

activities within a predetermined area, while jointly conserving the covered species and their habitats.

Implementation of the Douglas County MSGCP, rather than a species-by-species or plan-by-plan approach, will maximize the benefits of conservation measures for covered species at a larger landscape scale and facilitate future review of multiple individual ITPs.

National Environmental Policy Act Compliance

The development of the draft MSGCP for Douglas County and the proposed issuance of ITPs under this plan is a Federal action that triggers the need for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*; NEPA). We have prepared a draft EA to analyze the environmental impacts of three alternatives related to the issuance of ITPs and implementation of the conservation program under the proposed MSGCP. The three alternatives include the proposed action, a no-action alternative, and an expanded conservation lands alternative.

The proposed action alternative is the implementation of the MSGCP and issuance of ITPs to participating agricultural landowners and operators in Douglas County.

Under the no-action alternative, the proposed MSGCP would not be implemented and no ITPs would be issued to agricultural landowners and operators in Douglas County to cover the incidental take of covered species resulting from farming and ranching activities. The no-action alternative would not give agricultural landowners and operators regulatory certainty, and actions that could result in take of listed species on non-Federal lands would be prohibited under section 9 of the Act.

The expanded conservation lands alternative would include many of the same features as described for the proposed action alternative, including the same covered activities, covered species, and monitoring and adaptive management. The key difference would be in the approach to managing conservation lands. In recent years, the conservation of all wildlife species in Douglas County has been considerably improved by implementation of the Natural Resources Conservation Service's Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Prior to 2009, about 33 percent of the "eligible lands" in Douglas County (186,144 acres) were enrolled in the CRP. This expanded conservation lands alternative involves an increase in the extent of lands enrolled in the CRP or similar protected lands by 100,000 acres above the 2009 benchmark of 186,144

acres over the next 10 years, to a level of about 50 percent of the eligible lands in Douglas County. This would be a voluntary commitment on the part of landowners.

Public Comments

You may submit your comments and materials by one of the methods listed in the **ADDRESSES** section. We specifically request information, views, and opinions from the public on our proposed Federal action, including identification of any other aspects of the human environment not already identified in the draft EA pursuant to NEPA regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) at 40 CFR 1506.6. Further, we specifically solicit information regarding the adequacy of the MSGCP pursuant to the requirements for ITPs at 50 CFR parts 13 and 17.

Public Availability of Comments

All comments and materials we receive become part of the public record associated with this action. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personally identifiable information (PII) in your comments, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your PII—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your PII from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. Comments and materials we receive, as well as supporting documentation we use in preparing the EA, will be available for public inspection by appointment, during normal business hours, at our Eastern Washington Field Office (see **ADDRESSES**).

Next Steps

After completion of the EA, we will determine whether adoption of the Douglas County MSGCP warrants a finding of no significant impact or whether an environmental impact statement should be prepared. We will evaluate the Douglas County MSGCP and its potential use by future ITP applicants, as well as any comments we receive, to determine whether the MSGCP, when used by ITP applicants, would meet the requirements for issuance of ITPs under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Act. We will also evaluate whether issuance of section 10(a)(1)(B) ITPs under the MSGCP would comply with section 7 of the Act by conducting an intra-Service section 7 consultation on anticipated ITP actions.

Authority

We provide this notice in accordance with the requirements of section 10 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) and NEPA regulations (40 CFR 1501.7, 1506.6, and 1508.22).

Dated: October 21, 2014.

Richard Hannan,

Deputy Regional Director, Pacific Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

[FR Doc. 2014-27021 Filed 11-13-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

[DR.5B711.IA000815]

Indian Gaming

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of extension of Tribal-State Class III Gaming Compact.

SUMMARY: This publishes notice of the extension of the Class III gaming compact between the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the State of South Dakota.

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 14, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paula L. Hart, Director, Office of Indian Gaming, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary—Policy and Economic Development, Washington, DC 20240, (202) 219-4066.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to 25 CFR 293.5, an extension to an existing tribal-state Class III gaming compact does not require approval by the Secretary if the extension does not include any amendment to the terms of the compact. The Yankton Sioux Tribe and the State of South Dakota have reached an agreement to extend the expiration of their existing Tribal-State Class III gaming compact to April 23, 2015. This publishes notice of the new expiration date of the compact.

Dated: November 4, 2014.

Kevin K. Washburn,

Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.

[FR Doc. 2014-27004 Filed 11-13-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-4N-P