

The proposed take would occur within SAWS's rights-of-way (permit area) during construction of two water pipelines (by Micron and WRIP) in Bexar County, Texas, as a result of vegetation disturbance; excavation; temporary placement of excavated material; permanent placement of pipe, casings, and stabilizing materials; backfilling of excavated trenches; and restoration of surface conditions (covered activities). The permit area is 160.4 acres.

Documents Available for Review

In accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*; NEPA), we advise the public that:

1. We have gathered the information necessary to determine impacts and formulate alternatives for the dEA related to potential issuance of an ITP to the applicant; and

2. The applicant has developed a dHCP as part of the application for an ITP, which describes the measures the applicant has agreed to take to minimize and mitigate the effects of incidental take of the covered species to the maximum extent practicable pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA.

As described in the dHCP, the proposed incidental take would occur within the rights-of-way of two proposed water pipelines in Bexar County, Texas, and would result from activities associated with otherwise lawful activities.

Proposed Action

The proposed action involves the issuance of an ITP by the Service for the covered activities in the permit area, pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA. The ITP would cover incidental take of the covered species associated with construction of the Micron and WRIP water pipelines within the permit area.

To meet the requirements of a section 10(a)(1)(B) ITP, the applicant has developed and proposes to implement its dHCP, which describes the conservation measures the applicant has agreed to undertake to minimize and mitigate for the impacts of the proposed incidental take of the covered species to the maximum extent practicable, and ensures that incidental take will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of these species in the wild.

The applicant proposes to mitigate with the perpetual protection,

management, and monitoring of 57.6 acres of the undeveloped portion of SAWS's Anderson Pump Station, which is adjacent to the proposed pipelines.

Alternatives

Two alternatives to the proposed action we are considering as part of this process are:

1. No Action: No ITP would be issued. Under a No Action alternative, the Service would not issue the requested ITP, and SAWS would not construct the Micron and WRIP water pipelines. Therefore, the applicant would not implement the conservation measures described in the dHCP.

2. Reduced Take and Reduced Mitigation: The Reduced Take and Reduced Mitigation alternative is similar to the Proposed Action in that the Service would issue an ITP for the proposed projects. However, the HCP under this alternative would be modified to cover a reduced area of karst zone impacts and thus would subsequently reduce the amount of conservation to offset the impacts. All other aspects of the proposed project and the HCP would remain the same.

Public Availability of Comments

Written comments we receive become part of the public record associated with this action. 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 request in your comment that we withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public disclosure in their entirety.

Authority

We provide this notice under section 10(c) of the ESA and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 17.22 and 17.32) and NEPA and its implementing regulations (40 CFR 1506.6).

Joy E. Nicholopoulos,

Acting Regional Director, Southwest Region, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

[FR Doc. 2017-21563 Filed 10-5-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

[Docket No. FWS-HQ-IA-2017-0059; FXIA16710900000-156-FF09A30000]

Foreign Endangered Species Issuance of Permits

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of issuance of permits.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), have issued the following permits to conduct certain activities with endangered species, marine mammals, or both. We issue these permits under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA).

ADDRESSES: Documents and other information submitted with these applications are available for review, subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act, by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Management Authority, Branch of Permits, MS: IA, 5275 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041; fax (703) 358-2281. To locate the **Federal Register** notice that announced our receipt of the application for each permit listed in this document, go to www.regulations.gov and search on the permit number provided in the tables in **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joyce Russell, (703) 358-2023 (telephone); (703) 358-2281 (fax); or DMAFR@fws.gov (email).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On the dates below, as authorized by the provisions of the ESA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*; ESA), we issued requested permits subject to certain conditions set forth therein. For each permit for an endangered species, we found that (1) the application was filed in good faith, (2) the granted permit would not operate to the disadvantage of the endangered species, and (3) the granted permit would be consistent with the purposes and policy set forth in section 2 of the ESA.

Permit number	Applicant	Receipt of application Federal Register notice	Permit issuance date
26612C	U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.	82 FR 28348; June 21, 2017	July 26, 2017.
19878C	Schubot Exotic Bird Health Center	82 FR 25615; June 2, 2017	July 17, 2017.
24212C	University of Alaska Fairbanks	82 FR 25616; June 2, 2017	July 27, 2017.
64163A	NH&S Holdings, LLC	82 FR 24382; May 26, 2017	July 27, 2017.
93674B	International Crane Foundation	82 FR 28348; June 21, 2017	July 28, 2017.
71315A	Arizona Tortoise Compound	79 FR 65981; November 6, 2014	February 5, 2015.

Authority: We issue this notice under the authority of the ESA, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Joyce Russell,

Government Information Specialist, Branch of Permits, Division of Management Authority.

[FR Doc. 2017-21556 Filed 10-5-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333-15-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLNVB00000.L51100000.GN0000.LVEMF 1703550.211B.17XMO#4500108947]

Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Gold Bar Mine Project, Eureka County, Nevada

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Mount Lewis Field Office, Battle Mountain, Nevada, has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Gold Bar Mine Project (Project) in Eureka County, Nevada, and by this Notice is announcing its availability.

DATES: The BLM will not issue a final decision on the proposal for a minimum of 30 days after the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the FEIS for the Project and other documents pertinent to this proposal may be reviewed at the Mount Lewis Field Office: 50 Bastian Road, Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820. The document is available for download at <http://bit.ly/2gyfZms>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Gabriel—Project Manager, telephone 775-635-4000; address 50 Bastian Road, Battle Mountain, Nevada 89820; email blm_nv_bmdo_mlfo_gold_bar_project_eis@blm.gov. Contact

Christine Gabriel to have your name added to the project mailing list. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Relay Service (FRS) at 1-800-877-8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FRS is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to leave a message or question with the above individual. You will receive a reply during normal business hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: McEwen Mining Inc. (MMI) proposes to develop a gold mine in the southwest portion of the Roberts Mountains approximately 30 miles northwest of Eureka, Nevada. The mine plan boundary encompasses 5,362 acres of public lands and 199 acres of private lands located in Eureka County, Nevada. The proposed Project would include four open pits; waste rock dump areas (WRDAs); crushing, screening, and agglomeration facilities; heap leach pads (HLP), an associated process solution pond, and an event pond; an adsorption, desorption, and recovery (ADR) plant including barren and pregnant solution tanks; ancillary and other facilities including an explosive storage area, ammonium nitrate prill silos, liquid natural gas (LNG) Cryostorage or compressed natural gas (CNG) generators with a switch station, a truck shop and wash bay, a ready line, landfill, laydown areas, water and power infrastructure, buildings, yards, parking, storage, growth media stockpiles, production water wells (GBPW-210 and GBPW-211) and an associated water supply pipeline, groundwater monitoring wells (GBMW-01, GBMW-03, and GBMW-04), communication facilities, potable water and fire water facilities, septic systems, and fencing; and mine access roads (Three Bars Road, Atlas Haul Road, North Roberts Creek Road, Bypass Road [NVN-91566], and Roberts Creek Road). The Project would disturb 1,154 acres, including re-disturbing 420 acres of existing, non-reclaimed disturbance from a previous abandoned mining operation; 718 acres of new disturbance; and 16 acres of new disturbance as a result of exploration. Of the 1,154 acres,

185 acres would be on private land, and 969 acres would be on public land.

The proposed pit depths would not intercept groundwater. No pit dewatering would be necessary and no pit lakes are anticipated to form after mining operations end. The Final EIS, through scoping and a 45-day public comment period, has identified and analyzed impacts to the following resources areas: Water resources, air quality, vegetation resources, wildlife, grazing management, land use and access, aesthetics (noise and visual), cultural resources, paleontological resources, geological resources (including minerals and soils), recreation, social and economic values, hazardous materials, Native American cultural concerns, and wild horses. The proposed project area does not have any lands with wilderness characteristics (LWCs). The Pony Express National Historic Trail crosses existing Three Bars and North Roberts Creek Roads; however, public and recreational access to the National Historic Trail would not be affected by mining activities.

The FEIS describes and analyzes the proposed Project's direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on all affected resources. In addition to the proposed Project, four alternatives were analyzed including the 25kV Overhead Distribution Line Alternative, the Three Bars Road/Atlas Haul Road as Only Access Alternative, the Mount Hope and North Roberts Creek Road for Light Vehicle Traffic Alternative, and the No Action Alternative. The Draft EIS was released for a 45-day public comment period, which ended April 17, 2017. A public meeting was held in Eureka, Nevada on March 22, 2017. A total of 2,178 comment letters were received from the general public, agencies, special interest groups, businesses and organizations. The FEIS responds to all comments received. These public comments resulted in the addition of clarifying text, but did not significantly change the analysis. Based on the analysis in the FEIS, the BLM has determined that the preferred alternative is the approval of the Project, with accompanying mitigation measures and voluntary applicant-committed