

established in SEKI's General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement, approved in 2007.

From 1870 to 1988, nonnative fish were introduced into many heretofore fishless waterbodies throughout SEKI. Surveys conducted from 1997 to 2002 determined that self-sustaining nonnative trout populations had become established in approximately 575 lakes, ponds, and marshes, plus connecting streams, and nearly all streams that drain these sites from high to low elevations. Impacts of nonnative trout on high elevation aquatic and adjacent terrestrial ecosystems are well documented and occur at all levels of the food web. Nonnative trout impact native species directly through predation and indirectly through competition for food resources. Nonnative trout can disrupt the type and distribution of species, and thus the natural function of aquatic ecosystems.

Two species of mountain yellow-legged frogs (MYLFs) are integral components of SEKI's high elevation aquatic ecosystems. Formerly abundant MYLFs are today among the world's endangered amphibians: Over 92% of their populations in the Sierra Nevada have disappeared, and most of the remaining populations are much smaller and more isolated than they were historically. Extensive research has identified two primary factors for this decline. The first factor is the introduction of nonnative trout. Nonnative trout have several direct effects on MYLFs, including predation, competition for food, restriction of breeding to marginal habitat, and fragmentation of remaining populations. The second factor is the recent spread of chytridiomycosis, a disease caused by amphibian chytrid fungus, which has infected and imperiled most remaining MYLF populations. A third emerging factor is global climate change, which has begun to dry up smaller, shallower ponds in SEKI. Ponds have become important habitat for MYLFs because, in basins where nonnative trout occur, fish occupy most of the larger lakes, which are more resistant to climate change. This has restricted many MYLF populations to smaller waterbodies that are more vulnerable to drought and warming.

The Restoration Plan/Final EIS therefore proposes to recover smaller relatively-simple habitats using physical tools and larger more-complex habitats (including whole basins) using alternative tools. Because eradication of nonnative fish from larger, more-complex habitats has been determined infeasible using gill nets and electrofishers, the NPS is considering

alternatives using piscicides (rotenone) in order to restore these ecologically significant habitats.

Alternative A: No-action/Status Quo would continue the ongoing ecosystem restoration effort for 25 waterbodies, but no new fish eradication activities would be initiated. Physical treatment methods (gill netting, electrofishing, disturbing redds, and/or temporarily covering spawning habitat with boulders) would continue to be utilized until 2017. Native species and ecological processes in high elevation aquatic ecosystems would be monitored. Research on native species, ecological processes, and their stressors would continue in accordance with NPS policy. After all treatments are completed, self-sustaining nonnative trout populations would continue to exist in 550 waterbodies (252 lakes, 235 ponds, 63 marshes) and hundreds of miles of stream.

Alternative B (NPS preferred alternative) would include physical and piscicide treatments preceding restoration. Under this alternative, a prescription (detailed plan of action) for restoration would be developed for each proposed restoration area based on the criteria for basin selection, pre-treatment surveys, habitat size, basin topography, wilderness values, visitor use, and field crew safety. Prescriptions would consider the actual distribution of fish, results of amphibian surveys, and whether any unique habitats were detected (such as springs). Physical treatment as described under alternative A, plus trapping, would be utilized. Piscicide treatment methods would be considered for waterbodies determined infeasible for physical treatment. Based on current knowledge of the proposed fish eradication sites, physical treatment would be applied in 52 waterbodies (27 lakes, 24 ponds, 1 marsh; total of 492 ac/199 ha) and 15 mi (25 km) of streams in 17 basins, and piscicide treatment would be applied in 33 waterbodies (4 lakes, 25 ponds, and 4 marshes; total of 142 ac/57 ha) and 16 mi (25 km) of streams in 9 basins. In addition, any unsurveyed habitat adjacent to treated lakes, ponds, marshes, and streams found to contain nonnative fish would also require treatment in order to eradicate fish from the geographic area. After all treatments are completed, self-sustaining nonnative trout populations would continue to exist in 465 waterbodies (221 lakes, 186 ponds, 58 marshes) and hundreds of miles of stream.

Alternative C would use physical treatment methods only to eradicate nonnative fish, and blasting rock to create vertical fish barriers (if needed). In comparison to alternative B, excluded

from the list of proposed restoration waterbodies are long reaches of stream, several large lakes, and interconnected lake complexes that are too large for effective physical treatment. Physical treatment methods would be applied in 52 waterbodies (27 lakes, 24 ponds, and 1 marsh; total of 492 ac/199 ha) and 15 mi (25 km) of streams contained in 17 basins. In addition, any unsurveyed habitat adjacent to treated lakes, ponds, marshes, and streams found to contain nonnative fish would be treated to eradicate fish from the entire scope of the restoration area. After all treatments are completed, self-sustaining nonnative trout populations would continue to exist in 498 waterbodies (225 lakes, 211 ponds, 62 marshes) and hundreds of miles of stream.

Alternative D emphasizes speed in recovering habitat because MYLF populations are declining rapidly. To achieve this, only piscicide treatment would be used for nonnative fish eradication, which can be conducted faster than using physical methods. Piscicide treatment would be used for 85 waterbodies (31 lakes, 49 ponds, and 5 marshes; total of 634 ac/257 ha), approximately 31 mi (50 km) of streams, and connected fish-containing habitat as necessary. After all treatments are completed, self-sustaining nonnative trout populations would continue to exist in 465 waterbodies (221 lakes, 186 ponds, 58 marshes) and hundreds of miles of stream.

Dated: March 25, 2016.

Patricia L. Neubacher,

Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 2016-13840 Filed 6-10-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-IMR-SAGU-20976; PPIMIMLAE6 PS.SIMLA0044.00.1]

Minor Boundary Revision at Saguaro National Park

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notification of boundary revision.

SUMMARY: The boundary of Saguaro National Park is modified to include 273.08 acres of land located in Pima County, Arizona, immediately adjacent to the boundary of the park. Subsequent to the proposed boundary revision, the United States will acquire the land by donation from The Trust for Public Land, a nonprofit conservation organization.

DATES: The effective date of this boundary revision is June 13, 2016.

ADDRESSES: The map depicting this boundary revision is available for inspection at the following locations: National Park Service, Land Resources Program Center, Intermountain Region, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, Denver, Colorado 80228 and National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 1849 C Street NW., Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Chief Realty Officer Steve Muyskens, National Park Service, Land Resources Program Center, Intermountain Region, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, Denver, Colorado 80228, telephone (303) 969-2610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Notice is hereby given that, pursuant to 54 U.S.C. 100506(c)(1)(B), the boundary of Saguaro National Park is modified to include 273.08 acres of adjacent land identified as Tract 01-177. The boundary revision is depicted on Map No. 151/117,410A, dated April 7, 2015.

54 U.S.C. 100506(c)(1)(B) provides that, after notifying the House Committee on Natural Resources and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make this boundary revision upon publication of notice in the **Federal Register**. The Committees have been notified of this boundary revision. This boundary revision and subsequent acquisition will ensure preservation and protection of a significant riparian corridor and habitat at the park.

Dated: May 2, 2016.

Colin Campbell,

Acting Regional Director, Intermountain Region.

[FR Doc. 2016-13842 Filed 6-10-16; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-CB-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement

[Docket ID BSEE-2016-0009; OMB Control Number 1014-0004; [164E1700D2 EEEE500000 ET1SF0000.DAQ000]

Information Collection Activities: Oil and Gas Well-Completion Operations; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

ACTION: 60-Day notice.

SUMMARY: To comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) is

inviting comments on a collection of information that we will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval. The information collection request (ICR) concerns renewal to the paperwork requirements in the regulations under Subpart E, *Oil and Gas Well-Completion Operations*.

DATE: You must submit comments by August 12, 2016.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by either of the following methods listed below.

- Electronically: go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for BSEE-2016-0009. Follow the instructions to submit public comments and view all related materials. We will post all comments.

- Email regs@bsee.gov or hand-carry comments to the Department of the Interior; BSEE; Regulations and Standards Branch; Attention: Kelly Odom; 45600 Woodland Road; Sterling, Virginia 20166. Please reference ICR 1014-0004 in your comment and include your name and return address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kelly Odom, Regulations and Standards Branch at (703) 787-1775 to request additional information about this ICR.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: 30 CFR part 250, subpart E, Oil and Gas Well-Completion Operations.

OMB Control Number: 1014-0004.

Abstract: The Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Lands Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1331 *et seq.* and 43 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe rules and regulations necessary for the administration of the leasing provisions of the Act related to the mineral resources on the OCS. Such rules and regulations will apply to all operations conducted under a lease. Operations on the OCS must preserve, protect, and develop mineral resources in a manner that is consistent with the need to make such resources available to meet the Nation's energy needs as rapidly as possible; to balance orderly energy resource development with protection of human, marine, and coastal environments; to ensure the public a fair and equitable return on the resources of the OCS; and to preserve and maintain free enterprise competition.

Section 5(a) of the OCS Lands Act requires the Secretary to prescribe rules and regulations "to provide for the prevention of waste, and conservation of the natural resources of the Outer Continental Shelf, and the protection of correlative rights therein" and to include provisions "for the prompt and efficient exploration and development

of a lease area." These authorities and responsibilities are among those delegated to BSEE to ensure that operations in the OCS will meet statutory requirements; provide for safety and protection of the environment; and result in diligent exploration, development, and production of OCS leases. This information collection (IC) request addresses the regulations at 30 CFR 250, Subpart E, Oil and Gas Well-Completion Operations, and any associated supplementary Notices to Lessees and Operators (NTLs) intended to provide clarification, description, or explanation of these regulations.

In addition to the general rulemaking authority of the OCSLA at 43 U.S.C. 1334, section 301(a) of the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act (FOGRMA), 30 U.S.C. 1751(a), grants authority to the Secretary to prescribe such rules and regulations as are reasonably necessary to carry out FOGRMA's provisions. While the majority of FOGRMA is directed to royalty collection and enforcement, some provisions apply to offshore operations. For example, section 108 of FOGRMA, 30 U.S.C. 1718, grants the Secretary broad authority to inspect lease sites for the purpose of determining whether there is compliance with the mineral leasing laws. Section 109(c)(2) and (d)(1), 30 U.S.C. 1719(c)(2) and (d)(1), impose substantial civil penalties for failure to permit lawful inspections and for knowing or willful preparation or submission of false, inaccurate, or misleading reports, records, or other information. Because the Secretary has delegated some of the authority under FOGRMA to BSEE, 30 U.S.C. 1751 is included as additional authority for these requirements.

Regulations at 30 CFR part 250 implement these statutory requirements. We use the information to ensure that planned well-completion operations will protect personnel and natural resources. They use the analysis and evaluation results in the decision to approve, disapprove, or require modification to the proposed well-completion operations. Specifically, BSEE uses the information to ensure: (a) Compliance with personnel safety training requirements; (b) crown block safety device is operating and can be expected to function to avoid accidents; (c) proposed operation of the annular preventer is technically correct and provides adequate protection for personnel, property, and natural resources; (d) well-completion operations are conducted on well casings that are structurally competent;