laws. For a period of 45 days from the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register, interested parties may submit comments regarding the proposed conveyance for classification of the lands to the District Manager, Las Vegas District, 4765 W. Vegas Drive, Las Vegas, NV 89108.

Classification Comments: Interested parties may submit comments involving the suitability of the land for a transfer station. Comments on the classification are restricted to whether the land is physically suited for the proposal, whether the use will maximize the future use or uses of the land, whether the use is consistent with local planning and zoning, or if the use is consistent with State and Federal programs.

Application Comments: Interested parties may submit comments regarding the specific use proposed in the application and plan of development, whether the BLM followed proper administrative procedures in reaching the decision, or any other factor not directly related to the suitability of the land for a transfer station facility.

Any adverse comments will be reviewed by the State Director.

In the absence of any adverse comments, the classification of the land described in this Notice will become effective 60 days from the date of publication in the Federal Register. The lands will not be offered for conveyance until after the classification becomes effective.

Dated: July 23, 1996.

Donette Gordon,

Acting Associate District Manager.

[FR Doc. 96–19616 Filed 8–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1430–HC–U

[NV–030–1430–01; N–57155]

Cancellation of Realty Action

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Cancellation of realty action.

The Notice of Realty Action—Noncompetitive Sale of Federal Lands in Douglas County, Nevada—published in the Federal Register, Vol. 58, No. 67, Pg. 18413, on April 9, 1993, is hereby cancelled in its entirety.

The federal lands had been found suitable for direct sale to accommodate private improvements on them, placed there as the result of an erroneous private survey. However, these lands were later determined to have some level of hazardous contamination, the result of past nearby mining and mineral processing. The transfer of the lands, under these conditions, was determined not to be in the interest of either the United States or the sale proponent. A private well and pipeline, on these federal lands, were authorized through the issuance of a right-of-way.

Dated: July 24, 1996.

James M. Phillips,

Assistant District Manager. Non-Renewable Resources.

[FR Doc. 96–19618 Filed 8–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–03–P

[ID–040–4610–00]

Notice of Availability of the Challis Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Labor.

ACTION: Notice of proposed ACEC designations.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and BLM Planning Regulations (43 CFR part 1600), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Upper Columbia—Salmon Clearwater Districts has prepared a Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMP/EIS) for the Challis Resource Area. The Challis Draft RMP/EIS has been published and is available for review and comment by requesting a copy from the address indicated in the ''Addresses'' section below. In compliance with 43 CFR 1610.7–2(b), this notice of availability of the Challis Draft RMP/EIS also constitutes notice of ACEC designations proposed in the Challis Draft RMP/EIS. More detailed information about the existing and proposed ACECs described in the Challis Draft RMP/EIS is provided in the ''Supplementary Information'' section of this notice.

The Challis Draft RMP/EIS describes and analyzes five alternative ways of managing approximately 792,657 acres of BLM public lands in the Challis Resource Area, located in Custer and Lemhi counties of east-central Idaho. When implemented, the Challis RMP would replace the three Management Framework Plans currently used by the Challis Resource Area. The Challis RMP may also amend the Little Lost-Birch Creek Management Framework Plan (BLM 1981), if Alternatives 2, 4, or 5 are selected and the Donkey Hills Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) is designated to include 4,714 acres within the Big Butte Resource Area, managed by the Idaho Falls District—BLM in Butte County, Idaho.

DATES: Written comments on the Challis Draft RMP/EIS must be submitted or postmarked no later than November 21, 1996. Meetings will be held to receive public comments on the Challis Draft RMP/EIS. The dates and locations of public meetings will be announced through the local media and a mailing list, as appropriate.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the Challis Draft RMP/EIS may be obtained upon request by contacting the Bureau of Land Management, Salmon Field Office, Route 2, Box 610, Salmon, Idaho 83467; phone (208) 756–5400. Written comments on the Challis Draft RMP/EIS should be sent to Kathe Rhodes, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management, Salmon Field Office, Route 2, Box 610, Salmon, Idaho 83467.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathe Rhodes, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Bureau of Land Management, Salmon Field Office, Route 2, Box 610, Salmon, Idaho 83467; phone (208) 756–5440. Documents relevant to the Challis Draft RMP/EIS planning process are available at the above address for public viewing during normal office hours.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Challis Draft RMP/EIS describes and analyzes five alternative land use plans to address the planning issues identified through public involvement and BLM input. Each alternative proposes resource condition objectives, land use allocations, and management actions and direction to guide resource management of the Challis Resource Area on a long term, sustainable basis during the next 15 to 20 years. Alternative 1, the ''no action'' alternative, describes resource management of the Challis Resource Area as of approximately 1991, when the planning process was initiated. The four ''action'' alternatives (Alternatives 2, 3, 4, and 5) differ in how much they emphasize three aspects of resource management: (a) the protection, restoration, and enhancement of natural values (e.g., visual quality), (b) traditional commodity production (e.g., timber harvest, livestock grazing, mineral production), and (c) non-commodity resource uses (e.g., recreation).

Four issues and related management concerns were identified during the scoping process for the Challis Draft RMP:

Issue	Related management concern(s)
Range Management.	Livestock Grazing, Wild Horse and Burro Management, Wildlife Habitat Management, Noxious Weed Infestation, Vegetation Treatment Projects, Upland Watershed, Fire Management.
Water Related Resource Management.	Riparian Areas, Floodplain/Wetland Areas, Water Quality, Minimum Streamflow, Fisheries.
Land Tenure and Access.	Land Tenure.
Special Management Areas.	Wild and Scenic Rivers, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Management of Wilderness Study Areas if Released from Wilderness Review.

In order to provide complete disclosure and analysis of resource uses in the Challis Resource Area, the Challis Draft RMP/EIS also discusses the following management concerns identified during the scoping process: Forested Areas; Special Status Species Management; Managing for Biological Diversity; Oil, Gas, Geothermal, Locatable, and Saleable Minerals; Visual Quality Management; Recreation Opportunities and Visitor Use; Off-highway Vehicle Use; Cultural Resource Management; Paleontological Resource Management; Tribal Treaty Rights; Transportation; Hazardous Materials Management; Air Quality.

The four ''action'' alternatives for the Challis RMP propose and analyze the designation of additional Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs). Under existing management, eight ACECs totaling 14,069 acres are designated in the Challis Resource Area to highlight various values and resources for management and protection, including unique plant communities, petrified trees, fragile soils, and a bighorn sheep population. These existing ACECs include 5,997 acres of Research Natural Areas designated for study of natural, pristine, or unique characteristics. Depending on the alternative, future proposed ACEC designations would include the following: (a) expansion of one existing ACEC by approximately 269 acres; and (b) designation of six to eight additional ACECs totaling from 48,889 acres up to 129,354 acres. The proposed ACECs would highlight values and resources including unique plant communities, an additional bighorn sheep population, elk winter range and calving habitat, cultural resources, anadromous fish habitat, fragile soils, and geological, special status fish, and roadless-primitive resources. The chart below lists the expanded and proposed ACECs by alternative, including any resource use limitations which would occur if the ACECs were formally designated (per 43 CFR 1610.7–2(b)).

ACEC/RNA	Acres proposed for designation; potential resource use limitations if designated				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Thousand Springs ACEC/RNA.	824 acres ACEC 252 acres RNA; fencing to control livestock use in the RNA.	1,093 acres ACEC 252 acres RNA; fencing to control livestock use on all areas of the ACEC.	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2.
Dry Gulch ACEC/RNA.	0 acres	400 acres ACEC/RNA, as an extension of the existing Cronk's Canyon ACEC; fence an undeveloped natural spring; limit motorized vehicle use to the existing road.	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2, except close the ACEC to motorized vehicle use.
Pennal Gulch ACEC	0 acres	4,975 acres ACEC; limit motorized vehicle use to the existing road.	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2, except close the ACEC to motorized vehicle use.
Herd Creek Watershed ACEC.	0 acres	18,155 acre ACEC, which includes 2,064 acres of the existing Lake Creek ACEC/RNA (i.e., new designation of 16,091 acres); limit motorized vehicle use to existing roads and vehicle ways, except close the existing trail above Herd Lake.	Same as Alt 2, except maintain the existing trail above Herd Lake for motorized vehicle use if suitable portions of the Jerry Peak WSA are released from wilderness review.	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2.
Sand Hollow ACEC/RNA.	0 acres	3,905 acres ACEC/RNA; continue to close the Sand Hollow watershed to livestock and wild horse grazing and motorized vehicle use; remove wild horses from the area as necessary.	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2, except, in addition, incorporate the Sand Hollow ACEC/RNA into the Road Creek Watershed ACEC.	Same as Alt 4.

ACEC/RNA	Acres proposed for designation; potential resource use limitations if designated				
	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Donkey Hills ACEC	0 acres	28,826 acres ACEC, including 4,714 acres in the Big Butte Resource Area; seasonal OHV closure; OHV use limited the remainder of the year to existing roads and vehicle ways; timber harvest stipulations.	13,500 acres ACEC; resource use limitations the same as Alt 2.	33,026 acres ACEC, including 4,714 acres in the Big Butte RA; resource use limitations the same as Alt 2, except, in addition, 5,069 acres would be removed from the commercial timber base.	Same as Alt 4, except the ACEC would be closed to motorized vehicle use.
Birch Creek ACEC	0 acres	9,687 acres ACEC; seasonal OHV closure; OHV use limited the remainder of the year to existing roads and vehicle ways; maintain current livestock water development restrictions.	0 acres	9,687 acres ACEC; closed yearlong to motorized vehicle use; closed to livestock grazing.	Same as Alt 4.
Lone Bird ACEC	0 acres	10,018 acres ACEC; physically close portions of the existing road; close the ACEC to motorized vehicle use, rockhounding, collection of mineral materials, and mineral material sales.	Same as Alt 2, except limit motorized vehicle use to existing roads and vehicle ways.	Same as Alt 2	Same as Alt 2
Road Creek Watershed ACEC.	0 acres	0 acres	0 acres	55,157 acres ACEC, including incorporation of the 3,905-acre proposed Sand Hollow ACEC; restrict motorized vehicle use to four existing roads/ways.	Same as Alt 4.

The Challis Draft RMP/EIS also presents suitability findings for most of the 57 river segments found eligible for further Wild and Scenic Rivers study during the Challis Resource Area's Wild and Scenic Rivers eligibility evaluation conducted in 1992 and 1993. Depending on the alternative, three to nine eligible river segments would have a suitability finding deferred until a coordinated river suitability study with the U.S. Forest Service and the State of Idaho can be completed. In addition, under all five alternatives, one river segment would have an eligibility determination deferred pending further coordinated study. In order to provide a range of alternatives, most eligible river segments were found suitable under at least one alternative and unsuitable under at least one alternative. Suitability findings described in the Challis Draft RMP are as follows: 0 river segments found suitable under Alternative 1; 5 river segments found suitable under Alternative 2; 0 river segments found suitable under Alternative 3; 19 river segments found suitable under Alternative 4; and 54 river segments found suitable under Alternative 5.

Public participation will continue throughout the remainder of the Challis RMP planning process. Following the 90-day public review and comment period for the Challis Draft RMP/EIS which ends November 21, 1996, the BLM will prepare a Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The public will then be invited to review the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Dated: July 29, 1996.

Fritz U. Rennebaum,

District Manager.

[FR Doc. 96–19647 Filed 8–1–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–GG–U

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

United States v. Alex. Brown & Sons, Inc., et al.; Stipulation and Order and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)–(h), that a Stipulation and Order (''proposed order'') and a Competitive Impact Statement have been filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in *United States* v. *Alex, Brown & Sons Inc., et. al,* Civil No. 96–5313 (filed July 17, 1996).

The Complaint alleges that the twenty-four market making firms named in the Complaint and others, through the adherence to and enforcement of a ''quoting convention,'' inflated the ''inside spread'' of certain stocks quoted on The Nasdaq Stock Market, Inc. (''Nasdaq''). (The inside spread is the difference between the best price to buy stock being quoted by any market maker and the best price to sell stock being quoted by any market maker.) As a result, according to the Complaint, investors have been required to pay more to buy and sell such stocks that they would have in a competitive market.

Under the quoting convention, market makers are required to quote prices at which they are willing to buy and sell stocks in even-eighth amounts (25 cents)