(a) Separated by Production Operations; Drilling and Workover Operations (including Allied Services); and Construction Operations:

- Number of company employee recordable accidents,
- Number of contract employee recordable accidents,
- Number of company employee lost time accidents,
- Number of contract employee lost time accidents,
- Company employee hours worked,
- Contract employee hours worked,

(b) By totals:

- Number of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) reported non-compliances,
- Oil spills <1 bbl by number and volume.

We use the information collected to work with industry representatives to identify ''pacesetter'' companies and ask them to make presentations at periodic best practice sharing workshops. We can better focus regulatory and research programs on areas where the performance measures indicate that operators are having difficulty meeting our expectations. We are more effective in leveraging resources by redirecting research efforts, promoting appropriate regulatory initiatives, and shifting inspection program emphasis. The performance measures also give us a verifiable gauge against which to judge the reasonableness of company requests for our approval of alternative approaches to comply with our regulatory objectives. They also provide a starting point for the dialog in the annual performance review meetings between company management and us.

Company management use the information to understand how the offshore operators are doing as a group and where their own company ranks. It provides information for them to know on what areas to focus their continuous improvement efforts. This should lead to more cost-effective prevention actions. Offshore operators and organizations use the information as a credible data source to demonstrate to those outside the industry how the industry and individual companies are performing.

If respondents submit confidential or proprietary information, we will protect such information in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act; 30 CFR 250.118, Data and information to be made available to the public; and 30 CFR Part 252, OCS Oil and Gas Information Program. No items of a sensitive nature are involved. The requirement to respond is voluntary.

Frequency: Annual basis in the first quarter of the calendar year.

Estimated Number and Description of Respondents: 100 Federal OCS oil and gas or sulphur lessees and operators.

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Hour''Burden: 8–16 burden hours per response. The previous estimate was 28 hours per response; however, we expected this to decrease after respondents became more familiar with the performance measures. Several companies informally indicated that the burden was not significant for the first report and would be even less now that they are set up to report the information. In parenthesis are the estimates reported to us by two major companies (4 and 10 hours), two small companies (1 and 4 hours), and 1 very small operator (unsure but possibly several days) that we contacted.

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Cost'' Burden: We have identified no cost burdens on respondents for providing this information.

Comments: We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval. All comments are public record. In calculating the burden, we may have assumed that respondents maintain much of the information collected in the normal course of their activities, and we considered that to be usual and customary business practice.

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

(a) Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the proper performance of MMS's 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 those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology?

(2) In addition, the PRA requires agencies to estimate the total annual cost burden to respondents as a direct result of this collection of information. The MMS needs your comments on this item. 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. Do not include in your estimates 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 10, 1998.

William S. Cook,

Acting Chief, Engineering and Operations Division.

[FR Doc. 98–22163 Filed 8–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Gettysburg National Military Park, PA

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Availability of draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan for Gettysburg National Military Park.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan (DEIS/GMP) for Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania.

DATES: The DEIS/GMP will remain available for public review through October 15, 1998. Public meetings will be held in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania during August, September or October, 1998. The exact dates and locations of the public meetings will be announced in press releases to regional newspapers.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the DEIS/GMP should be sent to the Superintendent, Gettysburg National Military Park, 97 Taneytown Road, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, 17325. Public reading copies of the DEIS/GMP will be

available for review at the following locations:

- Office of the Superintendent, Gettysburg National Military Park, 97 Taneytown Road, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325. (717) 334–1124 ext. 1452.
- Office of Public Affairs, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 18th and C Streets NW, Washington, DC 20240. (202) 208–6843.
- Chesapeake Systems Office, National Park Service, Park Planning, Natural Resources and Special Projects Office, U.S. Customs House, 200 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106–2878. (215) 597–1669.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DEIS/GMP describes four alternatives for the management of Gettysburg National Military Park, the environment that would be affected by the management prescriptions, and the environmental consequences of implementing those actions. Alternative A continues the existing management direction of the park. Alternative B proposes rehabilitation of large-scale landscape patterns on the 1863 battlefield and in the Soldiers' National Cemetery, the development of a new visitor center, enhanced interpretation and resource management. Alternative C, the proposed plan, proposes the rehabilitation of features significant to the Battle of Gettysburg and to the Soldiers' National Cemetery, a new visitor center, enhanced and expanded interpretation, and enhanced resource management. Alternative D proposes restoration of the 1863 battlefield, the Soldiers' National Cemetery and the commemorative areas of the park, a new visitor center, interpretation using the historic tablets, markers and monuments of the park and enhanced resource management.

The DESI/GMP evaluates the environmental consequences of the proposed action and the other alternatives on: the historic landscapes of the park; collections and archives; buildings and structures; threatened, endangered and sensitive species; other species; socioeconomics; traffic, parking and transit; and park operations.

All review comments received on the DEIS will become part of the public record.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Gettysburg NMP, at the above address and telephone number.

Dated: August 10, 1998.

John A. Latschar,

Superintendent, Gettysburg NMP.

[FR Doc. 98–22120 Filed 8–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Approval of Record of Decision Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Santa Rosa Island Resources Management Plan for Improving Water Quality and Conserving Rare Species and Their Habitats, Channel Islands National Park, Santa Barbara County, California

Introduction: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91–190, and the regulations promulgated by the Council of Environmental Quality at 40 CFR Part 1500, the Department of Interior, National Park Service (NPS) has prepared and approved a Record of Decision (Decision) on the abbreviated Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Resources Management Plan for Improvement of Water Quality and Conservation of Rare Species and Their Habitats on Santa Rosa Island (Final EIS/RMP). This Notice of the Decision is a summary statement of the nature of public comment during the ''no-action'' period, what alternatives were considered, and what alternative was selected. The complete Decision may be obtained from the Superintendent, Channel Islands National Park, 1901 Spinnaker Drive, Ventura, CA 93001.

Decision: The NPS will implement the actions described as the Proposed Action, Alternative F, in the Final EIS/RMP issued in May, 1998. The Draft EIS/RMP was issued in February, 1998. The actions selected to be implemented are summarized as follows.

Selected Action: Alternative F, Negotiated Settlement, was selected to improve water quality and riparian habitat, and to conserve rare plants and their habitats. There will be rapid removal of cattle by the end of 1998 (except for 12 head in Lobo Pasture). There will be phased removal of elk and deer by the end of 2011 (although removal may be earlier if necessary to achieve selected recovery goals; and after initial reductions an adaptive management program may be implemented). Other actions to be implemented include road management to reduce impacts to streams, and development of a comprehensive alien plant management plan to reduce impacts on native plants. Monitoring programs for rare species, water quality, and riparian recovery will be developed by the park. Visitor access to Santa Rosa Island will be increased beyond current levels.

Alternatives Considered: Five alternatives to the selected action were considered and evaluated in the Draft and Final EIS/RMP. These were: Alternative A (No Action), Alternative B (Minimal Action), Alternative C (Targeted Action), Alternative D (Revised Conservation Strategy), and Alternative E (Immediate Removal of Ungulates). These are summarized in the Decision and analyzed in detail in the Final EIS/RMP.

Basis for Decision and Finding: In choosing an action from those identified and analyzed in the Final EIS/RMP, the NPS sought to select an alternative that would: meet the goals and objectives of the plan; comply with applicable laws, regulations and policies regarding management of grazing, water quality and rare species; and minimally impinge upon park operations necessary to fulfill stewardship obligations while protecting core interests of the negotiating parties. The detailed rationale for selecting Alternative F is set forth in the Decision.

Public Comments: During the public comment period for the Draft EIS/RMP, the park received 9 comments. The substantive responses focused on: (1) adequacy of adaptive management for protecting and restoring plants and habitat; (2) management use of fire; (3) conflicts between deer and elk management activities and visitor use; and (4) entry by visitors into buildings and areas traditionally used by Vail and Vickers. All comments were carefully considered and aided in preparation of the Final EIS/RMP.

In contrast, no comments were received during the 30-day ''no action'' period for the Final EIS/RMP.

Conclusion: The above briefly summarizes factors considered in selecting Alternative F, Negotiated Settlement, for implementation. The actions contained in this alternative will be incorporated into a new Special Use Permit for the hunting operation. This new permit will become effective, and actions encompassed under Alternative F will be implemented, as soon as possible. As noted above, copies of the approved Decision may be obtained from the Superintendent, Channel Islands National Park, address as noted above or via telephone at (805) 658–5776.

Dated: August 3, 1998.

John J. Reynolds,

Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 98–22123 Filed 8–17–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P