

interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years in accordance with the Administration Act.

Our Draft CCP and Environmental Assessment (EA) were available for a 45-day public review and comment period, which we announced via several methods, including press releases, updates to constituents, and a **Federal Register** notice (74 FR 28271, June 15, 2009). The Draft CCP/EA identified and evaluated four alternatives for managing the Refuge for the next 15 years. Alternative A was the no-action alternative, which described current Refuge management activities. Alternative B placed greater emphasis on biological resources than on visitor services. Alternative C (the selected alternative) provided an optimal balance of improved biological resource objectives and expanded visitor services

opportunities. Alternative D placed greater emphasis on visitor services than on biological resources.

We received 82 comment letters on the Draft CCP and EA during the review period. We incorporated these received comments into the CCP when possible, and we responded to the comments in an appendix to the CCP. In the FONSI, we selected Alternative C, the basis for the CCP, for implementation. The FONSI documents our decision and is based on the information and analysis contained in the EA.

Under the selected alternative, the Refuges will achieve an optimal balance of biological resource objectives and visitor services opportunities. Habitat management and associated biological resource monitoring will be improved. Visitor service opportunities will focus on quality wildlife-dependent recreation distributed throughout the Refuge.

Waterskiing on the Refuge-owned portion of Dorris Reservoir will be prohibited. In addition, environmental education, interpretation, wildlife observation, photography, fishing, and hunting programs will be improved and/or expanded.

The selected alternative best meets the Refuge's purposes, vision, and goals; contributes to the Refuge System mission; addresses the significant issues and relevant mandates; and is consistent with principles of sound fish and wildlife management.

**Public Availability of Documents**

In addition to the methods in **ADDRESSES**, you can view or obtain documents at the following locations:

- Our Web site: <http://www.fws.gov/modoc>.
- Public Libraries: during regular library hours, at the following libraries:

Library	Address
Modoc County Library .....	212 West Third Street, Alturas, CA 96101.
Cedarville Branch Library .....	460 Main Street, Cedarville, CA 96104.
USFWS-NCTC Library .....	698 Conservation Way, Shepherdstown, WV 25443.

Dated: June 8, 2010.

**Ren Lohofener,**

*Regional Director, Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento, California.*

[FR Doc. 2010-14439 Filed 6-15-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Bureau of Land Management**

[LLAK9100000-L131000000.PP0000-L.X.SS.052L0000]

**Notice of Public Meeting, BLM Alaska Resource Advisory Council**

**AGENCY:** Alaska State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 (FACA), the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Alaska Resource Advisory Council will meet as indicated below:

**DATES:** The Alaska Resource Advisory Council will conduct a field trip within the Glennallen, Alaska, area from August 3-5, 2010, which includes a public meeting on Tuesday, August 3, at the BLM Glennallen Field Office at Mile Post 186.5 Glenn Highway, Glennallen, Alaska beginning at 2 p.m. The meeting will include discussions on resource

management and planning issues followed by a public comment period beginning at 4 p.m.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Ruth McCoard, Alaska State Office, 222 W. 7th Avenue #13, Anchorage, AK 99513. Telephone (907) 271-4418 or e-mail [rmccoard@blm.gov](mailto:rmccoard@blm.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The 15-member Council advises the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with public land management in Alaska. When making public comment, participants should know that their address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in their comment, along with their entire comment may be made publicly available at any time. Participants can ask that personal identifying information be withheld from their comments but this cannot be guaranteed.

All meetings are open to the public. The public may present written comments to the Council. Each formal Council meeting will also have time allotted for hearing public comments. Depending on the number of people wishing to comment and time available, the time for individual oral comments may be limited. Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation,

transportation, or other reasonable accommodations, should contact the BLM.

Dated: June 9, 2010.

**Julia Dougan,**

*Acting State Director.*

[FR Doc. 2010-14484 Filed 6-15-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-JA-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Minerals Management Service (MMS)**

**Record of Decision for the Cape Wind Energy Project; Secretary of the Interior's Response to Comments From the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on the Cape Wind Energy Project**

**AGENCY:** Minerals Management Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Record of Decision (ROD) and Notice to the Public of the Secretary of the Interior's Response to Comments From the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the MMS is announcing the availability of the ROD for the Cape Wind Energy Project (the Project). The ROD for the Project records the decisions that the MMS reached to

select the Preferred Alternative at Horseshoe Shoal in Nantucket Sound described in its Final Environmental Impact Statement (January 2009). After careful consideration of all the concerns expressed during the lengthy review and consultation process and thorough analyses of the many factors involved, the Secretary approved the ROD finding that the public benefits weigh in favor of approving the Cape Wind Project at the Horseshoe Shoal location. The MMS will offer a commercial lease to Cape Wind Associates, LLC (CWA) in response to CWA's application. The CWA's rights to construct and operate the Project pursuant to the lease are subject to construction and operation approvals from the MMS. The Secretary of the Interior (the Secretary) and the Director of the MMS co-signed the ROD for the Project on April 28, 2010.

In accordance with the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the public is also notified that on April 28, 2010, the Secretary responded to the April 2, 2010, comments of the ACHP concerning the Project. The ACHP provided comments to the Secretary following his termination of the Section 106 consultation on March 1, 2010. The Secretary's response explains his decision and indicates how the ACHP's comments were taken into account in his consideration of the effects of the project on historical and cultural resources. The Secretary provides a detailed response for each of the ACHP's comments and recommendations.

**Authority:** The NOA of the ROD is published pursuant to the regulations at 40 CFR 1506.6, implementing the provisions of NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*). The Notice to the Public of the Secretary of the Interior's Response to the ACHP is published pursuant to the regulations at 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4)(iii), implementing the provisions of NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Cape Wind Energy Project Description**

Following the passage of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct) and amendments to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA), the Department of the Interior (the Department) was given statutory authority to issue leases, easements, or rights-of-way for renewable energy projects on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). The Secretary delegated this authority to the MMS. Subsequent to the enactment of EPAct, the MMS finalized regulations to process and permit offshore renewable energy projects in 2009. The CWA submitted an

application to the MMS in 2005, prior to the promulgation of those regulations, to construct, operate, and eventually decommission an offshore wind power facility on Horseshoe Shoal in Nantucket Sound, offshore of Massachusetts.

The Project will be located completely on the OCS, except for transmission cables which will pass through Massachusetts' territory. The project calls for 130 3.6 megawatt wind turbine generators, each with a maximum blade height of 440 feet, to be arranged in a grid pattern in approximately 25 square miles of Nantucket Sound. With a maximum electric output of 468 megawatts and an average anticipated output of 182 megawatts, the facility is projected to generate up to three-quarters of the Cape and nearby islands' electricity needs. Each of the 130 wind turbine generators will generate electricity independently. Solid dielectric submarine inner-array cables from each wind turbine generator will interconnect within the array and terminate on an electrical service platform, which will serve as the common interconnection point for all of the wind turbines. The submarine transmission cable system from the electric service platform to the landfall location in Yarmouth will be approximately 12.5 miles in length (7.6 miles of which will fall within Massachusetts' territory).

##### **Record of Decision**

The decision to offer a commercial lease is based on the comprehensive environmental evaluation presented in the *Final Cape Wind Energy Project Environmental Impact Statement* (FEIS). The FEIS assessed the physical, biological, and socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project and 13 alternatives, including a no-action alternative. Since the FEIS was published in January 2009, the MMS prepared an Environmental Assessment (April 2010) to evaluate whether the MMS needed to supplement the FEIS based on new information pertaining to the project. The MMS determined that there was no new information that necessitated a reanalysis of the range of the alternatives or the kinds, levels, or locations of the impacts of the project and that the analyses, potential impacts, and conclusions detailed in the FEIS were still valid. The MMS concluded that a supplemental EIS was not required.

The ROD summarizes the alternatives considered, the decision, the basis for the decision, the environmentally preferable alternative, adopted mitigation measures, and bureau

undertakings to involve the public, other Federal and state agencies, and affected Indian tribes. The ROD discusses the Secretary and MMS's careful balancing of the need to diversify the Nation's energy portfolio, advance energy independence, combat climate change, and create jobs with the need to protect and preserve the rich environmental and cultural resources in Nantucket Sound. The ROD identifies and adopts a suite of mitigation measures and monitoring requirements deemed practicable to avoid or minimize the environmental harm that could result from the project.

Prior to construction and commercial operation of facilities, CWA must submit, and obtain the MMS's approval of, its Construction and Operations Plan (COP). The MMS reserves the right to approve, disapprove, or approve with modifications the COP, pursuant to the Renewable Energy Final Rule and other applicable regulations.

##### **Secretary of the Interior's Response to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)**

The ACHP provided comments and recommendations to the Secretary concerning the potential adverse effects of the Project, following the Secretary's decision to terminate Section 106 consultations. In its comments and recommendations, the ACHP indicated that the effects on historic properties and cultural resources from the Project would be direct and indirect, could not be avoided, and could not be satisfactorily mitigated. The ACHP reached this conclusion based on its finding that the project would adversely affect the viewsheds of 34 historic and/or traditional cultural properties in the area and potentially adversely affect other cultural resources located on the seafloor or buried in the Nantucket Sound. Regulations at 36 CFR 800.7(c)(4), implementing Section 106 of the NHPA, require the Secretary to prepare a response to the ACHP and make that response available to the public. The Secretary's response, transmitted on April 28, 2010, describes the Department and the MMS's efforts to identify, assess, avoid, and minimize potential impacts on traditional cultural resources and historic properties. The Department and the MMS participated in numerous Section 106 meetings with consulting and interested parties, as well as Government-to-Government meetings with the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe. The Department complied with the Section 106 process for the Project. The Secretary took into

account the Council's comments and documented the decision.

The Secretary's response provides a detailed description of project design changes and mitigation measures adopted by the MMS, as well as other Federal and state agencies to avoid and minimize potential visual and bottom-disturbing impacts.

#### Availability of the ROD and Secretary's Response

To obtain a single printed copy of the ROD or the Secretary's Response to the ACHP, you may contact the Minerals Management Service, Office of Offshore Alternative Energy Programs (Mail Stop 4080), 381 Elden Street, Herndon, Virginia 20170. An electronic copy of the ROD and Secretary's Response is available at the MMS's Web site at: <http://www.doi.gov/news/doinews/Secretary-Salazar-Announces-Approval-of-Cape-Wind-Energy-Project-on-Outer-Continental-Shelf-off-Massachusetts.cfm>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Minerals Management Service, Ms. Maureen Bornholdt, Office of Offshore Alternative Energy Programs, 381 Elden Street, Herndon, Virginia 20170, (703) 787-1300.

Dated: June 7, 2010.

**Robert P. LaBelle,**

*Acting Associate Director for Offshore Energy and Minerals Management.*

[FR Doc. 2010-14528 Filed 6-15-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

[FWS-R1-R-2010-N001; 1265-0000-10137-S3]

#### Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge, Clark County, WA

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

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

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), announce the availability of our draft comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment (DCCP/EA) for the Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge (refuge), for public review and comment. The DCCP/EA describes our alternatives, including our preferred alternative, for managing the refuge for the 15 years following approval of the final CCP.

**DATES:** To ensure consideration, we need to receive your written comments by July 16, 2010.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments, requests for more information, or requests for copies of the DCCP/EA, by any of the following methods.

*E-mail:*

*FW1PlanningComments@fws.gov.*

Include "Ridgefield NWR DCCP/EA" in the subject line.

*Fax:* Attn: Bob Flores, Project Leader, (360) 887-4109.

*U.S. Mail:* Bob Flores, Project Leader, Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge, P.O. Box 457, Ridgefield, WA 98642.

*Web site:* <http://www.fws.gov/ridgefieldrefuges/ridgefield>; select "Contact Us."

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bob Flores, Project Leader, (360) 887-4106.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Introduction

The refuge encompasses 5,218 acres along the lower Columbia River in Clark County, WA. Habitat types on the refuge include seasonal, semipermanent, and permanent wetlands; floodplain forests; managed pastures; croplands; and oak woodlands. The refuge was established to provide migration and wintering habitat for dusky Canada geese and other waterfowl. It also provides important habitat for sandhill cranes, waterbirds, migratory landbirds, and raptors.

##### Background

###### *The CCP Process*

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee) (Refuge Administration Act), as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, requires us to develop a CCP for each national wildlife refuge. The purpose for developing a CCP is to provide refuge managers with a 15-year plan for achieving refuge purposes and contributing toward the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System, consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management, conservation, legal mandates, and our policies. In addition to outlining broad management direction on conserving wildlife and their habitats, CCPs identify wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public, including opportunities for hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years in accordance with the Refuge Administration Act.

##### *Public Outreach*

We began public outreach by publishing a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** (71 FR 43787; August 2, 2006), announcing our intent to complete a CCP/EA and inviting public comments. In August 2006, we distributed Planning Update 1 to our mailing list and public outlets. On September 14 and 20, 2006, we held public scoping meetings in Ridgefield and Vancouver, Washington, respectively, to meet the public and obtain comments. The meetings were announced through local media outlets, on the Refuge's Web site, and in Planning Update 1. In January 2007, we distributed Planning Update 2, which included a summary of the comments we received, a planning schedule, and a description of the CCP's scope. In March 2009, we distributed Planning Update 3; in it we summarized our preliminary draft alternatives, requested public comments, and invited the public to an open house. On March 26, 2009, we held an open house in Ridgefield, Washington, to gather input on the preliminary alternatives.

##### **DCCP/EA Alternatives We Are Considering**

We identified and evaluated four alternatives for managing the refuge, including a No Action Alternative (Alternative 1). Brief descriptions of the alternatives follow.

###### *Alternative 1 (No Action)*

Under Alternative 1, the refuge would continue to manage and where feasible restore habitat for priority species, including dusky Canada geese, other Canada geese subspecies, cackling geese, other waterfowl, and Federal and State imperiled listed species. Hunting would continue on the River 'S' Unit's 760-acre hunt area. The 4.3-mile auto tour route would remain open year round in its current configuration. The refuge would coordinate with its Friends groups, local educators, and Tribes to conduct environmental and cultural education and interpretation programs. This alternative is considered the base from which to compare the action alternatives.

###### *Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)*

Under Alternative 2, our preferred alternative, the refuge would continue to protect, maintain, and where feasible, restore habitat for priority species, including dusky Canada geese, other waterfowl, and Federal and State imperiled listed species (e.g. sandhill crane). Under this alternative the refuge would maintain high-quality green forage for geese in improved pastures