

- includes a ranking form with criteria and assigned points. (0–3 pts)
- h. States' ranking criteria are adequate to prioritize projects based on conservation priorities identified in proposal. (0–2 pts)
- i. Project proposals will be (or were) subject to an objective ranking procedure (e.g., internal ranking panel, diverse ranking panel comprising external agency members and/or members of the public, computerized ranking model). (0–2 pts)
- Monitoring—Proposal describes State's biological and compliance monitoring plan for LIP including annual monitoring and evaluation of progress toward desired program objectives, results, and benefits.
- j. Proposal describes compliance monitoring that will ensure accurate and timely evaluation to determine that landowners have completed agreed-upon practices in accordance with landowner agreement, and that includes the process for addressing landowners who fail to comply with agreements. (0–3 pts)
- k. Proposal describes biological monitoring that will ensure species and habitats are monitored and evaluated adequately to determine the effectiveness of LIP-sponsored activities (Items to address in monitoring may include establishing baselines, monitoring standards, establishing timeframes for conducting monitoring activities, and setting expectations for monitoring.) (0–3 pts)
6. BUDGET—Proposal clearly identifies funds for use on private lands, identifies percentage of cost match, and identifies past funding awards. (14 points total)
- a. Proposal describes the percentage of the State's total LIP Tier–2 program fund identified for use on private lands as opposed to staff and related administrative support (admin). (4 points total)
- 0 points if this is not addressed or admin is >35%
- 1 point if admin is >25 to 35%
- 2 points if admin is >15 to 25%
- 3 points if admin is >5 to 15%
- 4 points if admin is 0 to 5%
- Use on private lands includes all costs directly related to implementing on-the-ground projects with LIP funds. Activities considered project use include: Technical guidance to landowner applicants; habitat restoration, enhancement, or management; purchase of conservation easements (including costs for appraisals, land survey, legal review, etc); biological monitoring of Tier 2 project sites; and performance monitoring of Tier 2 projects. Staffing costs should only be included in this category when the staff-time will directly relate to implementation of a Tier 2 project. Standard Indirect rates negotiated between the State and Federal government should also be included under Project Use.
- Staff and related administrative support include outreach (presentations, development or printing of brochures,

etc.); planning; research; administrative staff support; staff supervision; and overhead charged by subgrantees unless the rate is no approved negotiated rate for Federal grants.

- b. Proposal identifies the percentage of nonfederal cost sharing. (3 points total). (Note: I.T.=Insular Territories)
- 0 points if nonfederal cost share is 25%
- 1 point if nonfederal cost share is >25% to 30% (>0 to 25% I.T.)
- 2 points if nonfederal cost share is >30% to 35% (>25 to 30% I.T.)
- 3 points if nonfederal cost share is >35% (>30% I.T.)
- c. Has applicant received Tier 2 grant funds previously? (2 points total)
- 0 points if State has received Tier 2 funds previously or has not applied for Tier-2 funds previously
- 1 point if State has applied 2 of 3 previous years and no funds were awarded
- 2 points if State has applied 3 previous years and no funds were awarded
- d. Proposal identifies percentage of previously awarded funds (exclude last fiscal year's awarded funds) that have been expended or encumbered (landowners that are under signed contract to conduct on-the-ground projects) (5 points total)
- 0 points if less than 50% of the funds are expended for on-the-ground project
- 1 point if >50% of the funds are expended for on-the-ground project
- 2 points if >60% of the funds are expended for on-the-ground project
- 3 points if >70% of the funds are expended for on-the-ground project
- 4 points if >80% of the funds are expended for on-the-ground project
- 5 points if >90% of the funds are expended for on-the-ground project
- Total Score Possible=68 points  
Total Score \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: August 5, 2005

**Mitch King,**

*Assistant Director—Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs.*

[FR Doc. 05–18415 Filed 9–15–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–55–M**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Bureau of Land Management**

**[MT–922–05–1310–FI–P; NDM 85983, NDM 85987, NDM 85992, NDM 85998, and NDM 92293]**

**Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Leases**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Per 30 U.S.C. 188(d), the lessees, Headington Oil, Limited Partnership, Upton Resources U.S.A., Inc., Northern Energy Corporation, and W.H. Champion, timely filed petitions for reinstatement of oil and gas leases

NDM 85983, NDM 85987, NDM 85992, NDM 85998, and NDM 92293, Billings County, North Dakota. The lessees paid the required rentals accruing from the date of termination, February 1, 2005.

No leases were issued that affect these lands. The lessees agree to new lease terms for rentals and royalties of \$10 per acre and 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  percent or 4 percentages above the existing competitive royalty rate for each lease. The lessees paid the \$500 administration fee for the reinstatement of each lease and \$155 cost for publishing this Notice.

The lessees 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, February 1, 2005, subject to:

- The original terms and conditions of each lease;
- The increased rental of \$10 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 \$155 cost of publishing this Notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Karen L. Johnson, Chief, Fluids Adjudication Section, BLM Montana State Office, PO Box 36800, Billings, Montana 59107, 406–896–5098.

**Karen L. Johnson,**

*Chief, Fluids Adjudication Section.*

[FR Doc. 05–18456 Filed 9–15–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–55–P**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**Bureau of Land Management**

**[WY–920–1310–01; WYW159200]**

**Notice of Proposed Reinstatement of Terminated Oil and Gas Lease**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed reinstatement of terminated oil and gas lease.

**SUMMARY:** Under the provisions of 30 U.S.C. 188(d) and (e), and 43 CFR 3108.2–3(a) and (b)(1), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) received a petition for reinstatement of oil and gas lease WYW159200 from EOG Resources Inc. for lands in Fremont County, Wyoming. The petition was filed on time and was accompanied by all the rentals due since the date the lease terminated under the law.