resources of the OCS; and preserve and maintain free enterprise competition.

Regulations at 30 CFR 250, subpart K, implement these statutory requirements. We use the information collected to determine if produced gas can be economically put to beneficial use, to analyze the risks of transporting the liquid hydrocarbons against the value of the resource, and to account for volumes of flared gas and burned liquid hydrocarbons. The MMS uses the information in its efforts to conserve natural resources, prevent waste, and protect correlative rights including the Government's royalty interest. Specifically, MMS uses the information to review records of burning liquid hydrocarbons and venting and flaring actions to ensure that they are not excessive; to determine maximum production and maximum efficient rates; to compare the volume of hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) flared and the sulphur dioxide (SO_2) emitted to the specified amounts in approved contingency plans; to monitor monthly atmospheric emissions of SO_2 for air quality; to review applications for downhole commingling to ensure that action does not result in undervalued royalties; and to ensure that operations are effective and result in optimum ultimate recovery.

We will protect information from respondents considered proprietary under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and its implementing regulations (43 CFR part 2) and under regulations at 30 CFR 250.118. No items of a sensitive nature are collected. Responses are mandatory.

Frequency: The frequency is on occasion or monthly.

Estimated Number and Description of Respondents: Approximately 130 Federal OCS oil and gas lessees.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping ''Hour'' Burden: The currently approved annual reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection is 13,650 hours, which averages 105 hours per respondent.

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

Comments

We will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in our submission for OMB approval. As a result of your comments and our consultations with a representative sample of respondents, we will make any necessary adjustments to the burden in our submission to OMB. In calculating the burden, we assumed that respondents perform many of the 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.

(1) We specifically solicit your comments on the following questions:

(a) Is the proposed collection of information necessary for us to properly perform our 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 respondents, 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 reporting ''non-hour cost'' burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. We need to know if you have costs associated with the collection of this information for either total capital and startup cost components or annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of service components. 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. 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.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer

Jo Ann Lauterbach, (202) 208–7744.

Dated: November 8, 1999.

Elmer P. Danenberger,

Chief, Engineering and Operations Division.

[FR Doc. 99–30078 Filed 11–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

Outer Continental Shelf, Central Gulf of Mexico, Oil and Gas Lease Sale 175

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, Interior.

ACTION: Availability of the proposed notice of sale.

Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf (OCS); Notice of Availability of the proposed Notice of Sale for proposed Oil and Gas Lease Sale 175 in the Central Gulf of Mexico. This Notice is published pursuant to 30 CFR 256.29(c) as a matter of information to the public.

With regard to oil and gas leasing on the OCS, the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 19 of the OCS Lands Act, provides the affected States the opportunity to review the proposed Notice. The proposed Notice sets forth the proposed terms and conditions of the sale, including minimum bids, royalty rates, and rentals.

The proposed Notice of Sale for Sale 175 and a ''Proposed Sale Notice Package'' containing information essential to potential bidders may be obtained from the Public Information Unit, Gulf of Mexico Region, Minerals Management Service, 1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard, New Orleans, Louisiana 70123–2394. Telephone: (504) 735–2519.

The final Notice of Sale will be published in the **Federal Register** at least 30 days prior to the date of bid opening. Bid opening is currently scheduled for March 15, 2000.

Dated: November 8, 1999.

Thomas R. Kitsos,

Acting Director, Minerals Management Service.

[FR Doc. 99–30095 Filed 11–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Record of Decision, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Comprehensive Management and Use Plan; Oregon, California, Mormon Pioneer and Pony Express National Historic Trails

Introduction

The National Park Service has developed a Comprehensive Management Plan / Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Oregon, California, Mormon Pioneer and Pony

Express National Historic Trails. The Final Environmental Impact Statement presents alternatives and their environmental consequences for the administration and protection of resources, visitor use and interpretation, and agency cooperation among all the partners involved in this project.

The purpose of this Record of Decision is to document the selected alternative from those presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The Record of Decision highlights information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Background

In 1978 Congress authorized the Oregon and Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails to commemorate these significant routes of travel and to promote their preservation, interpretation, public use, and appreciation. In 1992 it authorized the California and Pony Express National Historic Trails. The National Trails System Act required that comprehensive management and use plans be prepared. Plans for the Oregon and Mormon Pioneer were approved in 1981, but need to be updated to provide additional guidance on high-potential sites and segments, resource protection techniques, site certification, visitor use, interpretation, and cooperative management.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement is programmatic in that the proposal does not call for any undertaking or action that would result in ground disturbances. Any future development would require additional environmental compliance to be carried out as required by state and local regulations and the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Selected Alternative

The National Park Service selected alternative 2, the proposed action as described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for implementation.

Alternative 2 (enhanced conditions and a historic trails partnership) focuses on enhancing resource preservation and visitor use. To do so, it would be necessary to achieve the highest possible degree of cooperation among the partners, increase awareness of the need to work together, and communicate what is being planned and what is actually being done. The alternative calls for an improved visitor experience through integrated development and programming and a comprehensive strategy for resource protection, including an ambitious program to inventory and monitor resources that would bring together, in one location, information that is currently dispersed.

Some components of this plan signal new approaches to the management of historic trails. A geographic information system (GIS) has been used to map most of the routes and the locations of the high-potential sites and segments associated with the four trails. These data, in conjunction with the computerized data set of the trail resources generated during the planning process would become the starting point for a systematic and coordinated effort to use the Salt Lake City office as the central repository for all trail-related resource information.

Other Alternative Considered

An additional alternative has been considered in addition to the proposed action. Alternative 1 is a continuation of current management practices. It reflects the wide variability in the administration and management, resource protection strategies, and interpretation, visitor experience, and use that exist today. The alternative notes how resource protection, trail marking, and interpretation are ongoing processes and how increasing levels of cooperation and coordination are becoming more common among the various trail partners. However, coordination among the different trail-managing agencies, or even within the same agency is inconsistent. Furthermore, the various existing plans that these agencies have developed seldom address trail resources and measures for their protection and appropriate public use.

Basis for Decision

Alternative 2 is selected because it most fully satisfies the dual purposes of the National Trails System Act—to ''provide for the outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population,'' and ''to promote the preservation of, public access to, travel within, and enjoyment and appreciation of the open-air, outdoor areas and historic resources of the nation.'' The proposal focuses on attaining increased efficiency, closer communication, and more strategic resource protection. It fosters interagency cooperation that would result in greater resource protection and make for a much more efficient cost-conscious administration.

Environmentally Preferable Alternative

The environmentally preferable alternative is alternative 2. This alternative best protects and preserves historic, cultural and natural resource. The assessment of resource vulnerability, the resource monitoring program and the increased coordination among the trail partners will minimize any impacts from the increased visitation that might result from this alternative. Enhanced trail education programs and the resulting increase in public awareness will make visitors more sensitive to the significance and fragile nature of trail resources, in particular cultural landscapes. This in turn might have beneficial impacts on cultural landscapes, as visitors would be more likely to appreciate and respect resources.

Measures To Minimize Environmental Harm

The selected alternative establishes conceptual-level guidelines for administering resource protection and visitor experience. Potential impacts of implementation have been discussed for this level of analysis and all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm have been identified. The Final Environmental Impact Statement is a programmatic document that will require additional planning and compliance if specific actions were to be implemented and would cause any ground disturbance. At that time, NPS will consult with the partner agencies and the public and will document compliance with all relevant federal, state, and local laws, regulations and policies. Through this process, all site-specific impacts will be identified and all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm will be adopted.

Public and Interagency Involvement

Public involvement was extensive, including newsletters, public reviews, and public meetings. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement was available for a 60-day public review from August 21 to October 19, 1998. Close to 1,000 copies were distributed for review. Public meetings were held in later September and early October at nine locations throughout the west and were attended by approximately 180 people. Written comments were received from 32 federal, state, and local agencies. The Final Environmental Impact Statement has been revised in response to substantive comments on the draft document. In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing NEPA, all written responses from public agencies are reprinted as part of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Substantive comments from individuals were summarized and included in table format.

Conclusion

Considering each alternative and its environmental impacts, the public response, the purpose of the trails, and the administrative objectives, the National Park Service concludes that alternative 2 is the best course of action for preserving trail resources and for their interpretation and public enjoyment.

Address

Copies of the Record of Decision can be obtained from the following address: Superintendent, Long Distance Trails Office, 324 S. State Street, Suite 250, PO Box 45155, Salt Lake City, UT 84145–0155, Telephone (801) 539–4095.

Recommended:

Dated: November 10, 1999.

Jere L. Krakow,

Superintendent, Long Distance Trails Office.

Approved: November 10, 1999.

Michael D. Synder,

Director, Intermountain Region.

[FR Doc. 99–30113 Filed 11–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Final Environmental Impact Statement for General Management Plan, Redwood National and State Parks, Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, California; Notice of Availability

Summary: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 81–190 as amended), the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, has prepared a final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) assessing the potential impacts of adopting a General Management Plan (GMP) for Redwood National and State Parks. These parks comprise a 105,516-acre cooperative federal-state parklands area that preserves some of the last remaining stands of the world's tallest trees along 35 miles of scenic northwestern California coastline. The document identifies and evaluates the potential environmental consequences of a Proposed Action and three Alternatives; appropriate mitigation measures are also identified and evaluated. Once approved, the GMP will guide resource management and preservation, watershed protection, restoration, and other stewardship activities (as well interpretation, site planning and other operations) for the next 10–15 years.

This FEIS/GMP document also incorporates all the elements of an Environmental Impact Report/General Plan, which were prepared concurrently by the State of California's Department of Parks and Recreation. Although this comprehensive document results and benefits from a cooperative effort, each agency has slightly different requirements for completing the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process.

Proposal and Alternatives

This document presents and analyzes four alternatives for joint management of the commingled Redwood National and State Parks. The concept under Alternative 1 (the proposed action) would be to emphasize the protection of the parks' resources and values (including proactive restoration where sensitive resources are at risk). A variety of opportunities for visitors to be inspired by cultural and natural values would be ensured. Under Alternative 2 (no action), existing management policies and resources protection, preservation, and restoration programs would be continued; some trail development and new campgrounds as described in previously approved plans for the area would also occur. Under Alternative 3 the agencies would emphasize resource restoration, protection, and preservation; the opportunities for public use and enjoyment of parklands would be limited to experiences consistent with a high degree of resource stewardship. Under Alternative 4 priority would be placed on providing a wide spectrum of appropriate visitor experiences, consistent with overarching stewardship obligations to protect parklands resources and values.

The degree of foreseeable impact varies according to each Alternative, and includes: major beneficial effects from watershed and estuary restoration; some short-term adverse effects from proposed facility development and visitor use activities; and substantial economic benefits from park visitation, operations, and construction in the Humboldt-Del Norte area. Both the Draft and Final documents evaluate the same Proposed Action and Alternatives. The environmental consequences of the Alternatives are fully documented in the FEIS. No significant adverse impacts are foreseen from the three action Alternatives, because each includes provisions to avoid or mitigate potentially significant impacts. However, the No-Action Alternative could result in significant long-term impacts to natural and cultural resources due to management and protection activities insufficient to keep pace with conditions and trends foreseen. Estimated costs to implement the Alternatives are presented and compared in the appendices.

Public Review

Public collaboration with various local and regional organizations and individuals was formally initiated with a Notice of intent published in the **Federal Register** on May 24, 1996. Public scoping meetings were held in Brookings, Oregon and Eureka, Orick, Klamath, and Crescent City, California during June, 1996. During this period a number of focus group meetings and workshops were held. Consultations were undertaken with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and the California State Historic Preservation Office. The Yurok Tribal Heritage Preservation Officer participated as an active consultant in the overall conservation planning and environmental analysis process (following a one-day scoping workshop undertaken with eight American Indian Tribes, Rancherias, and Nations). The Draft EIS/GMP was formally released July 9, 1998 for a 60 day public review (which was extended for 30 days through November 8, 1998). During the draft review period, four public meetings and numerous workshops and informal meetings were conducted in local communities. Approximately 600 written comments and preprinted signed forms were received.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For more information or to obtain a copy of the document, contact the Superintendents, Redwood National and State Parks, 1111 Second Street, Crescent City, CA 95531; or telephone 1–800–423–6101 or voice/TDD 707–464–6101; or via e-mail at redw__superintendent@nps.gov. The document will also be available at area libraries. the no-action period for the FEIS/GMP will extend for thirty (30) days after the Environmental Protection Agency's notification of the filing of the document is published in the **Federal Register.** Subsequently, the National Park Service will prepare a Record of Decision, which will also be duly noticed in the **Federal Register**. The official responsible for the NPS decision is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region; the responsibility for the State decision is vested with the California State Park and Recreation Commission in concert with the Depart of Parks and Recreation. The officials responsible for implementation are the Superintendents, Redwood National and State Parks.