

Citation 30 CFR 250 Subpart L	Reporting or recordkeeping requirement	Non-hour cost burdens		
		Hour burden	Average number of annual responses	Annual burden hours (rounded)
				\$600,065 Non-Hour Cost Burdens.

Estimated Reporting and Recordkeeping Non-Hour Cost Burden: We have identified two non-hour cost burdens, both of which are cost recovery fees. Note that the actual fee amounts are specified in 30 CFR 250.125, which provide a consolidated table of all the fees required under the 30 CFR part 250 regulations. The non-hour cost burden total in this collection of information is an estimated \$600,065. The cost burdens are for: (1) Filing fees associated with submitting requests for approval of simple applications (applications to temporarily reroute production (for a duration not to exceed 6 months); production tests prior to pipeline construction; departures related to meter proving, well testing, or sampling frequency (\$1,271 per application)) or, (2) submitting a request for approval of a complex application (creation of new facility measurement points (FMPs); association of leases or units with existing FMPs; inclusion of production from additional structures; meter updates which add buyback gas meters or pigging meters; other applications which request deviations from the approved allocation procedures (\$3,760 per application)).

We have not identified any other non-hour paperwork cost burdens associated with this collection of information.

Public Disclosure Statement: The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) provides that an agency may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Until OMB approves a collection of information, you are not obligated to respond.

Comments: Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.*) requires each agency “* * * to provide notice * * * and otherwise consult with members of the public and affected agencies concerning each proposed collection of information * * *” Agencies must specifically solicit comments to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the agency to perform its duties, including whether the information is useful; (b) evaluate the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) enhance the quality,

usefulness, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) minimize the burden on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

To comply with the public consultation process, on November 3, 2009, we published a **Federal Register** notice (74 FR 56858) announcing that we would submit this ICR to OMB for approval. The notice provided the required 60-day comment period. In addition, § 250.199 provides the OMB control number for the information collection requirements imposed by the 30 CFR 250 regulations. The regulation also informs the public that they may comment at any time on the collections of information and provides the address to which they should send comments. We have received no comments in response to these efforts.

If you wish to comment in response to this notice, you may send your comments to the offices listed under the **ADDRESSES** section of this notice. The OMB has up to 60 days to approve or disapprove the information collection but may respond after 30 days. Therefore, to ensure maximum consideration, OMB should receive public comments by June 18, 2010.

Public Availability of Comments: Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware 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 your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

MMS Information Collection Clearance Officer: Arlene Bajusz, (202) 208-7744.

Dated: April 1, 2010.

Doug Slitor,

Acting Chief, Office of Offshore Regulatory Programs.

[FR Doc. 2010-11921 Filed 5-18-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan; Joshua Tree National Park; San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, CA; Notice of Intent To Prepare Environmental Impact Statement

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(C), the National Park Service is updating the General Management Plan (GMP) for Joshua Tree National Park, California. The new GMP will update the overall direction for the park approved in 1995, refining goals and objectives for managing the park over the next 15 to 20 years. The GMP will prescribe desired resource conditions and visitor experiences that are to be achieved and maintained throughout the park based on such factors as the park’s purpose, significance, special mandates and the body of laws and policies directing park management and resource analysis, other designations such as establishment of 594,502 acres by Congress as Wilderness, and the spectrum of public expectations and concerns. The GMP also will outline the kinds of resource management activities, visitor activities, and developments that would be appropriate and sustainable in the park in the future.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A range of reasonable alternatives for managing the park will be developed by the National Park Service (NPS) through this conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process, and which will include, at a minimum, no-action and agency-preferred alternatives. Major issues the GMP will address include changes in visitor use patterns, adequacy and sustainability of existing visitor facilities and park operations, management of natural and cultural resources, collaboration and partnership opportunities, Wilderness stewardship goals, evaluation of park boundaries, and pro-active planning in response to climate change. The environmental impact statement (EIS) will evaluate the potential environmental consequences of the

alternative management approaches and identify all possible measures to avoid or minimize harm; an “environmentally preferred” alternative will also be identified.

Early in this scoping period the NPS will distribute a GMP newsletter to neighboring communities, state and federal agencies, associated American Indian tribes, County commissioners, local organizations, researchers and institutions, the Congressional delegation, and other interested members of the public. In addition, five public scoping meetings will be hosted during May 17–21, 2010, to provide opportunities for interested persons to learn about the proposed update of the GMP. Specific times and locations will be announced in the local and regional media, and details will be included in the GMP newsletter and also posted on the project Web site <http://www.nps.gov/jotr> (details may also be obtained by telephone, as noted below).

Scoping Comments and Dates:

General park information requests or requests to be added to the GMP mailing list should be directed to Karin Messaros, Management Assistant, Joshua Tree National Park, Joshua, 74485 National Park Drive, Twentynine Palms, California 92277. Telephone: (706) 367–5512. General information about Joshua Tree National Park is also available on the internet at <http://www.nps.gov/jotr>. If you wish to provide relevant information or suggest any issues to be considered in updating the GMP, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods: (1) Mail comments to Management Assistant Karen Messaros (address as noted above); (2) transmit via the internet to karin_messaros@nps.gov or <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/jotr>; (3) hand-deliver comments to park headquarters at Joshua Tree National Park, 74485 National Park Drive, Twentynine Palms, California 92277, or deliver at any of the public meetings. All written comments must be postmarked or transmitted not later than August 31, 2010. Before including your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware 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 your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Decision Process: Following due consideration of all public and agency comments as may be forthcoming; a

draft EIS/GMP will be prepared. Availability would be announced through the Federal Register as well as via direct mailing, Web site postings, and through local and regional press media. After an opportunity for public review, a final EIS/GMP would be prepared. As a delegated EIS, the official responsible for the final decision on the plan update is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region; subsequently the official responsible for implementation of the updated GMP would be the Superintendent, Joshua Tree National Park.

Dated: April 5, 2010.

Cicely A. Muldoon,

Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 2010-11955 Filed 5-18-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-EK-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Cachuma Lake Resource Management Plan, Santa Barbara County, CA

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has made available the Final EIS for the Cachuma Lake Resource Management Plan (RMP). The RMP involves alternatives for future use of the project area for recreation and resource protection and management.

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on July 25, 2008 (73 FR 43472). The written comment period on the Draft EIS ended on September 23, 2008. On October 9, 2008 a notice was published in the **Federal Register** (73 FR 59669) extending the comment period on the Draft EIS until October 31, 2008. The Final EIS contains responses to all comments received and reflects comments and any additional information received during the Draft EIS review period.

DATES: Reclamation will not make a decision on the proposed action until at least 30 days after release of the Final EIS. After the 30-day wait period, Reclamation will complete a Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD will state the action that will be implemented and will discuss all factors leading to the decision.

ADDRESSES: Send requests for a compact disc copy of the Final EIS to Mr. Jack

Collins, Bureau of Reclamation, 1243 N Street, Fresno, CA 93721.

Copies of the Final RMP/EIS will be available at: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=283. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for locations where copies of the Final EIS are available.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jack Collins, Bureau of Reclamation, Monday through Friday, 7 a.m. to 1 p.m., at (559) 349–4544 (TDD (559) 487–5933) or jwcollins@usbr.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Cachuma Lake is an existing reservoir formed by Bradbury Dam, and located in Santa Barbara County, California. The dam, which provides irrigation, domestic, and municipal and industrial water supplies to the City of Santa Barbara, Goleta Water District, Montecito Water District, Carpinteria Valley Water District, and Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, was constructed in the 1950s. The Cachuma Project has delivered an average of 25,000 acre-feet per year over the past 45 years and encompasses approximately 9,250 acres. In 1956, operation and maintenance of the Cachuma project was transferred from Reclamation to the Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board. Reclamation still retains ownership of all project facilities and is responsible for the operation of the dam. The RMP will have a planning horizon of 20 years.

The new RMP would: (1) Ensure safe storage and timely delivery of high-quality water to users while enhancing natural resources and recreational opportunities; (2) protect natural resources while educating the public about the value of good stewardship; (3) provide recreational opportunities to meet the demands of a growing, diverse population; (4) ensure recreational diversity and the quality of the experience; and (5) provide the updated management considerations for establishing a new management agreement with the managing partner.

The Final EIS is a program-level analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with adoption of the RMP. The Final EIS outlines the formulation and evaluation of alternatives designed to address these issues by representing the varied interests present at the Plan Area and identifies Alternative 2 (Enhancement) as the Preferred Alternative. The RMP is intended to be predominately self-mitigating through implementation of RMP management actions and strategies, and the EIS also includes