

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Barbara Davis, Office of Information Management, 202-267-2326, for questions on this document; Dorothy Beard, Chief, Documentary Services Division, U.S. Department of Transportation, 202-366-5149, for questions on the docket.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Public Participation and Request for Comments**

We encourage you to participate in this request for comment by submitting comments and related materials. We will post all comments received, without change, to <http://dms.dot.gov>, and they will include any personal information you have provided. We have an agreement with DOT to use the Docket Management Facility. Please see DOT's "Privacy Act" paragraph below.

Submitting Comments

If you submit a comment, please include your name and address, identify the docket number for this request for comment [USCG-2003-15096], indicate the specific section of this document to which each comment applies, and give the reason for each comment. You may submit your comments and material by electronic means, mail, fax, or delivery to the Docket Management Facility at the address under **ADDRESSES**; but please submit your comments and material by only one means. If you submit them by mail or delivery, submit them in an unbound format, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, suitable for copying and electronic filing. If you submit them by mail and would like to know that they reached the Facility, please enclose a stamped, self-addressed postcard or envelope. We will consider all comments and material received during the comment period. We may change this proposed rule in view of them.

Viewing Comments and Documents

To view comments, as well as documents mentioned in this preamble as being available in the docket, go to <http://dms.dot.gov> at any time and conduct a simple search using the docket number. You may also visit the Docket Management Facility in room PL-401 on the Plaza level of the Nassif Building, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

Privacy Act

Anyone can search the electronic form of all comments received in dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the

comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review the Privacy Act Statement of DOT in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 [65 FR 19477], or you may visit <http://dms.dot.gov>.

Regulatory History

This request constitutes the 30-day notice required by OIRA. The Coast Guard has already published [68 FR 25898 (May 14, 2003)] the 60-day notice required by OIRA. That notice elicited no comments.

Request for Comments

The Coast Guard invites comments on the proposed collections of information to determine whether the collections are necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Department. In particular, the Coast Guard would appreciate comments addressing: (1) The practical utility of the collections; (2) the accuracy of the Department's estimated burden of the collections; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information that is the subject of the collections; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments, to DMS or OIRA, must contain the OMB Control Number of the ICR addressed. Comments to DMS must contain the docket number of this request, USCG 2003-15096. Comments to OIRA are best assured of having their full effect if OIRA receives them 30 or fewer days after the publication of this request.

Information Collection Request

1. *Title:* Financial Responsibility for Water Pollution (Vessels).

OMB Control Number: 1625-0046.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Operators or owners of vessels over 300 gross tons.

Form: CG-5585, CG-5586, CG-5586-1, CG-5586-2, CG-5586-3, CG-5586-4, and CG-5586-5.

Abstract: The collection of information requires operators of vessels over 300 gross tons to submit to the U.S. Coast Guard evidence of their financial responsibility to meet the maximum amount of liability in case of a spill of either oil or hazardous substances.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: The estimated burden is 2,162 hours a year.

2. *Title:* Boat Owner's Report, Possible Safety Defect.

OMB Control Number: 1625-0071.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Owners and users of recreational boats and of items of designated associated equipment.

Form: CG-5578.

Abstract: The collection of information provides a form for consumers who believe their recreational boats or designated associated equipment either contains substantial-risk defects or fails to comply with Federal safety standards to report the deficiencies to the Coast Guard for investigation and possible remedy.

Annual Estimated Burden Hours: The estimated burden is 10 hours a year.

Dated: July 23, 2003.

Nathaniel S. Heiner,

Acting Director of Information & Technology.
[FR Doc. 03-19258 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

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

[AK-962-1410-HY-P; AA-16670; CIA-7]

Alaska Native Claims Selection

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of decision approving lands for conveyance.

SUMMARY: As required by 43 CFR 2650.7(d), notice is hereby given that an appealable decision approving coal, oil, and gas for conveyance pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the Act of January 2, 1976, and the Terms and Conditions for Land Consolidation and Management in the Cook Inlet Area, as clarified August 31, 1976, will be issued to Cook Inlet Region, Inc. The lands are located in Tps. 8 and 9 N., R. 8 W., and T. 3 N., R. 11 W., Seward Meridian, Alaska, and aggregate approximately 17,156 acres. Notice of the decision will also be published four times in the *Anchorage Daily News*.

DATES: The time limits for filing an appeal are:

1. Any party claiming a property interest which is adversely affected by the decision shall have until August 28, 2003, to file an appeal.

2. Parties receiving service of the decision by certified mail shall have 30 days from the date of receipt to file an appeal.

Parties who do not file an appeal in accordance with the requirements of 43 CFR part 4, subpart E, shall be deemed to have waived their rights.

ADDRESSES: A copy of the decision may be obtained from: Bureau of Land

Management, Alaska State Office, 222 West Seventh Avenue, #13, Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7599.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christy Favorite by phone at 907-271-5656, or by e-mail at cfavorit@ak.blm.gov.

Christy Favorite,

Land Law Examiner, Branch of ANCSA Adjudication.

[FR Doc. 03-19203 Filed 7-28-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310--\$-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

[DES03-44]

Ten-Year Water Exchange Agreements With Mendota Pool Group, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), has prepared a draft EIS, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to evaluate the proposed exchange of up to 25,000 acre-feet of water per year over a 10-year period with the Mendota Pool Group.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide water to irrigable lands on Mendota Pool Group properties in Westlands Water District and San Luis Water District to offset substantial reductions in contract water supplies attributable to the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), the Endangered Species Act listings and regulations, and new Bay-Delta water quality rules. This water would thereby enable the Mendota Pool Group farmers to maintain production on historically irrigated lands. The project is not intended to increase the amount of water for farming activities but would replace some of the contract water lost because of increased environmental regulations that restrict water deliveries south of the export pumps at Tracy, California.

Reclamation has obtained public input on the scope of the project and potential alternatives through comment letters and a public scoping meeting. The EIS addresses the comments received.

There are no known Indian Trust Assets or environmental justice issues associated with the proposed action.

DATES: The draft EIS is available for a 60-day public comment period ending

on September 29, 2003. Submit written comments on the draft EIS on or before this date at the address provided below.

ADDRESSES: The draft EIS may be obtained by contacting Mr. David Young at the address provided below. The draft EIS is also available on the Internet at <http://www.usbr.gov> or <http://www.entrix.com>.

Written comments on the draft EIS should be sent to Mr. David Young, Bureau of Reclamation, South-Central California Area Office, 1243 N Street, Fresno CA 93721-1813; by telephone at 559-487-5127; (TDD 559-487-5933); by e-mail at dkyoung@mp.usbr.gov; or faxed to 559-487-5397.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Young, Environmental Specialist, at the above address or by telephone at 559-487-5127 or TDD 559-487-5933.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Delta export service area of the Central Valley Project (CVP) has total contractual obligations and delivery losses of approximately 3.45 million acre-feet per year. The theoretical maximum pumping capability of CVP facilities serving this area is approximately 3.09 million acre-feet per year. Available supplies are apportioned under a hierarchy of allocation in which agricultural water service contracts, totaling about 1.85 million acre-feet per year, are provided water only after all other obligations are met.

Implementation of the CVPIA (1992), Endangered Species Act (1993-1995) and revised Bay-Delta water quality standards have further reduced pumping capabilities and water supplies available to agricultural contractors. Currently these parties can expect to receive a long-term average supply of about 50 to 55 percent of contract water as compared to a pre-1992 average of 88 to 92 percent.

Alternatives identified and evaluated provide for continued agricultural production, and include the proposed project, construction of new wells, and fallowing of farmland. The project proponents propose to pump up to 269,600 acre-feet of groundwater over the 10-year period from non-CVP wells located adjacent to the Mendota Pool into the Mendota Pool to make up for a portion of the annual shortfall in the contract water to be delivered via the CVP. The actual quantity of water to be pumped would depend on whether the year is classified as wet (0 acre-feet per year), normal (maximum of 31,600 acre-feet per year), or dry (maximum of 40,000 acre-feet per year). Of the total quantity pumped each year, a maximum of 25,000 acre-feet would be exchanged with Reclamation. This water would be

made available to Reclamation in the Mendota Pool to offset their existing water contract obligations. In exchange, Reclamation would make an equivalent amount of CVP water available to the members of the Mendota Pool Group for irrigation purposes at Check 13 of the Delta-Mendota Canal. Any quantity of water pumped beyond the 25,000 acre-feet exchanged would be delivered directly to other lands that are presently under irrigation around the Pool. As part of this program, a maximum of 12,000 acre-feet per year of groundwater would be pumped from deep wells (*i.e.*, screened interval greater than 130 feet deep), with the remainder coming from shallow wells (*i.e.*, screened interval less than 130 feet deep). The proposed project will comply with the terms specified in the Settlement Agreement for Mendota Pool Transfer Pumping Program, effective January 1, 2001.

The primary environmental resource issues that are evaluated in the EIS include groundwater levels, groundwater quality, subsidence, surface water quality, and biological resources. Other resource areas evaluated include cost of water, CVP operations, archaeological and cultural resources, Indian Trust assets, environmental justice, socioeconomic resources, land use, transportation, air quality, and noise.

The environmental review was conducted pursuant to NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, and other applicable laws, and analyzes the potential environmental impacts of implementing each of the feasible alternatives. The EIS is based upon previously prepared environmental reports and ongoing monitoring activities. Public input on alternatives and the criteria for evaluation of the alternatives was obtained through the initial scoping meeting and initial comment letters.

Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from public disclosure, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold a respondent's identity from public disclosure, 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 letter. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of