we are concerned that many people will not be able to meet our deadline; therefore we announce extension of the review period until September 15, 2007.

DATES: We must receive your comments on or before September 15, 2007.

ADDRESSES: To provide written comments or to request a paper copy or compact disk of the Draft CCP/EA, contact: Peter Wikoff, Planning Team Leader, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1011 East Tudor Rd., MS. 231, Anchorage, Alaska 99503, or at *fw7_kanuti_planning@fws.gov,* or at 907–786–3837. You may view or download a copy of the Draft CCP/EA at: *alaska.fws.gov/nwr/planning/plans.htm.* Copies of the Draft CCP/EA may be viewed at the Kanuti Refuge Office in Fairbanks, Alaska; at local libraries; and at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Regional Office in Anchorage, Alaska.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Wikoff at the above address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966, as amended by the Refuge Improvement Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.), requires each refuge to develop and implement a CCP. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service published FR Doc. E7–9281 in the **Federal Register** on May 15, 2007, announcing availability of the Draft Revised Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment for Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. The document identified a review period ending on July 16, 2007. Because summer is such a busy time in Alaska, we are concerned that many people would not be able to meet our deadline; therefore we announce extension of the review period until September 15, 2007.

Public availability of comments: Before including your name, address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: July 12, 2007.

Thomas O. Melius,

Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, Alaska.

[FR Doc. E7–13942 Filed 7–17–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Final Environmental Impact Statement on Light Goose Management

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of final environmental impact statement on light goose management.

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public of the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on light goose management. The FEIS follows publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a proposed rule, each of which had extensive public comments periods. The FEIS analyzes the potential environmental impacts of several management alternatives for addressing problems associated with overabundant light goose populations. The FEIS analyzes the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to several management alternatives and provides the public with responses to comments received on the DEIS.

DATES: The public review period for the FEIS will end August 13, 2007. After that date, we will publish a Record of Decision and a final rule.

ADDRESSES: You can obtain a copy of the FEIS by writing to the Division of Migratory Bird Management, 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, MBSP–4107, Arlington, VA 22203; by e-mailing us at: *LightGooseEIS@fws.gov*; or by calling us at (703) 358–1714. We will also post the FEIS on our Web site at: *http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/issues/snowgse/tblcont.html.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Blohm, Chief, Division of Migratory Bird Management, (703) 358–1714; or James Kelley (612) 713–5409.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On May 13, 1999, we published a notice in the **Federal Register** announcing our intent to prepare an EIS to address population expansion by light goose populations (64 FR 26268). On September 28, 2001, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a notice of availability of our DEIS on light goose management (66 FR 49668). We followed the EPA notice with our own notice of availability of the DEIS on October 5, 2001, and provided for a public comment period that ended on November 28, 2001 (66 FR 51274). On December 10, 2001, we published a notice extending the public comment period to January 25, 2002 (66 FR 63723). On July 13, 2007, EPA published a notice of availability of our FEIS (72 FR 38576).

The DEIS evaluated four management alternatives to address habitat destruction and agricultural depredations caused by light geese on various breeding, migration, and wintering areas: (1) Take no Action, or a continuation to manage light goose populations through existing wildlife management policies and practices (Alternative A); (2) Modify harvest regulation options and refuge management (Alternative B) (proposed action); (3) Implement direct agency control of light goose populations on migration and wintering areas in the U.S. (Alternative C); or (4) Seek direct light goose population control on breeding grounds in Canada (Alternative D). Our proposed alternative (Alternative B) would modify existing light goose hunting regulations to expand methods of take during normal hunting season frameworks. In addition, we proposed to create a conservation order to allow take of light geese outside of normal hunting season frameworks. We would also modify management practices on certain National Wildlife Refuges to alter the availability of food and sanctuary to light geese. On October 12, 2001, we published a proposed rule that summarized these alternatives in more detail, and outlined how we proposed to amend parts 20 and 21 of subchapter B, chapter I, title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations (66 FR 52077).

In response to public comments that the alternatives we analyzed in the DEIS were mutually exclusive and did not represent a comprehensive management approach, we created a new alternative (Alternative E) in the FEIS that combined Alternatives B, C, and D. Alternative E would achieve light goose control using an integrated, two-phased approach involving increased harvest resulting from new regulatory tools (e.g. conservation order), changes in refuge management, and direct agency control. Phase 1 of Alternative E is identical to Alternative B, whereas phase 2 includes elements of Alternatives C and D. We envision that no more than 5 years would elapse in phase 1 before we evaluate the effectiveness of the light goose management program and assess the potential need for proceeding to phase 2. Because we have no jurisdiction over management actions in Canada (Alternative D), we would begin phase 2 with the actions outlined in Alternative C. If additional population control actions are required to achieve management goals, we would approach the Canadian Wildlife Service and urge implementation of actions outlined in

Alternative D. The FEIS describes Alternatives A–E in more detail and analyzes the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to each alternative. The FEIS also provides the public with responses to comments received on the DEIS.

Dated: June 4, 2007.

Kenneth Stansell,

Acting Director.

[FR Doc. E7–13935 Filed 7–17–07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

Rainwater Basin Wetland Management District, Nebraska

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service, We) announces that the draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) and Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Rainwater Basin Wetland Management District (WMD, District) is available. This draft CCP/EA describes how the Service intends to manage this District for the next 15 years. We request public comment.

DATES: To ensure consideration, we must receive your written comments on the draft CCP/EA by August 17, 2007.

ADDRESSES: Please provide written comments to Bernardo Garza, Planning Team Leader, Division of Refuge Planning, Branch of Comprehensive Conservation Planning, Mountain-Prairie Region, P.O. Box 25486, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225–0486; via facsimile at 303–236–4792; or electronically to *bernardo_garza@fws.gov.* A copy of the CCP/EA may be obtained by writing to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuge Planning, 134 Union Boulevard, Suite 300, Lakewood, Colorado 80228; or by download from *http://mountain-prairie.fws.gov/planning.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bernardo Garza, 303–236–4377 or John Esperance, 303–236–4369.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Rainwater Basin WMD was established in 1963 when the Service began acquiring critical migratory waterfowl habitat in south-central and southeast Nebraska with Duck Stamp dollars. This WMD was established for the following purposes: (1) ''* * * To assure the long-term viability of the breeding waterfowl population and production through the acquisition and management of Waterfowl Production Areas, while considering the needs of other migratory birds, threatened and endangered species and other wildlife.'' (purpose statement developed for all WMDs in Region 6 in June 2004); (2) ''* * * to acquire * * * small wetland and pothole areas * * * to be designated as 'Waterfowl Production Areas' * * * as an inviolate sanctuary or for any other management purpose, for migratory birds * * * and to restore and develop adequate wildlife habitat'' under the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act [16 U.S.C. 715d (2), 715i(a) & 718 (c)]; (3) ''for conservation purposes'' under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act [7 U.S.C. 2002(a)]; (4) ''promote * * * the conservation of the wetlands of the Nation in order to maintain the public benefits they provide and to help fulfill international obligations in various migratory bird treaties and conventions with Canada, Mexico, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and with various countries in the Western Hemisphere'' under the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act [16 U.S.C. 3901(b)]; and (5) ''to protect waterfowl production areas'' under Public Land Orders 6979 [May 25, 1993], and 7206 [June 24, 1996].

Today, the District manages approximately 23,500 acres in 61 individual tracts of land within the geographic area called the Rainwater Basin. This District encompasses a complex of wetlands scattered throughout a 17-county area. Current public use opportunities at this WMD include hunting, wildlife observation and photography.

This draft CCP/EA identifies and evaluates two alternatives for managing the District for the next 15 years. Alternative A, the No Action alternative, reflects the current management of the District. It provides the baseline against which to compare the other alternative. District habitats would continue to be managed on an opportunistic schedule that may maintain, or most likely would result in further decline in, the diversity of vegetation and water quality and quantity in the wetlands. District staff would continue to perform only limited research and would monitor only long-term vegetation change. Partnerships and priority public uses such as fishing, hunting, wildlife observation and wildlife photography would continue at present levels. Other priority public uses such as environmental education and interpretation would only be available on an informal basis. Outreach efforts would not be attainable due to the staff's inability to support them. The District would continue to support and work cooperatively to further the goals of the Rainwater Basin Joint Venture.

Alternative B is the Service's proposed action and basis for the draft CCP. Under this alternative the staff would continue to pursue the same goals and activities as in Alternative A but the emphasis would be to address all aspects in a holistic manner. The WMD would work with formal and informal partnerships, including landowners, to improve waterfowl production areas at a landscape level. Actions would strive to build a ''neighborly interaction'' between privately-owned, State and WMD lands within each watershed. The WMD would work with partners to complete the engineering and funding and would continue to support and work cooperatively to further the goals of the Rainwater Basin Joint Venture.

The proposed action (Alternative B) was selected because it best meets the purposes and goals of the District, as well as the mission and goals of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The proposed action will also benefit federally listed species, shore birds, migrating and nesting waterfowl, neotropical migrants and resident wildlife. Environmental education and partnerships will result in improved wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities. Cultural and historical resources as well as federally listed species will be protected.

Opportunity for public input will be provided at public meetings to be scheduled soon. The specific date and time for the public meeting is yet to be determined, but will be announced via local media and a planning update. All information provided voluntarily by mail, by phone, or at public meetings (e.g., names, addresses, letters of comment, input recorded during meetings) becomes part of the official public record. If requested under the Freedom of Information Act by a private citizen or organization, the Service may provide copies of such information. The environmental review of this project will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); NEPA Regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508); other appropriate Federal laws and regulations; Executive Order 12996; the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997; and Service policies and procedures for compliance with those laws and regulations.