

submission as 1024–0126, Proposed Sale of Concession Operations, 36 CFR 51, Subpart J. Please send a copy your comments to Madonna L. Baucum, Acting Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW., Mailstop 2605 (Rm. 1242), Washington, DC 20240 (mail); or [madonna\\_baucum@nps.gov](mailto:madonna_baucum@nps.gov) (email).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Jo A. Pendry, Chief, Commercial Services Program, National Park Service, 1849 C Street NW., Mailstop 2410, Washington, DC 20240 (mail); [jo\\_pendry@nps.gov](mailto:jo_pendry@nps.gov) (email); or (202) 371–2090 (fax). To see a copy of the entire ICR submitted to OMB, go to <http://www.reginfo.gov> (Information Collection Review, Currently under Review).

### I. Abstract

The NPS authorizes private businesses known as concessioners to provide necessary and appropriate visitor facilities and services in areas of the National Park System. Concession authorizations may be assigned, sold, transferred, or encumbered by the concessioner subject to prior written approval of the NPS. The NPS requires that certain information be submitted for review prior to the consummation of any sale, transfer, assignment, or encumbrance. The information requested is used to determine whether or not the proposed transaction will result in an adverse impact on the protection, conservation, or preservation of the resources of the unit of the National Park System; decreased services to the public; the lack of a reasonable opportunity for profit over the remaining term of the authorization; or rates in excess of approved rates to the public. In addition, pursuant to the regulations at 36 CFR part 51, the value of rights for intangible assets such as the concession contract, right of preference in renewal, user days, or low fees, belongs to the Government. If any portion of the purchase price is attributable either directly or indirectly to such assets, the transaction may not be approved. The amount and type of information to be submitted varies with the type and complexity of the proposed transaction. Without such information, the NPS would be unable to determine whether approval of the proposed transaction would be adequate.

### II. Data

*OMB Control Number:* 1024–0126.

*Title:* Proposed Sale of Concession Operations, 36 CFR 51, Subpart J.

*Form(s):* None.

*Type of Request:* Extension of a previously approved collection of information.

*Description of Respondents:* Businesses, nonprofit organizations.

*Respondent Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain a benefit.

*Frequency of Response:* On occasion.

*Estimated Total Annual Responses:* 20

*Estimated Average Completion Time per Response:* 80 hours.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden*

*Hours:* 1,600 hours.

*Estimated Annual Nonhour Burden Cost:* \$5,000.

### III. Request for Comments

We invite comments concerning this ICR on:

- Whether or not the collection of information is necessary, including whether or not the information will have practical utility;
- The accuracy of our estimate of the burden for this collection of information;
- Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and
- Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents.

Please note that the comments submitted in response to this notice are a matter of public record. 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.

Dated: June 19, 2012.

**Madonna L. Baucum,**

*Acting Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2012–15296 Filed 6–21–12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312–52–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS–AKR–KATM–9814; 9926–0902–525]

### Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Brooks River Visitor Access for Katmai National Park and Preserve

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement

on Brooks River Visitor Access for Katmai National Park and Preserve.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on Brooks River Visitor Access for Katmai National Park and Preserve. The document evaluates the environmental impacts of four action alternatives that include bridge and boardwalk systems to replace the existing Brooks River floating bridge and sites to relocate the existing Naknek Lake barge landing area at the mouth of the Brooks River. A no-action alternative is also evaluated. If implemented, this EIS would amend the access provisions of the 1996 Brooks River Area Final Development Concept Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

This notice announces the public comment period, the locations of public meetings, and solicits comments on the DEIS.

**DATES:** Comments on the DEIS must be received no later than August 21, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments on the DEIS should be submitted to Glen Yankus, National Park Service, 240 West 5th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska 99501.

Submit comments electronically through the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment system (PEPC) at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov>. The DEIS may be viewed and retrieved at this Web site as well. Hard copies of the DEIS are available by request from the aforementioned address. See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for the locations of public meetings.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Glen Yankus, National Park Service, Telephone: (907) 644–3535.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Five alternatives for access at the Brooks River area of Katmai National Park are presented in the EIS. Alternative 1 (the no-action alternative) presents a continuation of current management direction and is included as a baseline for comparing the consequences of implementing each alternative. Alternatives 2–5 present different ways of providing access to and within the Brooks River area.

*Alternative 1 (No Action):* This alternative represents a continuation of the existing situation. The no-action alternative would maintain seasonal use of the floating bridge, which is 8 feet wide and about 320 feet long. The bridge would be used by both pedestrians and light utility vehicles. NPS would continue to install and remove the bridge each spring and fall.

The existing barge landing and associated road would remain on the south side of Brooks River.

*Alternative 2:* This alternative evaluates construction of a new bridge and boardwalk system across the Brooks River. This alternative calls for a three-span bridge about 360 feet in length. This bridge would have an 8-foot-wide wooden bridge deck with a steel truss on each side, and span 120 feet between steel pile foundations. The bridge and boardwalk system would have a total estimated length of 1,600 feet. A barge landing would be located on the shore of Naknek Lake about 2,000 feet south of the existing barge landing. A new access road, approximately 1,500 feet long and 14 feet wide, would be constructed to intersect the Valley Road and extend to the new barge landing site on Naknek Lake.

*Alternative 3:* This alternative evaluates construction of a new bridge and boardwalk system across the Brooks River. The bridge would be a pre-engineered bridge approximately 415 feet in length. The bridge and boardwalk system would have a total estimated length of 850 feet. A new barge landing site would be located approximately 200 feet south of the mouth of the Brooks River. A new road segment (about 100 ft. long) would be constructed from the existing access road and extend to a new Naknek Lake barge landing site.

*Alternative 4 (NPS Preferred Alternative):* This alternative evaluates construction of a new wooden bridge and boardwalk system across the Brooks River. The bridge would be approximately 350 feet in length with a minimum distance of 24 feet between piles. The bridge and boardwalk system would have a total estimated length of 1,550 feet. A barge landing would be located on the shore of Naknek Lake about 2,000 feet south of the existing barge landing. A new access road, approximately 1,500 feet long and 14 feet wide, would intersect the Valley Road and extend to the new barge landing site on Naknek Lake.

*Alternative 5:* This alternative evaluates construction of a new wooden bridge and boardwalk system across the Brooks River. The bridge would be approximately 350 feet in length with a minimum distance of 24 feet between piles. The bridge and boardwalk system would have a total estimated length of 1,100 feet. A barge landing would be located on the shore of Naknek Lake about 2,000 feet south of the existing barge landing. A new access road, approximately 1,500 feet long and 14 feet wide, would intersect the Valley Road and extend to the new barge landing site on Naknek Lake.

Public meetings are scheduled in Alaska at the following locations: Anchorage, Homer, and King Salmon, Alaska. The specific dates and times of the meetings and public meetings will be announced in local media.

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 to withhold your personal information from public review we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. We will always make submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives of or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

**Sue E. Masica,**

*Regional Director, Alaska.*

[FR Doc. 2012-15285 Filed 6-21-12; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-HD-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

[NPS-WASO-TPS-9445: 2200-686]

#### Notice of Intent To Modify Schedule of Fees for Reviewing Historic Preservation Certification Applications

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice; Request for public comment.

**SUMMARY:** This notice alerts the public to proposed changes to the fees the National Park Service (NPS) charges for reviewing Historic Preservation Certification Applications. The current fees were set in 1984 and have not been changed since then.

**DATES:** Written comments will be accepted until July 23, 2012.

**ADDRESSES:** You may submit comments by any of the following methods: email: [michael\\_auer@nps.gov](mailto:michael_auer@nps.gov); fax: 202-371-1616, Attention: Michael Auer Mail; Michael Auer, Technical Preservation Services, National Park Service, 1201 "Eye" St. NW., Org Code 2200, Washington, DC 20240.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Goeken, Chief, Technical Preservation Services, National Park Service, 1849 C St. NW., Org Code 2255, Washington, DC 20240, or email: [brian\\_goeken@nps.gov](mailto:brian_goeken@nps.gov), or telephone at 202-354-2033.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## Background

The NPS charges fees for reviewing certification applications for Federal tax incentives contained in Section 47 of the Internal Revenue Code (referred to herein as "Historic Preservation Certification Applications"). The fees have not been changed since 1984, despite the increased costs to the government of administering the Historic Preservation Tax Incentives Program. Current fees do not cover the full costs of administering the program.

### What is the authority for this action?

The authority for this action is title V of the Independent Offices Appropriations Act (IOAA) of 1952, codified at 31 U.S.C. 9701, which authorizes the head of a federal agency to "prescribe regulations establishing the charge for a service or thing of value provided by the agency." *Id.* § 9701(b). Each charge must be fair and must be based on the costs to the Government, the value of the service or thing to the recipient, public policy, and other relevant facts. *Id.* § 9701(b)(2); *see also* OMB Circular A-25 and 36 CFR 67.11(a).

### Why is the NPS adjusting fees at this time?

The fee schedule established in 1984 expressed the fees in fixed dollar amounts and did not contain provisions for adjusting the fees over time. This method contrasts with the now-standard Government practice of establishing and revising fees in periodic **Federal Register** notices, pursuant to the IOAA and OMB Circular A-25. Accordingly, the NPS published a final rulemaking, effective June 27, 2011, which stated that "Fees are charged for reviewing certification requests according to the schedule and instructions provided in public notices in the **Federal Register** by NPS." 36 CFR 67.11(a) (2011). This rule authorizes the NPS to make the changes it now proposes.

In planning to revise fees, the NPS studied its direct and indirect costs associated with the review of Historic Preservation Certification Applications. The NPS found that the 1984 fee schedule does not cover these costs. The current fee schedule therefore fails to meet the IOAA objective that agencies such as the NPS establish fees for specific services provided to identifiable recipients such that the service provided may be "self-sustaining to the extent possible." 31 U.S.C. 9701(a).

The NPS also studied application fees charged by State governments under similar State historic preservation tax credit programs, as well as fees charged