

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.

The draft plan/EIS is expected to be available for public review by October 1996; the final plan/EIS and Record of Decision are expected to be completed approximately six months later.

The responsible official is Stanley T. Albright, Field Director, Pacific West Area, National Park Service.

DATE: Written comments about the scope of issues and alternatives to be analyzed in the plan/EIS should be received no later than July 19, 1996.

ADDRESS: Written comments concerning the plan/EIS should be sent to Superintendent, Olympic National Park, 600 E. Park Ave., Port Angeles, WA 98284.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Olympic National Park, at the above address or at telephone number (360) 452-4501.

Dated: May 31, 1996.

William C. Walters,
*Deputy Field Director, Pacific West Area,
National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 96-14317 Filed 6-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

Greene Township—Conococheague Rural Historic District; Determination of Eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places

ACTION: Request for comments.

On August 3, 1995, the Greene Township—Conococheague Rural Historic District, Franklin County, Pennsylvania was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places for its historic and architectural importance, following a request from the Federal Highway Administration. The district consists of a landscape farmed continuously since the eighteenth century and reflects the agricultural patterns of the rich Cumberland Valley. Important features found in the district include intact farmsteads, with their significant collection of barns, farmhouses and outbuildings, the field patterns, fencerows, the network of the historic farm roads, and the remains of the once active and important industrial activities performed along Conococheague Creek. The finding of eligibility was based upon review of documentation submitted by the Federal Highway Administration, the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, and Greene Township.

Since the determination of eligibility was made, property owners within the district, the Federal Highway Administration, and township officials have written to us either endorsing or disagreeing with the determination of

eligibility. In order to accommodate those who wish to provide new information on whether or not this property meets the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, the National Park Service is providing a 60 day comment period. A written statement on the determination of eligibility will be issued by the National Park Service within 30 days of the close of the comment period.

The determination of eligibility remains in effect pending review of responses submitted during the comment period. To determine that the property is not eligible or to revise the boundary, the National Park Service must receive authoritative information, which evaluated in conjunction with documentation already on file, results in a finding that the property does not meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation or that the boundary does not accurately delineate the historic district in accordance with established National Register standards.

Comments should be addressed to the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127.

Carol D. Shull,
*Keeper of the National Register of Historic
Places, National Register, History and
Education.*

[FR Doc. 96-14316 Filed 6-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

Notice of Intent to Repatriate a Cultural Item in the Possession of the Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art, Indianapolis, IN

AGENCY: National Park Service

ACTION: Notice

Notice is hereby given under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3005(a)(2), of the intent to repatriate a cultural item in the possession of the Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art which meets the definition of "cultural patrimony" under Section 2 of the Act.

The cultural item is a Tlingit clan hat. This red, green, and black painted cedar hat is topped with a carved Murrelet bird with wings of human hair.

The Eiteljorg Museum's accession records indicate this hat was acquired by Mr. Harrison Eiteljorg from an unconfirmed source no later than 1982; and donated to the Eiteljorg Museum in 1987. This hat is presumed to have been alienated from the community during the 1970s or early 1980s.

Consultation evidence indicates the Murrelet on this hat serves as a crest

symbol for the Brown Bear House of the Kaagwaantaan Clan of Tlingit Indians. According to Tlingit law, crests are the property of the clan and not of any specific individual. Representatives of the Chilkoot Indian Association on behalf of the Brown Bear House of the Kaagwaantaan Clan of Tlingit Indians have stated further that the Murrelet crest has been used during the historic period by the Brown Bear House in care of appointed trustees who cannot make independent decisions regarding the alienation of clan property.

Based on the above-mentioned information, officials of the Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (3)(D), these cultural items have ongoing historical, traditional, and cultural importance central to the culture itself, and could not have been alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual. Officials of the Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art have also determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced between these items and the Brown Bear House of the Kaagwaantaan Clan of Tlingit Indians.

This notice has been sent to officials of the Chilkoot Indian Association acting on behalf of the Brown Bear House of the Kaagwaantaan Clan of Tlingit Indians. Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these objects should contact Robert B. Tucker, Eiteljorg Museum of American Indians and Western Art, 500 West Washington St., Indianapolis, IN 46204, telephone (317) 636-9378 before [thirty days following publication in the Federal Register]. Repatriation of these objects to the Chilkoot Indian Association representing the interests of the Brown Bear House of the Kaagwaantaan Clan of the Tlingit Indians may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: June 3, 1996.

Veletta Canouts,
*Acting Departmental Consulting
Archeologist,
Deputy Chief, Archeology and Ethnography
Program.*

[FR Doc. 96-14408 Filed 6-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

National Park Service To Update Planning Process Guidelines

The National Park Service is updating its Park Planning Guidelines. The purpose of this update is to document a concise, agreed-upon planning