

permits to make updates to the priors in the future.

Alternative 1 would mean that for a similar level of eagle use observed at a project site, the Service would use higher fatality estimates for bald eagles than for golden eagles. Alternative 2 would be a decision by the Service to be more 'risk-tolerant' for bald eagles. This would mean that initial fatality predictions would be lower, however it would also likely mean that more permits would have to be amended to increase the permitted take over time (*i.e.*, the Service would be underestimating take more often). Alternative 3 would be a decision by the Service that more information is needed to understand the potential variability of exposure and collision probability for bald eagles. Such a process could result in either higher or lower (or more variable) priors. With this notice, we are soliciting input from the public on these three alternatives, and we will take those comments into consideration in making a final decision.

Many commenters on the draft 2016 rule urged the Service to adopt changes to the golden eagle CRM priors based on a recent peer-reviewed scientific article by Bay et al. (2016). Service staff coordinated with authors of the Bay et al. paper in development of this update, and all data used in the Bay et al. paper that were available to us and that met our criteria were incorporated. The Service decided not to incorporate the results of the Bay et al. paper directly, however, for two main reasons. First, the Service could access and utilize more data than were used in the Bay et al. paper, and so our updated priors incorporate more recent information from a wider range of projects and sites than were used by Bay et al. Second, the Bay et al. analysis used a fatality estimator that did not account for the possibility of undetected eagle deaths during mortality monitoring when no dead eagles were found. The Service uses models in our update that account for imperfect detection when dead eagles are not encountered during monitoring, because there is ample evidence that finding no dead eagles does not mean there were no eagle fatalities. Thus, although the Service's updated collision probability for golden eagles is higher than that reported by Bay et al., our approach is more accurate and consistent with our risk-averse policy with respect to estimating and managing eagle take.

#### 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 the 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. 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.

#### Literature Cited

- Bay, K., Nasman, K., Erickson, W., Taylor, K., Kosciuch, K. (2016). Predicting Eagle Fatalities at Wind Facilities, *Journal of Wildlife Management* 80:1000–1010.
- New, L., Bjerre, E., Millsap, B., Otto, M.C., Runge, M.C. (2015). A Collision Risk Model to Predict Avian Fatalities at Wind Facilities: An Example Using Golden Eagles, *Aquila chrysaetos*, *PLOS ONE*, journal.pone.0130978.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013. Eagle conservation plan guidance. Module 1—land-based wind energy. Version 2. Division of Migratory Bird Management, Washington, DC. URL <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/eagleconservationplanguidance.pdf>.

Dated: April 6, 2018.

#### Susan Combs,

Senior Advisor to the Secretary, Exercising the Authority of the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 2018–13358 Filed 6–20–18; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4333–55–P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Geological Survey

[GX18LC00BM3FD00; OMB Control Number 1028–0079]

#### Agency Information Collection Activities; North American Breeding Bird Survey

**AGENCY:** U.S. Geological Survey, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of information collection; request for comment.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) is proposing to renew an information collection (IC).

**DATES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before August 20, 2018.

**ADDRESSES:** Send your comments on the information collection request (ICR) by mail to the U.S. Geological Survey, Information Collections Clearance Officer, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, MS 159, Reston, VA 20192; or by email to [gs-info\\_collections@usgs.gov](mailto:gs-info_collections@usgs.gov). Please reference OMB Control Number 1028–0079 in the subject line of your comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** To request additional information about this ICR, contact Keith Pardieck by email at [kpardieck@usgs.gov](mailto:kpardieck@usgs.gov) or by telephone at 301–497–5843.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We, the U.S. Geological Survey, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, provide the general public and other Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps us assess the impact of our information collection requirements and minimize the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand our information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format.

We are soliciting comments on the proposed ICR that is described below. We are especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is the collection necessary to the proper functions of the USGS; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the USGS enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the USGS minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology.

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 ICR. 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 may 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.

**Abstract:** Respondents supply the U.S. Geological Survey with avian population data for more than 600 North American bird species. The survey data, resulting population trend estimates, and relative abundance estimates will

be made available via the internet and through special publications, for use by Government agencies, industry, education programs, and the general public. We will protect information from respondents considered proprietary under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and its implementing regulations (43 CFR part 2), and under regulations at 30 CFR 250.197, "Data and information to be made available to the public or for limited inspection." Responses are voluntary. No questions of a "sensitive" nature are asked.

*Title of Collection:* North American Breeding Bird Survey.

*OMB Control Number:* 1028-0079.

*Form Number:* None.

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

*Respondents/Affected Public:* Individuals.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Respondents:* 1,600.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses:* 2,600.

*Estimated Completion Time per Response:* 11 minutes.

*Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours:* 28,600.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

*Frequency of Collection:* Annually.

*Total Estimated Annual Non-hour Burden Cost:* \$141,700. Mileage costs are on average \$54.50 per response, based on approximate 100-mile round trip for data collection per response and 2018 federal mileage rate of \$0.545 per mile.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The authorities for this action are the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*).

**John French,**

*Patuxent Wildlife Research Center Director.*

[FR Doc. 2018-13274 Filed 6-20-18; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4338-11-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Reclamation

[RR01016000; XXXR4524KK;  
RX.41129361.1010000]

#### Notice of Intent To Contract for Hydroelectric Power Development on the Bureau of Reclamation's North Unit Main Canal, Deschutes Project, Madras, Oregon

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to accept proposals, select lessee(s), and contract for hydroelectric power development.

**SUMMARY:** The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has received a proposal to allow hydroelectric power development on the North Unit Main Canal (NUMC) under a Lease of Power Privilege (LOPP). To ensure fair and open competition, Reclamation is soliciting competing proposals at this time.

**DATES:** Submit the written proposal on or before November 19, 2018. Late proposals will not be considered. Delayed delivery to the Regional Power Manager's office due to failures or misunderstandings of the entity and/or of mail, overnight, or courier services will not excuse lateness, and accordingly, are advised to provide sufficient time for delivery.

**ADDRESSES:** Send eight copies of the written proposal to Mr. Joseph Summers, Regional Power Manager, Bureau of Reclamation, 1150 North Curtis Road, Suite 100, Boise, ID 83706; telephone (208) 378-5290.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Questions regarding proposal requirements or technical data available for the North Unit Main Canal may be directed to Mr. Jake Nink, Bureau of Reclamation, 1150 North Curtis Road, Suite 100, Boise, ID 83706; telephone (208) 378-5090; email [jnink@usbr.gov](mailto:jnink@usbr.gov). Upon receipt of written request, Mr. Nink will also arrange an informational meeting and/or site visit with interested entities. In this regard, Reclamation reserves the right to schedule a single meeting and/or visit to address the questions of all entities that have submitted questions or requested site visits.

Specific information related to operations and maintenance of the canal system may be obtained from Mr. Mike Britton, Bureau of Reclamation, North Unit Irrigation District Manager, 2024 Northwest Beech Street, Madras, OR 97741; telephone (541) 475-3625; email to [mbritton@northunit.com](mailto:mbritton@northunit.com).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*General Overview.* The North Unit Irrigation District (NUID) operates and maintains the NUMC on the Deschutes Project located in the Deschutes River Basin, which supplies irrigation water to nearly 59,000 acres of farmland in Jefferson County, Oregon. Reclamation is considering allowing hydroelectric power development on the NUMC under a Lease of Power Privilege (LOPP).

A LOPP is a congressionally authorized alternative to Federal hydroelectric power development. It is

a contractual right given to a non-federal entity to use a Reclamation asset for electric power generation consistent with Reclamation project purposes. Terms of a LOPP shall not exceed 40 years. General authority under Reclamation law for a LOPP includes, among others, the Town Sites and Power Development Act of 1906 (43 U.S.C. 522), the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)) (1939 Act), and the Bureau of Reclamation Small Conduit Hydropower Development and Rural Jobs Act of 2013 (Act of August 9, 2013, 127 Stat. 498).

Reclamation will be responsible for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) related to any project selected for consideration pursuant to this Notice of Intent. Reclamation will also lead necessary consultation with American Indian Tribal Governments and compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act, and other related environmental regulations for all elements of the proposed project. A LOPP may be issued only after Reclamation has determined that NEPA and any other regulatory compliance requirements are completed.

#### Project Definition and Location

On August 7, 2017, Reclamation received a formal proposal for non-federal hydroelectric power development from Kinet Inc. at 12 sites on the NUMC. Kinet Inc. proposes to develop these sites utilizing a new technology called linear Pelton turbines. This solicitation is exclusive to the following 12 NUMC sites:

Site Name—Mile 2 South.  
Latitude Longitude—44.082201–121.286401.  
Canal Mile Marker—1.78  
Head (m)—6.1.  
Flow (cms)—20.  
Site Name—Mile 2 North.  
Latitude Longitude—44.086971–121.274233.  
Canal Mile Marker—2.11.  
Head (m)—6.1.  
Flow (cms)—20.  
Site Name—Mile 3.  
Latitude Longitude—44.092839–121.256296.  
Canal Mile Marker—3.52.  
Head (m)—6.1.  
Flow (cms)—20.  
Site Name—Mile 18.  
Latitude Longitude—44.251184–121.128517.  
Canal Mile Marker—18.34.  
Head (m)—6.71.  
Flow (cms)—21.  
Site Name—Mile 19.