3. Unnecessarily Complex

• Requirements are unnecessarily detailed and difficult to understand.

• Provisions are too process specific rather than results oriented.

These mandates should be simplified, clarified, or otherwise revised to facilitate understanding and implementation, or be terminated.

4. Unclear Goals or Standards

• Goals or standards are too vague, confusing, or poorly written to permit clear or consistent implementation of requirements or measurement of results.

These goals or standards should be rewritten or the mandate should be terminated.

5. Contradictory or Inconsistent

• Provisions in one mandate may make it difficult or impossible to comply with other provisions in the same or other Federal, State, local, or Tribal laws.

• Requirements use conflicting and confusing definitions and standards.

These mandates should be modified to bring conflicting requirements into conformance. In some instances, it may be appropriate to terminate one or all of the requirements. Where possible, common definitions and standards should be used, especially in planning and reporting requirements.

6. Duplicative

• Provisions in two or more Federal mandates may have the same general goals but require different actions for compliance.

These mandates could be terminated, consolidated, to modified or facilitate compliance.

7. Obsolete

• Provisions were enacted when conditions or needs were different or before existing technologies were available.

• Provisions have been superseded by later requirements.

These mandates should be modified to reflect current conditions or existing technology. If a mandate is no longer necessary or has been superseded, it should be terminated.

8. Inadequate Scientific Basis

• Provisions were enacted based on inadequate or inconclusive scientific research or knowledge.

• Provisions are not based on current, peer-reviewed scientific research.

• Provisions are not justified by risk assessment or cost-benefit.

These mandates should be terminated or modified to reflect current science. In some cases, suspension of the mandate may be appropriate to provide time for additional research.

9. Lacking in Practical Value

• Requirements do not achieve the intended results.

• Requirements are perceived by citizens as unnecessary, insignificant, or ineffective, thereby producing credibility problems for governments.

• Requirements have high costs relative to the importance of the issue.

These mandates should be evaluated to determine whether or not they are effective. If they cannot be shown to be effective and worthy of public support, they should be terminated. If they are effective, it still may be appropriate to suspend the mandates to allow time for public education and consensus building on their value.

10. Resource Demands Exceed Capacity

• Requirements for compliance exceed State, local, and Tribal governments' fiscal, administrative, and/or technological capacity.

These mandates should be terminated or modified to reduce compliance problems, or assistance could be provided to upgrade capacity. In some instances, compliance schedule extensions or exemptions may be appropriate.

11. Compounds Fiscal Difficulties

• Compliance with the requirements of any one mandate or with multiple mandates compounds fiscal difficulties of governmental jurisdictions that are experiencing fiscal stress.

In these situations, certain of the mandates affecting the jurisdictions—exclusive of those that are vital to public health or safety—should be considered for partial or total suspension until the government experiencing fiscal stress is able to comply. The conditions triggering consideration of such suspensions should include:

a. Governments faced with costs dramatically out of line with their revenue bases, as determined by comparisons with other similar governments that are complying; or

b. Governments that are experiencing severe fiscal distress for reasons not immediately within their control. There should be some definitive evidence of severe problems, such as State receivership, State declaration of distress, Chapter 9 bankruptcy, or a debt rating below investment grade. This should not include annual budget balancing problems.

Dated: May 18, 1995.

William E. Davis III,

Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 95–12591 Filed 5–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5500–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[AK–962–1410–00–P; AA–10968]

Alaska Native Claims Selection

In accordance with Departmental regulation 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that a decision to issue conveyance under the provisions of Section 14(h)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of December 18, 1971, 43 U.S.C. 1601, 1613(h), will be issued to Chugach Alaska Corporation for 0.10 acre. The land involved is in the vicinity of Long Bay, Alaska.

U.S. Survey No. 6935, Alaska.

A notice of the decision will be published once a week, for four (4) consecutive weeks, in the Anchorage Daily News. Copies of the decision may be obtained by contacting the Alaska State Office of the Bureau of Land Management, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513–7599 ((907) 271–5960).

Any party claiming a property interest which is adversely affected by the decision, an agency of the Federal government or regional corporation, shall have until June 22, 1995 to file an appeal. However, parties receiving service by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal. Appeals must be filed in the Bureau of Land Management at the address identified above, where the requirements for filing an appeal may be obtained. Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4, subpart E, shall be deemed to have waived their rights.

Margaret J. McDaniel,

Acting Chief, Branch of Gulf Rim Adjudication.

[FR Doc. 95–12558 Filed 5–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–JA–P

National Park Service

Environmental Assessment for Proposed M.J. Murdock Aviation Center and Proposed Master Plan Amendment for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Washington

ACTION: Notice of availability of environmental assessment.