

construction studies conducted at project sites, bird and bat conservation strategies, or any other record that supports a developer's adherence to the Guidelines. The extent of the documentation will depend on the conditions of the site being developed. Sites with greater risk of impacts to wildlife and habitats will likely involve more extensive communication with the Service and longer durations of pre- and post-construction studies than sites with little risk.

Distributed or community-scale wind energy projects are unlikely to have significant adverse impacts to wildlife and their habitats. The Guidelines recommend that developers of these small-scale projects do the desktop analysis described in Tier 1 or Tier 2 using publicly available information to

determine whether they should communicate with the Service. Since such project designs usually include a single turbine associated with existing development, conducting a Tier 1 or Tier 2 analysis for distributed or community-scale wind energy projects should incur limited nonhour burden costs. These analyses are conducted using readily available existing information, so the nature of these costs may include travel to project sites. For such projects, if there is no potential risk identified, a developer will have no need to communicate with the Service regarding the project or to conduct studies described in Tiers 3, 4, and 5.

Adherence to the Guidelines is voluntary. Following the Guidelines does not relieve any individual, company, or agency of the responsibility

to comply with applicable laws and regulations. Developers of wind energy projects have a responsibility to comply with the law; for example, they must obtain incidental take authorization for species protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and/or Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA).

## II. Data

*OMB Control Number:* 1018-0148.

*Title:* Land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines.

*Service Form Number:* None.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.

*Description of Respondents:* Developers and operators of wind energy facilities.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

*Frequency of Collection:* On occasion.

ACTIVITY (reporting and recordkeeping)	NUMBER of respondents	NUMBER of responses	COMPLETION time per response	TOTAL annual burden hours	NONHOUR burden cost per response	TOTAL annual nonhour burden cost
Tier 1 (Desktop Analysis) .....	150	150	83	12,450	\$2,000	\$300,000
Tier 2 (Site Characterization) .....	110	110	375	41,250	\$4,000	\$440,000
Tier 3 (Pre-construction studies) .....	80	80	2,880	230,400	\$23,000	\$1,840,000
Tier 4 (Post-construction fatality monitoring and habitat studies) .....	50	50	2,550	127,500	\$95,000	\$4,750,000
Tier 5 (Other post-construction studies ...)	10	10	2,400	24,000	\$191,000	\$1,910,000
TOTALS .....	400	400	.....	435,600	.....	\$9,240,000

*Estimated Annual Nonhour Burden Cost:* \$9,240,000. Costs will depend on the size and complexity of issues associated with each project. These expenses may include, but are not limited to: Travel expenses for site visits, studies conducted, and meetings with the Service and other Federal and State agencies; training in survey methodologies; data management; special transportation such as all-terrain vehicle or helicopter; equipment needed for acoustic, telemetry, or radar monitoring, and carcass storage.

## III. Comments

We invite comments concerning this information collection on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request

to OMB to approve this IC. Before including your address, phone number, email 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: March 26, 2012.

**Tina A. Campbell,**

*Chief, Division of Policy and Directives Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

[FR Doc. 2012-7840 Filed 3-30-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-55-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

**[LLCAD01000 L12200000.AL 0000]**

### Meeting of the California Desert District Advisory Council

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given, in accordance with Public Laws 92-463 and 94-579, that the California Desert District Advisory Council (DAC) to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM),

U.S. Department of the Interior, will meet in formal session on Saturday, April 21, 2012, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. in Ridgecrest, Calif. at a location to be noticed at least 15 days prior to the meeting. There also will be a field trip on Friday, April 20, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on BLM-administered lands. Field trip details will be posted on the DAC web page, <http://www.blm.gov/ca/st/en/info/rac/dac.html>, when finalized.

Agenda topics for the Saturday meeting will include updates by council members, the BLM California Desert District manager, five field office managers, and council subgroups. Final agenda items will be posted on the DAC web page listed above.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** All DAC meetings are open to the public. Public comment for items not on the agenda will be scheduled at the beginning of the meeting Saturday morning. Time for public comment may be made available by the council chairman during the presentation of various agenda items, and is scheduled at the end of the meeting for topics not on the agenda.

While the Saturday meeting is tentatively scheduled from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., the meeting could conclude prior to 4:30 p.m. should the council conclude its presentations and discussions. Therefore, members of the

public interested in a particular agenda item or discussion should schedule their arrival accordingly.

Written comments may be filed in advance of the meeting for the California Desert District Advisory Council, c/o Bureau of Land Management, External Affairs, 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, Moreno Valley, CA 92553. Written comments also are accepted at the time of the meeting and, if copies are provided to the recorder, will be incorporated into the minutes.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

David Briery, BLM California Desert District External Affairs, (951) 697-5220.

Dated: March 19, 2012.

**Raymond Lee,**

*Acting Associate District Manager, California Desert District.*

[FR Doc. 2012-7785 Filed 3-30-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-40-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-NCRO-MONO-0811-7948; 3130-SZM]

### Notice of a Record of Decision; Monocacy National Battlefield

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Monocacy National Battlefield.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the Record of Decision for the General Management Plan, Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland. As soon as practicable, the NPS will begin to implement the preferred alternative as contained in the Final Environmental Impact Statement issued by the NPS on August 27, 2010, and summarized in the Record of Decision. Copies of the Record of Decision may be obtained from the contact listed below or online at [www.nps.gov/mono](http://www.nps.gov/mono).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

David Hayes, National Park Service, 1100 Ohio Drive SW, Washington, DC 20242, (202) 619-7277, [DavidHayes@nps.gov](mailto:DavidHayes@nps.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Record of Decision includes a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative,

a finding on impairment of park resources and values, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm and an overview of public involvement in the decision-making process.

*Alternative 4 is the Selected*

*Alternative.* The following course of action will occur under Alternative 4:

All historic structures will be preserved and maintained, and the historic farmlands will continue to be leased to retain their use in agriculture. The outbuildings on the Best Farm will remain open. The Worthington House will be rehabilitated inside and be open to visitors with exhibits.

Monocacy National Battlefield administration will be moved into the rehabilitated Thomas House. The stone tenant house on the Thomas farm will contain exhibits and restrooms. Monocacy National Battlefield maintenance will continue to operate from its current location in a nonhistoric structure near the Gambrill Mill and be redesigned to meet the needs for office, vehicle storage, and work space.

Three nonhistoric structures will be removed from the landscape—two structures are houses constructed of cinderblocks, and the third is a historic toll house that was moved to the site from its original location. It is in severely deteriorated condition and lacks integrity, and its proximity to the intersection of Araby Church Road and Maryland Highway 355 (MD-355) makes it a safety concern.

The entrance to the 14th New Jersey Monument will be shifted south to allow better sight distances entering and exiting MD-355. An existing informal parking area on the east side of MD-355 used by fishermen will be closed and the area relandscaped. River access will continue from the 14th New Jersey Monument parking area. A landscaped commemorative area will be created at the site of the Pennsylvania and Vermont Monuments as a location for any new memorials that may be added to the Monocacy National Battlefield in the future.

Visitors will use their own vehicles to drive around the Monocacy National Battlefield using existing roadways (Baker Valley Road, Araby Church Road, and MD-355). The possibility of a pedestrian deck spanning Interstate 270 (I-270) is being evaluated in consultation with the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) as mitigation for MDOT widening of I-270 through the Monocacy National Battlefield. If the deck proves feasible and if an agreement can be worked out, it will provide a trail spanning I-270

that connects the Worthington and Thomas farms.

A new trail extension of the Gambrill Mill Trail will enable visitors to walk to the railroad junction and on to the sites of the Union entrenchments and Wallace's headquarters, all important interpretive locations within the Monocacy National Battlefield. Upgraded interpretation using new signs, wayside markers and brochures will be developed. Natural resource areas along rivers and drainages and along the heights behind the Worthington farmhouse will remain undeveloped and protected.

This course of action and three alternatives were analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. Three actions were key in the decision to make Alternative 4 the selected alternative.

First, moving the maintenance and administrative functions from the park into rental space in nearby Frederick, as would have occurred in Alternative 2, would have allowed the removal of the existing metal maintenance structure from the battlefield landscape and the commercial leasing of the Thomas House. However, this would have increased the amount of driving by park staff on busy MD-355 and would have unduly separated park staff from the resources managed and interpreted. It would also have placed a commercial use within the heart of the national battlefield (the lease of the Thomas House).

Second, an alternative transportation system in Alternative 2 would have decreased visitor driving within the park, made visitor access to park areas safer by obviating the use of busy MD-355, and decreased the size of parking areas at each site. This system weighed heavily in the selection of Alternative 2 as the environmentally preferable alternative. However, current visitation does not make such a system financially feasible as a commercial operation and there is no guarantee that such a system would be financially feasible in the future. Both Alternatives 3 and 4 utilize personal vehicles to access the park.

Third, Alternatives 2 and 4 include a connection of the Thomas and Worthington farms via a deck over I-270, while Alternative 3 does not. A connection of the two farms is an important interpretive tool allowing visitors and park staff to easily move back and forth between the two properties.

As a result Alternative 4 was selected to better connect park staff to the resource, (2) to more fully consider the financial feasibility of alternative transportation at this time, and (3) to