Issued in Renton, Washington, on June 4, 1997.

Darrell M. Pederson,

Acting Manager, Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 97–15061 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

30 CFR Parts 202, 206, and 211

RIN 1010–AC02

Amendments to Gas Valuation Regulations for Federal Leases

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service, Interior.

ACTION: Extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: The Minerals Management Service (MMS) hereby gives notice that it is extending the public comment period for a document requesting comments on supplemental information which was published in the **Federal Register** on April 22, 1997, (62 FR 19536). In this document, MMS withdrew its proposed rulemaking to amend the regulations for valuing natural gas produced from Federal leases and requested comments on supplemental options for natural gas valuation.

In response to requests for additional time, MMS will extend the comment period from June 23, 1997, to July 23, 1997.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before July 23, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments or suggestions should be sent to the following addresses.

For comments sent via the U.S. Postal Service use: Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, Rules and Publications Staff, P.O. Box 25165, MS 3021, Denver, Colorado 80225–0165.

For comments via courier or overnight delivery service use: Minerals Management Service, Royalty Management Program, Rules and Publications Staff, MS 3021, Building 85, Denver Federal Center, Room A–613, Denver, Colorado 80225–0165.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David S. Guzy, Chief, Rules and Publications Staff, phone (303) 231–3432, FAX (303) 231–3385 or (303) 231–3194, e-Mail David__Guzy@ mms.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: MMS received requests from representatives of the oil and gas industry to extend the comment period of this document. This time extension is in response to these requests in order to provide commentors with adequate time to provide detailed comments.

Dated: June 2, 1997.

Lucy Querques Denett,

Associate Director for Royalty Management.

[FR Doc. 97–15089 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Minerals Management Service

30 CFR Part 250

RIN 1010–AC17

Seismic Reassessment of California Outer Continental Shelf Platforms

AGENCY: Minerals Management Service (MMS), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: MMS has developed proposed regulations for the seismic reassessment of offshore platforms. This proposed rule would only apply to platforms on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) offshore the State of California. This proposed rule includes criteria for determining a platform's fitness through a structural analysis. Each platform on the California OCS would need to undergo a seismic assessment within 3 years of publication of the final rule. An analysis would also be triggered by damage to primary structural members, proposals to significantly increase loads, or other significant changes. Previously, MMS has allowed for good engineering judgment to determine how modifications or significant changes would affect a platform's structural integrity. This proposed rule will provide for more consistency in seismic reassessment analysis.

DATES: MMS will consider all comments received by August 11, 1997. We will begin reviewing comments then and may not fully consider comments we receive after August 11, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Mail or hand-carry written comments to the Department of the Interior; Minerals Management Service; 381 Elden Street; Mail Stop 4700; Herndon, Virginia 22070–4817; Attention: Rules Processing Team.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lawrence Ake, Engineering and Research Branch, at (703) 787–1567.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Platforms installed offshore Southern California prior to the 1970's were designed and constructed according to onshore codes used at the time of their installation. In 1969, the American Petroleum Institute (API) published a document entitled ''Recommended Practice for Planning, Designing, and Constructing Fixed Offshore Platforms,'' or API RP 2A, containing guidelines developed specifically for offshore structures. The 7th edition of API RP 2A (1976) was the first version to include guidelines for seismic loading. The 19th edition of API RP 2A is currently incorporated into MMS regulations, although the latest 20th edition was published in July 1993.

Following the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, MMS and the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) began investigating seismic reassessment of structures located offshore Southern California. The agencies began to evaluate seismic analyses that had been performed for offshore platforms in their design phases. MMS decided to require operators of the oldest platforms, constructed before the 1976 API RP 2A 7th edition guidelines were in place, to conduct preliminary seismic analyses that are normally required for new platforms. The CSLC began a program to reassess platforms that were undergoing significant changes in operations, loads, or personnel. Experience with this process has shown the need for the development of uniform seismic design criteria.

Aware of growing MMS and CSLC interest in reassessment and the lack of credible reassessment criteria, the API funded an independent study in 1991 by a panel of four distinguished experts in matters related to seismic design. The results of the study were based on the underlying recommendation that the seismic risk offshore should be similar to that used for well-designed structures onshore. An API task group was formed to develop reassessment procedures and criteria for storm and ice loads as well as seismic loads. Its members were composed of technical experts from the offshore industry, academia, and the MMS.

Using the panel's study on seismic reassessment as a guide, the API task group developed a Supplement to the 20th edition of API RP 2A that covers all environmental loading conditions. It provides technical criteria to be used in reassessing existing structures. The criteria embrace a fitness-for-purpose evaluation coupled with the risk of structural failure and the consequences of that failure. The details of the Supplement will not be discussed here since it has already been the subject of several 1994 Offshore Technology Conference papers. The API finalized and published this Supplement

document as Supplement 1 to API RP 2A in December 1996.

MMS held several workshops to involve industry, the public, regulatory agencies, and academia in the development of reassessment guidelines. MMS, CSLC, and others sponsored an international workshop on seismic reassessment of offshore structures in December 1992. In November 1993, MMS and CSLC co-sponsored a workshop on public policy issues related to the seismic reassessment of platforms offshore Southern California. In December 1993, MMS, API, and others sponsored an international workshop on reassessment for structures located in all areas for both earthquake and storm loadings. The workshops were well attended by the interested parties. Discussions on public policy issues at all three meetings resulted in consensus on the treatment of seismic reassessment at the final workshop. The technical aspects of these numerous public discussions have been incorporated into the API Supplement, and MMS has made the proposed rule consistent with these results. Proceedings are available for each of the workshops held.

MMS is moving forward with proposed seismic reassessment regulations since seismic reassessments can provide critical information about the offshore facilities in the seismically active California OCS. Consideration is also being given to incorporating the 20th edition of API RP 2A, including the Supplement, into MMS regulations instead of proceeding with this proposed rule. Commenters are urged to provide comments on the relative merits of incorporating the API documents into MMS regulations, as well as proceeding with this rule.

The proposed rule would require lessees to conduct seismic reassessments of OCS platforms located offshore the State of California within three years of final rule publication. Reassessments would also be triggered by changing circumstances at the platform such as an increase of loads on the structure, or a change from an unmanned platform to a manned platform. Most changes that trigger reassessments would have to be judged ''significant'', which the proposed rule defines as cumulative changes that cause a 10 percent decrease in the platform's loading capacity or a 10 percent increase in the platform's loads.

A manned platform would undergo an assessment to determine if it could withstand a median 1000 year seismic event; an unmanned platform's stability would be compared with the forces from a 500 year seismic event. The more stringent requirement for a manned platform is based on the higher standard needed to protect human life. Each seismic reassessment must be verified by a Certified Verification Agent (CVA) who has been approved by the MMS.

Executive Order (E.O.) 12866

This rule was reviewed under E.O. 12866. The Department of the Interior (DOI) has determined that the rule is not a significant rule under the criteria of E.O. 12866 and therefore, the rule was not reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

DOI has determined that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities. Any direct effects of this rulemaking will primarily affect the OCS lessees and operators—entities that are not small due to the technical complexities and financial resources necessary to conduct OCS activities. The indirect effects of this rulemaking on small entities that provide support for offshore activities have also been determined to be small.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule contains a collection of information which has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and approval under section 3507(d) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. As part of our continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, MMS invites the public and other Federal agencies to comment on any aspect of the reporting burden. Submit your comments to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs; OMB; Attention Desk Officer for the Department of the Interior (OMB control number 1010–0058); 725 17th Street, NW.; Washington, D.C. 20503. Send a copy of your comments to the Minerals Management Service; Attention: Rules Processing Team; Mail Stop 4700; 381 Elden Street; Herndon, Virginia 20170-4817. You may obtain a copy of the proposed collection of information by contacting the Bureau's Information Collection Clearance Officer at (202) 208–7744.

OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information contained in these proposed regulations between 30 and 60 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**. Therefore, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication. This does not affect the deadline for the public to comment to the Department on the proposed regulations.

The title of this collection of information is ''30 CFR 250, Subpart I, Platforms and Structures,'' OMB control number 1010–0058. The proposed rule adds the following requirements to the currently approved collection of information required in Subpart I:

- Submit a plan for analyzing the platform structure;
- Obtain Regional Supervisor approval for analysis criteria if utilizing a probabilistic analysis;
- Review of a site-specific study by an independent peer review panel; and
- Obtain and submit a CVA report.

MMS would use this information to ensure that offshore structures located on the California OCS meet today's standards for seismic loading.

Respondents are Federal OCS oil, gas, and sulphur lessees with platforms located on the California OCS. The proposed rule requires compliance once within 3 years after publication of the final rule and thereafter as applicable. The current approved reporting burden for Subpart I is 21,803 hours. MMS estimates eight new responses each year for the first three years. Additional years would average fewer than two responses. We estimate the additional annual reporting burden as a result of this rule would be 1,256 hours (157 hours per response). Based on $35 per hour, the burden hour cost to respondents is estimated to be $43,960.

In addition to the hour burden discussed above, the proposed rule would add one other cost burden associated with the collection of information. Section 250.145(e) requires respondents to obtain a final report prepared by a CVA and submit it to the Regional Supervisor. We estimate the cost of preparing that report (including the costs of conducting engineering analysis) is $100,000 per platform.

MMS will summarize written responses to this notice and address them in the final rule. All comments will become a matter of public record.

1. MMS specifically solicits comments on the following questions:

(a) Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the proper performance of MMS's functions, and will it be useful?

(b) Are the burden hour and cost of the final CVA report estimates reasonable for the proposed collection?

(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 those who are to respond, including through

the use of appropriate automated electronic, mechanical, or other forms of information technology?

2. In addition, the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 requires agencies to estimate the total annual cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information. MMS needs your comments on this item. Your response should split the cost estimate into two components:

(a) Total capital and startup cost; and

(b) Annual operation, maintenance, and purchase of services.

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: before October 1, 1995; to comply with requirements not associated with the information collection; for reasons other than to provide information or keep records for the Government; or as part of customary and usual business or private practices.

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Takings Implication Assessment

DOI determined that this proposed rule does not represent a governmental action capable of interference with constitutionally protected property rights. Thus, DOI does not need to prepare a Takings Implication Assessment pursuant to E.O. 12630, Governmental Actions and Interference with Constitutionally Protected Property Rights.

E.O. 12988

DOI has certified that this proposed rule meets the applicable civil justice reform standards provided in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of E.O. 12778.

National Environmental Policy Act

MMS has examined this proposed rulemaking and has determined that this rule does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995

DOI has determined and certifies according to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, 2 U.S.C. 1502 *et seq.*, that this rule will not impose a cost of $100 million or more in any given year on State, local, and tribal government, or the private sector.

List of Subjects in CFR Part 250

Continental shelf, Environmental impact statements, Environmental protection, Government contracts, Incorporation by reference, Investigations, Mineral royalties, Oil and gas development and production, Oil and gas exploration, Oil and gas reserves, Penalties, Pipelines, Public lands—mineral resources, Public lands—rights-of-way, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Surety bonds.

Dated: May 28, 1997.

Bob Armstrong,

Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management.

For the reasons stated in the preamble, Minerals Management Service (MMS) proposes to amend 30 CFR part 250 as follows:

PART 250—OIL AND GAS AND SULPHUR OPERATIONS IN THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

1. The authority citation for part 250 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 43 U.S.C. 1334.

2. Section 250.145 is added to Subpart I to read as follows:

§ 250.145 Seismic Reassessment of California OCS Platforms.

(a) *Applicability.* These requirements apply to all platforms located on the California OCS.

(b) *Definitions.* When used in this section, the terms have the following meanings:

Loss of Global Structural Stability means the point at which a structure is unable to establish equilibrium under the applied gravity loadings and induced earthquake forces.

Manned Platform means a platform that always has someone living on it.

Platform Capacity means the platform's ability to resist loading or to withstand a given maximum load.

Significant means cumulative damage or cumulative changes from the original design premise that lead to a decrease in capacity or an increase in loading greater than 10 percent.

Unmanned Platform means any platform other than a manned platform.

You means the lessee.

(c) *When must I conduct a seismic reassessment?* You must conduct a seismic reassessment of each of your California OCS platforms in its current condition by [Insert date that is 3 years after the date the final rule is published in the **Federal Register**]. You must also conduct a seismic reassessment when a reassessment initiator occurs. Reassessment initiators are changes in the platform status which result in a significant change in demand, capacity, or consequence of the platform's failure, such as, but not limited to:

(1) Functional or operational changes which result in significantly higher loads than in the original design (e.g., new waterflood operations, additional tanks, or crew quarters, etc.).

(2) Significant damage to primary structural members or joints found during an inspection.

(3) The availability of credible new seismic data that would indicate significantly higher loads than those used in the original design criteria.

(4) Significant changes in the original design criteria or methodologies that would negatively affect the platform. An example of this type of significant change is the evolution of the tubular joint equation.

(5) A change from an unmanned platform to a manned platform.

(d) *What are the criteria for a seismic reassessment?* Before you conduct the seismic reassessment, you must submit your plan for analyzing the structure to the Regional Supervisor for approval. In addition:

(1) For manned platforms, you must demonstrate that the platform in its current condition can withstand a median 1000-year seismic event without loss of global structural stability. The ultimate strength of all undamaged members, joints and piles must be considered and, if necessary, safety factors may be reduced to 1.0.

(2) For unmanned platforms, you must demonstrate that the platform in its current condition can withstand a median 500-year seismic event without loss of global structural stability. The ultimate strength of all undamaged members, joints, and piles must be considered, and if necessary, safety factors may be reduced to 1.0.

(3) The Regional Supervisor may accept a probabilistic analysis as an alternative to the analyses required in paragraphs (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this section. The probabilistic analysis must address the effects of uncertainty and

bias in loading and resistance. Before using this method, you must obtain approval for your analysis criteria from the Regional Supervisor.

(4) Topsides and appurtenances must withstand the seismic loads from paragraphs (d)(1) or (d)(2) of this section and be in conformance with the seismic provision of API RP 2A–WSD.

(5) You must conduct a site-specific study under 30 CFR 250.139 based on soil borings and geophysical data taken on or near the platform vicinity, using the best available technology. You may use a study previously conducted. An MMS approved independent peer review panel must review the study.

(e) *Does a third party need to verify the seismic reassessment?* You must use a Certified Verification Agent (CVA) approved by the MMS using the qualification standards in § 250.132(b)(1)(ii) to verify the analyses required in paragraphs (d)(1) through (d)(4) of this section. You must submit the CVA's final report to the Regional Supervisor. It must describe the analysis process and material reviewed, summarize the findings, and include a recommendation to the Regional Supervisor. The recommendation must advise the Regional Supervisor to either accept, request modifications, or reject the reassessment.

(f) *What if my platform does not pass the seismic reassessment?* If your structure does not meet the reassessment criteria, you must contact the Regional Supervisor for approval to initiate one or more mitigation actions. Mitigation actions are modifications to the structure or to operational procedures that reduce loads, increase capacities, or reduce consequences.

[FR Doc. 97–15088 Filed 6–9–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–MR–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 925

[SPATS No. MO–032–FOR]

Missouri Regulatory Program

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

ACTION: Proposed rule; Reopening and extension of public comment period on proposed amendment.

SUMMARY: OSM is announcing receipt of revisions to a previously proposed amendment to the Missouri Regulatory program (hereinafter referred to as the ''Missouri program'') under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The proposed amendment consists of revisions to Missouri's revegetation success guidelines. Missouri is proposing to withdraw the portion of its proposed amendment pertaining to the use of county average yields for determining prime farmland revegetation success and to revise the portion of its proposed amendment pertaining to special requirements for ground cover density on previously mined areas reclaimed to a pasture land use. The amendment is intended to revise the Missouri program to be consistent with the corresponding Federal regulations.

DATES: Written comments must be received by 4:00 p.m., c.d.t., June 25, 1997.