

Notice of Motor Vehicle Closure

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior Prineville District (OR-056-1220-00:GP7-0038).

ACTION: Notice is hereby given that effective immediately, the following legally described area below, including all roads and trails, is closed to motor vehicle use year-long.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: This closure order applies to the entire area, and all roads and trails within the area, located in Township 22 South, Range 10 East, north half of Section 1, east of the Great Northern Burlington Railroad tracks, and south of Rosland Road and Township 22 South, Range 11 East, north half of Section 6, west of Road 2205, and south of Rosland Road.

The purpose of this closure is to protect public safety and welfare. More specifically, this closure is ordered in light of the recent injuries in the "Rosland" gravel pit, pending further investigation and evaluation of the site. Exemptions to this closure order apply to administrative personnel of the Oregon Department of Transportation for access to the existing material site right-of-way (Serial #L 015800). Other exemptions to this closure order may be made on a case-by-case basis by the authorized officer. This emergency order will be evaluated in the Urban Interface Plan Amendment to the 1989 Brothers/La Pine Resource Management Plan. The authority for this closure is 43 CFR 8364.1: Closure and restriction orders.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Violation of this closure is punishable by a fine not to exceed \$1,000 and/or imprisonment not to exceed 12 months as provided in 43 CFR 8360.0-7.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sharon Netherton, PLM Prineville District Office, P.O. Box 550, Prineville, Oregon 97754 (Telephone 541-416-6766).

Dated: November 26, 1996.

James L. Hancock,
District Manager.

[FR Doc. 96-31235 Filed 12-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-33-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**Notice of Lodging of Consent Judgment Under the Clean Water Act**

In accordance both with a Court order dated November 19, 1996, and Department Policy, 28 C.F.R. § 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Degree in *United States v. The*

Telluride Company, Civil No. 93-K-2181 (D. Colo.), was lodged with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado on October 15, 1996.

The November 19, 1996, Court order required, among other things, that the proposed Consent Degree be published in the Federal Register in each of three consecutive weeks. This is the first of the three publications.

The proposed Consent Degree concerns alleged violations of section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a), resulting from the defendants' unauthorized filling of over 46 acres of alpine wetlands as part of their mountain resort development near Telluride, San Miguel County, Colorado. As part of the proposed Consent Degree, defendants will be required to pay a penalty of \$1.1 million dollars and to implement a 16-acre restoration project to the satisfaction of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Defendants have also agreed to abide by a site-wide management plan for the continued protection and preservation of the remaining wetlands that they own. The proposed Consent Degree preserves the United States' right to appeal an earlier ruling of the Court. If the appeal is successful, defendants will be obligated to perform an additional 15-acres of wetland restoration along the San Miguel River and pay an additional penalty of \$50,000.

The Clerk of the United States District Court will receive written comments relating to the proposed Consent Degree until January 22, 1997. Comments should be addressed to James R. Manspeaker, Clerk of the District Court, United States Courthouse, 1929 Stout Street, Denver, CO 80294. Please send a copy of any comments to Robert H. Foster, U.S. Department of Justice, Environmental Defense Section, 999 18th Street, Suite 945, Denver, CO 80202. The comments should refer to *United States v. The Telluride Company*, Civil No. 93-K-2181 (D. Colo.), and should also make reference to DJ # 90-5-1-4-293.

The proposed Consent Degree Judgment may be examined at three (3) locations: (1) the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 1929 Stout Street, Denver, CO 80295, (2) the Clerk's Office, San Miguel County Courthouse, 305 West Colorado, Telluride, CO 81435 and (3) the Clerk's Office, United States District Court for the District of Colorado, 402

Rood Avenue, Room 301, Grand Junction, CO 81501.

Letitia J. Grishaw,
Chief, Environmental Defense Section,
Environment and Natural Resources Division.
[FR Doc. 96-30991 Filed 12-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

Immigration and Naturalization Service**Agency Information Collection Activities: New Collection; Comment Request**

ACTION: Notice of information collection under review; application for transmission of citizenship through a grandparent.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval is being sought for the information collection listed below. This proposed information collection was previously published in the Federal Register on July 10, 1996, at 61 FR 36397 allowing for a 60-day public comment period. No comments were received by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments until January 8, 1997. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Office of Management and Budget, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Department of Justice Desk Officer, Washington, DC, 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to OMB via facsimile to 202-395-7285. Comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20530. Additionally, comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile to 202-514-1534.

Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency/component, including whether the information will have practical utility;

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies/components estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Overview of This Information Collection

(1) *Type of Information Collection:* New collection.

(2) *Title of the Form/Collection:*

Application for Transmission of Citizenship Through a Grandparent.

(3) *Agency form number, if any, and the applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Form N-600/N-643 Supplement A. Office of Examinations, Adjudications, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

(4) *Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Individuals or households. This form is required so that information on a grandparent's residence may be collected to establish a child's eligibility for naturalization.

(5) *An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond:* 4,000 responses at 30 minutes (.50) per response.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* 2,000 annual burden hours.

If additional information is required contact: Mr. Robert B. Briggs, Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Information Management and Security Staff, Justice Management Division, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW., Washington, DC 20530.

Dated: December 3, 1996.

Robert B. Briggs,
Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 96-31202 Filed 12-6-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-18-M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Notice of Cancellation of Previously Announced Open Meeting

TIME AND DATE: 5:00 p.m., Friday, December 6, 1996.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314-3428.

The National Credit Union Administration Board has canceled its previously announced open meeting scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on Friday, December 6, 1996.

The previously announced items were:

1. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Community Charter.

2. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Group Community Charter.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone 703-518-6304.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96-31349 Filed 12-5-96; 2:31 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535-01-M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Proposed Data Collection: Comment Request

Title of Proposed Collection: National Science Board and National Science Foundation Staff Task Force on Merit Review Discussion Report

Merit Review at NSF

For every proposal that receives funding from the National Science Foundation, two do not. To determine which get funded and which do not, NSF relies on a rigorous, competitive process of merit review based on peer evaluation.

Merit review is the cornerstone of the NSF's work. Virtually all of the 30,000 new proposals submitted to NSF annually undergo external merit review. NSF receives over 170,000 reviews each year to help evaluate these proposals. Through the use of merit review, NSF seeks to maintain the high standards of excellence and accountability for which it is known around the world.

Why Consider Changing NSF's Merit Review Criteria?

NSF's current criteria were adopted by the National Science Board in 1981. They remain an effective means for determining the optimal allocation of NSF's valuable resources. From time to time, it is nevertheless prudent to examine the review criteria—in the spirit of improving an already outstanding system.

Furthermore, there are also a number of important factors that deserve consideration in any assessment of NSF's review criteria:

—First, NSF's 1994 strategic plan established long-range goals and core strategies for the Foundation.
—Second, several studies suggest that there is room for improvement in

NSF's highly successful system of merit review. For example, surveys of reviewers and program officers have revealed that the current criteria are not always well understood and often ignored.

—Third, seminal events over the past fifteen years—notably the end of the Cold War and the rise of global economic competition—have altered the context for public support of research and education. It is now more important than ever to highlight and document the returns to society on NSF's investments in research and education.

It is worth noting in addition that maintaining flexibility in the application of criteria may be as important as the criteria themselves. Most reviewers will only address those elements that they feel they are capable of judging. Similarly, NSF also does not pre-assign weights to the criteria; given the variation across NSF's many different programs, any such "one size fits all" approach would be counterproductive. Overall, excellence will continue to be the hallmark of all NSF-sponsored activities.

Furthermore, NSF will continue to employ special criteria when proposals are expected to respond to the specific objectives of certain programs and activities. Examples include teacher training projects and the development of large research facilities.

Opportunity for Input and Comments

At the November 1996 meeting of the National Science Board, the Board's Merit Review Task Force recommended that the current merit review criteria be simplified and that the language be harmonized with the NSF strategic plan. The current criteria and the Task Force's recommended criteria are shown below.

With the release of the Task Force's discussion report, NSF and the Board aim to stimulate discussion within and outside the Foundation. NSF is seeking input and comments from all interested persons—especially current and potential grant applicants and reviewers, as well as informed observers and followers of science and engineering research and education. To encourage the broadest possible comment and discussion, we have posted a summary of this document along with a comparison of current and proposed merit review criteria on our homepage (<http://www.nsf.gov>). The summary includes "hotlinks" to the full NSB Task Force report, NSF strategic plan, and other related documents. Most important, there is a response box for you to provide the agency with your feedback electronically.