unlikely to recover to a management approved condition as a result of the event. Such activities shall be limited to: repair and installation of essential erosion control structures; replacement or repair of existing culverts, roads, trails, fences, and minor facilities; construction of protection fences; planting, seeding, and mulching; and removal of hazard trees, rocks, soil, and other mobile debris from, on or along roads, trails, campgrounds, and watercourses.

These activities: 
(a) Shall be completed within one year following the event; 
(b) Shall not include the use of herbicides or pesticides; 
(c) Shall not include the construction of new roads or other new permanent infrastructure; 
(d) Shall not exceed 4,200 acres; and 
(e) shall be conducted consistent with Bureau and Departmental procedures and applicable land and resource management plans.

J. Other

(1) Maintaining plans in accordance with 43 CFR 1610.5–4. 
(2) Acquisition of existing water developments (e.g., wells and springs) on public land. 
(3) Conducting preliminary hazardous materials assessments and site investigations, site characterization studies and environmental monitoring. Included are siting, construction, installation and/or operation of small monitoring devices such as wells, particulate dust counters and automatic air or water samples. 
(4) Use of small sites for temporary field work camps where the sites will be restored to their natural or original condition within the same work season. 
(5) Reserved. 
(6) A single trip in a one month period for data collection or observation sites. 
(7) Construction of snow fences for safety purposes or to accumulate snow for small water facilities. 
(8) Installation of minor devices to protect human life (e.g., grates across mines). 
(9) Construction of small protective enclosures including those to protect reservoirs and springs and those to protect small study areas. 
(10) Removal of structures and materials of nonhistorical value, such as abandoned automobiles, fences, and buildings, including those built in trespass and reclamation of the site when little or no surface disturbance is involved. 
(11) Actions where BLM has concurrence or coapproval with another DOI agency and the action is categorically excluded for that DOI agency.

Appendix 11.1

Using the Documentation NEPA Adequacy Worksheet and Evaluating the NEPA Adequacy Criteria

This worksheet replaces the worksheet contained in the Instruction Memorandum entitled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy.” During preparation of the worksheet, if you determine that one or more of the criteria are not met, you do not need to complete the worksheet. If one or more of these criteria are not met, you may reject the proposal, modify the proposal or complete appropriate NEPA compliance (EA, EIS, Supplemental EIS, or CX if applicable) and plan amendments before proceeding with the proposed action.

Worksheet: Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior; Bureau of Land Management (BLM)


A. Description of the Proposed Action

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Date Approved

Other document Date Approved

Other document Date Approved

* List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

C. Identify Applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Documents and Other Related Documents That Cover the Proposed Action

List by name and date applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, the proposed action or the selected alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, public interest, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

3. Is the existing analysis adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (i.e. rangeland health standards assessments; recent Endangered Species listings; updated lists of BLMSensitive Species)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

4. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name Resource/Agency Represented

Title

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes the BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

Signature of Project Lead:

Signature of NEPA Coordinator:

Signature of the Responsible Official:

Date:

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA, is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

[FR Doc. E6–775 Filed 1–24–06; 8:45 am] BILING CODE 4310–84–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

2006 Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp (Federal Duck Stamp) Contest

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: We, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, announce the dates and location of the 2006 Federal Duck Stamp contest, and the species eligible to be subjects for this year’s designs. The 2006 contest will be the second
contest to take place outside of Washington, DC. We invite the public to enter and to attend.

DATES:
1. The official date to begin submission of entries to the 2006 contest is June 1, 2006. All entries must be postmarked no later than midnight, Monday, August 15, 2006.
2. The public may view the 2006 Federal Duck Stamp entries at the Memphis location (see ADDRESSES) beginning on Monday, September 25, 2006 (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.), and through all the days of judging. Judging will be held on Friday, October 6, 2006, beginning at 6 p.m., and on Saturday, October 7, 2006, beginning at 9 a.m., at the Memphis location.

ADDRESSES: Requests for complete copies of the contest rules, reproduction rights agreement, and display and participation agreement may be requested by calling 1–703–358–2000, or requests may be addressed to: Federal Duck Stamp Contest, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Mail Stop MBSP–4070, Arlington, VA 22203–1622. You may also download the information from the Federal Duck Stamp Web site at http://duckstamps.fws.gov.

The contest will be held at the Memphis College of Art in Overton Park, 1930 Poplar Avenue, Memphis, TN 38104.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Ryan W. Booth, Federal Duck Stamp Office, by phone at (703) 358–2004, or by e-mail to Ryan_W_Booth@fws.gov, or by fax at (703) 358–2009.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
On March 16, 1934, Congress passed and President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act (16 U.S.C. 718–718j, 48 Stat. 452). Popularly known as the Duck Stamp Act, it required all waterfowl hunters 16 years or older to buy a stamp annually. The revenue generated was originally earmarked for the Department of Agriculture, but 5 years later was transferred to the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to buy or lease waterfowl sanctuaries. Regulations governing the contest appear at 50 CFR part 91.

In the years since, the Federal Duck Stamp Program has become one of the most popular and successful conservation programs ever initiated. Today, some 1.8 million stamps are sold each year, and as of 2004, Federal Duck Stamps have generated more than $700 million for the preservation of more than 5.2 million acres of waterfowl habitat in the United States. Numerous other birds, mammals, fish, reptiles, and amphibians have similarly prospered because of habitat protection made possible by the program. An estimated one-third of the Nation’s endangered and threatened species find food or shelter in wetland habitat. Moreover, the protected wetlands help dissipate storms, purify water supplies, store flood water, and nourish fish hatchlings important for sport and commercial fishermen.

The Contest
The first Federal Duck Stamp was designed at President Franklin Roosevelt’s request in 1934 by Jay N. “Ding” Darling, a nationally known political cartoonist for the Des Moines Register and a noted hunter and wildlife conservationist. In subsequent years, noted wildlife artists were asked to submit designs. The first contest was opened in 1949 to any U.S. artist who wished to enter, and 65 artists submitted a total of 88 design entries in what remains the only art competition of its kind sponsored by the U.S. Government. The Secretary of the Interior appoints a panel of noted art, waterfowl, and philatelic authorities to select each year’s design. Winners receive no compensation for their work, except a pane of their stamps, but winners may sell prints of their designs, which are sought by hunters, conservationists, and art collectors.

The 2006 contest will be the second contest to take place outside of Washington, DC. We plan to hold future duck stamp contests in various U.S. locations corresponding to flyways.

Contest Fee: All entrants must submit a nonrefundable fee of $125.00 by cashier’s check, certified check, or money order made payable to: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Eligible species
The following species are eligible for the 2006 contest: American wigeon, wood duck, gadwall, ring-necked duck, and cinnamon teal. Entries featuring a species other than the above listed species will be disqualified.


Thomas O. Melius,
Acting Director.

BILLING CODE 4310–55–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Submission of Information Collection to the Office of Management and Budget for Review Under the Paperwork Reduction Act

AGENCY: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of request for renewal.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, this notice announces that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is submitting an information collection to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for renewal. The collection concerns the Student Transportation Form. We are requesting a renewal of clearance and requesting comments on this information collection.

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before February 24, 2006.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments on the information collection to the Desk Officer for Department of the Interior at the Office of Management and Budget, by facsimile to (202) 395–6666 or you may send an e-mail to OIRA_DOCKET@omb.eop.gov.

Send copies of comments to the Office of Indian Education Programs, 1840 C Street, NW., Mail Stop 3609–MIB, Washington, DC 20240.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract
The Student Transportation regulations in 25 CFR part 39, subpart G, contain the program eligibility and criteria, which govern the allocation of transportation funds. Information collected from the schools will be used to determine the rate per mile. The information collection is needed to provide transportation mileage for Bureau-funded schools, which will receive an allocation of transportation funds.

II. Request for Comments
A 60-day notice requesting comments was published on July 11, 2005 (70 FR 39787). There were no comments received regarding that notice. You are invited to comment on the following items to the Desk Officer at OMB at the citation in ADDRESSES section:

(a) Whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the