

regulations (43 CFR part 2) and under regulations at 30 CFR 250.196, "Data and information to be made available to the public." No items of a sensitive nature are collected. Responses are mandatory.

Frequency: Monthly; and as specified in the NTL.

Estimated Number and Description of Respondents: Approximately 110 Federal OCS oil and gas lessees.

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping "Hour" Burden: The

approved reporting burdens for the current collections are 202,320 hours for 1010–0164, and 73,920 hours for 1010–0163. We expect the new burden hours to be approximately 26,880 which is an adjustment decrease of 249,360 burden hours. This decrease is a result of number of responses submitted. Even though there were approximately 1,600 facilities affected by Hurricane Rita, and 1,300 facilities affected by Hurricane Katrina in the GOM, usually respondents will submit only one or

more reports listing the damage to their facilities thereby making the number of responses significantly lower than what was previously estimated. The following chart details the individual components and respective hour burden estimates of this ICR. In calculating the burdens, we assumed that respondents perform certain requirements in the normal course of their activities. We consider these to be usual and customary and took that into account in estimating the burden.

Reporting requirement	Hour burden	Number of responses	Annual burden hours
Prepare and submit to MMS (1) list of impacted OCS structures, (2) timetable for inspections, and (3) inspection plan for each listed platform describing work to determine condition of structure	12	150	1,800
Submit amendments to list and inspection plans.	12	90	1,080
Submit report to MMS describing detected damage that may adversely affect structural integrity, including assessment of ability to withstand anticipated environmental storm conditions, and any remediation plans	120	200	24,000

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping "Non-Hour Cost"

Burden: We have identified no cost burdens for this collection.

Public Disclosure Statement: The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Until OMB approves a collection of information, you are not obligated to respond.

Comments: 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.

Agencies must also estimate the "non-hour cost" burdens to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. Therefore, 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, and record storage facilities. You should not include estimates for 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 submission for OMB approval. As a result of your comments, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB.

Public Comment Procedure: MMS's practice is to make comments, including names and addresses of respondents, available for public review. If you wish your name and/or address to be withheld, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. MMS will honor this request to the extent allowable by law; however, anonymous comments will not be considered. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be

made available for public inspection in their entirety.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Arlene Bajusz (202) 208–7744.

Dated: October 3, 2005.

E.P. Danenberger,
Chief, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs.
[FR Doc. 05–20435 Filed 10–11–05; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Draft Environmental Impact Statement; Reconstruction of the Furnace Creek Water Collection System; Death Valley National Park; Inyo County, CA; Notice of Availability

Summary: Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (Pub. L. 91–190, 42 U.S.C. 4321–4347, January 1, 1970, as amended), and the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Part 1500–1508), the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service and its cooperating agency have completed a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed reconstruction of the Furnace Creek water collection system at Death Valley National Park in Inyo County, California. The proposed project would rebuild the outdated water collection system in the Furnace Creek area to deliver a safe and reliable potable and nonpotable water supply to the park's main visitor use area. The draft EIS also describes and analyzes three alternatives and appropriate

mitigation measures, and identifies an "environmentally preferred" alternative.

Background: The National Park Service (NPS), Xanterra Parks and Resorts (Xanterra), and the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe (cooperating agency) are the primary water user groups in the Furnace Creek area. The Texas-Travertine Springs complex in the Furnace Creek area may be the most critical water resource in Death Valley National Park. This series of springs provides water for all of the human use needs in the park headquarters area; infrastructure in this area includes the primary NPS administrative offices and three campgrounds, two private resort/visitor services facilities owned and operated by Xanterra, and the offices and residences for the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe. The Texas-Travertine Springs complex also provides water that supports a riparian area, a biological community that includes habitat for a minimum of eight endemic special-status species, and a biologically and culturally important mesquite bosque.

The current water collection system consists of four water collection boxes at Travertine Springs, a collection gallery in Furnace Creek Wash, a tunnel for water collection constructed similar to a mine adit at Texas Springs, and a tunnel for water collection constructed similar to a mine adit at the Furnace Creek Inn. All water distributed by the existing collection system is potable, although much of the water is used for irrigation and other nonpotable purposes. The existing water collection system installed in the 1970's has become unreliable, subject to failure, and is nearing the end of its useful life-span. Many of the existing collection galleries have intermittently tested positive for *coliform* or *E. coli* bacteria, experienced unpredictable inputs of soil or organic matter, intermittently and unpredictably produced reduced volumes of water, and collected groundwater that does not meet state drinking water standards. When the system was installed approximately 30 years ago, there was an incomplete understanding of the Furnace Creek area's unique biological resource values and water conservation strategies were not a priority.

Proposal and Alternatives: The NPS proposes to rebuild the antiquated water collection system in the Furnace Creek area to deliver safe and reliable drinking water to the park's main visitor use area, and provide separate delivery systems for potable and nonpotable water. Desired redevelopment of the Furnace Creek water collection system includes efforts to restore historic wetland and riparian habitat, and ensure the long-

term conservation of species endemic to the Furnace Creek area. The draft EIS identifies and analyzes four alternatives for reconstructing the Furnace Creek water collection system.

Alternative 1 ("no action") would result in continued operation and maintenance of the existing water collection system. Under this alternative, the Furnace Creek water collection system would remain in its existing condition. Necessary maintenance and repairs would continue, but no major undertakings (e.g., maintenance activities) would occur. **Alternative 1** would provide potable water from collection galleries at Travertine Springs Lines 2, 3, and 4, and Furnace Creek Wash. Nonpotable water would be provided from the Inn Tunnel. Riparian water would be released from Travertine Springs Line 1, Texas Springs, and the Inn Tunnel. **Alternative 1** would continue to store water in the existing 2-million gallon and 500,000 gallon storage tanks. Potable water would continue to be disinfected at the 2-million gallon tank with chlorine.

All three "action" alternatives would separate the potable and nonpotable water system in the project area, and provide nonpotable water from the Inn Tunnel and a Furnace Creek Wash collection gallery. These alternatives primarily differ in terms of how each would provide potable water to the Furnace Creek area. **Alternative 2** would provide potable water from rebuilt collection galleries at Travertine Springs Line 3 and Line 4, and two to three new groundwater wells in the Texas Springs Syncline. **Alternative 2** would treat potable water using a reverse osmosis water treatment plant. Riparian water would be released from Travertine Springs Line 1 and Line 2 and Texas Springs to restore historic wetland and riparian habitat. The restoration effort would include the incorporation of riparian water release measures that would reduce erosion and promote groundwater infiltration.

Alternative 3 (agency preferred) would provide potable water from 4 to 6 new groundwater wells in the Texas Springs Syncline, and would treat potable water using a reverse osmosis water treatment plant. Riparian water would be released from all of Travertine Springs and Texas Springs to restore historic wetland and riparian habitat. The restoration effort would include the incorporation of riparian water release measures that would reduce erosion and promote groundwater infiltration.

Alternative 4 would provide potable water from Travertine Springs Lines 2, 3, and 4 and Texas Springs, and would

treat water using a reverse osmosis water treatment plant with supplemental water disinfection. Since the NPS would treat all potable water under this alternative (including bypass water), Travertine Springs would not require reconstruction of spring collection boxes or clearing and grubbing of vegetation from the spring area. Riparian water would be released from Travertine Springs Line 1 and Texas Springs to restore historic wetland and riparian habitat. The restoration effort would include the incorporation of riparian water release measures that would reduce erosion and promote groundwater infiltration.

The draft EIS identifies and evaluates a full range of mitigation strategies, project design elements, and other measures to minimize environmental harm. In addition to identifying the agency-preferred alternative, based on the environmental impact analysis detailed in the draft EIS an "environmentally preferred" alternative is also evaluated.

Scoping: Early public and agency participation has been incorporated in this conservation planning process. Death Valley National Park held public scoping and informal meetings in 2001 through 2004 to solicit ideas and concerns from park visitors, park staff, Native American groups, scientists, and government agencies. A notice of intent to prepare the Reconstruction of the Furnace Creek Water Collection System Draft Environmental Impact Statement was published in the **Federal Register** on November 20, 2000; the formal public scoping phase concluded on March 14, 2001. The public was notified about the public scoping process through the **Federal Register** announcement, local press releases, website postings, mailings, and the Furnace Creek Visitor Center newsletter.

During 2001 the NPS held three public scoping meetings on January 30 (in Pahrump, Nevada), January 31 (in Death Valley National Park), and February 1 (in Independence, California). The purpose of these meetings was to: (1) Provide participants with an overview of existing conditions and the proposed action; (2) ask participants to identify key issues that should be analyzed during the environmental review and compliance process; and (3) provide an opportunity for participants to ask questions regarding project alternatives and the overall environmental review and compliance process. As a result of the public scoping process, two letters were received via U.S. mail. Issues identified during the public scoping process are summarized in the EIS

under the Planning Issues section, in Chapter I, Purpose and Need. All comments received during the public scoping process have been duly considered in this EIS. In addition to public scoping, the park and its cooperating agency have also consulted with the Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, California State Historic Preservation Office, and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Comments: The draft EIS is now available for public review during a 60-day comment period. Persons wishing to express any new concerns about water management, facilities development, resource protection, or other pertinent aspects of the proposal are encouraged to do so; all responses should be sent to James T. Reynolds, Superintendent, Death Valley National Park, Death Valley, California 92328. Faxed or electronic comments are also acceptable (such transmittals may be sent to the park superintendent's attention at Deva_Superintendent@nps.gov or FAX (760) 786-3283). Written comments will also be accepted at NPS public meetings which are to be held November 15 and 16, 2005 at Pahrump, Nevada, and Death Valley, California. As soon as meeting venues are confirmed, details will be posted on the park's Web site and publicized via local and regional press (and may be obtained by contacting the park at (769) 786-3243).

All written comments must be postmarked (or transmitted) no later than 60 days from the date that the Environmental Protection Agency posts its notice of filing in the **Federal Register** (immediately upon confirmation, this date will be announced on the park's Web site and via local and regional press media; this information will also be available at the park's telephone contact at (760) 786-3243). Please note that names and addresses of people who comment become part of the public record. If individuals commenting request that their name or/and address be withheld from public disclosure, it will be honored to the extent allowable by law. Such requests must be stated prominently in the beginning of the comments. There also may be circumstances wherein the NPS will withhold from the record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. As always: The NPS will make available to public inspection all submissions from organizations or businesses and from persons identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations and businesses; and,

anonymous comments may not be considered.

Printed or compact disk copies of the draft EIS will both be available. Please specify which document format you would like to receive when calling, e-mailing, or faxing Death Valley National Park. The draft EIS also can be viewed on the internet at www.nps.gov/deva/pphtml/documents.html or reviewed at several public libraries.

Decision Process: Following careful consideration of all comments as may be received, a final EIS will be prepared. Not sooner than 30 days following release of the final EIS a Record of Decision would be prepared. At this time its anticipated that project construction may begin during winter, 2007. As a delegated EIS the approving official is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region of the National Park Service; subsequently the official responsible for project implementation would be the Superintendent, Death Valley National Park.

Dated: March 1, 2005.

Jonathan B. Jarvis,

Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

Editorial Note: This document was received at the Office of the Federal Register October 6, 2005.

[FR Doc. 05-20423 Filed 10-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-EF-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Committee for the Preservation of the White House; Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act that a meeting of the Committee for the Preservation of the White House will be held at the White House at 11 a.m. on Friday, October 28, 2005.

DATES: October 28, 2005.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Executive Secretary, Committee for the Preservation of the White House, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW., Washington, DC 20242. (202) 619-6344.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: It is expected that the meeting agenda will include policies, goals, and long range plans. The meeting will be open, but subject to appointment and security clearance requirements. Clearance information, which includes full name, date of birth and social security number,

must be received by October 21, 2005. Due to the present mail delays being experienced, clearance information should be faxed to (202) 619-6353 in order to assure receipt by deadline. Inquiries may be made by calling the Committee for the Preservation of the White House between 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. weekdays at (202) 619-6344. Written comments may be sent to the Executive Secretary, Committee for the Preservation of the White House, 1100 Ohio Drive, SW., Washington, DC 20242.

Dated: September 26, 2005.

Ann Bowman Smith,

Executive Secretary, Committee for the Preservation of the White House.

[FR Doc. 05-20422 Filed 10-11-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-54-M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[USITC SE-05-032]

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: United States International Trade Commission.

TIME AND DATE: October 14, 2005 at 11 a.m.

PLACE: Room 101, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, Telephone: (202) 205-2000.

STATUS: Open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Agenda for future meetings: None.
2. Minutes.
3. Ratification List.
4. Inv. Nos. 731-TA-298 and 299 (Second Review) (Porcelain-on-Steel Cooking Ware from China and Korea) and 701-TA-267 and 268 and 731-TA-304 and 305 (Second Review) Top-of-the-Stove Stainless Steel Cooking Ware from Korea and Taiwan)—briefing and vote. (The Commission is currently scheduled to transmit its determination and Commissioners' opinions to the Secretary of Commerce on or before October 27, 2005.)

5. Outstanding action jackets: None.

In accordance with Commission policy, subject matter listed above, not disposed of at the scheduled meeting, may be carried over to the agenda of the following meeting.

Issued: October 6, 2005.

By order of the Commission:

Marilyn R. Abbott,

Secretary to the Commission.

[FR Doc. 05-20570 Filed 10-7-05; 3:45 pm]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P