

Dated: October 2, 1997.

John E. Crowley,

Acting Director, Intermountain Region.

[FR Doc. 97-27407 Filed 10-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Record of Decision; Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement; Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana

ACTION: Notice of approval of Record of Decision.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has prepared a Record of Decision on the Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Nez Perce National Historical Park in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and Big Hole National Battlefield in Montana.

DATE: The Record of Decision was recommended by the Superintendent of Nez Perce National Historical Park, concurred by the Deputy Regional Director, Pacific West Region, and approved by the Regional Director, Pacific West Region, on September 23, 1997.

ADDRESS: Inquiries regarding the Record of Decision or the Environmental Impact Statement should be submitted to the Superintendent, Nez Perce National Historical Park, P.O. Box 93, Spaulding, ID 83551; telephone: (208) 843-2261.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The text of the Record of Decision follow.

The Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has prepared this Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the General Management Plan for Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington and Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana. This Record of Decision is a statement of the decision made, the background of the project, other alternatives considered, public involvement in the decision making process, the basis for the decision, the environmentally preferable alternative, and measures to minimize environmental harm.

The Decision (Selected Action)

The National Park Service will implement the actions common to all sites and all alternatives along with the proposed actions and final boundaries for individual sites within the park. Some actions remain consistent with those presented in the Draft Environmental Impact. Others were modified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement to respond to public comments and concerns. Implementing actions are synonymous with Alternative 1 for 6 sites, Alternative 2 for 25 sites, and Alternative 3 for 7 sites.

Many overall actions would be designed to unify the various individual park sites. Nez Perce life ways would be respected. Plans would be developed to manage resources and vegetation, eliminate exotic and noxious plants, and reintroduce native species. The park would continue to work with local governments on issues that could affect park resources. Nez Perce people would be encouraged to participate in decisions about park planning, management, and operation. The current overall general park management approach would be retained with the appropriate additions and changes of selected, specific management techniques. Incremental steps would be taken to improve visitor services and operations. More cooperative agreements and other partnership mechanisms would be developed as needed to protect resources, and improve interpretation. Some facilities would be rehabilitated or expanded, modest developments would be added at some sites to meet requirements, and some historic structures would be adaptively used.

Background of the Project

The need to prepare the General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement resulted from the addition of 14 sites to the park in 1992 and because several important new issues needed resolution and revised direction and renewed focus was necessary.

Other Alternatives Considered

At each site, two other alternatives to the selected action were considered. The alternative that became the selected action varied from site to site. At each site, Alternative 1 was the No Action alternative. Under this alternative the accomplishment of many of the park's goals and objectives would continue to hinge on partnership through various types of formal and informal agreements, and viewsheds and cultural resources would continue to be

protected through cooperative agreements, memorandums of understanding, scenic easements, or purchase on a willing-seller basis. While some individual sites are already adequately protected, under the No Action Alternative adverse impacts to cultural resources would potentially occur at other sites because this alternative provides the least additional protection of resources compared to the other alternatives. At most sites, few or no impacts to natural resources would occur. Interpretive information for visitors would be improved at most sites. The visitor experience would be enhanced because the interconnection of the various park sites would be made clear.

Under Alternative 2, the general management direction of the park would be retained unchanged. But, appropriate management techniques, based on individual circumstances would be applied. Incremental steps would be taken to fulfill requirements and standards for land and resource protection, visitor services, and operations. More cooperative agreements and other partnership mechanisms would be developed as needed to protect and interpret resources. Studies would be conducted to amplify and correct the interpretive story and to identify and protect natural and cultural resources. The existing facilities would be rehabilitated or expanded, and modest developments would be added at some sites to meet operational and visitor use requirements. Some new visitor facilities would be built and others rehabilitated, and several overlooks and pullouts would be constructed or relocated. Some historic structures would be adaptively used. These actions would be accomplished in partnership with other agencies and organizations.

Under Alternative 3, more facility development and a greater capital investment to develop new visitor facilities and the operational costs associated with added personnel for certain locations would occur. At a few sites visitation would increase more, and in a few cases interpretation would be improved through the addition of more park personnel or their presence for more months each year. There would be more capital improvement expenditures for the construction of new interpretive facilities, the enhancement of existing interpretive facilities, and the rehabilitation of several historic buildings.

Basis for Decision

After careful evaluation of public comments throughout the planning

process, including comments on the Draft and Final GMP/EIS, the selected action best accomplishes the legislated purpose of the park and battlefield. This includes facilitating the protection and interpretation of sites in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Montana that have exceptional value in commemorating a portion of the history of the United States and that balances the statutory mission of the National Park Service to provide long-term protection of the units' resources and significance while allowing for appropriate levels of visitor use and appropriate means of visitor enjoyment. The selected action also best accomplishes identified management goals and desired future conditions, with the fewest environmental impacts.

Environmentally Preferable Alternative

The alternative which causes the least damage to the cultural and biological environment, and that best protects, preserves, and enhances resources is Alternative 2.

Measures To Minimize Environmental Harm

All practicable measures to avoid or minimize environmental impacts that could result from implementation of the selected action have been identified and incorporated into the selected action. Implementation of the selected action would avoid any adverse impacts on wetlands and any endangered or threatened species or that would result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of such species. Protection of viewsheds and cultural resources not currently owned by the National Park Service would be done through cooperative agreements, memorandums of understanding, scenic easements, or purchase on a willing-seller basis.

Public Involvement

Public comment has been requested, considered, and incorporated throughout this planning process in numerous ways. The National Park Service held 21 public scoping meetings in Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and Montana in January and February 1995. A newsletter was mailed to approximately 1,600 addresses announcing these meetings and that presented the purpose, significance, and interpretive themes for the park. A second newsletter presenting the desired future for the park was distributed. A 50-page Alternatives Newsbook was distributed in April 1996. Informal meetings on the alternatives were also held. In July 1996, postcards indicating which alternative was selected for the proposed action

park-wide and for each individual site were distributed. Workshops were held in 16 communities near park sites, on the draft EIS. Consultation was also completed with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Forest Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Oregon, Montana, Idaho and Washington State Historic Preservation Offices, Native American tribes, state and local governments and organizations.

Dated: October 2, 1997.

Rory D. Westberg,

Superintendent, Columbia Cascades Support Office, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 97-27408 Filed 10-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Acadia National Park, Bar Harbor, Maine; Acadia National Park Advisory Commission; Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463, 86 Stat. 770, 5 U.S.C. App. 1, Sec. 10), that the Acadia National Park Advisory Commission will hold a meeting on Monday, October 27, 1997.

The Commission was established pursuant to Pub. L. 99-420, sec. 103. The purpose of the commission is to consult with the Secretary of the Interior, or his designee, on matters relating to the management and development of the park, including but not limited to the acquisition of lands and interests in lands (including conservation easements on islands) and termination of rights of use and occupancy.

The meeting will convene in the Chart Room, Youth Center Bldg., U.S. Navy Base, Winter Harbor, Maine, at 1 p.m. to consider the following agenda:

1. Review and approval of minutes from the meeting held July 28, 1997.
2. Tour of Schoodic Peninsula.
3. Land Conservation Committee report.
4. U.S. Naval Security Group Activity current mission and future projections.
5. Old business.
6. Superintendent's report.
7. Public comments.
8. Proposed agenda and date of next Commission meeting.

The meeting is open to the public. Interested persons may make oral/written presentations to the Commission or file written statements. Such requests should be made to the Superintendent at least seven days prior to the meeting.

Further information concerning this meeting may be obtained from the Superintendent, Acadia National Park, P.O. Box 177, Bar Harbor, Maine 04609, tel: (207) 288-3338.

Dated: October 3, 1997.

Paul F. Haertel,

Superintendent, Acadia National Park.

[FR Doc. 97-27406 Filed 10-15-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Manzanar National Historic Site Advisory Commission; Meeting

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act that a meeting of the Manzanar National Historic Site Advisory Commission will be held at 1 p.m. on Saturday, October 25, 1997, at the Inyo County Administrative Center, Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 224 N. Edwards Street (U.S. Highway 395), Independence, California, to hear presentations on issues related to the planning, development, and management of Manzanar National Historic Site.

The Advisory Commission was established by Pub. L. 102-248, to meet and consult with the Secretary of the Interior or his designee, with respect to the development, management, and interpretation of the site, including the preparation of a general management plan for the Manzanar National Historic Site. Members of the Commission are as follows:

Ms. Sue Kunitomi Embrey, Chairperson
Mr. William Michael, Vice Chairperson
Mr. Keith Bright
Ms. Martha Davis
Mr. Ronald Izumita
Mr. Gann Matsuda
Mr. Vernon Miller
Mr. Mas Okui
Mr. Glenn Singley
Mr. Richard Stewart

The main agenda items at this meeting of the Commission will include the following:

- (1) Status report on the development of Manzanar National Historic Site by Superintendent Ross R. Hopkins.
- (2) General discussion of miscellaneous matters pertaining to future Commission activities and Manzanar National Historic Site development issues.
- (3) Public comment period.

This meeting is open to the public. It will be recorded for documentation and transcribed for dissemination. Minutes of the meeting will be available to the