

Building, Washington, DC 20510-3002
 Honorable Robert G. Torricelli U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510-3001
 Honorable Richard Santorum, U.S. Senate, SR 120 Senate Russell Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510
 Honorable Arlen Specter, U.S. Senate, SH-530 Hart Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510-3802
 Honorable Pat Toomey, U.S. House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Bldg., Washington DC 20515
 Honorable Don Sherwood, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington DC 20515-3810
 Honorable Margaret Roukema, U.S. House of Representatives, 2244 Rayburn House Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20515-3005
 Honorable Tom Ridge, State Capitol, Harrisburg, PA 17120
 Honorable Christine Whitman, State House, Trenton, NJ 08625
 Kemp Library, East Stroudsburg University, E Stroudsburg PA 18301
 State Library of Pennsylvania, P.O. Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105
 Easton Area Public Library, 6th and Church Street, Easton PA 18042
 Sussex County Library, 125 Morris Turnpike, Newton NJ 07860
 New Jersey State Library, 185 West State Street, CN 520, Trenton NJ 08625
 Eastern Monroe Public Library, 1002 North Ninth Street, Stroudsburg PA 18360
 Pike County Library, 201 Broad Street, Milford PA 18337.
 Dated: June 15, 1999.

J. Robert Kirby,

Acting Superintendent.

[FR Doc. 99-15913 Filed 6-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Availability; Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park Final General Management Plan

AGENCY: National Park Service.

ACTION: Availability for 30 days of Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park Final General Management Plan.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Park Service announces the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park Final General Management Plan.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement is presented in an abbreviated format. It must be integrated with the Marsh-Billings National Historical Park Draft General Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued in April 1998, to be considered a complete document reflecting the full proposal and alternative, and all significant environmental impacts. The two documents *together* compose the complete Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park is the only national park to focus on conservation history and the evolving nature of land stewardship in America. Opened in June of 1998, Vermont's first national park preserves and interprets the historic Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller property in Woodstock. The park is named for George Perkins Marsh, Frederick Billings, and Laurance S. Rockefeller. George Perkins Marsh was one of the nation's first global environmental thinkers (who grew up on the property). Frederick Billings was an early conservationist who established a progressive dairy farm and professionally managed forest on the former Marsh farm. Frederick Billings's granddaughter, Mary French Rockefeller, and her husband, conservationist Laurance S. Rockefeller came to own the property in the 1950s. They sustained Billings's mindful practices in forestry and farming on the property over the latter half of the twentieth century. In 1983, they established the Billings Farm & Museum to continue the farm's working dairy and to interpret rural Vermont life and agricultural history. The Billings Farm & Museum is operated by the Woodstock Foundation, Inc. as a private nonprofit educational institution.

Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park was created in 1992 when the Rockefellers' gave the estate's residential and forest lands to the people of the United States. Today, the park interprets the history of conservation with tours of the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller mansion and the surrounding 550-acre forest—one of the oldest planned and continuously managed woodlands in America. Working in partnership, the park and the museum present historic and contemporary examples of conservation stewardship and interpret the lives and contributions of George Perkins Marsh, Frederick Billings and his descendants, and Mary and Laurance S. Rockefeller.

The National Park began to plan for the management of Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in 1993. Park planners conducted a conservation stewardship workshop, a

community study, visitor and community surveys, a transportation analysis, neighborhood meetings, and other resource inventories and assessments. In a Draft-General Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement that underwent 60 days of public review, the National Park Service presented and evaluated two management scenarios (the Proposal and the Alternative) and described five management options that were considered, but rejected by the planning team. After considering public and agency comment, the National Park Service adopted the draft plan's Proposal as the final plan.

Availability

The FEIS is available for a period for thirty days, beginning on the date of the Environmental Protection Agency publication in the **Federal Register**. The National Park Service will take no action for the thirty-day period of availability, after which time a Record of Decision will be prepared and made available.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public reading copies of the FEIS will be available for review at Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park, 54 Elm Street, Woodstock, Vermont. For further information, please contact the Superintendent, Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park, P.O. Box 178, Woodstock, Vermont 05091; voice at (802) 457-3368; fax at (802) 457-3405.

Dated: May 25, 1999.

Terry W. Savage,

Superintendent, Boston Support Office.

[FR Doc. 99-15912 Filed 6-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Draft Principles of Agreement Regarding the Disposition of Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains

AGENCY: National Park Service

ACTION: Notice

Section 8 (c)(5) of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (25 U.S.C. 3006 (c)(5)) requires the Review Committee to recommend specific actions for developing a process for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable Native American human remains. The Review Committee has developed the following draft principles of agreement

for comment and discussion. The document is intended for wide circulation to elicit comments from Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, museums, Federal agencies, and national scientific and museum organizations.

Anyone interested in commenting on the review committee's draft principles of agreement should send written comments to:

The NAGPRA Review Committee
c/o Departmental Consulting
Archeologist

National Park Service (2275)
1849 C St. NW. (NC340)
Washington DC, 20240

Comments received by August 15, 1999 will be considered by the committee at its next scheduled meeting. For additional information, please contact Dr. C. Timothy McKeown at (202) 343-4101.

Note: We will not accept any comments in electronic form.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

Francis P. McManamon,

*Departmental Consulting Archeologist,
Manager, Archeology and Ethnography
Program.*

DRAFT PRINCIPLES OF AGREEMENT

At its June 25-27, 1998 meeting, the NAGPRA Review Committee examined the legislative history of NAGPRA and discussed both the law's intent and how to proceed with one of the Committee's most pressing tasks-- making recommendations on the disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains. One result was a set of principles. Working from these, the Review Committee offers the following draft principles of agreement as a next step for discussion. The Committee wishes to underscore the preliminary nature of these principles and their placement as a beginning point for consideration of this topic.

A. Intent of NAGPRA.

1. The legislative intent of NAGPRA is stated by the statute's title, the "Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act".

2. Specifically, the statute mandates:

a. The disposition of all Native American human remains and cultural items excavated on Federal lands after November 16, 1990,

b. The repatriation of culturally affiliated human remains and associated funerary objects in Federal agency and museum collections,

c. The development of regulations for the disposition of unclaimed remains and objects (under 25 U.S.C. 3002) and culturally unidentified human remains in Federal agency and museum collections (under 25 U.S.C. 3006).

3. The legal standing of funerary objects associated with culturally unidentifiable human remains is not addressed by NAGPRA and is beyond the Review Committee's charge.

4. While the statute does not always specify disposition, it is implicit that:

a. The process be primarily in the hands of Native people (as the nearest next of kin),

b. Repatriation is the most reasonable and consistent choice.

5. Additionally, a fundamental tension exists within the statute between the legitimate and long denied need to return control over ancestral remains and funerary objects to Native people, and the legitimate public interest in the educational, historical and scientific information conveyed by those remains and objects. (25 U.S.C. 3002 (c); 25 U.S.C. 3005 (b))

B. Culturally Unidentifiable Human Remains.

1. Federal agencies and museums must make a decision as to whether all Native American human remains are related to lineal descendants, culturally affiliated with a present day Federally recognized Indian tribe, or are culturally unidentifiable. This determination must be made through a good faith evaluation of all relevant, available documentation and consultation with any appropriate Indian tribe.

2. A determination that human remains are culturally unidentifiable may change as additional information becomes available.

3. Human remains can be identified as "culturally unidentifiable" for different reasons. At present, four categories are recognized:

a. Those which are culturally affiliated, but with a non-Federally recognized Native American group.

b. Those which represent a defined past population, but for which no present day Indian tribe exists.

c. Those for which some evidence exists, but insufficient for a Federal agency or museum to make a determination of cultural affiliation.

d. Those for which no information exists.

C. Guidelines for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains.

1. Four principles must serve as the foundation for any regulations on the disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains. They must be:

a. *Respectful.* Culturally unidentifiable human remains are no less deserving of respect than those for which culturally affiliation can be established. While the Review Committee is aware that the term "culturally unidentifiable" is inherently

offensive to many Native people, it is the term used in the statute.

b. *Equitable.* Regulations must be perceived as fair and within the intent of the statute.

c. *Doable.* Regulations must propose a process that is possible for Federal agencies, museums, and claimants and worth the effort to implement.

d. *Enforceable.* There is no point in making regulations that can not or will not be enforced.

2. Since human remains may be determined to be culturally unidentifiable for different reasons, there will be more than one appropriate disposition/repatriation solution.

Examples:

a. Human remains that are, technically, culturally unidentifiable because the appropriate claimant is not federally recognized [section B(3)(a.) above], may be repatriated once federal recognition has been granted, or if the claimant works with another culturally affiliated, federally recognized Indian tribe (example-- the Titicut site / Mashpee case).

b. Human remains for which there is little or no information [section B(3)(c. and d.) above] should be speedily repatriated since they have little educational, historical or scientific value.

3. Documentation.

a. Since documentation is required (25 U.S.C. 3003 (b)(2)), it is appropriate that it be conducted in accordance with defined standards.

b. Documentation should be proportional to the importance of the information conveyed. For example, remains from a defined past population for which no present-day Indian tribe exists [section B(3)(b.) above] are of far greater educational, historical and scientific importance than those for which there is little or no information [section B(3)(c) and (d) above].

c. Appropriate documentation includes non-invasive techniques such as measurement, description and photography.

d. Invasive testing is not required for statutory documentation. Such testing may be performed if agreed upon by the parties in consultation.

e. Documentation prepared for compliance with the statute is a public record.

D. Models for the disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains.

1. Joint recommendations by institutions, Federal agencies, or states and appropriate claimants. The Review Committee has recommended the repatriation of culturally unidentifiable human remains in those cases where:

- a. All the relevant parties have agreed in writing.
- b. Statutory requirements have been met.
- c. The guidelines listed above have been followed.

These cases have included institutions (University of Nebraska, Lincoln), units of the National Park Service (Carlsbad Caverns NP and Guadalupe Mountains NM), and states (Minnesota and Iowa).

2. Regional consultations

Historical and cultural factors, and therefore issues concerning the definition and disposition of culturally unidentifiable human remains, vary significantly across the United States. For example, issues in the Southeast, where most Indian tribes were forcibly removed during the 19th century, are very different from those in the Southwest where many Indian tribes remain on their ancestral lands. Similarly, issues in the Northeast and California differ significantly from those in the Great Plains. Therefore, it is reasonable to look for regional solutions that best fit regional circumstances.

The Review Committee recommends a process in which the Federal agencies, institutions and Indian tribes within a region consult together and propose the most appropriate disposition solutions for that region.

As with joint recommendations, any proposed regional disposition must meet both statutory requirements and the guidelines listed above.

[FR Doc. 99-15975 Filed 6-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Central Valley, CA

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare a supplement to the draft programmatic environmental impact statement (DPEIS).

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Bureau of Reclamation is preparing a supplement to the DPEIS for the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. The original DPEIS was released for public review on November 7, 1997, and numerous comments addressing a wide range of issues were received on the document. Reclamation is preparing this supplement in response to a general group of comments received on the

DPEIS. These comments addressed an inconsistency that was discovered in the Project Simulation Model (PROSIM) hydrology shortly before the DPEIS was completed.

DATES: The supplement to the DPEIS will be released to the public in early July 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Alan Candlish, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California 95825; (916) 978-5190.

Dated: June 15, 1999.

Kirk C. Rodgers,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 99-15923 Filed 6-22-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-94-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Privacy Act of 1974, as Amended; System of Records

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of minor changes to a system of records.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended (5 U.S.C. 552a), notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior is updating a system of records managed by the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). The changes are to the system of records "Real Estate Comparable Sales Data Storage, WBR-43" which is published in its entirety below.

DATES: These actions are effective June 23, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For information regarding "Real Estate Comparable Sales Data Storage, WBR-43" contact Mr. Graham McMullen, Chief, Land Resources Branch at (916) 978-5260. For general information regarding Reclamation's Privacy Act program, contact Mr. Casey Snyder at (303) 445-2048.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: When originally published in the **Federal Register** this system of records was identified with an organization prefix of "LWP" (i.e., LWP-43). The content of the system of records is the same; the prefix on this system was changed to reflect organizational changes.

This system of records notice was previously published in the **Federal Register** on March 11, 1980 (45 FR 15684). This publication revises the system location, adds a purpose statement which was not included in the original system of records notice,

and revises the storage, retention and disposal, and system manager and address sections. All other changes proposed are editorial in nature.

Murlin Coffey,

Manager, Property and Office Services.

INTERIOR/WBR-43

SYSTEM NAME:

Real Estate Comparable Sales Data Storage.

SYSTEM LOCATION:

Mid-Pacific Regional Office, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento, California 95825.

CATEGORIES OF INDIVIDUALS COVERED BY THE SYSTEM:

Individuals who own or lease property adjacent to or within the vicinity of property owned or leased by the Bureau of Reclamation.

CATEGORIES OF RECORDS IN THE SYSTEM:

Records contain data on the physical and nonphysical characteristics of properties having transferred ownership within the vicinity of Federal reclamation projects. Ownership transfers are defined herein as a transfer by deed, agreements to sell or purchase, leases, and contracts. In addition to the property characteristics, the records contain the terms, names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the parties involved, plus other official recorded data.

AUTHORITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF THE SYSTEM:

(1) The Reclamation Act of 1902, as amended and acts supplemental thereto, 43 U.S.C. 371, *et seq.*; and (2) Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, 42 U.S.C. 4651, *et seq.*

PURPOSE(S):

(1) To make available to the Department of the Interior data concerning real estate which has transferred ownership within the vicinity of a Bureau of Reclamation project; (2) For use as comparable data involving real estate appraisals in connection with acquisition programs, land disposals or leases of land owned by the United States, or appraisals of excess land in compliance with the acreage limitation; and (3) To make available to independent appraisers, which are under contract with the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Justice, comparable data for use in connection with an appraisal assignment.