an integrated pest management approach, including prescribed fire, mechanical removal, herbicides, and other methods, to control invasive species.

The increased use of prescribed fire as a management tool would be emphasized for invasive brush and tree control. The plan calls for targeting and prioritizing problem areas for restoration using herbicides and prescribed fire as management tools. Existing areas of native bluestem and tall grass prairie, naturally occurring low water areas, riparian, timber, floodplain, and hardwood forest as well as the aquatic riverine habitats would be further protected and enhanced through planned management strategies.

The Refuge's biological program would become more focused and include comprehensive inventories of wildlife species and habitats, thereby improving the Refuge's baseline biological information. This would allow staff to better evaluate habitat management decisions in the future and reevaluate the local and regional threats to the ecosystem. Approximately 1,000 acres of Refuge lands optimal for crop production would continue to be farmed to provide forage for migratory birds and resident wildlife.

Under Alternative C, the Refuge would continue the expansion of habitat management and restoration activities, combined with an expanded public use development and an expanded farming program. This alternative would incorporate the habitat and wildlife management components called for in Alternative B; however, this alternative would include more concentrated efforts in developing the Refuge's public use programs and facilities beyond the existing program. The ODWC would simultaneously expand the hunting program services, but only on the ODWC-managed wildlife management unit, and would continue to comply with all applicable State hunting and wildlife regulations.

This alternative would primarily expand visitor services by developing extensive public use facilities including hiking, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental interpretive systems.

Additionally, the existing farming program would be expanded to produce increased hot foods sources for migrating waterfowl within the Refuge. Local populations of Canada geese are reportedly occurring in much fewer numbers than in previous years, largely due to the result of decreased agricultural activities within the region. With fewer supplemental food sources within the region, the Refuge is less capable of supporting the historically larger populations of geese. However, the expansion of the farming program would come at the expense of native grassland prairie restoration, either through conversion of grasslands to farm fields or by simply reducing the number of potential agriculture to grassland restoration sites.

Management efforts to develop the Refuge's public use and farming programs with this level of intensity would require a substantial increase in annual operational funding and the addition of one or two Visitor Services Park Rangers within 5 years. Additional miles in hiking trails as well as motorized tour routes would fall under areas of annual inundation and would require heavy maintenance and upkeep. This alternative may or may not be feasible under the existing budgetary constraints.

Public Availability of Documents

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

- Tishomingo National Wildlife Refuge, 12000 Refuge Road, Tishomingo, OK 73625.
- *Our Web site: http://fws.gov/southwest/refuges/plan/completeplans.html.*
- *Public Library:*—The Johnston County Library—Chikasaw Library System, located at 116 W. Main Street Tishomingo, OK 73460, during regular library hours.

Submitting Comments/Issues for Comment

We particularly seek comments on all issues.

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;
- Present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the draft 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.

Dated: December 09, 2009.

Brian A. Millsap,

Acting Regional Director, Region 2.

[FR Doc. 2010–112 Filed 1–21–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[LLNVS01000 L58530000 EU0000; 09–08807; TAS: 14X5232]

Notice of Availability of Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area, Las Vegas, NV

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for establishing a final boundary for the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area, Las Vegas, Nevada, and by this Notice is announcing the opening of the comment period.

DATES: To ensure comments will be considered, the BLM must receive written comments on the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area Draft Supplemental EIS within 60 days following the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes its Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register.** The BLM will announce future meetings or hearings and any other public involvement activities at least 15 days in advance through public notices, media releases, and/or mailings.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments related to the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area by any of the following methods:

- *Web site: http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/lvfo.html.*
- *E-mail: NV_SNDO_Planning@blm.gov.*
- *Fax:* 702–515–5023.
- *Mail:* Bob Ross, Field Manager, BLM Las Vegas Field Office, 4701 North Torrey Pines Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada 89130–2301.

Copies of the Draft Supplemental EIS for the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area are available in the Las Vegas Field Office at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information contact Gayle Marrs-Smith, telephone (702) 515–5156 or e-mail *Gayle_Marrs-Smith@blm.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft Supplemental EIS describes and analyzes possible boundary adjustments to the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area (CTA) referenced in the 2004 Final Las Vegas Valley Disposal Boundary

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision. Because of the significance of paleontological, botanical, hydrological, and cultural resources present within the CTA study area and the need for additional public input, the BLM is preparing a Supplemental EIS. The BLM proposes to establish a final boundary for the CTA. This decision was not made in the 2004 Record of Decision. The CTA study area is located in the northern portion of the Las Vegas Valley. A defined final boundary is needed to ensure protection of sensitive resources, including fossils, cultural resources, the natural functioning of the wash, and endemic plants on public lands available for disposal within the CTA study area, in accordance with applicable laws.

Six alternatives for boundaries are analyzed, ranging from approximately 13,000 acres to less than 1,500 acres. Alternative A, at 12,953 acres, includes the fossil formation, sensitive cultural and plant resources, active wash, the adjacent alluvial fan, and a one mile resource protection zone around northern and eastern boundaries of the Las Vegas Paiute reservation. Alternative B, at 11,008 acres, includes the fossil formation, sensitive cultural and plant resources, active wash, and the adjacent alluvial fan. Alternative B is the BLM's Preferred Alternative. Alternative C, at 6,362 acres, includes the fossil formation, sensitive cultural and plant resources, active wash, and a portion of the adjacent alluvial fan. Alternative D, at 5,301 acres, includes most of the fossil formation, the sensitive cultural and rare plant resources, and the active wash. Alternative E, at 3,314 acres, includes some of the fossil formation, the sensitive cultural and rare plant resources, and part of the active wash. The No Action alternative, at 1,448 acres, includes the Tule Spring cultural site and the 300-acre Eglington Preserve. Scoping of the project occurred from June 6 to August 20, 2007, and was extended to September 4, 2007. A total of 1,183 individuals submitted comments. Comments received pertained to a variety of broad categories, including alternatives, boundaries, management, and physical/natural resources. Additional stakeholder involvement has been achieved through the BLM's newsletters that provided updates on the Supplemental EIS process.

The Draft Supplemental EIS addresses the following issues identified during scoping: NEPA process (consultation/coordination, proposal description, alternatives, and connected actions/cumulative impacts); social resources (cultural resources, visual resources, noise, land use, recreation, transportation, and socioeconomic resources); and physical/natural resources (botanical resources, water resources, paleontological resources, and geologic/soil resources).

Maps of the CTA study area and the alternatives being analyzed in the Supplemental EIS are available at the BLM Las Vegas Field Office. Please note that public comments and information submitted including names, street addresses, and e-mail addresses of persons who submit comments will be available for public review and disclosure at the above address during regular business hours (8 a.m. to 4 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail 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.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6 and 1506.10.

Angie Lara,

Associate District Manager.

[FR Doc. 2010–976 Filed 1–21–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–HC–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Indian Gaming Commission

The National Environmental Policy Act Procedures Manual

AGENCY: National Indian Gaming Commission.

ACTION: Notice of reopening of comment period.

SUMMARY: This notice reopens the period for comments on the Draft NEPA Procedures Manual published in the **Federal Register** on December 4, 2009 (74 FR 63765, 74 FR 63787).

DATES: The comment period for the Draft NEPA Procedures Manual is being reopened from January 19, 2010, to March 4, 2010.

ADDRESSES: Please submit your comments by only one of the following means: (1) By mail to: Brad Mehaffy, National Indian Gaming Commission, 1441 L Street, NW., Suite 9100, Washington, DC 20005; (2) by hand delivery to: National Indian Gaming Commission, 1441 L Street, NW., Suite 9100, Washington, DC 20005; (3) by facsimile to: (202) 632–7066; (4) by e-mail to: *nepa_procedures@nigc.gov;* or (5) online at *http://www.regulations.gov.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bradley Mehaffy, NEPA Compliance Officer at the National Indian Gaming Commission: 202–632–7003 or by facsimile at 303–632–7066 (not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: In response to several requests, the Acting Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission has decided to reopen the comment period on the Draft NEPA Procedures Manual for an additional 45 days.

Dated: January 15, 2010.

George T. Skibine,

Acting Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission.

[FR Doc. 2010–1148 Filed 1–21–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7565–01–P

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation Nos. 731–TA–776–779 (Second Review)]

Preserved Mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Scheduling of expedited five-year reviews concerning the antidumping duty orders on preserved mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia.

SUMMARY: The Commission hereby gives notice of the scheduling of expedited reviews pursuant to section 751(c)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1675(c)(3)) (the Act) to determine whether revocation of the antidumping duty orders on preserved mushrooms from Chile, China, India, and Indonesia would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time. For further information concerning the conduct of these reviews and rules of general application, consult the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, part 201, subparts A through E (19 CFR part 201), and part 207, subparts A, D, E, and F (19 CFR part 207).

DATES: *Effective Date:* January 4, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Haines (202–205–3200), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street, SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain