

The applicant requests a permit to import the sport-hunted trophy of one male bontebok (*Damaliscus pygargus dorcas*) culled from a captive herd maintained under the management program of the Republic of South Africa, for the purpose of enhancement of the survival of the species.

PRT-009999

*Applicant:* Memphis zoo, Memphis, TN

The applicant requests a permit to transport in interstate commerce (i.e. provide funds to Smithsonian Institution's Komodo Dragon Conservation Fund) one captive-held wild-caught Komodo monitor (*Varanus komodoensis*) from the National Zoological Park for the purpose of conservation education and research to enhance the survival of the species.

Written data or comments should be submitted to the Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Management Authority, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203 and must be received by the Director within 30 days of the date of this publication.

Documents and other information submitted with these applications are available for review, subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act, by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents to the following office within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Management Authority, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Phone: (703/358-2104); FAX: (703/358-2281).

The public is invited to comment on the following application for a permit to conduct certain activities with marine mammals. The application was submitted to satisfy requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) and the regulations governing marine mammals (50 CFR 18).

PRT-011658

*Applicant:* Gilbert Kostelec, Chardon, OH

The applicant requests a permit to import a polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) sport-hunted trophy taken from the Lancaster Sound polar bear population, Canada for personal use.

PRT-011713

*Applicant:* Edward Turowski, Oxford, MI

The applicant requests a permit to import a polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) sport-hunted trophy taken from the Northern Beaufort Sea polar bear population, Canada for personal use.

PRT-011855

*Applicant:* Lewis Rupp, St. Louis, MO

The applicant requests a permit to import a polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) sport-hunted trophy taken from the McClintock Channel polar bear population, Canada for personal use.

Documents and other information submitted with these applications are available for review, subject to the requirements of the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act, by any party who submits a written request for a copy of such documents to the following office within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Management Authority, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 700, Arlington, Virginia 22203. Phone: (703/358-2104); FAX: (703/358-2281).

**MaryEllen Amtower,**

*Acting Chief, Branch of Permits, Office of Management Authority.*

[FR Doc. 99-12712 Filed 5-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-U

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Fish and Wildlife Service

#### Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Proposed Listing Priority Guidance for Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** We (the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) announce proposed guidance for assigning relative priorities to listing actions conducted under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended (Act) during fiscal years (FY) 1999 and 2000. We have returned to a more balanced listing program and have reduced the serious backlogs that remained from the 1995-96 moratorium and funding rescission. A method for prioritizing among the various listing activities is necessary to ensure that an organized system for conserving species is in place. It is extremely important for us to focus our efforts on listing actions that will provide the greatest conservation benefits to imperiled species in the most expeditious and biologically sound manner. We will no longer recognize tiers and nationwide, we will undertake all listing activities in all priority levels simultaneously; however, we will observe relative priorities among various listing actions as described in this guidance. The highest priority will be processing emergency listing rules

for any species determined to face a significant and imminent risk to its well being. Second priority is the processing of final determinations on proposed additions to the lists of endangered and threatened wildlife and plants. Third priority is processing new proposals to add species to the lists. The processing of administrative petition findings (petitions filed under section 4 of the Act) is the fourth priority. The processing of critical habitat determinations (prudency and determinability decisions) and proposed or final designations of critical habitat will be funded separately from other section 4 listing actions and will no longer be subject to prioritization under Listing Priority Guidance. Critical habitat determinations, which were previously included in final listing rules published in the **Federal Register**, may now be processed separately, in which case stand alone critical habitat determinations will be published as notices in the **Federal Register**. We will undertake critical habitat determinations and designations during FY 1999 and FY 2000 as allowed by our funding allocation for that year. Delisting activities are no longer part of the listing program and will be undertaken by the recovery program in FY 1999 and beyond.

**DATES:** We will accept comments on this guidance until June 21, 1999. The final FY 1998 and FY 1999 Listing Priority Guidance published on May 6, 1998 (63 FR 25502), will remain in effect until the Final FY 1999 and FY 2000 Listing Priority Guidance is published.

**ADDRESSES:** Send comments regarding this guidance to the Chief, Division of Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1849 C Street, N.W., Mailstop ARLSQ-420, Washington, D.C. 20240.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chief, Division of Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 703-358-2171 (see **ADDRESSES** section).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### Background

We adopted guidelines on September 21, 1983 (48 FR 43098-43105), that govern the assignment of priorities to species under consideration for listing as endangered or threatened under section 4 of the Act. We adopted those guidelines to establish a rational system for allocating available appropriations to the highest priority species when adding species to the lists of endangered or threatened wildlife and plants or reclassifying threatened species to endangered status. The system places greatest importance on the immediacy

and magnitude of threats, but also factors in the level of taxonomic distinctiveness by assigning priority in descending order to monotypic genera, full species, and subspecies (or, equivalently, distinct population segments of vertebrates). However, this system does not provide for prioritization among different types of listing actions such as preliminary determinations, proposed listings, and final listings.

Serious backlogs of listing actions resulted from the 1995–96 listing moratorium and funding rescission. The enactment of Public Law 104–6 in April 1995 rescinded \$1.5 million from our budget for carrying out listing activities through the remainder of FY 1995. Public Law 104–6 prohibited the expenditure of the remaining appropriated funds for final determinations to list species or designate critical habitat which, in effect, placed a moratorium on those activities. The net effect of the moratorium and reductions in funding was that our listing program was essentially shut down. The moratorium on final listings and the budget constraints remained in effect until April 26, 1996, when President Clinton approved the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1996 and waived the moratorium. At that time, we had accrued a backlog of proposed listings for 243 species. The extremely limited funding available to us for listing activities generally precluded petition processing and the development of proposed listings from October 1, 1995, through April 26, 1996.

When the moratorium was lifted and funds were appropriated for the administration of the listing program, we faced the considerable task of allocating the available resources to the significant backlog of listing activities. The Final Listing Priority Guidance for FY 1996 was published on May 16, 1996 (61 FR 24722). We followed that three-tiered approach until the Final Listing Priority Guidance for FY 1997 was published on December 5, 1996 (61 FR 64475). The FY 1997 Listing Priority Guidance employed four tiers for assigning relative priorities to listing actions to be carried out under section 4 of the Act. Tier 1, the highest priority, was the processing of emergency listings for species facing a significant risk to their well-being. Processing final decisions on pending proposed listings was assigned to Tier 2. Tier 3 was to resolve the conservation status of species identified as candidates and processing 90-day or 12-month administrative findings on petitions to list or reclassify species from threatened

to endangered status. Preparation of proposed or final critical habitat designations and processing reclassifications were assigned lowest priority (Tier 4). We published Listing Priority Guidance for FY 1998 and 1999 on May 6, 1998 (63 FR 25502), and employed a three-tiered system. Emergency actions comprised Tier 1, all other listing actions except critical habitat designation were included in Tier 2, and critical habitat designation was the lowest priority, or Tier 3.

While operating the listing program under the Final FY 1998 and FY 1999 Listing Priority Guidance, we focused our resources on completing Tier 2 activities. Two emergency listing actions (for the San Bernardino kangaroo rat (63 FR 3835) and Jarbidge population of bull trout (63 FR 42757)) were necessary in FY 1998. During FY 1998, we made final determinations for 57 species (47 final listings and 10 withdrawals). As a result of this expeditious progress, only 84 proposed species remained at the end of FY 1998 (including 42 newly proposed species). We published petition findings for 18 species (11 90-day findings and 7 12-month findings). We proposed one species, the peregrine falcon in North America, for delisting during FY 1998. Since the end of FY 1998, and as of April 30, 1999, 34 final determinations, 17 proposed rules, 12 petition findings, 3 proposed delistings, and 2 proposed critical habitat designations have been completed. The proposed critical habitat designations, Tier 3 activities, were undertaken to comply with a court order. However, the Service did make critical habitat determinations (prudence and/or determinability decisions) for each final listing during this period and FY 1998. Only two proposed species that were included in the premoratorium backlog remain to be finalized.

Despite the return to a balanced listing program, backlogs remain. As of April 30, 1999, there are 69 proposed species awaiting final determinations, and 154 candidates awaiting resolution of their conservation status. Forty-seven species have due/overdue 90-day petition findings and 13 species have due/overdue 12-month petition findings. Various district courts and appellate courts have remanded not prudent critical habitat determinations to us for reconsideration.

As stated in the FY 1998 and FY 1999 Listing Priority Guidance, it is important to recognize that we face even greater backlogs in our responsibilities to implement other aspects of the Act. The section 7 consultation and habitat conservation planning (HCP) backlogs

continue to grow. The backlog of species awaiting Recovery Plans and the shortage of recovery implementation funding make the recovery backlog most severe. We base our funding requests on the workloads faced by all activities of the endangered species program. The President's budget request for FY 1999 included a significant increase in funding for listing activities. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the other endangered species backlogs exceeds the listing backlog; therefore, the President's FY 1999 request for funding endangered species programs requested even larger increases in funding for consultation and recovery.

In enacting the Department of the Interior's FY 1999 Omnibus and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Pub. L. 105–277), Congress rejected our requests for significant resources in all three programs and provided only modest increases to the consultation, recovery, and listing programs' funding. The Department of the Interior's appropriation again includes an express limit on the amount we can spend on listing actions (including the designation of critical habitat); this year the limit is \$5.756 million.

Even with the gradual reduction of the backlogs of proposed species pending final action, candidate species awaiting proposal, and petitions awaiting administrative findings, it is extremely important for us to focus our efforts on listing actions that will provide the greatest conservation benefits to imperiled species in the most expeditious and biologically sound manner. It has been longstanding policy (1983 Listing and Recovery Priority Guidelines (48 FR 43098)) that the order in which species should be processed for listing is based primarily on the immediacy and magnitude of the threats they face. We will continue to base decisions regarding the order in which species will be proposed or listed on the 1983 listing priority guidelines. We also must continue to prioritize among types of listing actions and this level of relative prioritization is the guidance provided below.

We have made this guidance applicable to FY 2000 as well to avoid any confusion over whether this guidance will remain in effect if the budget process for FY 2000 is delayed. However, when we receive our FY 2000 budget, we will review this guidance, and, if appropriate, modify or terminate it.

*Proposed Listing Priority Guidance for Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000*

To address the biological, budgetary, and administrative issues noted above, we submit the following proposed listing priority guidance. As with the Final Listing Priority Guidance for FY 1998 and FY 1999 issued May 6, 1998, this guidance supplements, but does not replace, the 1983 listing priority guidelines, which was silent on the matter of prioritizing among different types of listing activities.

As noted above, the Department of the Interior's FY 1999 appropriation provides no more than \$5.756 million for our endangered species listing program. The \$5.756 million budget for all listing activities will fall far short of the resources needed to completely eliminate all the existing listing backlogs in FY 1999. Therefore, a form of relative prioritization is necessary. We will implement the following listing priority guidance in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to aid us in our expeditious completion of the wide array of listing actions necessary to maintain a balanced listing program.

The following sections describe how we will assign relative priorities to listing actions to be carried out under section 4 of the Act. The 1983 listing priority guidelines will continue to be used to set priority among species within types of listing activities. We emphasize that the Final Listing Priority Guidance for FY 1998 and FY 1999 will remain in effect until final FY 1999 and FY 2000 guidance is issued, unless extended or canceled by future notice.

In order to continue to operate a balanced listing program, we will concurrently undertake all types of listing actions in compliance with the relative priorities described below during FY 1999. It has been essential during periods of limited listing funds to maximize the conservation benefit of listing appropriations. For the past several years, we have determined that our limited resources were best utilized to add new species to the lists rather than designating critical habitat for species already receiving full protection under the Act. Designation of critical habitat, when undertaken in the past, consumed large amounts of our listing appropriation and, in most cases, added little conservation benefit beyond that achieved when a species was listed as endangered or threatened. For this reason, we have placed higher priority on addressing imperiled species that had very limited or no protection under the Act, than on devoting limited resources to the expensive process of

designating critical habitat for species already protected by the Act.

The reduced listing backlogs and the funding increase of \$566,000, which we received in the listing subactivity in FY 1999, will allow us to devote some resources to critical habitat actions without an undue impact on the more important activities in the listing program. Therefore, we will dedicate \$979,000 (17 percent of the total listing program funding) toward critical habitat determinations and designations during FY 1999. Progress toward critical habitat determinations and designations in FY 2000 will be governed by our listing appropriations for that fiscal year.

Critical habitat determinations, which were previously included in final listing rules published in the **Federal Register**, may now be processed separately, in which case stand alone critical habitat determinations will be published as notices in the **Federal Register**. We cannot estimate the number of species for which critical habitat designations will be prudent because each prudency determination is considered on a strictly biological, species-by-species basis. Although we consider the conservation benefits from critical habitat designation to be minimal for most species, we have surveyed our Regional Offices requesting them to identify species that would benefit from critical habitat designations, and are in the process of prioritizing Regional responses. We expect to undertake court ordered critical habitat determinations and designations, and non-court ordered determinations and designations for any species identified by Regional Offices as species that would benefit from critical habitat.

We are exploring how to revise our critical habitat determination and designation processes in order to streamline the process and maximize the conservation benefit provided. We will publish a separate notice in the **Federal Register** in the near future to solicit comments on how to revise the process for completing critical habitat determinations and designations. Public comment will be sought and considered in developing final guidance and policy regarding critical habitat determinations and designations.

*Relative Listing Priorities*

Nationwide in FY 1999 and FY 2000, we will undertake the full array of listing actions consistent with the relative priority guidance described below. However, some Regions and some Field Offices within Regions have significant backlogs of proposed species, candidates, and petitions. Therefore, additional guidance is needed to clarify

the relative priorities among the various listing activities.

Completion of emergency listings for species facing a significant risk to their well-being remains our highest priority. Emergency actions take precedent over all other section 4 listing actions. With the exception of emergency actions, all other listing activities may be undertaken simultaneously. Regions should assign relative priorities for their remaining non-emergency listing actions based on the following priority levels. Processing final decisions on pending proposed listings are priority 2 actions. Priority 3 actions are the resolution of the conservation status of species identified as candidates (resulting in a new proposed rule or a candidate removal). Priority 4 actions are the processing of 90-day or 12-month administrative findings on petitions.

The processing of petitions requesting critical habitat designations and the preparation of proposed and final critical habitat determinations and/or designations will no longer be prioritized with other section 4 listing actions. Critical habitat will be conducted within a specified amount of funding which has been set aside out of the listing subactivity.

*Priority 1—Emergency Listing Actions*

We will immediately process emergency listings for any species of fish, wildlife, or plant that faces a significant and imminent risk to its well-being under the emergency listing provisions of section 4(b)(7) of the Act. This would include preparing a proposed rule to list the species. Every petition to list a species or reclassify a threatened species to endangered will be reviewed in order to determine whether an emergency situation exists. If the initial review indicates an emergency situation, the action will be a Priority 1 action and an emergency rule to list the species will be prepared immediately. Emergency listings are effective for 240- days. A proposed rule to list the species is usually published concurrently with the emergency rule to ensure that the final listing and full protection of the Act are established before the 240-day emergency protection expires. If the initial review does not indicate that emergency listing is necessary, processing of the petition will be assigned to Priority 4 as discussed below.

*Priority 2—Processing Final Decisions on Proposed Listings*

Proposed species are just one step away from receiving the most important protections under the Act. The majority

of the unresolved proposed species face high-magnitude threats. By focusing our efforts on completing final determinations, we can provide the maximum conservation benefits to the largest numbers of those species that are in greatest need of the Act's protections. As proposed listings are reviewed and processed, they will be completed through publication of either a final listing or a withdrawal of a proposed listing. Completion of a withdrawal may not appear consistent with the conservation intent of this guidance. However, once a determination not to make a proposed listing final has been made, publishing the withdrawal of the proposed listing takes minimal time and appropriations. Thus, it is more cost effective and efficient to bring closure to the proposed listing than it is to postpone the action and take it up at some later time.

**Priority 3—Resolving the Conservation Status of Candidate Species (Resulting in a New Proposed Rule or a Candidate Removal)**

The publication of new proposals (candidate conservation resolution) to add species to the lists of threatened and endangered species has significant conservation benefit. Pursuant to the 1983 listing priority guidelines, proposed rules dealing with taxa believed to face imminent, high-magnitude threats have the highest relative priority within Priority 3. If an emergency situation exists, the species will be elevated to Priority 1. Proposed listings that cover multiple species facing high-magnitude threats have priority over single-species proposed rules unless we have reason to believe that the single-species proposal should be processed first to avoid possible extinction. Proposed listings for species facing high-magnitude threats that can be quickly completed have higher priority than proposed rules for species with equivalent listing priorities that require extensive work to complete.

Issuance of a new proposed listing is the first formal step in the regulatory process for listing a species. It provides some protection in that all Federal agencies must "confer" with us on actions that are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of proposed species. The resolution of a candidate species' conservation status will be accomplished through the publication of new proposed rules or the processing of candidate removal forms (which, when signed by the Director, remove species from the candidate list). Candidate species include species petitioned for listing, for which the Service has made a warranted but

precluded finding pursuant to section 4(b)(3)(iii) of the Act.

**Priority 4—Processing Administrative Findings on Petitions to Add Species to the Lists and Petitions Reclassify Species**

The processing of 90-day petition findings and 12-month petition findings to add species to the lists or reclassify species will be Priority 4 activities. Once a 90-day petition finding is published, we will make every reasonable effort to complete the 12-month finding in the appropriate time frame. When it is practicable for us to complete a 90-day finding within 90 days, we are statutorily afforded a 12-month period from the receipt of a petition to completion of the 12-month finding. However, in those cases in which it is not practicable for us to complete a 90-day finding within 90 days of receipt of the petition, after the 90-day finding is completed, we will require 9 months to complete a thorough biological status review and issue a 12-month finding.

#### **Allocating Listing Resources Among Regions**

We allocate the listing appropriation among our seven Regions based strictly on the number of proposed and candidate species for which the Region has lead responsibility, with the exception of providing minimum "capability funding" for each Region. The objective is to ensure that those areas of the country with the largest percentage of known imperiled species will receive a correspondingly high level of listing resources. Our experience in administering the Act for the past two decades has shown, however, that we need to maintain at least a minimal listing program in each Region in order to respond to emergencies and to retain a level of expertise that permits the overall program to function effectively over the longer term, thus the "capability funding" to each Region. In the past, when faced with seriously uneven workloads, we have experimented with reassigning workloads from heavily burdened Regions to less burdened Regions. This approach has proven to be very inefficient because the expertise developed by a biologist who works on a species' listing is useful in recovery planning and other conservation activities for that species. Additionally, biologists in a Region are familiar with other species in that Region that interact with the species proposed for listing, and that knowledge is useful in processing a final decision. For these reasons, we have found it unwise to

reassign one Region's workload to personnel in another Region. Because we must maintain a listing program in each Region, Regions with few outstanding proposed listings may be able to address more lower priority listing actions, while Regions with many outstanding proposed listings will use most of their allocated funds on Priority 2 actions (finalizing proposed listings) or Priority 3 actions (completing new proposals to add species to the lists). It is the responsibility of individual Regions to recognize their workloads and backlogs and undertake priorities (1-4) as their regional workloads permit. We will provide critical habitat funding on a project by project basis in FY 1999.

#### **Addressing Matters in Litigation**

The numerous statutory responsibilities we bear under the Act do not come with an unlimited budget. We are sometimes required to make painful choices about how to prioritize carrying out those statutory responsibilities in order to make the best use of our limited resources. Under these circumstances, technical compliance with the Act with respect to one species can mean failure to comply with the technical requirements of the Act for another species. This guidance is part of a continuing effort to strive to achieve compliance with the Act in the manner that best fulfills the spirit of the Act, using our best scientific expertise.

Individuals or organizations occasionally bring suit against us for failing to carry out specific actions with regard to specific species. Many of these suits question our judgment and priorities, and seek compliance with the Act in circumstances that do not, in the judgment of the Service, lead to the best use of our resources to provide the maximum conservation benefit to all species. In many of the outstanding section 4 matters currently in litigation, the effect of what the plaintiff seeks is to require us to postpone or sacrifice conservation actions that we believe would have major conservation benefits in favor of actions that we believe would have lesser conservation benefits.

In no case will we adjust our biological priorities to reflect the threat of litigation. We have sought and will continue to seek from the courts recognition of our need to allocate our limited listing budget so as to best fulfill the spirit of the Act. We will, of course, obey any outstanding court orders.

#### **Public Comments Solicited**

We intend that any action resulting from this proposed guidance be as accurate and as effective as possible.

Therefore, any suggestions from the public, concerned governmental agencies, the scientific community, environmental groups, industry, commercial trade entities, or any other interested party concerning any aspect of this proposed guidance are hereby solicited. We will take into consideration any comments and additional information received and we will announce final guidance after the close of the public comment period and as promptly as possible after all comments have been reviewed and analyzed. The Final FY 1998 and FY 1999 Listing Priority Guidance will remain in effect until publication of the Final FY 1999 and FY 2000 Listing Priority Guidance.

Executive order 12866 requires each agency to write regulations/notices that are easy to understand. We invite your comments on how to make this notice easier to understand, including answers to questions such as the following: (1) Are the requirements in the notice clearly stated? (2) Does the notice contain technical language or jargon that interferes with the clarity? (3) Does the format of the notice (grouping and order of sections, use of headings, paragraphing, etc.) aid or reduce its clarity? (4) Is the description of the notice in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of the preamble helpful in understanding the notice? What else could we do to make the notice easier to understand?

#### Authority

The authority for this notice is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*

Dated: April 2, 1999.

#### Jamie Rappaport Clark,

Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 99-12783 Filed 5-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[AZA-030-1610-00-25-2Z; AZPHX077416]

#### Arizona: Classification and Segregation of lands in Mohave County, Arizona

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Act of February 27, 1936 (49 Stat 1144) and the Recreation and Public Purpose Act 43 U.S.C. 869, *et seq.*, and the regulations at 43 CFR 2741.5(f), the following public land in Mohave County, Arizona has

been found suitable for lease or conveyance for public park, recreational and other municipal purposes.

#### Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona

T. 20 N., R. 15 W.,

Sec. 20, Mineral Survey 4515.

Containing 20 acres more or less.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments may be submitted to the Kingman Field Office, 2475 Beverly Ave, Kingman, Arizona 86401.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bill Wadsworth, Realty Specialist (520) 692-4437.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The lands are not needed for Federal purposes. Lease or conveyance is consistent with current BLM land use planning and would be in the public interest.

The patent or lease, when issued, will be subject to:

1. Provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act and to all applicable regulations of the Secretary of the Interior.
2. A right-of-way for ditches and canals.
3. A reservation of all the minerals to the U.S.
4. A reservation for Right-of-Way AZA-22645, Hualapai Mountain Road granted to Mohave County.

Upon publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, the lands described above will be segregated from appropriation under the public land and mineral laws. For a period of 45 days from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, interested persons may submit comments regarding the proposal to the address above.

Any adverse comments will be reviewed by the State Director. In the absence of any adverse comments, the classification will become effective 60 days from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

#### John C. Jamrog,

Program Manager, Nonrenewable.

[FR Doc. 99-12720 Filed 5-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-U

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[NM-050-1430-00]

#### Temporary Emergency Closure of Public Land, Socorro County, NM

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Interior.

ACTION: Temporary emergency closure of public Land.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that effective May 12, 1999, the Socorro Field Office is implementing a temporary emergency closure of certain public land described as:

#### New Mexico Principal Meridian

T. 2 N., R. 4 E,

Sec. 3, lots 1 and 2

Sec. 10, lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$

Sec. 11, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$

Sec. 14, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$

Sec. 15, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ .

This order temporarily closes the subject land to public use and access. The closure is implemented under Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart 8364, which authorizes the authorized officer to issue an order to close designated public land to protect persons, property, and public lands and resources. Persons that are exempt from this closure are any Federal, State or local office, or member of any organized rescue or fire fighting force in the performance of an official duty, or any person authorized or permitted in writing by the BLM. BLM personnel conducting official duties, cooperating agency personnel, and contractors authorized by the BLM are included in the exemption from this order.

**DATES:** This temporary emergency closure is effective May 24, 1999, and will remain in effect until rescinded by the authorized officer.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:** Kate Padilla, Socorro Field Manager, or Jon Hertz, Assistant Field Manager, 198 Neel Avenue, NW, Socorro, NM 87801, telephone (505) 835-0412.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Violations of this closure are punishable by fines not to exceed \$1,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed 1 year. This temporary action is taken to protect persons, properties, and public land resources. Copies of the closure order and maps showing the location of the affected land are available from the Socorro Field Office.

Dated: May 12, 1999.

#### Jon Hertz,

Assistant Field Manager.

[FR Doc. 99-12737 Filed 5-19-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MW-U

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[WY-921-41-1310; WYW84547]

#### Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease

Pursuant to the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 188(d) and (e), and 43 CFR