

FISCAL YEAR 2013 MIP RATES—MULTIFAMILY HOUSING, HEALTH CARE FACILITIES AND HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAMS—Continued

	Current basis points	FY13 basis points
223(a)(7) Refinance of Health Care Facilities with LIHTC	45	45
223d Operating Loss Loan for Health Care Facilities	80	95
241(a) Supplemental Loans for Health Care Facilities without LIHTC	57	72
241(a) Supplemental Loans for Health Care Facilities with LIHTC	45	45
FHA Hospitals		
242 Hospitals	50	70
223(a)(7) Refinance of Existing FHA-insured Hospital	50	55
223(f) Refinance or Purchase of Existing Non-FHA-insured Hospital	50	65
241(a) Supplemental Loans for Hospitals	50	65

* The first year MIP for the Section 207/223(f) loans for apartments is 100 basis (one percent) points for the first year, as specified in sections 24 CFR 207.252b(a). The first year MIP for a Section 232/223(f) health care facility remains at 100 basis points (one percent). The first year MIP for a Section 223(a)(7) refinancing loan remains at 50 basis points.

IV. Positive Credit Subsidy Programs

Positive credit subsidy will no longer be required for loans under any of the active mortgage insurance programs for multifamily housing or health care facilities. Beginning on October 1, 2012, commitments issued for Section 223(d) operating loss loans for health care facilities and Section 241(a) supplemental loans to FHA-financed multifamily housing will be reported under the budget risk category of their respective, primary FHA mortgages, all of which will generate negative credit subsidy in FY 2013. In addition, the Department will suspend issuance and reissuance commitments under two other programs that had previously required positive credit: Section 221(d)(3) multifamily housing loans for projects with non-profit sponsors or for Section 223(d) operating loss loans to multifamily housing projects with a primary FHA mortgage.

Dated: August 9, 2012.

Carol Galante,

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Housing—
Federal Housing Commissioner.*

[FR Doc. 2012–20045 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

[Docket No. FR–5613–N–06–A]

Privacy Act of 1974; New System of Records, Office of General Counsel E-Discovery Management System—Change in Final Effective Date

AGENCY: Office of the General Counsel, HUD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice advises that HUD's Office of General Counsel (OGC) is moving its final effective date of a

new system of records for the OGC E-Discovery Management System until after the opportunity for further comment is provided to the public.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For inquiries pertaining to Privacy Act records, contact Donna Robinson-Staton, Chief Privacy Officer, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 7th Street SW., Washington, DC 20410 (Attention: Capitol View Building, 4th Floor) telephone number (202) 402–8073 (this telephone number is not toll free). A telecommunications device for hearing- and speech-impaired persons (TTY) is available by calling the Federal Relay Service's toll-free telephone number (800) 877–8339.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552a), HUD published in the **Federal Register** on July 17, 2012, at 77 FR 41997, a notice that announced OGC's intent to establish a new system of records for OGC's E-Discovery Management System (EDMS), a system expected to improve significantly the efficiency of OGC's processing of records during the preservation, discovery and processing of litigation requests when litigation is “reasonably anticipated” and dramatically reduce the time spent on document review and production process. OGC's EDMS is in response to e-discovery preservation and production requirements in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The July 17, 2012, notice solicited public comment on the new record system for OGC–EDMS, which was detailed in the July 17, 2012, notice, for a period of 30 days. The notice advised that EDMS would carry a final effective date of August 16, 2012, unless HUD received comments which would result in a contrary determination. HUD anticipates receiving public comments

prior to August 16, 2012, but even in the absence of comment, HUD determined, upon further review of the system, to make certain clarifications and solicit public comment for another 30-day period. Accordingly, following conclusion of the comment period on August 16, 2012, HUD will consider any public comments related to the July 17, 2012, notice, and subsequently publish another notice. The second notice to be published on the new record system for OGC–EDMS will make the clarifications that HUD believes need to be made, respond to any public comments received by August 16, 2012, make any additional changes that may be recommended by commenters and with which HUD agrees, and solicit public comment for an additional period of 30-days.

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 552a; 88 Stat. 1896; 42 U.S.C. 3535(d).

Dated August 10, 2012.

Camille E. Acevedo,

Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations.

[FR Doc. 2012–20042 Filed 8–14–12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210–67–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**Fish and Wildlife Service**

[FWS–R2–R–2012–N160;
FXRS12610200000S3–123–FF02R06000]

Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex, Brazoria, Fort Bend, Matagorda, and Wharton Counties, TX; Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the availability of a draft comprehensive conservation plan (CCP) and an environmental assessment (EA) for public review and comment. The draft CCP/EA describes our proposal for managing the Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex for the next 15 years. The Complex, which includes Brazoria, San Bernard, and Big Boggy National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs), is located approximately 50 miles south of Houston, Texas.

DATES: To ensure consideration, please send your written comments by August 15, 2012. We will announce upcoming public meetings in local news media.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments or requests for copies or more information on the Draft CCP/EA by any of the methods listed below. You may request hard copies or a CD-ROM of the documents. Please contact Jennifer Sanchez, Project Leader, or Carol Torrez, Lead Planner/R2 NWRs NEPA Coordinator.

Email: carol_torrez@fws.gov. Include "TMC NWR Complex Draft CCP and EA" in the subject line of the message.

Fax: Attn: Carol Torrez, 505-248-6803.

U.S. Mail: Carol Torrez, Lead Planner/ NWRs NEPA Coordinator, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NWRs Division of Planning, P.O. Box 1306, Albuquerque, NM 87103.

In-Person Drop-off, Viewing, or Pickup: You may drop off comments during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at 500 Gold Street SW., 4th Floor, Room 4336, Albuquerque, NM 87102.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Sanchez, Project Leader, Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex, CCP—Project, 5247 CR 316, Brazoria, TX 77422; phone: 979-964-4011; fax: 979-964-4021.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Introduction

With this notice, we continue the CCP process for the Texas Mid-Coast NWR

Complex. We started this process through a notice in the **Federal Register** (74 FR 29714; June 23, 2009).

The Complex is located along the upper Texas Gulf Coast, approximately 50 miles south of Houston, Texas. It is comprised of three refuges: Brazoria NWR, which was established in 1966, and encompasses 44,414 acres; San Bernard NWR, which was established in 1968, and encompasses 52,400 acres; and Big Boggy NWR, which was established in 1983, and encompasses 4,526 acres. These lands provide a vital complex of salt and freshwater marshes, sloughs, ponds, coastal prairies, and bottomland hardwood forests that provide habitat for a wide variety of resident and migratory wildlife.

Background

The CCP Process

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd–668ee) (Refuge Administration Act), as amended by the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997, requires us to develop a CCP for each national wildlife refuge. The purpose for developing a CCP is to provide refuge managers with a 15-year plan for achieving refuge purposes and contributing toward the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System, consistent with sound principles of fish and wildlife management, conservation, legal mandates, and our policies. In addition to outlining broad management direction on conserving wildlife and their habitats, CCPs identify wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities available to the public, including opportunities for wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation. We will review and update the CCP at least every 15 years in accordance with the Refuge Administration Act.

Public Outreach

Formal scoping began with publication of a notice of intent to prepare a comprehensive conservation plan and environmental assessment

(EA) in the **Federal Register** on June 23, 2009 (74 FR 29714). The Refuge solicited comments on issues and concerns to aid in CCP development through three open house meetings held in September 2009.

An ecoregion-wide coordination meeting was held at the Complex's Discovery Center on December 2, 2009, to gain a better understanding of the issues within the Gulf Coast Prairies and Marshes Ecoregion, where the Complex is located, and to determine the Complex's role in addressing issues impacting fish, wildlife, and their habitats within the larger landscape. In February 2010, the Complex met with representatives from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department to discuss their concerns regarding past management, future management, and issues common to both agencies.

Additional public scoping for the Land Protection Planning process was conducted in January 2012. Three open house meetings were held to provide information on the proposed expansion and respond to questions and concerns.

The feedback received at the conclusion of the public involvement period identified numerous concerns from a variety of stakeholders. These concerns were organized by five broad issue categories and one administrative category: Ecoregion, Habitat, Wildlife, Visitor Services, and Facilities/ Infrastructure Management.

CCP Alternatives We Are Considering

During the public scoping process with which we started work on this draft CCP, we, other governmental partners, Tribes, and the public, raised multiple issues. Our draft CCP addresses them. A full description of each alternative is in the EA. To address these issues, we developed and evaluated the following alternatives, summarized below.

Issue topic	Alternative A—no action	Alternative B—proposed action	Alternative C
Ecoregion Management Issue 1: Climate Change.	Supplement natural forest regeneration with restoration efforts; monitor carbon sequestration; conduct education programs; and use "green" technologies and building products on all new construction.	Same as Alternative A plus increase restoration efforts; utilize exchange of carbon credits; gather baseline data on habitat composition/wildlife diversity; update refuge displays; and increase use of "green" technologies.	Same as Alternative B plus increase restoration efforts above described levels.
Ecoregion Management Issue 2: Erosion/Saltwater Intrusion.	Construct/Use a variety of structural and some restoration techniques at various locations.	Same as Alternative A plus increase the types and amounts of structural and restoration techniques used.	Same as Alternative A plus increase the types and amounts of structural and restoration techniques used.

Issue topic	Alternative A—no action	Alternative B—proposed action	Alternative C
Ecoregion Management Issue: 3 Wildland Fire Use.	Follow direction of current Fire Management Plan (FMP).	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Ecoregion Management Issue 4: Petroleum Development.	Work cooperatively with companies to minimize impacts to refuge resources.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Ecoregion Management Issue 5: Land Conservation.	The Complex will continue to acquire lands under the 1997 Austin's Woods Conservation Plan until the 28,000-acre cap is reached.	The Complex will acquire lands under the new Land Protection Plan up to 70,000 acres.	Same as Alternative B.
Habitat Management Issue 1: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Restoration and Management.	Cooperative haying conducted; wetland and farmland rehabilitation. Native prairie restoration.	Same as Alternative A, plus increase acreage of haying, and increase number of rehabilitation projects. Increase prairie restoration.	Same as Alternative B plus develop seed bank on prairie restoration areas.
Habitat Management Issue 2: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Management of Invasive Species (Flora).	Mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire use allowed; grazing not allowed.	Same as Alternative A plus increase the types and amounts of management prescriptions used, including limited livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B but diversify the types of management prescriptions used, including bison grazing.
Habitat Management Issue 3: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Prescribed Fire Use.	Allowed Complex-wide to improve habitats and reduce hazardous fuels.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Habitat Management Issue 4: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Farming Program.	Cooperative farming and force account farming occur on all three refuges.	Same as A, plus incorporate additional moist soil units into farming rotation at Brazoria NWR.	Reduce cooperative farming acres at Brazoria NWR and eliminate farming at Big Boggy and San Bernard NWRs.
Habitat Management Issue 5: Gulf Coast Prairie and Marshes—Water Management.	Restore prairie pothole hydrology as opportunity arises; use established wells to provide fresh water to moist soil units during drought periods; and purchase water from various water authorities annually.	Same as Alternative A plus drill additional wells, and develop new/rehabilitate existing water control structures.	Same as Alternative B plus increase water availability through the development of partnerships and purchase of water rights; expand wetlands; and rehabilitate marshes.
Habitat Management Issue 6: Bottomland Hardwood Forest—Restoration.	Allow natural regeneration; where appropriate add supplemental planting of hardwood species; treat invasive species.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Habitat Management Issue 7: Bottomland Hardwood Forest—Water Management.	Restore previously drained wetlands.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Habitat Management Issue 8: Dune and Beach Management.	Management of beach resources has not been clearly defined due to recent silting in of Cedar Lakes Cut and trespass across upland vegetation on private land to access the Cut.	Cooperatively work with County and General Land Office (GLO) to provide additional protection on San Bernard Beach restricting type of access and activities by visitors that would be compatible with Refuge Purpose.	Same as Alternative B.
Wildlife Management Issue 1: Threatened and Endangered Species.	Implement the Sea Turtle Recovery Plan.	Same as A, plus if reintroduction of APC and whooping crane occur, implement APC and whooping crane recovery plans.	Same as Alternative B.
Wildlife Management Issue 2: Migratory Bird Species and Species of Special Management Concern.	Manage a variety of habitats for resting, feeding, and reproductive purposes.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Wildlife Management Issue 3: Management of Invasive Species (Fauna).	Hunting and trapping used to control feral hogs. Baiting and broad scale treatments to control ants.	Same as Alternative A plus release natural predators to control ants.	Same as Alternative A, but diversify the types of management prescriptions used for each invasive.
Visitor Services Issue 1: Hunting ...	Allowed in designated areas for waterfowl, youth deer/feral hog hunt on San Bernard NWR, and a youth feral hog hunt. One permit area and ATV use allowed in designated area for disabled hunters.	Same as Alternative A plus provide a youth waterfowl hunt; revise the hunting schedule at two locations.	Same as Alternative B plus provide a population reduction deer hunt.
Visitor Services Issue 2: Fishing ...	Allowed on all navigable waters and from designated locations.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.

Issue topic	Alternative A—no action	Alternative B—proposed action	Alternative C
Visitor Services Issue 3: Wildlife Observation.	Brazoria and San Bernard NWRs open to wildlife observation; visitors directed to designated public use areas.	Same as Alternative A plus construct additional photo blinds, new trails, a boardwalk, and road pull-offs to provide for additional opportunity.	Same as Alternative B.
Visitor Services Issue 4: Wildlife Photography.	Photo blind at Hudson Woods	Same as Alternative A plus develop additional photography opportunities.	Same as Alternative B.
Visitor Services Issue 5: Environmental Education.	Various programs and events conducted.	Same as Alternative A plus increase number of programs conducted and expand programs into additional school districts at San Bernard NWR.	Same as Alternative B.
Visitor Services Issue 6: Interpretation.	One annual 3-day event	Same as Alternative A plus expand organized interpretive programs at a variety of Refuge venues on a monthly basis.	Same as Alternative B.
Visitor Services Issue 7: Preservation of Historic Sites.	Historical sites are identified and interpreted in public use areas when appropriate.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Visitor Services Issue 8: Entrance Fee.	No entrance fee required	Require entrance fee	Provide donation boxes at various public use areas.
Facilities Issue 1: Visitor Orientation.	Visitor contact station located at Brazoria NWR Discovery Center.	Same as Alternative A plus additional Visitor Contact Station at San Bernard NWR.	Same as Alternative A plus construct stand-alone Visitor Center at San Bernard NWR Field Office.
Facilities Issue 2: Visitor Use—Trails.	Hiking trail provided at Brazoria and San Bernard NWRs.	Same as Alternative A plus construct a new trail at Brazoria NWR Field Office; provide bicycle access at Dow Woods Unit.	Same as Alternative B.
Facilities Issue 3: Visitor—Non-Motorized Boat Launches Visitor.	Canoe/Kayak launches provided at San Bernard and Brazoria NWRs.	Same as Alternative A plus construct one additional launch.	Same as Alternative B plus construct two additional launches.
Facilities Issue 4: Visitor—Signs/Exhibits.	Signs and exhibits at Brazoria and San Bernard NWRs.	Construct new exhibits and signs and improve quality and content of existing exhibits and signs.	Same as Alternative B.
Facilities Issue 5: Visitor—Roadways.	Vehicular access allowed on designated refuge roads.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.
Facilities Issue 6: Administrative—Volunteer.	Recreation vehicle pads provided at Brazoria and San Bernard NWRs.	Construct new recreation vehicle site at Brazoria NWR, and expand recreation vehicle sites at San Bernard NWR; include additional facilities at both locations.	Same as A, plus construct additional facilities at Brazoria NWR.
Facilities Issue 7: Administrative Facilities.	A variety of administrative/maintenance facilities available at various refuges.	Construct new administrative/maintenance facilities at various refuges.	Same as Alternative B.

Public Availability of Documents

In addition to any methods in **ADDRESSES**, you can view or obtain documents at the following locations:

- Texas Mid-Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex Headquarters Office, CR 316, Brazoria, TX, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday.

• Our web site: <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/refuges/Plan/plansinprogress.html>.

- At the following public libraries:

Library	Address	Phone No.
Brazoria County Library City of Lake Jackson Branch	250 Circle Way, Lake Jackson, TX 77566	979-297-1271
Brazoria County Library West Columbia Branch	518 East Brazos, West Columbia, TX 77486	979-345-3394
Bay City Public Library	1100 7th Street, Bay City, Texas 77414	979-245-6931

Submitting Comments/Issues for Comment

We consider comments substantive if they:

- Question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of the information in the document;

- Question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental assessment (EA);

- Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the EA; and/or

- Provide new or additional information relevant to the assessment.

Next Steps

After this comment period ends, we will analyze the comments and address them in the form of a final CCP and finding of no significant impact.

Public Availability of Comments

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: July 26, 2012.

Joy E. Nicholopoulos,

Regional Director, Southwest Region.

[FR Doc. 2012-19891 Filed 8-14-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**Bureau of Land Management**

[LLNVE030000.L10600000.DI0000 241A; 12-08807; MO# 4500035685; TAS: 14X1109]

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for Proposed Wild Horse Eco-Sanctuary in Elko County, Nevada, and an Associated Resource Management Plan Amendment for the Wells Field Office

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

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) Wells Field Office, Elko, Nevada, intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and an associated Resource Management Plan (RMP) amendment for a proposed privately operated wild horse eco-sanctuary and by this notice, is announcing the beginning of the scoping process to solicit public comments and identify issues.

DATES: This notice initiates the public scoping process for the EIS and associated RMP amendment. Comments on issues may be submitted until September 14, 2012. The date(s) and location(s) of any scoping meetings will be announced at least 15 days in advance through local news media, mailings to interested individuals, and the BLM Elko District Web site at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/elko_field_office.html. In order to be included in the analysis, all comments must be received prior to the close of the 30-day scoping period or 15 days

after the last public meeting, whichever is later. The BLM will provide additional opportunities for public participation as appropriate.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on issues and planning criteria related to the EIS and RMP amendment by any of the following methods:

- *Email:*

EcoSanctuaryComments@blm.gov

- *Fax:* 775-753-0255

- *Mail:* Bureau of Land Management, Wild Horse Sanctuary RMP Amendment, Wells Field Office, 3900 E. Idaho Street, Elko, NV 89801

Documents pertinent to this proposal may be examined at the BLM Elko District Office, 3900 E. Idaho Street, Elko, Nevada, during regular business hours of 7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Pertinent documents are also available on-line at: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/elko_field_office.html.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information or to have your name added to our mailing list, contact Judy May, resource assistant, BLM Wells Field Office, telephone: 775-753-0267; address: 3900 East Idaho Street, Elko, NV 89801; email: jmay@blm.gov. Persons who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 to contact the above individual during normal business hours. The FIRS 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: This document provides notice that the BLM Wells Field Office, Elko, Nevada, intends to prepare an EIS with an associated RMP amendment to the Wells RMP, and announces the beginning of the scoping process and seeks public input on issues and planning criteria. The planning area is located in Elko County, Nevada, and encompasses approximately 510,000 acres of public land. The organization Saving America's Mustangs (SAM) proposes to establish a privately operated eco-sanctuary to accommodate up to 900 non-reproducing wild horses (all one sex or sterilized) on a mixture of public and private lands in Elko County, Nevada, about 25 miles southeast of Wells. The proposed eco-sanctuary is in response to the BLM's request for applications for funding (Funding Opportunity L11AS0043) to assist in the development of a Wild Horse Partnership for an Eco-Sanctuary on Public and Private Land. Preliminarily, the BLM expects that the

EIS will address the impacts of the proposed eco-sanctuary and reasonable alternatives to that proposal, and an RMP amendment that may: (1) Adjust the boundaries and management objectives of existing wild horse herd management areas (HMAs) within or near the proposed eco-sanctuary; and (2) reduce and potentially eliminate livestock grazing within the portion of the Spruce Allotment east of Highway 93. The purpose of the public scoping process is to determine relevant issues that will influence the scope of the environmental analysis, including alternatives, and guide the process for developing the EIS. At present, the BLM has identified the following preliminary issues:

(a) Potential effects to archaeological resources.

(b) Potential effects to greater sage-grouse and other sensitive species.

(c) Potential effects to important elk, mule deer, and other wildlife habitats.

(d) Ability to meet standards for rangeland health.

(e) Ability to manage healthy wild horse populations within the eco-sanctuary.

(f) Ability to provide public access for recreational purposes.

(g) Potential effects of reducing public lands available for livestock grazing.

(h) Ability to manage non-reproducing herd.

Preliminary planning criteria for the RMP amendment include:

1. Any amendment to the Wells RMP will comply with FLPMA (43 U.S.C 1701) and the BLM's land use planning regulations (43 CFR 1600).

2. Public participation would be encouraged throughout the process. The Wells Field Office managers and interdisciplinary team members will work cooperatively with the State of Nevada, tribal governments, county and municipal governments, other Federal agencies, local resource advisory councils, appellants, affected permittees, and any other interested groups, agencies, and individuals.

3. The EIS will comply with NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4332 *et seq.*) and its implementing regulations, as well as other Federal regulations.

4. Any amendment to the Wells RMP will appropriately recognize the State's authority to manage wildlife and water.

5. Any amendment to the Wells RMP will recognize valid existing rights.

6. The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will be consulted under the NHPA and kept involved throughout the planning process, consistent with the National Programmatic Agreement (February 2012) and the State of Nevada Protocol Agreement between the BLM