

Management, including whether the information will have practical utility;

2. The accuracy of BLM's estimate of the burden of collecting the information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

3. The quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. How to minimize the burden of collecting the information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology.

*Title:* Application for Permit for Drill, Deepen, or Plug Back.

*OMB Approval Number:* 1004-0136.

*Abstract:* Data submitted by oil and gas operators is used for agency approval of proposed drilling operations through review of technical and environmental factors.

*Bureau Form Number:* 3160-3.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Description of Respondents:* Oil and gas operators.

*Estimated Completion Time:* 30 minutes.

*Annual Responses:* 4,000.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 2,000.

*Bureau Clearance Officer:* Carole Smith (202) 452-0367.

Dated: September 29, 1997.

**Carole Smith,**

*Bureau of Land Management Information Clearance Officer.*

[FR Doc. 97-28445 Filed 10-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-84-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[AZ917-AZA29960]

#### Notice of Proposed Decision of Exchange of Lands in Maricopa and Pima Counties, Arizona

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that on October 17, 1997 Michael A. Taylor, Phoenix Field Office Manager, approved the proposed land exchange between the Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix Field Office and Tucson Mountain Investors, L.L.C. The proposed decision, the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and the Environmental Assessment (EA) are available for public review at the State Office, 222 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85004. Copies can also be obtained by calling Alicia A. Leone at (602) 417-9567. The following described federal land has been

determined to be suitable for transfer out of federal ownership by exchange pursuant to Section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (U.S.C. 1716), as amended:

#### Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona

T. 5 N., R. 1 W.,

Sec. 1, lots 1-7, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ,

SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 3, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 4, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 5, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 7, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 8, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 9, all;

Sec. 10, all;

Sec. 11, all;

Sec. 14, lots 1-10, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 15, lots 1-10, N $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 22, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$ , SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ .

The area described contains 4,322.40 acres.

In exchange the United States will acquire the following described land from Tucson Mountain Investors, L.L.C.:

#### Gila and Salt River Meridian, Arizona

T. 13 S., R. 12 E.,

Sec. 10, part of;

Sec. 11, part of.

The area described contains 632.78 acres more or less.

Approval of the exchange is to implement the Phoenix Resource Management Plan Decision which identified the selected federal lands for disposal and on development information submitted by Noranda Properties, Inc. Acquisition of the private lands was authorized by Public Law 103-364, signed into law in October 1994, which added 3,460 acres to the park and changed the name from Saguaro National Monument to Saguaro National Park. Resource values of the private lands enhance the resource management within the Saguaro National Park. The offered lands contain representative Sonoran Desert vegetation in excellent condition. The diversity of vegetation, representing the paloverde/saguaro/mixed cactus and ironwood associations, provides important habitat for some of the sensitive wildlife species which occur in the Arizona Upland vegetation type. Also as part of the Saguaro National Park, the area will be accessible to hikers, horseback riders, birdwatchers, botanists and students of natural history. The public interest will be served by making the exchange.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested parties may submit comments and/or protests concerning the Proposed Decision for

the exchange to the Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix Field Office 2015 West Deer Valley Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85027. Comments must be in writing to the Field Office Manager and be postmarked within 45 days from the publication of this notice.

Dated: October 17, 1997.

**Michael A. Taylor,**

*Field Manager.*

[FR Doc. 97-28512 Filed 10-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-32-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[ES-960-1910-12] ES-48891, Group 29, Illinois

#### Notice of Cancellation of Plat of Survey

The plat accepted July 11, 1997 published in the **Federal Register** on July 22, 1997 (62 FR 39249) and stayed August 28, 1997 published August 28, 1997 (62 FR 45680) has been cancelled effective October 17, 1997.

Dated: October 20, 1997.

**Stephen G. Kopach,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor.*

[FR Doc. 97-28446 Filed 10-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GJ-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan; San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park, California; Record of Decision

##### Introduction

Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Pub. L. 91-190 (as amended), and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality at 40 CFR 1505.2, the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has prepared this Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final Environmental Impact Statement on the General Management Plan for San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park. The ROD is a concise statement of what decisions were made, what alternatives were considered, the environmentally preferred alternative, the basis for the decision, and the mitigating measures developed to avoid or minimize environmental impacts.

##### Selected Action

The National Park Service (NPS) will implement Alternative A, described as the proposed action in the Draft and

Final Environmental Impact Statements (EIS). The NPS will emphasize the preservation and maintenance of the park's collection, including the fleet of historic vessels, small watercraft, historic structures, library, and archival materials. Minimal measures to slow down deterioration of the steam schooner Wapama will be implemented, but the vessel's underlying structural decay will not be addressed. The park will pursue multiple strategies for ship restoration, such as continued use of commercial shipyards and appropriate agreements with San Francisco Bay Area dry dock facilities. Efforts will be made to seek out other agencies or private organizations interested in reconstructing or preserving Wapama as a dryberth exhibit. If such efforts are unsuccessful, the ship will be dismantled when it can no longer be maintained in a safe condition. Wapama will suffer an adverse effect if she is dismantled. Greater use of the park's collection by the public for research and interpretive purposes will be provided through the use of additional facilities, including rehabilitation of the Haslett Warehouse. The intersection of Hyde and Jefferson Streets will be redesigned to enhance pedestrian access and visibility of the pier and historic ships, and to expand interpretive opportunities. Aquatic Park will be enhanced and maintained as a public open space, and recreational activities in the lagoon such as swimming, rowing, and the temporary mooring of sailboats will continue to be provided to all users. Park volunteer programs will be enhanced and visitors will be encouraged to experience other related sites in the San Francisco Bay Area. Historic properties will generally benefit from a consistent maintenance and preservation approach aimed at perpetuating their historic integrity. The library and museum collection will receive the space, equipment, and staffing needed to protect, preserve, and use them appropriately. Local traffic patterns and parking will be affected during peak use times. There will be minor disturbance along the shoreline from construction activities.

#### Other Alternatives Considered

Two alternatives to the selected plan were detailed and evaluated in the Draft and Final EIS documents. Alternative B emphasized preservation and maintenance of the historic ships, small watercraft, historic structures, library, and archival materials. Space would be upgraded and expanded for the park's collection. The park would pursue multiple strategies for major ship restoration work. The intersection of

Hyde and Jefferson Streets would be further developed as an expanded-permanent pedestrian plaza with public seating, unobstructed views of the ships and Bay, and additional space for interpretive demonstrations, displays, and public programs. Impacts from Alternative B would be very similar to the selected action, except: the Eppleton Hall would be deaccessioned; there would be a permanent change in local traffic and parking patterns; the swimming and rowing clubs would be relocated to the west side of the Aquatic Park lagoon; and slightly more disturbance from construction activities along the shoreline would occur.

Alternative C (No Action-Minimum Requirements) would continue current management strategies, with minimum actions implemented to stabilize and preserve the park's collection and historic properties.

#### Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The NPS has determined Alternative A (the selected action) to be the environmentally preferred alternative. It causes the least damage to the biological environment; it best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources; and it would disturb the least acreage. Both Alternative A and Alternative B would greatly benefit the preservation and maintenance of the park's collection. Both alternatives would improve the visitor experience through creation of a pedestrian plaza, although under Alternative B the plaza would be expanded and permanent. Creation of a pedestrian plaza would result in some adverse effects on traffic and parking, which would primarily be confined to certain times during summer weekends under Alternative A.

#### Basis for Decision

As presented in the Draft EIS, the National Park Service developed twenty-six (26) management objectives, covering resource management, visitor experience, park development/facility design, and local context. After evaluation of public comments on the alternatives presented in the Draft EIS, it was determined that the selected action best achieves the stated management objectives and achieves the park's purpose which is to preserve and interpret the history and achievements of seafaring Americans and the Nation's maritime heritage, especially on the Pacific Coast.

#### Measures to Minimize Harm

The NPS consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Officer and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation according to the

Council's implementing regulations (36 CFR 800). A Programmatic Agreement completed April 25, 1997 stipulates mitigative measures that will be implemented. Further conservation planning and impact analysis will be conducted for any individual construction projects, and recorded in separate environmental decision documents subject to public review. Appropriate mitigation, such as erosion control measures, would be identified during that time. A traffic and transportation analysis will be completed before implementing any vehicular access/circulation or parking proposals.

#### Conclusion

The above factors and considerations warrant selection of the alternative identified as the proposed action in the Final EIS.

Dated: October 9, 1997.

**Patricia L. Neubacher,**

*Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.*

[FR Doc. 97-28497 Filed 10-27-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Environmental Impact Statement/ General Management Plan; Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks, California; Notice of Intent

#### Summary

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190, as amended), and in accordance with the President's Council of Environmental Quality regulations promulgated at 40 CFR 1501.7 and 1508.22, the National Park will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a General Management Plan (GMP) intended to guide management activities for Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks during the next 10-15 years.

#### Background

The purpose of the GMP is to set forth the basic management philosophy for the parks and provide strategies for addressing issues and achieving identified management objectives. The EIS will identify and evaluate foreseeable environmental impacts (and associated mitigation measures) of a range of alternatives formulated to address distinct management issues for the parks and strategies identified for resource protection, visitor uses, facility development, and adjacent federal, state, and lands. As a conceptual