

interpret the Federal manufactured housing construction and safety standards in accordance with this subsection;

(ii) Provide periodic recommendations to the Secretary to adopt, revise, and interpret the procedural and enforcement regulations, including regulations specifying the permissible scope and conduct of monitoring in accordance with subsection (b);

(iii) Be organized and carry out its business in a manner that guarantees a fair opportunity for the expression and consideration of various positions and for public participation; and

(iv) Be deemed to be an advisory committee not composed of Federal employees.

#### **Tentative Agenda**

Convene  
Federal Advisory Committee  
preliminaries  
Establish presence of Designated  
Federal Official (DFO)  
DFO Announcements  
Call to Order  
Roll Call/Establish Quorum  
Welcome/Introductions/New Members  
Administrative Matters/Announcements  
Report from HUD officials  
Call for Committee Reports (status  
information only)  
Public Comments  
Proposals from MHCC to HUD  
MHCC recommendations to the  
Secretary to adopt, revise, and  
interpret the Federal manufactured  
housing construction and safety  
standards  
MHCC recommendations to the  
Secretary to adopt, revise, and  
interpret the procedural and  
enforcement regulations  
Proposals from HUD to MHCC  
Adjourn

Dated: October 4, 2010.

**David H. Stevens,**

*Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal  
Housing Commissioner.*

[FR Doc. 2010-25443 Filed 10-7-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210-67-P**

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

### **U.S. Geological Survey**

[USGS-8327CPDM2]

#### **Notice of a Revision of a Currently Approved Information Collection (1028-0091)**

#### **Correction**

In notice document 2010-24374  
beginning on page 60134 in the issue of

Wednesday, September 29, make the  
following correction:

On page 60135, in the second line of  
the section beginning with **DATES**,  
“December 28, 2010” should read  
“October 29, 2010”.

[FR Doc. C1-2010-24374 Filed 10-7-10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 1505-01-D**

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

### **Fish and Wildlife Service**

[FWS-R5-R-2010-N115; BAC-4311-K9-S3]

#### **Nomans Land Island National Wildlife Refuge, Town of Chilmark, Martha's Vineyard, MA**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of final  
comprehensive conservation plan and  
finding of no significant impact for  
environmental assessment.

**SUMMARY:** We, the U.S. Fish and  
Wildlife Service (Service), announce the  
availability of our final comprehensive  
conservation plan (CCP) and finding of  
no significant impact (FONSI) for the  
environmental assessment (EA) for  
Nomans Land Island National Wildlife  
Refuge (NWR). In this final CCP, we  
describe how we will manage this  
refuge for the next 15 years.

**ADDRESSES:** You may view or obtain  
copies of the final CCP and FONSI by  
any of the following methods. You may  
request a hard copy or CD-ROM.

*Agency Web site:* Download a copy of  
the document(s) at [http://www.fws.gov/  
northeast/planning/NomansLand/  
ccphome.html](http://www.fws.gov/northeast/planning/NomansLand/ccphome.html).

*Electronic mail:*  
[northeastplanning@fws.gov](mailto:northeastplanning@fws.gov). Include  
“Nomans Land Island final CCP” in the  
subject line of the message.

*U.S. Postal Service:* Eastern  
Massachusetts NWR Complex, 73 Weir  
Hill Road, Sudbury, MA 01776.

*In-Person Viewing or Pickup:* Call  
978-443-4661 to make an appointment  
during regular business hours at the  
above address.

*Facsimile:* 978-443-2898.

#### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Libby Herland, Project Leader, Eastern  
Massachusetts NWR Complex, 73 Weir  
Hill Road, Sudbury, MA 01776; phone:  
413-443-4661, or Carl Melberg,  
Planning Team Leader, phone: 978-  
443-4661; electronic mail:

[Carl\\_Melberg@fws.gov](mailto:Carl_Melberg@fws.gov).

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Introduction**

With this notice, we finalize the CCP  
process for Nomans Land Island NWR,

which we started with the notice of  
intent we published in the **Federal  
Register** (69 FR 72210) on December 13,  
2008. We prepared the EA/draft CCP in  
compliance with the National  
Environmental Policy Act of 1969  
(NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the  
National Wildlife Refuge System  
Administration Act of 1966  
(Administration Act) (16 U.S.C. 668dd-  
668ee), as amended by the National  
Wildlife Refuge System Improvement  
Act of 1997 (Improvement Act). We  
released the EA/draft CCP to the public,  
announcing and requesting comments  
in a notice of availability in the **Federal  
Register** (75 FR 30052) on May 28, 2010.

Nomans Land Island is a 628-acre  
roadless island located approximately 3  
miles south of Martha's Vineyard,  
Massachusetts. The refuge was  
established in 1998 for the conservation  
and management of migratory birds. We  
first began managing a portion of the  
eastern side of the island in 1970 as an  
“overlay” refuge under a joint  
management agreement between the  
U.S. Department of the Interior and the  
U.S. Department of the Navy (Navy),  
while it was still under Navy  
management. In 1998, management of  
the island was transferred to the  
Service, and all 628 acres became  
Nomans Land Island NWR.

This island has a unique history, from  
its use by Native Americans as a  
summer camp, to sheep grazing when  
the island was privately owned in the  
1800s, to use as a bombing range by the  
Navy during World War II. Because  
Nomans Land Island provides diverse  
habitats including intertidal, freshwater  
wetland, grassland, and shrubland  
habitats, it serves an important role for  
nesting landbirds and colonial  
waterbirds, and is a stopover for  
migratory birds and raptors, including  
the peregrine falcon.

We announce our decision and the  
availability of the FONSI for the final  
CCP for Nomans Land Island NWR in  
accordance with NEPA requirements.  
The FONSI is included as Appendix K  
in the final CCP. We completed a  
thorough analysis of impacts on the  
human environment, which we  
included in the EA/draft CCP.

Alternative C, as we described in the  
EA/draft CCP, is the foundation for the  
final CCP.

#### **Background**

The Administration Act, as amended  
by the Improvement Act, 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 (NWRS), 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 Administration Act.

#### **CCP Alternatives, Including Selected Alternative**

Our EA/draft CCP addressed several key issues, including the amount of shrubland to manage, other priority habitat types to conserve, land protection and conservation priorities, improving the visibility of the Service and refuge, and ways to improve opportunities for off-site public use while ensuring the restoration and protection of priority ecological and cultural resources.

To address these issues and develop a plan based on the purposes for establishing the refuge, and the vision and goals we identified, we identified three alternatives in the EA. The alternatives have some actions in common, such as protecting and monitoring federally listed species and the regionally significant coastal shrubland, controlling invasive plants and wildlife diseases, monitoring programs that benefit our resource decisions, protecting cultural resources, and distributing refuge revenue-sharing payments to counties.

Other actions distinguish the alternatives. Alternative A, or the "No Action Alternative," consists of our current management activities. It serves as the baseline against which to compare the other two alternatives. Our habitat management and visitor services programs would not change under this alternative. We would continue to use the same tools and techniques, and not expand existing facilities. Under Alternative A, we would continue to passively manage refuge lands, and the Service would have minimal presence. Habitat management would be limited to continuing to passively oversee the current 400 acres of shrub habitat, up to 150 acres of freshwater wetland communities, 100 acres of marine intertidal beach and rocky shore habitat, and 15 acres of herbaceous upland dune vegetation. We would continue minimal monitoring of focal species as current

staffing allows. We would provide oversight and coordination to Navy contaminant and unexploded ordnance (UXO) cleanup.

The refuge would continue to be closed to the public. Administration of off-site visitor services, land protection, and biological and law enforcement activities would be handled by existing staff from the Eastern Massachusetts NWR Complex based in Sudbury, Massachusetts, as funds and staffing permit.

Under Alternative B, we would emphasize more active monitoring and management of all refuge habitats to support focal species whose habitat needs also benefit other species of conservation concern in the region. In particular, the alternative emphasizes active habitat management for breeding and migrating priority bird species of conservation concern identified by national, regional, and State conservation plans.

With the addition of seasonal biological and law enforcement staff, under Alternative B, we would also implement a more active prescribed burning regime, invasive species and predator control programs, and better enforcement of the no-public-access policy. We would actively monitor and manage beach/nesting species such as terns, plovers, and rare plants, and consider the introduction of the New England cottontail. We would improve our visitor services through partnerships and working with them to develop programs and facilities on their lands that help increase awareness of the refuge's biological and cultural resources. Finally, our biological program would be enhanced through partnerships that would increase our ability to conduct surveys and long-term monitoring.

Alternative C was identified as the Service-preferred alternative in the EA/draft CCP. It allows the 400 acres of critical migration stopover shrub habitat to be influenced by natural processes such as succession over the next 15 years, with minimal management. It allows coastal processes of wind and wave action to shape the current 15 acres of herbaceous upland dune vegetation, 100 acres of marine intertidal beach and rocky shore habitats, and almost 150 acres of freshwater wetlands. Under this alternative, we also would continue to study the feasibility of introducing New England cottontail on the refuge.

The alternative recognizes the island as one of the few opportunities in the Northeast region of the United States for wilderness designation and proposes pursuing formal designation as a unit of

the National Wilderness Preservation System. It also recognizes the need to coordinate with the Navy annually to promote communication, exchange information on Navy operations and management planning, and facilitate cleanup of contaminants and UXO on the refuge. We would also closely coordinate with the Navy and the Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Office for any proposed ground-disturbing activity. We would monitor vegetation changes every 3 years through aerial photography and/or site visitation. We would establish a fire regime to manage shrub habitat as needed, and we would monitor invasive plant species annually and control those that threaten healthy ecosystems.

Existing refuge complex staff would enhance the visitor services program through a broader array of off-site programming and outreach through partnership opportunities as they arise, similar to, but to a lesser extent than would take place under the other alternatives.

#### **Comments**

We invited comments on the EA/draft CCP during a public review and comment period, from May 28 through July 3, 2010, and held a public meeting on June 23, 2010, in the Town of Chilmark, Massachusetts.

We received 24 unique letters and oral comments representing individuals, organizations, and State agencies. We made modifications to the draft that are outlined in Appendix J, "Summary of Public Comments and Service's Response on the Environmental Assessment and Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan for Nomans Land Island National Wildlife Refuge" in the final CCP. Highlights of some of the changes are listed below:

1. We were made aware of additional partnership opportunities on Martha's Vineyard and have modified the final CCP to reflect these opportunities (pages 4–7 through 4–8). We also inserted language in the Rationale to Objective 2.2 (page 4–30) that these partnerships would potentially provide additional resources to increase our visitor services capacity from what we originally proposed.

2. We added language to Chapter 4 in the final CCP (page 4–11) stating that although it would not be possible to clean up the island to pre-bombing conditions, we would continue to work with the Navy and Federal and State regulators for the 5-year site reviews as required by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. If, at some point in the future, there is a

major advance in technology that would allow the extraction of UXOs without massive ground disturbance or impact to wildlife, then additional cleanup might warrant further consideration at that time.

3. We included language in our Habitat Management and Protection summary in Chapter 4 of the final CCP (page 4–14) and biological rationales [Objectives 1.1 (page 4–19) and 1.2 (page 4–24)] to work with the Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program to evaluate the appropriateness of altering the frequency of prescription burns to incorporate rare plant management, and for tern restoration efforts.

4. We added language to several sections in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 in the final CCP to incorporate more life history information and to refine our biological objectives and management actions for piping plover (pages 3–33, 3–35, 4–21, 4–23, and 4–24). This is due to the presence of a breeding pair on the island for the first time in 30 years.

5. We corrected typographical and grammatical errors identified by reviewers.

#### Selected Alternative

After considering the comments we received on our EA/draft CCP, we have selected Alternative C for implementation, for several reasons. Alternative C comprises the mix of actions that, in our professional judgment, works best toward achieving refuge purposes, our vision and goals, and the goals of other State and regional conservation plans, and it is most consistent with the principles of sound fish and wildlife management. We also believe it most effectively addresses the key issues raised during the planning process. The basis of our decision is detailed in Appendix K, Finding of No Significant Impact, in the final CCP.

#### Public Availability of Documents

You can view or obtain documents as indicated under **ADDRESSES**.

Dated: September 9, 2010.

**James G. Geiger,**

*Acting Regional Director, Northeast Region,  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Hadley, MA  
01035.*

[FR Doc. 2010–25393 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–55–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Indians Fee-to-Trust Transfer and Casino Project, Calexico, CA

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), as lead agency, and the National Indian Gaming Commission, the City of Calexico, and the Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Indians as cooperating agencies, intend to file a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the Tribe's proposed 60.8-acre fee-to-trust transfer and casino project to be located in Calexico, California, and that the DEIS is now available for public review and comment. This notice provides a 75-day public comment period, which adds a 30-day extension to the normal 45-day public comment period.

**DATES:** The DEIS will be available for public comment beginning October 8, 2010. Written comments on the DEIS must arrive by December 22, 2010. A public hearing will be held on Wednesday, November 10, 2010 from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. or until the last public comment is received.

**ADDRESSES:** You may mail or hand carry written comments to Dale Risling, Acting Regional Director, Pacific Regional Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California 95825. A public hearing will be held at: City of Calexico, 608 Heber Avenue, Calexico, California 92231. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this notice for directions on submitting comments and for locations where the DEIS will be available for review.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John Rydzik (916) 978–6051.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Tribe proposes that 60.8 acres of land be taken into trust for the purpose of developing a casino facility. The property is located at the northernmost gateway to the City of Calexico, a California/Mexico border city of growing importance in international trade. The project site is situated at the southwest quadrant of State Highway 111 and Jasper Road and is bounded on the south and west by the Central Main and Dogwood Canals. The 60.8-acre parcel is undeveloped former agricultural land and is located within

the City of Calexico's proposed 111 Calexico Place project site, a commercial highway development project that was approved by the City of Calexico City Council on May 5, 2010.

The proposed action consists of the fee-to-trust transfer of the project site, Federal review (by the National Indian Gaming Commission) of the development and management contract, and development of the proposed project. The proposed project includes a 459,621-square-foot casino facility on the 60.8-acre parcel. The casino facility would include an approximately 93,880-square-foot casino; 63,000 square feet of food/beverage and retail components; a 38,660-square-foot entertainment venue; and 218,081 square feet of other operational facilities (e.g., back of house area, central plant). In addition, there will be a 46,000-square-foot banquet/meeting hall and 200-room hotel. The casino will have 2,000 slot machines and 45 gaming tables. There will be three guest restaurants and one employee dining room. A swimming pool and 6,000-space parking facility will also be developed within the project area.

BIA, serving as the lead agency for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), published a Notice of Intent to prepare the EIS for the proposed action in the **Federal Register** on March 6, 2008. In addition, BIA held a public scoping meeting on March 27, 2008, at the County of Imperial's Board of Supervisors Chamber Room in the City of El Centro, California. From that scoping meeting, a range of project alternatives were developed and subsequently analyzed in the DEIS, including: (1) Alternative A—Proposed Action, (2) Alternative B—Reduced Casino, and (3) Alternative C—No Action. Environmental issues addressed in the DEIS include land resources, water resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural and paleontological resources, socioeconomic conditions, transportation, land use and agriculture, public services, noise, hazardous materials, visual resources, environmental justice, growth inducing effects, indirect effects, cumulative effects, and mitigation measures.

#### Directions for Submitting Comments

Please include on the first page of your written comments your name, return address, and the phrase "DEIS Comments, Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Indians, 60.8-Acre Fee-to-Trust Casino Project, Calexico, California."