Alternative B: Provide a high level of environmental protection for wildlife habitat and other resource values, while allowing the production of resource commodities.

Alternative C: Maximize the production of resource commodities while providing an adequate level of environmental protection for other resources.

Alternative D: (BLM's Preferred Alternative): Optimize the mix of resource outputs, including production of resource commodities and wildlife habitat, while providing enhancement of environmental protection for all resources.

The key issues addressed by the alternatives are: (1) Development of domestic energy sources, including wind power; (2) off highway vehicle/snowmobile use and outdoor recreation; (3) National Historic Trails and cultural resources management; (4) management of wildlife habitat, including special status plant and animal species; (5) special management designations; and (6) travel management planning.

The Draft RMP/EIS included analysis of nine new areas proposed for consideration as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). The BLM found that these areas meet relevance and importance criteria as set forth in 43 CFR 1610.7–2, and the impacts of including these proposed ACECs were analyzed as part of the alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS.

With Alternative D (BLM Preferred Alternative), the BLM proposes to establish the Bridger Butte ACEC (727 acres); Special status plant species ACEC (907 acres); and Cushion plant community ACEC (61 acres); and retain the Raymond Mountain ACEC (13,926 acres).

In addition, in Alternative D, the BLM analyzed the effects of opening 3,963 acres for consideration of future coal leasing. The proposed coal lease area is situated in T. 17 N., R. 117 W., Section 18, 20, 30, and 32; T. 16 N., R. 118 W., Section 2; 17 N., R. 118 W., Section 24.

Comments on the Draft RMP/EIS received from the public and internal BLM review were incorporated as appropriate into the proposed plan. After careful consideration of the comments received, adjustment and clarifications were made to Alternative D, BLM's Preferred Alternative. As modified, Alternative D is now presented as the Proposed Kemmerer RMP in the PRMP/FEIS. The Proposed Kemmerer RMP would provide comprehensive, long-range decisions for the use and management of resources in the planning area administered by the BLM and focus on the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Instructions for filing a protest with the Director of the BLM regarding the PRMP/FEIS may be found in the Dear Reader Letter of the Kemmerer PRMP/FEIS and at 43 CFR 1610.5–2. E-mailed and faxed protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these conditions, the BLM will consider the e-mailed or faxed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide the BLM with such advance notification, please direct faxed protests to the attention of the BLM protest coordinator at 202–452–5112, and e-mails to *Brenda_Hudgens-Williams@blm.gov*. All protests, including the follow-up letter (if e-mailing or faxing) must be in writing and mailed to the appropriate address, as set forth in the **ADDRESSES** section above. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your protest, you should be aware that your entire protest—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your protest to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Martin G. Griffith,

Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. E8–19387 Filed 8–21–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

60-Day Notice of Intention To Request Clearance of Collection of Information; Opportunity for Public Comment

AGENCY: Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR Part 1320, Reporting and Record Keeping Requirements, the National Park Service (NPS) invites public comments on a proposed new collection of information (1024-xxxx).

DATES: Public comments will be accepted on the proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) on or before October 21, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to: Margaret Littlejohn; Park Studies Unit, College of Natural Resources, University of Idaho; P.O. Box 441139, Moscow, Idaho 83844–1139; or via phone at 208/885–7863; or via fax at 208/885–4261; or via e-mail at *littlej@uidaho.edu.* Also, you may send comments to Leonard E. Stowe, NPS Information Collection Clearance Officer, 1849 C St., NW., (2605), Washington, DC 20240; or via e-mail at *leonard stowe@nps.gov.* All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. James Gramann, NPS Social Science Program, 1201 ''Eye'' St., Washington, DC 20005; or via phone at 202/513–7189; or via e-mail at *James_Gramann@partner.nps.gov* . You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free of charge.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Programmatic Approval for the National Park Service Visitor Services Project

Bureau Form Number: None

OMB Number: To be requested.

Expiration Date: To be requested.

Type of Request: New collection.

Description of Need: The National Park Service (NPS) relies on accurate information concerning park visitors to inform planning and management aimed at better serving the visiting public. The NPS collects information on visitors' characteristics, opinions, preferences, and trip expenditures by means of visitor surveys, including those conducted by the NPS Visitor Services Project (VSP). Each year, the VSP completes up to 18 visitor surveys and focus groups in individual units of the National Park System. The NPS currently has a programmatic approval for NPS-sponsored public surveys (1024–0224). This programmatic approval has resulted in dramatic improvements in the agency's ability to conduct social science research in and around NPS units. The proposed VSP Programmatic Approval would extend these benefits by allowing this relatively homogeneous subset of information collections to go through its own review process. This will reduce the time that it takes for VSP information collections to be reviewed and fielded, benefiting parks that depend on VSPs to collect timely and accurate data from visitors for planning and management purposes.

The VSP conducts site-specific information collections, including in-depth visitor surveys and focus groups, at up to 18 parks per year. These studies

are similar in terms of the populations contacted, the types of questions asked, and the research methods employed. Due to these similarities, the NPS is proposing to the OMB an alternative approach to complying with the Paperwork Reduction Act by allowing individual VSP information collection requests to be submitted to OMB under the proposed Programmatic Approval. Implementation of this proposal will lead to less time involved in creating submissions for individual VSP collections and decreased review times for studies submitted under the Programmatic Approval. The obligation to respond is voluntary.

Automated data collection: This information will be collected via mail-back surveys or standard focus group protocols. No automated data collection will take place.

Description of respondents: A sample of visitors to parks and/or residents of communities near parks.

Estimated average number of respondents: The program does not identify the number of respondents because that number will differ in each information collection, depending on the purpose and design of the project.

Estimated average number of responses: The program does not identify the number of responses because that number will differ in each information collection. For most projects, respondents will be asked to respond only one time. In those cases, the number of responses will be the same as the number of respondents.

Estimated average burden hours per response: Completion times for individual visitor surveys conducted by the VSP average around 20 minutes per respondent. Average contact times are one minute per contact. Focus groups average two hours in length.

Frequency of Response: 1 time per respondent.

Estimated total annual reporting burden: The program identifies the requested total number of burden hours annually for all information collections to be 10,000 burden hours per year. The total annual burden per project for most studies conducted under the auspices of this program will be within the range of 100 to 900 burden hours.

Comments are invited on: (1) the practical utility of the information being gathered; (2) the accuracy of the burden hour estimate; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden hour to respondents, including use of automated information techniques or other forms of information technology. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: August 7, 2008.

Leonard E. Stowe,

NPS, Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. E8–19427 Filed 8–21–08; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

60-Day Notice of Intention To Request Clearance of Collection of Information; Opportunity for Public Comment

AGENCY: Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and 5 CFR Part 1320, Reporting and Record Keeping Requirements, the National Park Service (NPS) invites public comments on a proposed new collection of information (1024–xxxx).

DATES: Public comments will be accepted on the proposed Information Collection Request (ICR) on or before October 21, 2008.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to: Tatjana Rosen, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, 205 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511; or via e-mail at *Tatjana.Rosen@yale.edu.* Also, you may send comments to Leonard E. Stowe, NPS Information Collection Clearance Officer, 1849 C St., NW., (2605), Washington, DC 20240; or via e-mail at *leonard_stowe@nps.gov.* All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record.

To request a draft of proposed collection of information contact: Tatjana Rosen, School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, 205 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511; or via e-mail at *Tatjana.Rosen@yale.edu.*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. James Gramann, National Park Service Social Science Program, 1201 ''Eye'' St., Washington, DC 20005; or via phone at 202/513–7189; or via e-mail at *James_Gramann@partner.nps.gov.* You are entitled to a copy of the entire ICR package free of charge.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Title:* Economic Study of Roadside Bear Viewing in Yellowstone National Park.

Bureau Form Number: None.

OMB Number: To be requested.

Expiration Date: To be requested.

Type of Request: New Collection.

Description of Need: Yellowstone National Park (YNP) now attempts to enhance opportunities for roadside bear viewing by leaving bears in proximity of park roads and devoting resources to managing ''bear jams'' (traffic jams created by visitors stopping to view the bears) and their associated challenges. Three questions arise with respect to this policy. First, what economic value does the opportunity to view bears near roads in YNP have to the visitors themselves; second, what are visitors' perceptions about the current roadside bear management policy; and third, what impact does the policy to allow bears to remain in roadside locations have on YNP visitation rates and on visitors' broader views of bears, other wildlife, and other natural resources.

To explore these questions, YNP is planning to use a mail-back questionnaire designed to systematically collect data from visitors in the following areas: Visit and individual characteristics, importance of different natural resources to the trip, acceptability of different wildlife management practices for roadside bear viewing, effects of management policy changes on the decision to return to the park (including regional economic impact) and perspectives on roadside bear viewing. The information acquired will help determine the effectiveness of current bear roadside management practices and—if the results so show—provide a credible basis to seek additional funds to manage roadside bears. The Bear Management Office in YNP has collected data on ''bear jams'' reported in the park since 2000, including the number of personnel hours spent by park staff in order to keep bear jams safe and visitors satisfied. Currently there are more ''bear jams'' than park rangers to manage them and several visitors and ''bear enthusiasts'' have expressed some level of concern about that situation.

The results of the survey will help define the costs and benefits associated with the current roadside bear management policy in YNP. In addition, it will provide park managers and others with important, accurate information about the YNP visitor population in general, as well as visitor and trip