

protected, and there are no questions of a sensitive nature included in this ICR.

We have also changed the title of this ICR to clarify the regulatory language we are covering under 30 CFR part 208.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion.  
*Estimated Number and Description of Respondents:* 10 purchasers.  
*Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping "Hour" Burden:* 10

burden hours. The following chart shows the breakdown of the estimated burden hours by CFR section and paragraph.

30 CFR section	Reporting requirement	Burden hours per response	Annual number of responses	Annual burden hours
208.11 (a), (b), (d), and (e) ....	The eligible purchaser, prior to execution of the contract, shall furnish an "MMS-specified surety instrument," in an amount equal to the estimated value of royalty oil that could be taken by the purchaser in a 99-day period, plus related administrative charges * * * The purchaser or its surety company may elect not to renew the letter of credit at any monthly anniversary date, but must notify MMS of its intent not to renew at least 30 days prior to the anniversary date. * * * The "MMS-specified surety instrument" shall be in the form specified by MMS instructions or approved by MMS. All surety instruments must be in a form acceptable to MMS and must include such other specific requirements as MMS may require adequately to protect the Government's interests.	1	10	10
Total .....	.....	.....	.....	10

*Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping "Non-Hour Cost" Burden:* We have identified no cost burdens for this collection.

*Comments:* The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) provides 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 OMB control number. Before submitting an ICR to OMB, PRA section 3506(c)(2)(A) requires each agency " \* \* \* to provide notice \* \* \* and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information \* \* \*. Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality, usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

The PRA also requires agencies to estimate the total annual reporting "non-hour cost" burden to respondents or record keepers resulting from the collection of information. We have not identified non-hour cost burdens for this information collection. If you have costs to generate, maintain, and disclose this information, you should comment and provide your total capital and startup cost components or annual

operation, maintenance, and purchase of service components. 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, 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.

We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our ICR submission for OMB approval, including appropriate adjustments to the estimated burden. We will provide a copy of the ICR to you without charge upon request, and the ICR will also be posted on our Web site at [http://www.mrm.mms.gov/Laws\\_R\\_D/FRNotices/FRInfColl.htm](http://www.mrm.mms.gov/Laws_R_D/FRNotices/FRInfColl.htm).

*Public Comment Policy:* We will post all comments in response to this notice on our Web site at [http://www.mrm.mms.gov/Laws\\_R\\_D/FRNotices/FRInfColl.htm](http://www.mrm.mms.gov/Laws_R_D/FRNotices/FRInfColl.htm). We will also make copies of the comments available for public review, including names and addresses of respondents, during regular business hours at our offices in

Lakewood, Colorado. Individual respondents may request we withhold their home address from the public record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold from the rulemaking record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. If you request that we withhold your name and/or address, state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. However, we will not consider anonymous comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

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

Dated: November 25, 2002.

**Lucy Querques Denett,**  
Associate Director for Minerals Revenue Management.

[FR Doc. 02-30565 Filed 12-2-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Environmental Statement; Notice of Availability

**AGENCY:** National Park Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability for public review of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the General Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) for Biscayne National Park in the State of Florida.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service (NPS) has prepared a draft Environmental Impact Statement on the General Management Plan Amendment for Biscayne National Park. The statement evaluates potential environmental impacts associated with various management alternatives for the preservation and use of 7 structures collectively known as Stiltsville in the northern portion of Biscayne Bay within the National Park. This GMPA and EIS have been prepared in response to the requirements of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978, Public Law 95-625, and in accord with Director's Order Number 2, the planning guidance for National Park Service units that became effective May 27, 1998. The NPS has conducted public scoping meetings in the local area to receive input from interested parties on issues, concerns, and suggestions pertinent to the management of the Stiltsville area of Biscayne National Park. The comment period for this draft GMPA/EIS will be 60 days from the publication of the Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**.

Please note that due to public disclosure requirements, the National Park Service, if requested, is required to make the names and addresses of those who submit written comments public. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their names and addresses from the public record. If you wish to withhold your name and/or address, you must state that request prominently at the beginning of your comment. Anonymous comments will be included in the public record. However, the National Park Service is not legally required to consider or respond to anonymous comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

**DATES:** Two public meetings will be conducted to receive comments on the draft EIS for the GMPA. On Monday, December 16, 2002, a meeting will be held at Keys Gate Golf and Tennis Club, 2300 Palm Drive, Homestead, Florida from 3 p.m. until 8 p.m. On Tuesday, December 17, 2002, a meeting will be held at the Renaissance Ballroom, 5910 SW 8 Street, Miami, Florida from 3 p.m. until 8 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the EIS should be submitted to the following address to ensure adequate consideration by the Service: Superintendent, Biscayne National Park,

9700 SW. 328th Street, Homestead, Florida, 33033-5634 or by email, [bisc\\_stiltsville@nps.gov](mailto:bisc_stiltsville@nps.gov).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Superintendent, Biscayne National Park, 9700 SW. 328th Street, Homestead, Florida, 33033-5634, (305) 230-1144, ext. 3002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Draft and Final General Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement will be made available to all known interested parties and appropriate agencies. Full public participation by federal, state, and local agencies as well as other concerned organizations and private citizens is invited throughout the preparation process of this document.

The responsible official for this Environmental Impact Statement is Patricia A. Hooks, Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region, National Park Service, 100 Alabama Street SW., 1924 Building, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

Dated: September 26, 2002.

**Jerre Brumbelow,**

*Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region.*

[FR Doc. 02-30490 Filed 12-2-02; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, For Vancouver National Historic Site, Clark County, Washington; Notice of Availability**

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR part 1500-1508), the National Park Service (NPS), Department of the Interior, has prepared a draft general management plan (GMP) and environmental impact statement (EIS) for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site (NHS) located in Vancouver, Washington. This GMP describes and analyzes three alternatives which respond to both NPS planning requirements and to the issues identified during the public scoping process. These alternatives address visitor use and the preservation of the cultural and natural resources that provide the environment in which the Hudson's Bay Company story is presented to the public. *Alternative A* constitutes the No Action alternative and assumes that existing programming, facilities, staffing, and funding would generally continue at their current

levels. *Alternative B*, the Preferred Alternative, expands opportunities for the visitor to appreciate the broad sense of history that occurred at Fort Vancouver and its place in Northwest history. *Alternative C*, proposes full reconstruction within the Fort and additional reconstruction or delineation elsewhere within the NHS. The environmental consequences of all the alternatives, and mitigation strategies, are identified and analyzed in the EIS.

**Scoping:** Public meetings were initiated in January 1999 to solicit early participation into the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process, and aided in defining the range of issues to be analyzed. A Notice of Intent announcing the decision to prepare the general management plan and environmental impact statement was published in the **Federal Register** on January 7, 1999. A newsletter was produced and mailed to approximately 600 people on the park's mailing list to encourage participation and comment on critical park issues. The park received 29 written comment letters. The NPS held two public meetings in January 2000 and received and recorded over 150 oral comments during the two meetings. Scoping comments continued to be accepted and considered through the end of March 1999. During this period, the NPS facilitated discussions and briefings to park staff, the Vancouver National Historic Reserve Trust Board, congressional staff, elected officials, tribal representatives, public service organizations, educational institutions, and other interested members of the public.

**Proposed Plan and Alternatives:** The draft EIS/GMP includes two action alternatives and a no-action (existing conditions) alternative. Under all the alternatives, the agricultural fields around the fort palisade would be restored as part of the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) historic landscape when the City of Vancouver vacates Pearson Airfield T-hangars and the former aviation museum building by the end of the year 2002. In addition, The NPS staff would administer any and all portions of the south and east Vancouver Barracks area determined to be excess to the needs of the U.S. Army by the Secretary of the Army. Use of this area could include restoring the Vancouver Barracks cultural landscape, adapting and reusing existing historic buildings, leasing properties to the City of Vancouver, providing for additional parking, staging public transportation operations, and incorporating administrative functions. Decisions