

RESPONDENTS' ESTIMATED ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS—Continued

30 CFR part 1210	Reporting and recordkeeping requirement	Hour burden	Average number of annual responses (lines of data)	Annual burden hours
	(b) Period for keeping records. Lessees, operators, revenue payors, or other persons required to keep records under this section shall maintain and preserve them for 6 years from the day on which the relevant transaction recorded occurred unless the Secretary notifies the record holder of an audit or investigation involving the records and that they must be maintained for a longer period * * *. [In accordance with 30 U.S.C. 1724(f), Federal oil and gas records must be maintained for 7 years from the date the obligation became due.]			
Total for Royalty and Production Reporting.			10,499,998	337,933

* **Note:** ONRR considers each line of data as one response/report.

Estimated Annual Reporting and Recordkeeping “Non-hour” Cost Burden:

We have identified non-hour costs for this collection of information for the implementation of system changes and new setups in the accounting system. Based on information provided by participants, we estimate that the average total non-hour cost for each participant is approximately \$7,200. Since there are an estimated 3,870 respondents, the total estimated non-hour costs are \$27,864,000 (\$7,200 × 3,870 = \$27,864,000). This equates to an annual non-hour cost of \$9,288,000 for this ICR renewal. It is important to note that these are one-time costs due to the regulation changes implemented in May of 2015 and are not expected to continue past this ICR renewal period.

III. Request for Comments

Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the PRA requires each agency to “* * * publish a 60-day notice in the **Federal Register** * * * 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, we published a

notice in the **Federal Register** on May 15, 2015 (80 FR 28003), announcing that we would submit this ICR to OMB for approval. The notice provided the required 60-day comment period. We received no comments in response to the notice.

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 January 11, 2016.

Public Disclosure Statement: The PRA (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) 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.

Public Comment Policy: ONRR will post all comments, including names and addresses of respondents at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Before including Personally Identifiable Information (PII), such as your address, phone number, email address, or other personal information in your comment(s), you should be aware that your entire comment (including PII) may be made available to the public at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold PII from public view, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: November 24, 2015.

Gregory J. Gould,
Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue.

[FR Doc. 2015–31289 Filed 12–10–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4335–30–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

[RR02015200, XXXR0680R1, RR.17520306.0000006]

Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Statement, Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project, El Dorado County, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Reclamation, the California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency have prepared the final Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/ EIS/EIS) for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project). The purpose of the Project is to restore natural geomorphic processes and improve ecological functions and values in this lowest reach of the Upper Truckee River and the surrounding marsh and help reduce the river’s discharge of nutrients and sediment that diminish Lake Tahoe’s clarity.

DATES: Reclamation will not make a decision on the proposed action until at least 30 days after the release of the final EIR/EIS/EIS. After the 30-day waiting 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 written correspondence or requests for the document to Scott Carroll,

Environmental Planner, State of California, California Tahoe Conservancy, 1061 Third Street, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150; by fax to (530) 542-5567; or by email to scott.carroll@tahoe.ca.gov.

The final EIR/EIS/EIS is accessible at the following Web sites:

- <http://tahoe.ca.gov/upper-truckee-marsh-69.aspx>.
- http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=2937.

To request a compact disc of the final EIR/EIS/EIS, please contact Mr. Carroll as indicated above, or call (530) 543-6062. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section for locations where paper copies of the final EIR/EIS/EIS are available for public review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Scott Carroll, California Tahoe Conservancy, at scott.carroll@tahoe.ca.gov, or (530) 543-6062; or Shannon Friedman, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, at sfriedman@trpa.org, or (775) 589-5205; and Rosemary Stefani, Bureau of Reclamation, at (916) 978-5045, or rstefani@usbr.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The approximately 592-acre project area is along the most downstream reaches of the Upper Truckee River and Trout Creek, including their mouths at Lake Tahoe in the City of South Lake Tahoe, within El Dorado County, California. It includes 1.8-miles of the Upper Truckee River as well as the marsh and meadows surrounding the lowest reaches of Trout Creek. The majority of the project area is owned by the Conservancy though the Project does include small areas owned by other public agencies and private landowners.

Four action alternatives (Alternatives 1-4), and the No-Project/No-Action Alternative (Alternative 5), were analyzed in the draft EIR/EIS/EIS. None of the alternatives evaluated in the draft EIR/EIS/EIS were designated as preferred. Rather, guiding principles were developed requiring that each alternative be designed as a "full-spectrum" alternative that addressed, to varying degrees, all project objectives and design directives; be modular in nature, such that recreation access and infrastructure components could be interchangeable with habitat restoration and protection measures proposed; and embody a diverse range of feasible and implementable concepts, consistent with constraints identified and mapped early in the planning process. After input from responsible and interested agencies, and public comments provided on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS, and through additional outreach efforts, the

lead agencies used a qualitative system to weigh the pros and cons of the alternatives to develop the Preferred Alternative described following the action alternatives below.

Alternative 1 would involve restoration of the Upper Truckee River by increasing channel length and decreasing channel capacity. Alternative 1 includes maximum recreation access and infrastructure on the perimeter of the marsh, including a bridge and board walk. Alternative 2 would involve river restoration by directly raising the streambed elevation, increasing the channel length, and decreasing channel capacity. A key element of this alternative's restoration component would be the excavation of a new river channel that has less capacity than the existing channel. Alternative 2 includes a minimum recreation access and infrastructure design approach, focusing primarily on habitat protection features. Alternative 3 would promote the development, through natural processes, of a new main channel and/or distributary channels in the central portion of the project area. A "pilot" channel would be constructed from the existing river channel to historical channels in the center of the project area, but no construction would occur in the central or northern portions of the project area. Rather, natural processes would be allowed to dictate the flow path(s), bed and bank elevations, and capacities of the channel(s) through the central and northern portions of the project area. Alternative 3 would include a moderate level of recreation access and infrastructure, including more signage, more trail development, and viewpoints than proposed under Alternative 2 but less than Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would restore the river channel and its connection to the floodplain by lowering bank heights by excavating an inset floodplain along much of the river channel, and by localized cut and fill to create meanders in the existing straightened reach. Alternative 4 would include a similar level of recreation infrastructure as Alternative 3. Alternative 5 would not provide any actions to restore the river channel and its connection to the floodplain or recreation features beyond maintaining existing infrastructure in the project area. This alternative would allow, but not facilitate the long-term, passive recovery of the river system via natural processes. This alternative represents a projection of reasonably foreseeable future conditions that could occur if no project actions were implemented.

The Preferred Alternative includes the most beneficial and cost-effective

elements of the five alternatives evaluated in the draft EIR/EIS/EIS. This alternative is also the most feasible, the most highly responsive to public comments, and the most resilient to the potential impacts of climate change. It includes the following components:

- Alternative 3 restoration elements which involve construction of a small pilot channel that would reconnect the Upper Truckee River to the middle of the marsh to attain ecosystem and water quality improvements. This concept proposes the most geomorphically appropriate channel configuration allowing the pilot channel to strategically connect the current river alignment to historic channels and lagoons. The river would form its own pattern and spread over the expanse of the marsh, resulting in substantial benefits to habitats, wildlife, and water quality. The abandoned sections of existing river channel would be largely filled to create restored meadow and expanded wetlands.

- Alternative 5 for recreation elements on the east side of the Upper Truckee Marsh that would maintain the current dispersed recreation experience. No new recreation infrastructure would be installed and public access would be afforded through the current informal user-created trail system. The Conservancy would continue to manage and reduce the impacts of recreational use and new trails while providing on-site signage.

- Alternative 3 recreation elements for the west side of the Upper Truckee Marsh would upgrade the recreation infrastructure through construction of ADA-accessible trails to Lake Tahoe and formalized viewpoints that provide interpretive and site-information signage. The developed recreation experience would be maintained consistent with natural resource values.

- Previously proposed only under Alternatives 1 and 2, the Preferred Alternative would also include the restoration of sand ridges ("dunes") at Cove East Beach that were graded and leveled as part of the Tahoe Keys development and the removal of fill at the east end of Barton Beach to create a restored lagoon.

The detailed description of the Preferred Alternative, the selection process, and a summary of Alternatives 1 through 5 are presented in Chapter 2 of the final EIR/EIS/EIS.

A Notice of Availability of the draft EIR/EIS/EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on February 26, 2013 (78 FR 13082). The comment period on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS ended on April 29, 2013. The final EIR/EIS/EIS contains responses to all comments received and

reflects comments and any additional information received during the review period.

Copies of the final EIR/EIS/EIS are available for public review at the following locations:

- State of California, California Tahoe Conservancy, 1061 Third Street, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150.
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency front desk, 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV 89449.
- Mid-Pacific Regional Library, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, CA 95825.

Public Disclosure

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in any correspondence, you should be aware that your entire correspondence—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your correspondence to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Dated: November 20, 2015.

Jason R. Phillips,

Deputy Regional Director, Mid-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 2015-31230 Filed 12-10-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4332-90-P-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

[S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000
167S180110; S2D2S SS08011000
SX064A000 16XS501520]

North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area, Tennessee Lands Unsuitable for Mining Draft Petition Evaluation Document and Environmental Impact Statement OSM-EIS-37

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Interior.
ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) announces that the draft Petition Evaluation Document and Environmental Impact Statement (PED/EIS) for the North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area Petition to Find Certain Lands Unsuitable for Surface Coal Mining Operations is available for public review and comment.

DATES: *Electronic or written comments:* OSMRE will accept electronic or written comments within 45 days of the

publication of this Notice in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted using any of the following methods:

Electronic Comments: <http://www.osmre.gov/programs/rcm/TNLUM.shtm>. Please follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

Mail/Hand-Delivery/Courier: Earl D. Bandy Jr., Director—Knoxville Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, John J. Duncan Federal Building, 710 Locust Street, 2nd Floor Knoxville, Tennessee 37902.

You may review the draft PED/EIS online at <http://www.osmre.gov/programs/rcm/TNLUM.shtm>. You also may review these documents in person at the location listed below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Earl D. Bandy Jr., Director—Knoxville Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, John J. Duncan Federal Building, 710 Locust Street, 2nd Floor, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902. Telephone: 865-545-4103. Email: TNLUM@OSMRE.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 30, 2010, pursuant to section 522 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA), 30 U.S.C. 1272(c), the State of Tennessee filed a petition with OSMRE to designate certain lands in the state as unsuitable for surface coal mining operations. These lands include the area within 600 feet of all ridge lines (a 1,200 foot corridor) lying within the North Cumberland Wildlife Management Area (NCWMA)—made up of the Royal Blue Wildlife Management Area, the Sundquist Wildlife Management Area, and the New River Wildlife Management Area (also known as the Brimstone Tract Conservation Easement)—and the Emory River Tracts Conservation Easement (ERTCE). The area under consideration for designation encompasses in total approximately 67,326 acres along 505 miles of ridgelines. In accordance with its responsibility to administer the federal coal program in Tennessee, OSMRE must process and make decisions on all petitions submitted to designate areas in the state as unsuitable for surface coal mining operations.

The petition includes two primary allegations with numerous allegations of fact and supporting statements. In primary allegation 1, the petitioner contends that the petition area should be designated unsuitable for surface coal mining operations because surface coal

mining in the area would be incompatible with existing state or local land use plans or programs. SMCRA 522(a)(3)(A), 30 U.S.C. 1272(a)(3)(A). In primary allegation 2, the petitioner contends that the OSMRE should designate the petition area as unsuitable for surface coal mining operations because such operations would affect fragile or historic lands, resulting in significant damage to important historic, cultural, scientific, and aesthetic values and natural systems. SMCRA 522(a)(3)(B), 30 U.S.C. 1272(a)(3)(B).

The Director, OSMRE, is required to make a decision on the petition. The draft EIS currently considers in detail the following alternatives for action by the Secretary:

- Alternative 1—do not designate any of the petition area as unsuitable for surface coal mining operations (no-action). There would be no change in types of permits applications accepted for evaluation.
- Alternative 2—designate the entire petition area (67,326 acres) as unsuitable for all surface coal mining operations (State's proposed action). No types of surface mining permits applications would be accepted for this area.
- Alternative 3—designate the state petition area (67,326 acres) while allowing remining and road access (agency's preferred alternative). The only acceptable types of permits would be permits for remining.
- Alternative 4—grant an expanded corridor designation of independently-identified ridgelines within the petition area (76,133 acres) while allowing remining and road access. The only acceptable types of permits would be permits for remining.
- Alternative 5—designate lands based on the presence of certain sensitive resources (12,331 acres). No types of surface mining permits would be accepted for this area.
- Alternative 6—designate a reduced corridor of 600 feet (39,106 acres). No types of surface mining permits applications would be accepted for this area.

In accordance with the applicable regulations under 30 CFR parts 762 and 764 and the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, OSMRE evaluated the merits of the unsuitability petition and analyzed the impacts of these alternatives. This analysis is reflected in the draft PED/EIS.

OSMRE has identified Alternative 3 as its preferred alternative.