DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease, Wyoming

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) received a petition for reinstatement from Quaneco LLC for competitive oil and gas lease WYW154704 for land in Uinta County, Wyoming. The petition was filed on time and was accompanied by all the rentals due since the date the lease terminated under the law.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bureau of Land Management, Julie L. Weaver, Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication, at (307) 775–6176.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of $10 per acre or fraction thereof, per year and 16% percent, respectively. The lessee has paid the required $500 administrative fee and $163 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in Sections 31(d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW154704 effective December 1, 2009, under the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above. The BLM has not issued a valid lease to any other interest affecting the lands.

Julie L. Weaver,
Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication.

[FR Doc. 2010–16607 Filed 7–8–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of Realty Action; Direct Sale of Public Lands in Minidoka County, ID

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of realty action.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposes to sell four parcels of public land totaling 262.11 acres in Minidoka County, Idaho, to the owners of the surrounding private land for the appraised fair market value of $85,200. The private land surrounding the public land is owned by the Western Mortgage and Realty Company.

DATES: Comments regarding the proposed sale must be received by the BLM by August 23, 2010.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease, Wyoming

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) received a petition for reinstatement from Craig Settle for competitive oil and gas lease WYW161375 for land in Natrona County, Wyoming. The petition was filed on time and was accompanied by all the rentals due since the date the lease terminated under the law.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bureau of Land Management, Julie L. Weaver, Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication, at (307) 775–6176.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of $10 per acre or fraction thereof, per year and 16% percent, respectively. The lessee has paid the required $500 administrative fee and $163 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in Sections 31(d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW161375 effective April 1, 2010, under the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above. The BLM has not issued a valid lease to any other interest affecting the lands.

Julie L. Weaver,
Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication.

[FR Doc. 2010–16764 Filed 7–8–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of Realty Action; Direct Sale of Public Lands in Minidoka County, ID

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of realty action.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) received a petition for reinstatement from Quaneco LLC for competitive oil and gas lease WYW154704 for land in Uinta County, Wyoming. The petition was filed on time and was accompanied by all the rentals due since the date the lease terminated under the law.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bureau of Land Management, Julie L. Weaver, Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication, at (307) 775–6176.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of $10 per acre or fraction thereof, per year and 16% percent, respectively. The lessee has paid the required $500 administrative fee and $163 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in Sections 31(d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW154704 effective December 1, 2009, under the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above. The BLM has not issued a valid lease to any other interest affecting the lands.

Julie L. Weaver,
Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication.

[FR Doc. 2010–16607 Filed 7–8–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–22–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease, Wyoming

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) received a petition for reinstatement from Craig Settle for competitive oil and gas lease WYW161375 for land in Natrona County, Wyoming. The petition was filed on time and was accompanied by all the rentals due since the date the lease terminated under the law.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Bureau of Land Management, Julie L. Weaver, Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication, at (307) 775–6176.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The lessee has agreed to the amended lease terms for rentals and royalties at rates of $10 per acre or fraction thereof, per year and 16% percent, respectively. The lessee has paid the required $500 administrative fee and $163 to reimburse the Department for the cost of this Federal Register notice. The lessee has met all the requirements for reinstatement of the lease as set out in Sections 31(d) and (e) of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188), and the Bureau of Land Management is proposing to reinstate lease WYW161375 effective April 1, 2010, under the original terms and conditions of the lease and the increased rental and royalty rates cited above. The BLM has not issued a valid lease to any other interest affecting the lands.

Julie L. Weaver,
Chief, Branch of Fluid Minerals Adjudication.

[FR Doc. 2010–16764 Filed 7–8–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–22–P
Regulations contained in 43 CFR 2711.3–3 make allowances for direct sales when a competitive sale is inappropriate and when the public interest would best be served by a direct sale, including the need to recognize an authorized use, such as an existing business which could suffer a substantial economic loss if the tract were purchased by someone other than the authorized user. In accordance with 43 CFR 2710, the BLM authorized officer finds that the public interest would best be served by authorizing the direct sale to the Western Mortgage and Realty Company, which would allow the identified lands to be consolidated with Western Mortgage and Realty Company’s adjacent private property to continue to be used for agricultural purposes.

It has been determined that the subject parcel contains no known mineral values; therefore, the BLM proposes that the conveyance of the Federal mineral interests occur simultaneously with the sale of the land. On August 25, 2008, the above described land was segregated from appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws. The segregation terminates: (1) Upon issuance of a patent; (2) publication in the Federal Register of a termination of the segregation; or (3) 2 years from the date of segregation, whichever occurs first. The lands will not be sold until at least 60 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register.

The Western Mortgage and Realty Company will be required to pay a $50 nonrefundable filing fee for the conveyance of the available mineral interests. Any patent issued will contain a. A reservation of right-of-way to the United States for ditches and canals constructed by the authority of the United States under the Act of August 30, 1890, 43 U.S.C. 945; b. A condition that the conveyance be subject to all valid existing rights of record; c. A notice and indemnification statement under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9620(W)), indemnifying and holding the United States harmless from any release of hazardous materials that may have occurred; and d. additional terms and conditions that the authorized officer deems appropriate.

Public Comments

Public comments regarding the proposed sale may be submitted in writing to the BLM Shoshone Field Office (see ADDRESSES above) on or before August 23, 2010. Comments received in electronic form, such as e-mail or facsimile, will not be considered. Any adverse comments regarding the proposed sale will be reviewed by the BLM Idaho State Director or other authorized official of the Department of the Interior, who may sustain, vacate, or modify this realty action in whole or in part. In the absence of timely filed objections, this realty action will become the final determination of the Department of the Interior.

Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold from public review your personal indentifying information, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Authority 43 CFR 2711.1–2(a) and (c).

Ruth A. Miller,
Shoshone Field Manager.
[FR Doc. 2010–16712 Filed 7–8–10; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310–GG–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Yosemite Valley Plan; Yosemite National Park; Mariposa, Madera, and Tuolumne Counties, California; Notice of Revised Record of Decision

SUMMARY: On December 29, 2000, the National Park Service (NPS) executed a Record of Decision selecting Alternative 2 from the Final Yosemite Valley Plan/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for implementation (as noticed in the Federal Register on January 12, 2001). As explained below, the NPS has subsequently approved a revised Record of Decision for the Final Yosemite Valley Plan and will implement Modified Alternative 2 instead.

Decision: The NPS has approved adoption of a Modified Alternative 2 which consists of completed actions and projects that conform to four broad purposes and goals. These are to restore natural processes in Yosemite Valley, to ameliorate environmental impacts, to preserve cultural resource values, and to continue providing opportunities for high-quality visitor experiences. Excluded from the approved Modified Alternative 2 were certain projects yet to be initiated, including but not limited to consolidation of some parking and facilities in the eastern end of Yosemite Valley, relocation of equestrian facilities, removal of Sugar Pine Bridge, and several traffic recirculation plans. Also revised were Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI decisions) for Yosemite Lodge area redevelopment and improvements at Curry Village and East Yosemite Valley campgrounds.

Background: In 2006, a lawsuit was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California challenging the 2000 Final Yosemite Valley Plan. Occurringly, the NPS was involved in a separate lawsuit filed by the same plaintiffs challenging the 2005 Merced River Plan lawsuits. In March 2006, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Following that decision, the NPS and the plaintiffs agreed to suspend proceedings on the Yosemite Valley Plan lawsuit until the courts reached a final decision on the Merced River Plan lawsuit. In March 2008, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued a ruling affirming that the 2005 Merced River Plan did not adequately fulfill requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act nor the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.