

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****Bureau of Land Management**

[MT-922-06-1310-FI-P; MTM 93185, MTM 93188]

**Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Leases MTM 93185 and MTM 93188****AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Per 30 U.S.C. 188(d), Coastal Petroleum Company timely filed petitions for reinstatement of oil and gas leases MTM 93185 and MTM 93188, Valley County, Montana. The lessee paid the required rentals accruing from the date of termination.

No leases were issued that affect these lands. The lessee agrees to new lease terms for rentals and royalties of \$5 per acre and 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent or 4 percentages above the existing competitive royalty rate. The lessee paid the \$500 administration fee for the reinstatement of each lease and \$163 cost for publishing this Notice.

The lessee met the requirements for reinstatement of the leases per Sec. 31 (d) and (e) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (30 U.S.C. 188). We are proposing to reinstate the leases, effective the date of termination subject to:

- The original terms and conditions of the leases;
- The increased rental of \$5 per acre for each lease;
- The increased royalty of 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent or 4 percentages above the existing competitive royalty rate for each lease; and
- The \$163 cost of publishing this Notice

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Karen L. Johnson, Chief, Fluids Adjudication Section, BLM Montana State Office, 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana 59101-4669, 406-896-5098.

Dated: July 6, 2006.

**Karen L. Johnson,**

Chief, Fluids Adjudication section.

[FR Doc. E6-11074 Filed 7-13-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-SS-P

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR****National Park Service****Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ General Management Plan; Olympic National Park; Clallam County, WA**

*Summary:* Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental

Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C) and the Council of Environmental Quality implementing regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-08), the National Park Service announces the availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/ General Management Plan (Draft EIS/ GMP) for Olympic National Park. The purpose of the Draft EIS/GMP is to set forth the basic management philosophy for the park, to define resource conditions, wilderness objectives, and visitor experiences to be achieved within the park, and to provide the framework for addressing issues and achieving identified management objectives for the next 15 to 20 years. In addition to a "no-action" alternative (which would maintain current management), the Draft EIS/GMP describes and analyzes three "action" alternatives that respond to public concerns and issues identified during the scoping process, as well as NPS's conservation planning requirements. These alternatives present varying management strategies that address visitor use and the preservation of cultural and natural resources within the park. The potential environmental consequences of each alternative, and mitigation strategies, are identified and analyzed.

*Scoping Background:* A Notice of Intent announcing the preparation of the Draft EIS/GMP was published in the **Federal Register** on June 4, 2001. Public engagement has included public meetings, newsletter mailings, local press releases, and website postings. In June 2001 a scoping newsletter was distributed to approximately 800 people on the park's mailing list. In addition, during September and October 2001, public scoping meetings were held in several locations around the Olympic Peninsula and in Seattle and Silverdale, Washington. Hundreds of comments were received during the scoping process. In January 2002, a newsletter was distributed to summarize the planning issue and concerns brought forward during scoping, and to announce five workshops that were held in the area in late January to seek public assistance in developing alternatives. This was followed by the releases of a preliminary alternatives newsletter (distributed in May 2003) and a park update newsletter (distributed November 2004) to the project mailing list, which had reached approximately 1,200 individuals, agencies, and organizations.

*Proposed Plan and Alternatives:* The Draft EIS/GMP describes and analyzes the environmental impacts of the "no-action" alternative and three "action" alternatives. The Draft EIS/GMP also

includes alternative maps which include specific information for each front country area of the park, and identifies the "environmentally preferred" alternative (Alternative D)

*Alternative A* constitutes the no-action alternative and serves as an environmental baseline to facilitate comparisons between "action" alternatives. This alternative assumes that existing programs, faculties, staffing, and funding would generally continue at their current levels, and current management practices would continue.

*Alternative B* emphasizes cultural and natural resource protection, and natural processes would have priority over visitor access in certain areas of the park. In general, the park would be managed as a large ecosystem preserve emphasizing wilderness management for resource conservation and protection, with a reduced number of faculties to support visitation. Some roads and faculties would be moved or closed to protect natural processes, and visitor access and services in sensitive areas would be reduced.

*Alternative C* emphasizes increased recreational and visitor opportunities. The natural and cultural resources would be protected through management actions and resource education programs. However, maintaining access to existing faculties would be a priority, and access would be retained to all existing front country areas, and increased by improving park roads to extend the season of use. New or expanded interpretation and educational faculties would be constructed.

*Alternative D* is the park's preferred alternative. It was developed using components of the other alternatives, emphasizing both the protection of park resources and improving visitor experiences. Management activities would use methods to minimize adverse effects on park resources to the extent possible. Access would be maintained to existing front country areas, but roads might be modified or relocated for resource protection and/or to maintain vehicular access. Visitor education and interpretative faculties would be improved or developed to improve visitor opportunities. The preferred alternative also proposes three boundary adjustments, which includes a land exchange with the U.S. Forest Service and partnering with Washington Department of Natural Resources, and acquiring private land by willing seller only.

*Public Review and Comment:* The Draft EIS/GMP is now available for public review. The document can be