

allowed by law. If you wish to withhold your name and/or a address, you must state that request prominently at the beginning of your comment. The draft and final stream management plan/environmental impact statement will be made available to all known interested parties and appropriate agencies. Full public participation by Federal, State, and local agencies as well as other concerned organizations and private citizens is invited throughout the preparation process of this document.

Dated: May 10, 2004.

**Ernest Quintana,**

*Regional Director, Midwest Region.*

[FR Doc. 04-17589 Filed 8-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-94-M

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Bison Brucellosis Vaccine, Environmental Impact Statement, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate a park-wide program for remote delivery of a brucellosis vaccine to bison in Yellowstone National Park.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with section 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), the National Park Service (NPS) is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for a remote delivery brucellosis vaccination program for bison in Yellowstone National Park. Remote delivery in this proposed action is distinguished from hand delivery that occurs in penned situations at or near Yellowstone National Park's boundaries that is authorized under a 2000 Record of Decision (ROD). The purpose of and need for the action is to implement a program to deliver a suitable vaccine to wild and free ranging bison without capturing and handling individual animals. A brucellosis vaccine would be delivered to untested bison within the park to lower the percentage of the Yellowstone bison population infected with brucellosis. This planning effort will result in a decision determining whether or not to implement remote delivery of a vaccine to free-ranging bison inside Yellowstone National Park. The alternatives to be considered include no-action, and an adaptive management strategy to implement a program using currently available technology while pursuing new research

and development of improved techniques. The major issues to resolve include: (1) The effectiveness and safety in wildlife of a remote delivery system, (2) The effectiveness and safety of a vaccine for bison, (3) The human health and safety of park staff and visitors, and (4) The visitor experience.

A scoping brochure has been prepared that details the background and issues identified to date. Copies of that information may be obtained by contacting the Bison Ecology and Management Office, POB 168, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, 82190-0168 or by viewing the brochure at the Yellowstone National Park Web site <http://www.nps.gov/yell>.

**DATES:** The National Park Service will accept comments from the public for 30 days from the date this notice is published in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Information will be available for public review and comment at the Yellowstone Center for Resources, Yellowstone National Park, P.O. Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, 82190-0168 (307) 344-2393.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Bison Ecology and Management Office, Yellowstone National Park, P.O. Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, 82190-0168. Telephone: 307-344-2505.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In 2000, the NPS, in collaboration with the State of Montana, the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and USDA National Forest Service, developed a final Interagency Bison Management Plan (IBMP). The NPS evaluated alternatives for the IBMP in an EIS, which focused on a study area including the park and adjacent areas in Montana. The purpose of the IBMP is to maintain a free-ranging population of bison and address the risk of brucellosis transmission to cattle to protect the economic interests and viability of the livestock industry in Montana. The Record of Decision (ROD) for the IBMP directed the partner agencies to vaccinate bison at capture facilities when a vaccine is shown to be safe according to the criteria defined in the IBMP. The ROD also directed the NPS to develop an in-park remote vaccination program for free ranging bison when a safe and effective vaccine becomes available and when a safe and effective remote delivery system is developed to further reduce the risk of transmission of brucellosis from bison to cattle.

The environmental consequences of a park-wide program for remote delivery of vaccine to free-ranging bison were not

analyzed in the final EIS for the IBMP. Research has shown that a safe and effective vaccine using a safe and effective delivery system now exists. Consequently, the NPS is preparing an EIS to analyze alternatives for a remote delivery program for administering brucellosis vaccine to bison within the entirety of Yellowstone National Park. To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are identified and taken into account, all interested individuals, organizations, and agencies are invited to provide comments through attendance at public scoping meetings, submission of comments through access to the Yellowstone National Park Web site, or submission of written comments mailed directly to the Bison Ecology and Management Office at Yellowstone National Park during the scoping period. In addition, you may hand deliver comments to receptionists at the Superintendent's office, the park planning office, and the Yellowstone Center for Resources, all located in the headquarters area at Mammoth, Wyoming.

The public is advised that individual commentor names and addresses may be included as part of the public record. Names and addresses of individuals submitting comments will be available for public review during regular business hours. Any person, business or organization wishing to have their name and other information withheld from the public record must state this prominently at the beginning of any correspondence or comment. The request will be honored to the extent allowable by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be placed in the public record and will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

Dated: June 17, 2004.

**Stephen P. Martin,**

*Regional Director, Intermountain Region.*

[FR Doc. 04-17586 Filed 8-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-CT-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Clark County, Washington; Notice of Approval of Record of Decision**

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy

Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91–190, as amended) and the implementing regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service has prepared, and the Regional Director, Pacific West Region has approved, the Record of Decision for the General Management Plan for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, in southwestern Washington. The formal no-action period was officially initiated January 22, 2004, with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's **Federal Register** notification of the filing of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

**Decision:** As soon as practicable the NPS will begin to implement the General Management Plan described and analyzed as the *Proposed Action (Alternative B)* contained in the abbreviated Final EIS. The selected plan features a deliberate, long-term strategy to protect historic, cultural, and natural resources, while providing for improved visitor experience and increased educational opportunities. Various programs and projects to be accomplished in partnership with others are included. This plan was also deemed to be the "environmentally preferred" alternative.

This course of action and two alternatives were identified and analyzed in the Final EIS, and previously in the Draft EIS (the latter was distributed in November 2002). The full spectrum of foreseeable environmental consequences were assessed, and appropriate mitigation measures identified, for each alternative. Beginning with early scoping, through the preparation of the Draft and Final EIS, numerous public meetings were conducted and newsletter updates were regularly provided. Approximately 118 written comments (and about 185 oral comments at public meetings) responding to the Draft EIS were received and duly considered. As no substantive or adverse comments were received, an abbreviated Final EIS was prepared (and released for a 30-day no-action period which commenced on January 22, 2004). Key consultations which aided in preparing the Draft and Final EIS involved (but were not limited to) the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USDA Wildlife Service, Oregon and Washington State Historic Preservation Offices, Washington State Dept. of Transportation, three native American Tribes, cities of Vancouver and Oregon City, and Clark County.

**Copies:** Interested parties desiring to review the Record of Decision may obtain a complete copy by contacting

the Superintendent, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, 612 E. Reserve St., Vancouver, WA 98661; or via telephone request at (360) 696–7655.

Dated: June 2, 2004.

**Patricia L. Neubacher,**

*Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.*

[FR Doc. 04–17587 Filed 8–2–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312–52–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Notice of Availability of a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Coronado National Memorial

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91–190, 83 Stat. 852, 853, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service announces the availability of the Record of Decision for the General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for Coronado National Memorial, Arizona. On May 28, 2004, the Director, Intermountain Region approved the Record of Decision for the project. As soon as practical, the National Park Service will begin to implement the General Management Plan, described as the Preferred Alternative contained in the FEIS issued on April 16, 2004. In the preferred alternative, the visitor center will be rehabilitated and updated interpretation offered. The Montezuma Ranch area will be restored to natural contours and revegetated with native species. The abandoned powerline along the road to Montezuma Pass will be removed and revegetated with native species. Grazing in the national memorial will be discontinued. An annex will be built behind the visitor center containing additional office and storage space, along with a multipurpose room. Additional pullouts and waysides will be developed along the main road as well as trails in the memorial's grasslands. A new group picnic area will be developed. The visitor shelter at Montezuma Pass will be converted into a minimal contact station. A new four-unit structure might be added to house temporary employees. The park will work toward creating an offsite cultural festival to celebrate various cultures associated with the memorial, emphasizing the historical aspects of the

Coronado Expedition. The park staff will promote special events highlighting the Coronado Expedition, its legacy, and its impact of the present American Southwest. This course of action and four alternatives were analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences were assessed, and appropriate mitigating measures identified.

The full Record of Decision includes a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a finding on impairment of park resources and values, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, and an overview of public involvement in the decision-making process.

### Basis for Decision

In reaching its decision to select the preferred alternative, the National Park Service considered the purposes for which Coronado National Memorial was established, and other laws and policies that apply to lands in the memorial, including the Organic Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and the *NPS Management Policies*. The National Park Service also carefully considered public comments received during the planning process. To develop a preliminary preferred alternative, the planning team evaluated the alternatives that had been reviewed by the public. To minimize the influence of individual biases and opinions, the team used an objective analysis process called "Choosing by Advantages." This process has been used extensively by government agencies and the private sector. The following conclusions were reached:

- Alternative B will best safeguard the resources and scenic values of Coronado National memorial while making those resources easily accessible for visitors.

- Alternative B best preserves the park's cultural landscapes through application of management zones that provide for a better understanding and appreciation of the park's cultural landscapes by limited future development away from areas that contain cultural landscapes.

- Alternative B will maintain the archeological and historic integrity of the park by providing better protection of the cultural resources through ending the impacts of grazing on these resources.

- Alternative B will enhance the visitor's experience by providing multiple opportunities for visitors to make intellectual and emotional