

construction of about 93 miles of new roads, construction of 40 miles of surface pipelines, construction of 90 miles of buried pipelines, and construction of 33 miles of powerlines. In all, approximately 2,685 acres would be disturbed under this alternative. It is estimated that 1,272 acres would be subject to interim reclamation.

2. *Proposed Action*—Under this alternative, up to 2,808 new gas wells would be drilled from 233 new well pads and 960 expanded well pads. This alternative also includes drilling 3 water disposal wells, constructing 18 LGS facilities, constructing about 49 miles of new roads, constructing 36 miles of surface pipelines, constructing 90 miles of buried pipelines, and constructing 33 miles of powerlines. In all, approximately 2,909 acres would be disturbed under this alternative. It is estimated that 410 acres would be subject to interim reclamation.

3. *Resource Protection (BLM-preferred)*—Under this alternative, up to 2,808 new gas wells would be drilled from 162 new well pads and 960 expanded well pads. This alternative also includes drilling 3 water disposal wells, constructing 18 LGS facilities, constructing about 36 miles of new roads, constructing 23 miles of surface pipelines, constructing 90 miles of buried pipelines, and constructing 33 miles of powerlines. In all, approximately 2,547 acres would be disturbed under this alternative. It is estimated that 333 acres would be subject to interim reclamation.

4. *Other Protections*—Under this alternative, up to 2,808 new gas wells would be drilled from 157 new well pads and 880 expanded well pads. This alternative also includes drilling 3 water disposal wells, constructing 18 LGS facilities, constructing about 35 miles of new roads, constructing 102 miles of buried pipelines, and constructing 33 miles of powerlines. In all, approximately 2,629 acres would be disturbed under this alternative. It is estimated that 435 acres would be subject to interim reclamation.

5. *Alternatives Considered, but Eliminated from Further Analysis*—Seven alternatives were considered, but eliminated from further analysis. These include:

a. *Use of Produced Water for Waterflood Projects*: A possible alternative would require that produced water be treated, sold, and transported for use in oil field waterflood operations in adjacent fields (the Chapita project itself is not an oil field waterflood project). This alternative would require the construction of treatment and transportation facilities, or the treated

water would have to be transported by truck. Either way, this alternative would result in effects greater than the Proposed Action, so it was dismissed from detailed analysis.

b. *All Project Wells would be Connected to the LGS*: A Federal Energy Regulatory Commission-delineated jurisdictional boundary divides the Chapita project area between power suppliers Moon Lake Electric and Rocky Mountain Power. EOG has contracted with Rocky Mountain Power and is obligated to use that power solely within Rocky Mountain Power's jurisdiction boundary. Also, EOG's current Proposed Action connects as many wells to the electrified LGS as is feasible based on available power, so further expansion of the LGS would require the construction and operation of large hydrocarbon-fueled compressor and generator engines. Therefore, this alternative is technically and economically unfeasible and would result in effects greater than the Proposed Action, so it was dismissed from detailed analysis.

c. *All Field Facilities would be Electrified*: This alternative was not carried forward for the same reasons as the previous alternative, "All Project Wells would be Connected to the LGS."

d. *Field-Wide Electrification Using Solar Panel Generation*: A solar panel facility sufficient to generate the power needed to electrify the Chapita project area (an estimated 40 megawatts), would cover about 200 acres. The cost would be an estimated \$300 million. In addition, backup power via gas-fired generators would be needed. Therefore, this alternative is technically and economically unfeasible and would result in effects greater than the Proposed Action, so it was dismissed from detailed analysis.

e. *New Roads Limited to a 14-foot running surface*: Because of vehicle safety concerns (safe passing width and road stability issues) this alternative was dismissed from detailed analysis.

f. *New Wellheads within the White River Viewshed would be Placed Below Ground*: Alternative D would preclude further surface disturbance within the 100-year floodplain of the White River by prohibiting new wells or well pads within 0.5 mile or line-of-sight of the White River. This alternative is not analyzed in detail in this EIS because it is sufficiently similar to the other protections.

g. *Full Field Development*: EOG's original proposal included drilling up to 7,028 wells over a 15-year period. When the issue of high concentrations of winter-time ground level ozone in the Uinta Basin was recognized, EOG

reduced its well count (among other commitments) to reduce emission of pollutants, in particular ozone precursors. This alternative would result in effects greater than the Proposed Action. Accordingly, it was dismissed from detailed analysis.

The public is encouraged to comment on any of these alternatives. The BLM asks that those submitting comments make them as specific as possible with reference to chapters, page numbers, and paragraphs in the Draft EIS document. Comments that contain only opinions or preferences will not receive a formal response; however, they will be considered, and included, as part of the BLM decision-making process. The most useful comments are those that contain new technical or scientific information, identify data gaps in the impact analysis, or provide a technical or scientific rationale for opinions or preferences.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comments, please 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.

Edwin L. Roberson,
State Director.

[FR Doc. 2018-03771 Filed 3-8-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-DQ-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLCAD01000 L12100000.MD0000
18XL1109AF]

Meeting of the California Desert District Advisory Council

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management.
ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) California Desert District Advisory Council (DAC) will meet as indicated below.

DATES: The BLM's California DAC will hold a public meeting on Tuesday, March 20, 2018, from 12:00 p.m. to 5 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Hilton Garden Inn, Mirage Room,

12603 Mariposa Rd., Victorville, CA 92395. The final agenda for the March 20, 2018, public meeting will be posted on the BLM web page at: <https://www.blm.gov/site-page/get-involved-rac-near-you-california-california-desert-district>. Written comments may be filed in advance of the meeting and sent to the California Desert DAC, c/o Bureau of Land Management, External Affairs, 22835 Calle San Juan de Los Lagos, Moreno Valley, CA 92553.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephen Razo, BLM California Desert District External Affairs, telephone: 951-697-5217, email: srazo@blm.gov. 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 individuals. You will receive a reply during normal hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: All DAC meetings are open to the public. The 15-member DAC advises the Secretary of the Interior, through the BLM, on a variety of planning and management issues associated with public land management on BLM-administered lands in the California desert. The agenda will include time for public comment at the beginning and end of the meeting, as well as during various presentations. While the meeting is tentatively scheduled from 12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., the meeting could conclude earlier depending on the length of time for presentations and discussions. Members of the public interested in a particular agenda item or discussion should schedule their arrival accordingly. The agenda for the meeting will include an update on the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan and updates from council members and the BLM California Desert District Manager.

Written comments will also be accepted at the time of the meeting and, if copies are provided to the recorder, will be incorporated into the minutes.

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 in your comment that the BLM withhold your personal identifying information from public

review, the BLM cannot guarantee that it will be able to do so.

Beth Ransel,

California Desert District Manager.

[FR Doc. 2018-04786 Filed 3-8-18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-40-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

**[NPS-WASO-NRNL-25097;
PPWOCRADIO, PCU00RP14.R50000]**

National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations and Related Actions

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Park Service is soliciting comments on the significance of properties nominated before February 17, 2018, for listing or related actions in the National Register of Historic Places.

DATES: Comments should be submitted by March 26, 2018.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be sent via U.S. Postal Service and all other carriers to the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW, MS 7228, Washington, DC 20240.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The properties listed in this notice are being considered for listing or related actions in the National Register of Historic Places. Nominations for their consideration were received by the National Park Service before February 17, 2018. Pursuant to section 60.13 of 36 CFR part 60, written comments are being accepted concerning the significance of the nominated properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation.

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.

Nominations submitted by State Historic Preservation Officers:

CALIFORNIA

Riverside County

Bates, Miles C., House, 73697 Santa Rosa Way, Palm Desert, SG100002238

Solano County

Westminster Presbyterian Church and Cemetery of Tremont, 8290 Tremont Rd., Dixon, SG100002240

IOWA

Woodbury County

Milwaukee Railroad Shops Historic District, 3400 Sioux River Rd., Sioux City, SG100002243

KANSAS

Morris County

Madonna of the Trail, (Santa Fe Trail MPS), 11 E. Main St., Council Grove, MP100002245

Saline County

Norton Apartments, The, 1111 & 1115 E Iron Ave., Salina, SG100002246

Sedgwick County

North Topeka Avenue—10th Street Historic District (Boundary Decrease), 1165, 1103, 1109, 1113, and 1108 N. Topeka Ave., Wichita, BC100002247,

Wilson County

Neodesha City Hall Building, 102 S. 4th St., Neodesha, SG100002248

LOUISIANA

Iberia Parish

Avery Island, LA 329, Avery Island, SG100002249

MONTANA

Hill County

Fort Assinniboine (Boundary Increase), Star Rt. 36, Box 43, Havre vicinity, BC100002250

NEW JERSEY

Burlington County

Woolman, John, Memorial House, 99 Branch St., Mount Holly Township, SG100002251

Cumberland County

Mauricetown Historic District, Roughly along Highland St., Commercial Township, SG100002252

NEW YORK

Erie County

Niagara Machine and Tool Works Factory, 631 & 683 Northland Ave., Buffalo, SG100002255

NORTH DAKOTA

Kidder County

(Federal Relief Construction in North Dakota, 1931-1943, MPS), Robinson Hall, 118 Main St., Robinson, MP100002253

TENNESSEE

Bradley County

Sanda Hosiery Mills, 130-140 Edwards St., Cleveland, SG100002258

Hamblen County

Bethel Methodist Church, 703 N. Cumberland St., Morristown, SG100002260