prohibited to enhance the quality and type of visitor experience and improve the condition of coral reefs condition by increasing its resiliency to other impacts.

• Alternative 5 would promote the protection of natural resources, including taking actions to optimize conditions for protection and restoration. A permit system would be used in some parts of the park to provide specific experiences.

• Similar to alternative 4, alternatives 6 and 7 would emphasize strong natural and cultural resource protection while providing a diversity of visitor experiences. Alternatives 6 and 7 include a special recreation zone that would be managed as part of an adaptive management strategy to achieve the goal of a healthier coral reef ecosystem within the zone to provide a more enjoyable and diverse visitor experience, including fishing.

• The final NPS preferred alternative (alternative 8) would support strong natural and cultural resources protection while providing improved opportunities for quality visitor experiences. This alternative is a hybrid of alternatives 4 and 6 and combines the "no fishing" marine reserve zone with other management zones described in alternative 6.

When approved, the plan will guide the management of the national park over the next 15 to 20 years.

The responsible official for this Final EIS/GMP is the Regional Director, NPS Southeast Region, 100 Alabama Street SW., 1924 Building, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

Dated: May 26, 2015.

#### Barclay C. Trimble,

Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region. [FR Doc. 2015–13634 Filed 6–3–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4610–JD–P

# DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### **Antitrust Division**

# Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Pistoia Alliance, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on April 29, 2015, pursuant to section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 et seq. ("the Act"), Pistoia Alliance, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, gritsystems A/S, Copenhagen, DENMARK; BioReference Laboratories, Elmwood Park, NJ; Lab-Consultation Co. Ltd., Suita, Osaka, JAPAN; Terry Stouch (individual member), West Winsor, NJ; and Genexyx srl, Via Pigafetta, Trieste, ITALY, have been added as parties to this venture.

Also, Andrea Splendiani (individual member), London, UNITED KINGDOM; and Harsha K. Rajasimha (individual member), Derwood, MD, have withdrawn as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Pistoia Alliance, Inc. intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 28, 2009, Pistoia Alliance, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on July 15, 2009 (74 FR 34364).

The last notification was filed with the Department on February 12, 2015. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to section 6(b) of the Act on March 13, 2015 (80 FR 13422).

### Patricia A. Brink,

Director of Civil Enforcement, Antitrust Division. [FR Doc. 2015–13591 Filed 6–3–15; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE P