Dayton Aviation Heritage Commission. 
Notice of this meeting is required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463).

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Monday, March 25, 1996; 5:15 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

ADRESSES: Innerwest Priority Board conference room, 1024 West Third Street, Dayton, Ohio 45407.

AGENDA TOPICS INCLUDE: Update on the park and general management plan. This business meeting will be open to the public. Space and facilities to accommodate members of the public are limited and persons accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis. The Chairman will permit attendees to address the Commission, but may restrict the length of presentations. An agenda will be available from the Superintendent, Dayton Aviation, one week prior to the meeting.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Gibson, Superintendent, Dayton Aviation, National Park Service, P.O. Box 9280, Wright Brothers Station, Dayton, Ohio 45409, or telephone 513-225-7705.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Dayton Aviation Heritage Commission was established by Public Law 102-419, October 16, 1992.

Dated: February 16, 1996.

William W. Schenk, 
Field Director, Midwest Field Area. [FR Doc. 96-4783 Filed 2-29-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

Mississippi River Coordinating Commission Meeting

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: This notice announces an upcoming meeting of the Mississippi River Coordinating Commission. Notice of this meeting is required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463).

MEETING DATE AND TIME: Monday, April 1, 1996; 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

ADRESSES: Metropolitan Council Chambers, 230 Fifth Street East, St. Paul, Minnesota.

An agenda for the meeting will be available by March 20, 1996, from the Superintendent of the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area at the address below. Public statements about matters related to the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area will be taken at the meeting.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Mississippi River Coordinating Commission was established by Public Law 100-696, November 18, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent JoAnn Kyral, Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, 175 East Fifth Street, Suite 418, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 or telephone 612-290-4160.

Dated: February 16, 1996.

William W. Schenk, 
Field Director, Midwest Field Area. [FR Doc. 96-4783 Filed 2-29-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Cancellation of a Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on the Proposed Development of the Bull Mountains Mine No. 1 and Associated Support Facilities, Musselshell and Yellowstone Counties, Montana

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Interior.

ACTION: Cancellation of a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) is cancelling the notice published in the Federal Register on May 9, 1990 (55 FR 19365) for the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed development of the Bull Mountains Mine No. 1 and its associated support facilities. Meridian Minerals Company (Meridian) had submitted a permit application package (PAP) for their proposed underground coal mine and its associated support facilities, located about 35 miles northeast of Billings, Montana and 12 miles southeast of Roundup, Montana. Decisions on the application for a Federal permit to mine coal and for the possible Federal approval of a mining plan are no longer required.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Michael, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center, Room 218, Three Parkway Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15220.

The Administrative Record for this request is available for review at both the address above and OSM’s Columbus Office, Eastland Professional Plaza, 4480 Refugee Road, Suite 201, Columbus, Ohio 43232 during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William W. Schenk, Field Director, Midwest Field Area. [FR Doc. 96-4783 Filed 2-29-96; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

For Determination of Valid Existing Rights Within the Wayne National Forest

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

ACTION: Notice of request for determination and invitation for interested persons to participate.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) has received a request for a determination that Buckingham Coal Co., Inc. (the requester) has valid existing rights (VER) pursuant to section 522(e) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) to mine coal by surface methods on 25.2 acres of Federal land within the Wayne National Forest in Perry County, Ohio. By this notice, OSM is inviting interested persons to participate in the proceeding and to submit relevant factual information on the matter.

DATES: OSM will accept written comments on this request until 5:00 p.m. local time on April 15, 1996.

ADRESSES: Mail or hand deliver written comments to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center, Room 218, Three Parkway Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15220.

The Administrative Record for this request is available for review at both the address above and OSM’s Columbus Office, Eastland Professional Plaza, 4480 Refugee Road, Suite 201, Columbus, Ohio 43232 during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Michael, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Appalachian Regional Coordinating Center, Room 218, Three Parkway Center, Pittsburgh, PA 15220. Telephone: (412) 937-2867.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on VER Requirements for National Forest Lands

Section 522(e) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1272(e)) prohibits surface coal mining operations on certain lands unless a person has VER to conduct such operations or unless the operation was in existence on August 3, 1977. Section 522(e)(2) applies the prohibition to Federal lands within the boundaries of any national forest unless the Secretary of the Interior finds that there are no significant recreational, timber, economic, or other values that may be incompatible with surface coal mining operations and the surface operations...
and impacts are incident to an underground coal mine.

Under section 523 of the Act and 30 CFR 740.11, the approved State program (including the State definition of VER) applies to all Federal lands within States with approved regulatory programs. However, under 30 CFR 745.13, the Secretary has exclusive authority to determine VER for surface coal mining and reclamation operations on Federal lands within the boundaries of the areas specified in paragraphs (e)(1) and (e)(2) of section 522 of the Act. OSM reaffirmed these basic principles in the preamble to the suspension notice concerning VER published on November 20, 1986 (51 FR 41954) with the caveat that, in States with an all-permits standard for VER, OSM would apply the standard as if it contained a good-faith component.

Ohio represents a special case in that OSM is not restricted to use of the State program definition of VER. In situations in which application of the State definition would result in a denial of permit, the Act and 30 CFR 740.11 would apply. OSM reaffirmed these basic principles in the preamble to the suspension notice concerning VER published on November 20, 1986 (51 FR 41954) with the caveat that, in States with an all-permits standard for VER, OSM would apply the standard as if it contained a good-faith component.
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