

Management's Director. Any person or organization who participated in the planning process and has an interest which is, or may be, adversely affected by approval of this Supplement to the RMP may protest the plan. Careful adherence to the following guidelines will assist in preparing a protest:

- Only those persons or organizations who participated in the planning process may protest.
- A protesting party may raise only those issues which were commented on during the planning process.
- Additional issues may be raised at any time and should be directed to the Miles City District for consideration in plan implementation, as potential plan amendments, or as otherwise appropriate.

In order to be considered complete, a protest must contain, at a minimum, the following information:

1. The name, mailing address, telephone number, and interest of the person filing the protest.
2. A statement of the issue being protested.
3. A statement of the portion of the plan being protested. To the extent possible, this should be done by reference to the specific pages, paragraphs, and sections in the proposed management plan.
4. A copy of all documents addressing the issue submitted during the planning process or a reference to the date the issue was discussed for the record.
5. A concise statement explaining why the BLM State Director's decision is believed to be incorrect is a critical part of the protest. Take care to document all relevant facts and references or cite the planning documents, environmental analysis documents, and available planning records (meeting minutes, summaries, correspondence). A protest without any data will not provide the BLM with sufficient information, and the Director's review will be based on existing analysis and supporting data.

DATES: The period for filing protests begins when the Environmental Protection Agency publishes a Notice of Receipt of the Supplement in the Federal Register. The protest period lasts 30 days and there is no provision for any time extension. To be considered "timely" the protest must be postmarked no later than the last day of the 30-day protest period. Although not a requirement, sending a protest by certified mail, return receipt requested, is recommended.

ADDRESSES: All protests must be filed in writing to: Director (480), Bureau of Land Management, Resource Planning

Team, 1849 C Street NW., Washington, DC 20240.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Bloom, RMP/EIS Team Leader, Miles City District Office, 111 Garryowen Road, Miles City, MT 59301, (406) 232-4331.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Calypso Trail is a road that separates two roadless areas that make up the Terry Badlands Wilderness Study Area. The Supplement analyzes four alternatives to resolve management for the Calypso Trail: Alternative A is existing management where off-road vehicle use is allowed on the Calypso Trail. Under Alternative B, off-road vehicle use would be closed on the Calypso Trail, which by definition closes the road to motorized vehicles, except for authorized use. Alternative C is the same as Alternative A. The proposed decision, Alternative D, is to manage Calypso Trail as was presented in the 1993 Draft Big Dry RMP/EIS. BLM proposes to keep the trail open to motorized vehicles and off-road vehicle use would be limited to the trail itself.

Dated: May 15, 1996.
Glenn A. Carpenter,
District Manager.
[FR Doc. 96-12960 Filed 6-6-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-DN-P

Minerals Management Service

Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: As part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, the Minerals Management Service (MMS) invites the public and other Federal agencies to comment on a request to reinstate with change a collection of information contained in an interim final rule for 30 CFR Part 203, Relief or Reduction in Royalty Rates.

DATES: Submit written comments by August 6, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to the Department of the Interior; Minerals Management Service; Mail Stop 4700; 381 Elden Street; Herndon, Virginia 22070-4817; Attention: Chief, Engineering and Standards Branch.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marshall Rose, Chief, Economic Evaluation Branch, Resource Evaluation Division, Minerals Management Service, telephone (703) 787-1536.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: 30 CFR Part 203, Relief or Reduction in Royalty Rates.

Abstract: The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) and the Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (DWRRA) give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to reduce or eliminate royalty or any net profit share set forth in Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) oil and gas leases to promote increased production.

MMS is issuing an interim rule to establish the terms and conditions for granting reductions in royalty rates under the OCSLA and royalty suspension volumes under the DWRRA for certain leases in existence before November 28, 1995. It also defines the information required for a complete application as required by 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C). The interim final rule was published in the Federal Register on May 31, 1996 (61 FR 27263).

The MMS uses the information to determine whether granting a royalty relief request will result in the production of resources that would not be produced without such relief. An application for royalty relief must contain sufficient financial, economic, reservoir, geologic and geophysical, production, and engineering data and information for MMS to determine whether relief should be granted according to applicable law. The application also must be sufficient to determine whether the requested relief will result in an ultimate increase in resource recovery and receipts to the Federal Treasury and provide for reasonable returns on project investments.

The applicant's requirement to respond is related only to a request to obtain royalty relief. The applicant has no obligation to make such a request. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 provides that 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 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number.

The MMS requested OMB to approve emergency processing of this collection of information to coincide with the effective date of the interim final rule. This notice provides the full notice and comment period requirement.

Description of Respondents: Federal OCS oil and gas lessees.

Frequency: On occasion.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 130 lessees making an estimated 54 applications per year.

Estimate of Burden: Average of 835 hours per response.

Estimate of Total Annual Burden Hours: 45,080 burden hours.

Estimate of Total Annual Cost to Respondents for Hour Burdens: Based on \$35 per hour, the total cost to lessees is estimated to be \$1,577,800.

Estimate of Total Other Annual Costs to Respondents:

There are two other known cost burdens to the respondents.

(a) We will charge lessees (respondents) applying for royalty relief an amount which covers the cost of processing their applications. We estimate that our costs for processing OCSLA applications will range from \$8,500 (continuation of production) to \$22,500 (project involving capital expansion). We estimate that our costs for processing DWRRA applications will range from \$27,500 to \$50,000, depending on the number of leases involved and the complexity of the proposed development project. For some applications (approximately 30 percent; average of 9 per year), we may need to audit the financial data to make an adequate determination on the economics of the proposed development. We estimate an audit to cost up to \$40,000. We will issue a Notice to Lessees (NTL) that will provide more detailed information on the amounts of royalty relief application processing costs, and when and how payments are to be made to us for this purpose. We will revise the NTL periodically to reflect our cost experience and to provide other information necessary for the administration of this program. An application processing cost would average \$30,000 for an estimated burden of \$1,620,000 ($\$30,000 \times 54$ applications=\$1,620,000).

(b) A respondent's application or pre-production report must be accompanied by a report prepared by an independent certified public accountant as described in § 203.55(c) of the rule. The OCSLA applications will require this report only once; the DWRRA applications will require this report at two stages (redetermination and short form applications are excluded). We estimate an average cost for a report will be \$175,000. The estimated burden is \$7,175,000 ($\$175,000 \times 41$ applications=\$7,175,000).

Type of Request: Reinstatement with change.

OMB Number: 1010-0071.

Form Number: N/A.

Comments: MMS will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in the regular request for a 3-year OMB approval. Your comments will also be considered as MMS develops the final rule for 30 CFR Part 203. All comments will become a matter of public record.

(1) MMS specifically solicits comments on the following questions:

(a) Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the proper performance of MMS's functions, and will it be useful?

(b) Are the estimates of the burden hours of the proposed collection reasonable?

(c) Do you have any suggestions that would enhance the quality, clarity, or usefulness of the information to be collected?

(d) Is there a way to minimize the information collection burden on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology?

(2) In addition, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 requires agencies to estimate the total annual cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. MMS needs your comments on this item. Your response should split the cost estimate into two components:

(a) Total capital and startup cost component and

(b) Annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of services component.

Your estimates should consider the costs to generate, maintain, and disclose or provide the information. You should describe the methods you use to estimate major costs factors, including system and technology acquisition, expected useful life of capital equipment, discount rate(s), and the period over which you incur costs. Capital and startup costs include, among other items, computers and software you purchase to prepare for collecting information; monitoring, sampling, drilling, and testing equipment; and record storage facilities. Generally, your estimates should not include equipment or services purchased: (1) Before October 1, 1995; (2) to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; (3) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; (4) or as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

Bureau Clearance Officer: Carole A. deWitt, (703) 787-1242.

Dated: May 23, 1996.

Henry G. Bartholomew,
Deputy Associate Director for Operations and Safety Management.

[FR Doc. 96-14268 Filed 6-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-MR-M

National Park Service

Lake Crescent Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement, Olympic National Park, WA

AGENCY: National Park Service, DOI.

ACTION: Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.

SUMMARY: In January 1995, the National Park Service began the preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) to analyze the environmental effects of implementing various alternatives of a proposed management plan for Lake Crescent in Olympic National Park, Washington. As work on the EA progressed, it became apparent that some of the alternatives under consideration had the potential for significant environmental impacts, so a decision was made to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) instead of an EA.

Scoping is the term given to the process by which the scope of issues to be addressed in the plan/EIS is identified. A public scoping meeting for the plan and EA was initially conducted in Port Angeles, Washington, on July 11, 1995. In addition, public comment was solicited at several information boards at key sites around Lake Crescent during the summer of 1995. Information gained from those sources will be used in the plan/EIS, but no additional public scoping meetings will be held. However, representatives of Federal, State and local agencies, American Indian tribes, private organizations and individuals from the general public who may be interested in or affected by the proposed plan/EIS are invited to participate in the scoping process by responding to this Notice with written comments. All comments received will become part of the public record and copies of comments, including names, addresses and telephone numbers provided by respondents, may be released for public inspection.

The proposed plan and accompanying EIS will help guide the management of recreational uses of Lake Crescent and the surrounding watershed for the next 15-20 years. The management plan/EIS will describe a range of alternatives formulated to address major issues relating to visitor use and resource management and protection. A "no action" alternative will be included; other likely alternatives could include ones with a recreation use emphasis, preservation emphasis and/or some balanced combination of use and resource preservation. The environmental impacts associated with each alternative will be analyzed.