BURDEN BREAKDOWN—Continued

Citation 30 CFR Part 256	Reporting requirement	Annual Number of responses	Burden per response (hours)	Annual burden hours
256.56	Provide plan to fund lease-specific abandonment account and related information.	3 submissions	8	24
256.57	Provide third-party guarantee, related notices, and annual update.	10 submissions	.5	5
256.58(a)	Request termination of period of liability and cancellation of bond.	50 requests	.5	25
Subpart J: 256.62; 256.64; 256.67	File application for assignment or transfer.	2,275 applications	5	11,375
256.64(a)(8)	Submit non-required documents for record purposes.	Voluntary, non-required submissions of documents the lessee wants MMS to file with the lease.		0
Subpart K: 256.76	File written request for relinquishment	505 relinquishments.	5	2,525
Total Reporting		5,824		17,525

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping Cost Burden: $420,875 for transfer application fees (approximately 2,275 applications × $185 fee) and $62,500 for non-required documents filing fees (approximately 2,500 requests × $25 fee).

Comments: The MMS will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in its submission for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. As a result of comments we receive and our consultations with a representative sample of respondents, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB. In calculating the burden shown in the chart above, MMS assumed that respondents perform many of the requirements and maintain records in the normal course of their activities. The MMS considers these to be usual and customary and took that into account in estimating the burden.

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

(a) Is the proposed collection of information necessary for MMS to properly perform its 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 respondents, 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. We need to know if you have any other cost burdens in addition to the filing fees required in 30 CFR part 256. 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 cost 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: (i) before October 1, 1995; (ii) to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; (iii) for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; or (iv) as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Jo Ann Lauterbach, (202) 208–7744.

Dated: August 19, 1997.

E.P. Danenberger,

Chief, Engineering and Operations Division.

[FR Doc. 97–22874 Filed 8–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

Notice and Agenda for Meeting of the Royalty Policy Committee of the Minerals Management Advisory Board

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of the Department of the Interior (Department) has established a Royalty Policy Committee, on the Minerals Management Advisory Board, to provide advice on the Department's management of Federal and Indian minerals leases, revenues, and other minerals related policies.

Committee membership includes representatives from States, Indian Tribes and allottee organizations, minerals industry associations, the general public, and Federal Departments.

At this fifth meeting, the Minerals Management Service (MMS) will be prepared to respond to questions concerning plans to implement previously approved reports.

The Committee will consider progress reports and recommendations by the Net Receipts Sharing and Coal subcommittees. Additionally, the Committee will hear status reports from some of the current efforts being undertaken by the Royalty Management Program.

DATES: The meeting will be held on Thursday, September 25, 1997, 8:30 a.m.–4:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Embassy Suites, Denver Southeast, 7525 East Hampden Avenue, Denver,

Colorado 80231, telephone number (303) 696–6644.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Michael A. Miller, Chief, Program Services Office, Royalty Management Program, Minerals Management Service, P.O. Box 25165, MS 3060, Denver, CO 80225–0165, telephone number (303) 231–3413, fax number (303) 231–3362.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The location and dates of future meetings will be published in the **Federal Register**.

The meetings will be open to the public without advanced registration. Public attendance may be limited to the space available.

Members of the public may make statements during the meeting, to the extent time permits, and file written statements with the Committee for its consideration.

Written statements should be submitted to Mr. Michael A. Miller, at the address listed above. Minutes of Committee meetings will be available 10 days following each meeting for public inspection and copying at the Royalty Management Program, Building No. 85, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado.

These meetings are being held by the authority of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. No. 92–463, 5 U.S.C. Appendix 1, and Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A–63, revised.

Dated: August 22, 1997.

Donald T. Sant,

Acting Associate Director for Royalty Management.

[FR Doc. 97–22897 Filed 8–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report on the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, San Francisco Bay/ Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Supplemental notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement/environmental impact report.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) is issuing this supplemental notice of intent (NOI). The original NOI titled, ''Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report on the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, California'' was published in the **Federal Register** at 61 FR 10379, Mar. 13, 1996. The NOI summarized the CALFED Program, the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR), and provided a list of scoping meeting dates and locations.

This notice supplements the original NOI to expand the scope of the Programmatic EIS/EIR to include the preparation of a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) as defined under Section 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and satisfying the requirements of the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The CALFED agencies intend to prepare an HCP and the State agencies intend to apply for an incidental take permit, pursuant to FESA and CESA. Both FESA and CESA require permits for any activity which could result in ''take'' of threatened and endangered species. The HCP planning process is intended to ensure that the effects of the incidental take are avoided, minimized, or mitigated to the extent practicable. In addition, the Federal agencies will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (Services) pursuant to Section 7 of FESA. This consultation will be coordinated with the HCP planning process. NEPA requires that Federal agencies assess the environmental impacts of agency actions. A joint programmatic EIS/EIR will be prepared pursuant to NEPA and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate potential impacts associated with the actions contained within an HCP and subsequent issuance of an incidental take permit.

Upon receipt of an application or request for an incidental take permit, the Services must evaluate whether to issue an incidental take permit for the Bay-Delta Program under section 10(a)(1)(B) of the FESA and the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) must evaluate whether to authorize take under CESA or the Natural Community Conservation Program Act (NCCPA). The Programmatic EIS/EIR will include an analysis of the HCP and Program alternatives as part of the Bay-Delta Program and the action of the Services' issuance of an incidental take permit and DFG's approval of a management authorization. If an HCP is approved and an incidental take permit issued, non-Federal members of CALFED would receive assurances, pursuant to the Department of the Interior's No Surprises Policy. The purpose of this HCP is to provide comprehensive, long-term conservation of threatened and endangered species such that the plan participants can be assured that in the event of unforeseen circumstances, no additional land, funds, or restrictions on covered program actions will be required.

DATES: Written public comments on the options for structuring an HCP and the potential of granting assurances by way of the HCP process should be sent to CALFED by October 20, 1997.

Three CALFED status/HCP and NEPA scoping meetings are scheduled to solicit public input. Specific times and locations of these meetings will be sent to individuals, agencies, and organizations on the CALFED mailing list and will be published in local newspapers prior to the meeting dates.

- September 16, 1997, Redding, California.
- September 23, 1997, Sacramento, California.
- October 2, 1997, Los Angeles, California.

In addition, the CALFED Bay-Delta Program will hold public meetings or workshops to discuss the development of the HCP and the Programmatic EIS/ EIR. These meetings will occur in advance of the Program's issuing a draft Programmatic EIS/EIR for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the proposal to prepare an HCP for the CALFED Bay-Delta Program should be sent to Ms. Sharon Gross, CALFED Bay-Delta Program, 1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1155, Sacramento, California 95814.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Sharon Gross at the above address or call at the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Office at (916) 657–2666.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

The Federal Ecosystem Directorate (FED) and the Governor's Water Policy Council of the State of California (Council), are jointly known as CALFED. The CALFED Bay-Delta Program is a joint effort among State and Federal agencies with management and regulatory responsibilities in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Bay-Delta system of California. The Federal co-lead agencies include the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Reclamation, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the National Resources Conservation Service. The U.S. Forest Service, Western Area Power Administration, Bureau of Land