

operations for mining claims, and 13 plans of operations for non-Federal oil and gas rights.

Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: One. To conduct mineral development operations in park units, a prospective operator must submit a proposed plan of operations to the NPS for review and approval. Once approved, such a plan covers the life of the operation. If the plan is for geophysical work associated with private oil and gas rights it may only cover a period of a few months. In contrast, a plan for a production oil and gas well or a hardrock mine may cover a period of 10 or more years.

Estimate of Burden Per Respondent: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 176 hours per response.

Estimated Total Annual Burden: 2992 hours. This number breaks down to 704 total hours to comply with the information requirements of the 9A regulations governing mining claim operations in parks, and 2288 total hours to comply with the information requirements of the 9B regulations governing non-Federal oil and gas operations in parks.

Methodology and Assumptions Underlying the Hour Estimate: Under the Service's 9A regulations and the 9B regulations, a complete plan may consist of 10 pages of text *plus* 2–10 pages of illustration inclusive of location maps, site plans and cross-sections to 100 pages of text *plus* several volumes of supporting material depending on the complexity of the proposed operations. The latter type of plan for hardrock mining is a rarity in the NPS. The time to prepare a plan could range from 24 hours to 6 months for a very complicated plan. Because the content of each plan is specific to the operation and site, and each operation and site present a unique set of circumstances, it is difficult to identify an "average" plan on which to base an estimate of preparation time. The NPS thus chose to use 160 hours (4 weeks) *plus* 10% for purposes of this analysis. In the case of the 9A regulations where an average of 4 complete proposed plans are expected per year, the estimated total amount of time involved to prepare plans of operations is 704 hours (*i.e.*, 176 hours $\times$ 4 complete proposed plans). In the case of the 9B regulations where an average of 13 complete proposed plans are expected per year, the estimated total amount of time involved to prepare plans of operations is 2288 hours (*i.e.*, 176 hours $\times$ 13 complete proposed plans).

Estimated Cost Per Respondent To Comply with the Paperwork

Requirements: The NPS estimates that the annualized cost to all respondents to comply with the 9A regulations ranges from \$7,040 to \$70,040. The NPS estimated the cost per plan at \$1,760 to \$17,600. In the case of the 9B regulations, the NPS estimates the annualized cost to all respondents ranges from \$65,000 to \$260,000 based on a likely individual compliance cost range of \$5,000 to \$20,000.

Methodology and Assumptions Underlying the Cost Estimate: For the 9A regulations, the annualized estimated cost to all the respondents was determined as follows:

(1) Nationwide, 4 plans of operations and associated information (*e.g.*, bond, commercial vehicle registration) are expected annually from different operators;

(2) Using an estimate of 160 hours to prepare a plan complete with attachments at a cost of \$10 to \$100 per hour (assuming the use of consultants for some or all parts of the plan requirements), the cost to prepare a plan could range from \$1600 to \$16,000.

(3) The NPS added ten percent (*i.e.*, \$160 to \$1,600) of the cost to prepare a plan of operations to account for administrative costs associated with changes in claim ownership, *etc.*

An operator with experience in preparing plans of operations likely can prepare an acceptable plan for a moderately complex operation in a few weeks, since most of the components of the plan are compiled during the course of normal business activities. Many of the information requirements of the regulations should be compiled by a responsible operator as part of normal business activities, to minimize liabilities, maintain business records for tax and other purposes, obtain financial backing, and ensure a safe, efficient, and well-planned operation. Under the regulations, information may be submitted in the manner in which it is customarily maintained in the industry.

Response to 60-Day Notice: On January 31, 2003, the NPS issued a notice in the **Federal Register** as to its intent to request an extension and revision to the information collection budget associated with the Service's minerals management program pursuant to 36 CFR part 9. See 68 FR 5040–5041. The comment period closed on April 1, 2003. The NPS received no comments to the 60-day notice.

Dated: June 23, 2003.

Doris Lowery,

Acting Information Collection Clearance Officer, WASO Administrative Program Center, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 03–19966 Filed 8–5–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–52–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Coronado National Memorial, Arizona

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Coronado National Memorial.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332 (C) the National Park Service announces the availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan (DEIS/GMP) for Coronado National Memorial, Arizona.

DATES: The DEIS/GMP will remain available for public review for 60 days following the date of this notice. No public meetings are scheduled at this time.

Comments: If you wish to comment you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may mail comments to Superintendent, Dale Thompson, Coronado National Memorial, 4101 East Montezuma Canyon Road, Hereford, AZ 85615. You may comment via the Internet to at <http://planning.nps.gov/plans.cfm>. Please submit Internet comments as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Please also include "Attn: GMP Team" and your name and return address in your Internet message. If you do not receive a confirmation from the system that we have received your Internet message, you can contact Superintendent Dale Thompson directly at telephone (520) 366–5515 or Job Captain John Paige at telephone (303) 969–9721. Finally you may hand-deliver your comments to park headquarters, 4101 East Montezuma Canyon road, Hereford, Arizona. Comments should be received no later than 60 days from the publication of this Notice of Availability. Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may

request that we withhold their home address from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold from the record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the DEIS/GMP are available from the Superintendent, Dale Thompson, Coronado National Memorial, 4101 East Montezuma Road, Hereford, AZ 85615. Public reading copies of the DEIS/GMP will be available for review at the following locations:

Coronado National Memorial Visitor Center, Coronado National Memorial, 4101 East Montezuma Road, Hereford, AZ 85615, Telephone: (520) 366-5515.

Planning and Environmental Quality, Intermountain Support Office—Denver, National Park Service, 12795 West Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287, Telephone: (303) 969-2851 [or (303) 969-2377].

Office of Public Affairs, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 18th and C Streets NW., Room 7012, Washington, DC 20240, Telephone: (202) 208-6843.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DEIS/GMP analyzes a "no-action" alternative and four "action" alternatives:

- *Alternative A* (no-action) represents the continuation of existing conditions and management at the park.
- *Alternative B* (the NPS preferred alternative)—the visitor center would be rehabilitated, with an annex added for more office space and storage. New trails would be developed, and pullouts and waysides would be added to roads. Programs would help visitors understand the Coronado Expedition and its impact on the American Southwest. Grazing in the memorial would be ended.

- *Alternative C*—would focus on conserving cultural and natural resources. The visitor center's interior would be remodeled to make more space for interpretation. Grazing in the memorial would be ended.

- *Alternative D*—the memorial's international aspects would be emphasized. A structure would be built to commemorate the Coronado Expedition, and an educational center would be developed in the Montezuma

ranch area. The visitor center would be expanded and rehabilitated. Grazing would continue in the Joe's Spring allotment, but not in the Montezuma allotment.

- *Alternative E*—A new visitor/educational center, to which visitors could drive on a paved two-lane road and enjoy a panoramic view of the San Pedro valley and the United States-Mexico border. The visitor center would be converted into administrative offices. Grazing would be eliminated from the Joe's Spring allotment.

The DEIS/GMP evaluates the environmental consequences of the proposed action and the other alternatives on natural resources (e.g., air quality, cave resources, soils; vegetation; wildlife; water quantity; and threatened and endangered species); cultural resources (e.g. archeological resources, ethnographic resources, historic structures, and cultural landscapes); the visitor experience (e.g. visitors' experience of park resources, and access to orientation and interpretive information); and socioeconomic resources (e.g. recreational use, grazing, and the local and regional economy).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Dale Thompson or Job Captain John Paige at the above addresses and telephone numbers.

Dated: June 20, 2003.

Karen P. Wade,

Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 03-19961 Filed 8-5-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-DP-P

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

National Park Service

Fire Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement, Bandelier National Monument, NM

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Fire Management Plan for Bandelier National Monument.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332 (C) the National Park Service is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement for the Fire Management Plan for Bandelier National Monument. This effort will result in a new wildland fire management plan that meets current policies, provides a framework for making fire-related decisions, and

serves as an operational manual. Development of a new fire plan is compatible with the broader goals and objectives derived from the park purpose that governs resources management. Alternatives to be considered in addition to the required no-action alternative include: 1. In-park comprehensive action alternative, 2. the cooperative comprehensive management alternative, and 3. the limited strategies alternative. The no-action alternative maintains the current 1997 fire management plan strategy of suppression, wildland fire use, and prescribed burning. The In-park comprehensive alternative is a fully integrated fire management plan with all strategies available for use within park boundaries including suppression, mechanical thinning and prescribed and natural fires that meet management objectives. The cooperative comprehensive management alternative also is a fully integrated fire management plan with all strategies available. Opportunities for cooperative planning with interagency partners and adjacent land managers would be encouraged. The limited strategies alternative would allow the limited use of prescribed burning, limited manual (*i.e.*: chainsaw) thinning in developed areas only, and does not allow wildland fire use.

Major issues are environmental effects of the FMP that are potential problems. These include: protection of cultural resources, restoration of plant and wildlife habitats, habitat protection for threatened and endangered species, protection of park neighbors' properties, protection of air quality values, protection of life and property, and changes in landscape-scale vegetation patterns.

A scoping brochure has been prepared describing the issues identified to date. The brochure is available for downloading as a pdf document from Bandelier National Monument's Web site at <http://www.nps.gov/band>. To obtain a paper copy of the brochure, write to the Fire Management Office, Bandelier National Monument, HCR 1, Box 1, Suite 15, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544.

DATES: The Park Service will accept comments from the public through September 5, 2003.

ADDRESSES: If you wish to comment on the scoping brochure, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may mail comments to Fire Management Office, Bandelier National Monument, HCR 1, Box 1, Suite 15, Los Alamos, NM 87544. You may also comment via e-mail to *BAND*