

Some individuals have expressed concerns during the scoping and comment periods regarding the alternatives for managing the deer population in the parks. Some of the expressed concerns relating to the selected alternative included: Killing deer on a historic battlefield; that animals will lose their life; and that NPS personnel, not hunters, will kill deer in the parks. The NPS acknowledges the feelings and concerns of these individuals. Keeping in mind the purpose for which each park was established, however, this action was chosen to maintain the historic landscapes of the two parks and aid visitor understanding of the historic events, while ensuring public safety.

Other Alternatives Considered

Nine alternatives for controlling the deer browsing in the parks were dismissed from further analysis for reasons explained in the EIS. The rejected alternatives included: releasing predators; using deterrents, repellents, or poison; hunting in the parks; fencing; converting cropfields to hay and grass; selling the deer; and allowing private landowners to kill as many deer as they wished on their property and sell the carcasses for profit. Six alternatives, including the proposed action, were considered in the EIS. Alternative 1, No Action, considered taking no management action to control the effects of deer browsing in the parks. The NPS statutory mission is to preserve parks for the enjoyment of present and future generations. The historic woodlots could not be perpetuated for future generations under the No Action Alternative because deer browsing would continue to prevent seedlings from becoming established. In addition, the parks could not meet their landscape management objectives for cropfields with the No Action Alternative.

Alternative 2A, Capture and Transfer, discussed deer population management through capturing and relocating the deer. Live trapping for relocation, according to NPS policy, is the preferred method for controlling wildlife populations within parks. Suitable relocation sites outside the parks, however, have not been identified (see p. 61 of the EIS). Deer-related problems are amplified at the release site if deer are transferred to an unsuitable location. The Pennsylvania Game Commission will not support requests for permits to transfer any trapped deer (see Pennsylvania Game Commission comment letter p. 105-1 in final EIS). Transferring deer also requires the long-

term commitment of a large amount of resources.

Alternative 3, Reproductive Intervention, explored surgical sterilization and contraception of deer. This alternative was a component of the preferred alternative in the draft EIS. The use of contraceptives on deer, which are considered food-producing animals, must be approved by the Food and Drug Administration. Contraceptive vaccines and steroids to control deer reproduction for population management have not been approved for use at this time. In addition, surgical sterilization was considered impractical because of the large number of deer in the parks. This alternative was, therefore, rejected and removed from the preferred alternative in the final EIS.

Alternative 2B, Direct Reduction, is management of the deer population in the parks through shooting by NPS personnel and authorized agents. Alternative 4, Cooperative Management, is the combined effort of the NPS, Pennsylvania Game Commission, and nearby private landowners to increase public hunting opportunities outside the parks. These two alternatives comprise the selected alternative, Alternative 5, Combined Management.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The environmentally preferred alternative is the one that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment. It is the alternative or alternatives which best protect, preserve, and enhance the historic, cultural, and natural resources in the area where the proposed action is to take place.

Alternative 5, Combined Management, is the selected action and the environmentally preferred alternative. The combination of shooting deer inside and outside the parks will be the most successful at reducing the number of deer in the parks. This action will reduce the park deer population so park management objectives may be achieved. The historic and cultural resources are particularly important at these parks. The reduced deer density in the parks will make it possible for the historic woodlots to regenerate and the agricultural programs at the battlefield and the Eisenhower Farm to maintain the cropfield component of the cultural landscapes. The reduced level of deer browsing will result in an increase in abundance and diversity of herbaceous and woody vegetation. This reduction, not elimination, of the deer population in the parks will enhance the protection and preservation of the historic, cultural, and other natural resources of each park.

Capture and transfer was initially considered as another environmentally preferred alternative. Suitable relocation sites and transfer permits, however, are not available. Even if relocation sites could be found, the ability of capture and transfer to control deer populations on a long-term basis has not been proven for large populations (see p. 61 of the EIS). This alternative, therefore, was not selected as an environmentally preferred alternative.

Conclusion

The above factors and considerations justify selection of the preferred alternative as identified and detailed in the final EIS.

In July, park personnel will begin dialogue with local private landowners in an effort to increase hunting opportunities on private lands near the parks. An action plan will be written for the deer reduction efforts in the parks. Killing deer to reduce and maintain the population at a level where park landscape management objectives are met is proposed to begin in October, 1995.

Dated: July 5, 1995.

Warren D. Beach,

Northeast Field Area, Acting Associate Field Director.

[FR Doc. 95-17226 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

Subsistence Resource Commission Meeting

SUMMARY: The Superintendent of Gates of the Arctic National Park and the Chairperson of the Subsistence Resource Commission for Gates of the Arctic National Park announce a forthcoming meeting of the Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission.

The following agenda items will be discussed:

- (1) Call to order.
- (2) Roll call.
- (3) Approval of summary of minutes.
- (4) Review agenda.
- (5) Superintendent's introductions and review of the SRC's function and purpose.
- (6) Superintendent's management/research reports.
- (7) Public and agency comments.
- (8) Old business:
 - a. Correspondence.
 - b. Federal Subsistence Program update.
 - c. Regions 6 and 10 boundary adjustments.
 - d. NPS firearms/trapping regulations.
 - e. Hunting Plan Recommendation #11.
- (9) New business:

- a. Harvest monitoring strategies.
 - b. Hunting plan work session.
 - c. Recommendations to Region 10 Council on vacant SRC seat.
- (10) Set time and place of next SRC meeting.
- (11) Adjournment.

DATES: The meeting will be held Tuesday and Wednesday, July 18 and 19, 1995. The meeting will begin at 9 a.m. and end at 5 p.m. on Tuesday and begin at 8:30 a.m. and end at 3 p.m. on Wednesday.

LOCATION: The meeting will be held at the Noel Wein Public Library in Fairbanks, Alaska.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dave Mills, Acting Superintendent, Gates of the Arctic National Park, P.O. Box 74680, Fairbanks, Alaska 99707. Phone (907) 456-0281.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Subsistence Resource Commissions are authorized under Title VIII, Section 808, of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Public Law 96-487, and operate in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committees Act.

Paul R. Anderson,
Acting Field Director.

[FR Doc. 95-17198 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Overseas Private Investment Corporation; Agency Report Form Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Overseas Private Investment Corporation, IDCA.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), agencies are required to submit information collection requests to OMB for review and approval, and to publish a notice in the **Federal Register** notifying the public that the Agency has made such a submission. The proposed form under review is summarized below.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before July 27, 1995. If you anticipate commenting on the form but find that the time to prepare will prevent you from submitting comments promptly, you should advise the OMB Reviewer and the Agency Submitting Officer of your intent as early as possible.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the subject form and the request for review submitted to OMB may be obtained from the Agency

Submitting Officer. Comments on the form should be submitted to the Agency Submitting Officer and the OMB Reviewer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

OPIC Agency Submitting Officer: Lena Paulsen, Manager, Information Center, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, 1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20527; 202/336-8565.

OMB Reviewer: Jeff Hill, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Docket Library, Room 3201, Washington, D.C. 20503; 202/395-7340.

SUMMARY OF FORM UNDER REVIEW:

Type of Request: Revision.

Title: Request for Registration for Political Risk Investment Insurance.

Form Number: OPIC 50.

Frequency of Use: Once per investor per project.

Type of Respondents: Business or other institutions.

Standard Industrial Classification Codes: All.

Description of Affected Public: U.S. Companies investing overseas.

Reporting Hours: ½ hour per project.

Number of Responses: 850 per year.

Federal Cost: \$1060 per year.

Authority for Information Collection: Section 231 and 234 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Abstract (Needs and Uses): OPIC 50 is submitted by eligible investors to register their international investments, and, ultimately, to seek OPIC insurance. By submitting form 50 to OPIC prior to making an irrevocable commitment, the incentive effect of OPIC is demonstrated.

Dated: July 5, 1995.

James R. Offutt,

Assistant General Counsel, Department of Legal Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95-17137 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3210-01-M

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Notice of Appointment of Individuals To Serve as Members of Performance Review Boards

AGENCY: United States International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Appointment of individuals to serve as members of Performance Review Boards.

EFFECTIVE: July 3, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Micheal J. Hillier, Director of Personnel,

U.S. International Trade Commission (202) 205-2651.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Chairman of the U.S. International Trade Commission has appointed the following individuals to serve on the Commission's Performance Review Board (PRB):

Chairman of PRB—Vice Chairman Janet A. Nuzum

Member—Commissioner David B. Rohr
Member—Commissioner Don E. Newquist
Member—Commissioner Carol T. Crawford
Member—Commissioner Lynn M. Bragg
Member—Lyn M. Schlitt
Member—Robert A. Rogowsky
Member—Lynn I. Levine
Member—Eugene A. Rosengarden
Member—Vern Simpson
Member—Lynn Featherstone

Notice of these appointments is being published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the requirement of 5 U.S.C. 4314(c)(4).

Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter can be obtained by contacting our TDD terminal on (202) 205-1810.

Issued: July 7, 1995.

By order of the Chairman.

Donna R. Koehnke,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-17143 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Clean Water Act

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 CFR 50.7, notice is hereby given that a proposed Consent Decree in *United States of America v. ASARCO, Incorporated*, Civil Action No. 8:CV94-188, was lodged on June 28, 1995 with the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska. The Consent Decree resolves civil claims against ASARCO for unpermitted discharges of wastewater containing lead and other pollutants from the Omaha, Nebraska lead refinery in violation of the Clean Water Act. Under the proposed Consent Decree, Settling Defendants will pay a civil penalty of \$3.25 million, will implement two supplemental environmental projects at a cost of \$1 million, and will perform interim and final injunctive measures to control pollutant discharges.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney