

4. The above-listed surveys are now the basic record for describing the lands for all authorized purposes. These surveys have been placed in the open files in the BLM Nevada State Office and are available to the public as a matter of information. Copies of the surveys and related field notes may be furnished to the public upon payment of the appropriate fees.

Dated: June 30, 1995.

**John S. Parrish,**

*Chief Cadastral Surveyor, Nevada.*

[FR Doc. 95-17135 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-HC-P

### Bureau of Reclamation

#### Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Task Force

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, announcement is made of a meeting of the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Task Force.

**DATES:** Wednesday, September 13, 1995, at 8 a.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be at the Victorian Inn, 1709 Main Street, 299 East, Weaverville, California.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Chip Bruss, Trinity River Task Force Secretary, Bureau of Reclamation, MP-153, 2800 Cottage Way, Sacramento CA 95825; Telephone: (916) 979-2482 or TDD (916) 979-2310.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Task Force members will be briefed on a summary of the program, action plan revisions, and progress on the Flow Study Environmental Impact Statement.

The meeting of the Task Force is open to the public. Any member of the public may file a written statement with the Task Force before, during, or after the meeting in person or by mail. To the extent that time permits, the Task Force chairman may allow public presentation of oral statements at the meeting.

Dated: June 23, 1995.

**Dan M. Fults,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 95-17173 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-94-P

### Minerals Management Service

#### Information Collection Submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for Review under the Paperwork Reduction Act

The proposal for the collection of information listed below has been submitted to OMB for approval under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). Copies of the proposed collections of information may be obtained by contacting the Bureau's Clearance Officer at the telephone number listed below. Comments and suggestions on the proposal should be made directly to the Bureau Clearance Officer and to the Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20530, telephone (202) 395-7340, with copies to Renee Gyles, Office of Policy and Management Improvement, Mail Stop 4013, Minerals Management Service, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240.

*Title:* MMS' Generic Customer Satisfaction Surveys.

*Abstract:* Annually, thousands of individuals, Indian Allottees and Tribes, State and local government officials, industry, environmental groups, etc. have contact with the Minerals Management Service by mail, telephone or in person. The collections will obtain information for determining the level of satisfaction with the services provided by MMS to these individuals and organizations and to identify any areas where improvements in providing service could be made.

*Bureau Form Number:* None.

*Frequency:* On occasion, annually.

*Description of Respondents:* Individuals, Indian Allottees and Tribes, State and local governments, businesses and other for-profit organizations, Federal Agencies or employees, non-profit institutions, small businesses and organizations.

*Estimated Completion Time:* .30 hour.

*Annual Responses:* 17,000.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 8,500.

*Bureau Clearance Officer:* Arthur Quintana (703) 787-1239.

Dated: June 28, 1995.

**Hugh Hilliard,**

*Acting Associate Director for Policy and Management Improvement.*

[FR Doc. 95-17174 Filed 7-12-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

### National Park Service

#### Record of Decision on the White-Tailed Deer Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement for Gettysburg National Military Park/ Eisenhower National Historic Site, Pennsylvania

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

**ACTION:** Notice of release.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality in 40 CFR 1505.2, the National Park Service (NPS) has released the Record of Decision (ROD) on the White-tailed Deer Management Plan, Environmental Impact Statement for Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site.

**DATES:** The Record of Decision was recommended by the Superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park/ Eisenhower National Historic Site and approved by the Field Director of the Northeast Field Area on June 28, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Inquiries regarding the Environmental Impact Statement or the Record of Decision should be submitted to the Superintendent, Gettysburg National Military Park, 97 Taneytown Road, Gettysburg, PA 17325, telephone (717) 334-1124.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Introduction

Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site, located in Adams County, Pennsylvania, were established for their historic significance. Gettysburg National Military Park preserves the battlefield at Gettysburg and interprets its significance as one of the most eventful battles of the American Civil War. Eisenhower National Historic Site is adjacent to the battlefield and interprets the life and career of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the important events that occurred there.

The landscapes of the sites are critical to the interpretation of the events that took place in each park. Management objectives for maintaining landscape components, specifically historic woodlots and cropfields, were developed to enhance visitor understanding of each park's events. Perpetuation of the historic woodlots and the rural agricultural scene, according to the management objectives, is not possible because of deer browsing.

## Background

In the late 1970's resource managers at the parks noticed increasing evidence of deer browsing in the historic woodlots. At the same time, permittees that maintain the agricultural fields reported increasing deer browsing on field crops. In 1985, research was begun to document deer browsing impacts to the woodlots and to determine the deer population status, movements, and habitat use. Population surveys commenced in 1987 in the 11 square mile deer study area and have continued to the present. The April mean population estimates have ranged from 721 to 1,441 deer for the study area.

Data from the study showed that the woodlots and cropfields could not be maintained in a way necessary to achieve park management objectives. The high level of deer browsing was preventing a sufficient number of tree seedlings from becoming established, which is needed to perpetuate the historic woodlots. The agricultural program was unable to grow historical crops to maturity in Eisenhower NHS and the southern part of Gettysburg NMP due to deer browsing.

In 1992, the parks proposed to manage the level of deer browsing in the parks so the landscape management objectives could be met. The estimated number of deer in the study area that will have a level of deer browsing that allows the parks to meet their landscape management objectives is approximately 80 deer (see Appendix C and Appendix E of the EIS). The 1995 population survey estimated 1,148 deer in the study area.

Reasonable options for controlling the level of deer browsing were investigated. The decision was made to complete an environmental impact statement (EIS) in order to reach a decision on the best deer management alternative that would enable the parks to meet their management objectives. The EIS process was begun on August 21, 1992, with the publication in the **Federal Register** of a Notice of Intent to prepare a draft EIS. A public information meeting and a scoping meeting were held to identify issues and concerns related to the deer management proposal. The Notice of Availability of the draft EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on November 14, 1994. The comment period on the draft EIS ended February 10, 1995. Substantive comments were responded to in the final EIS which was released May 26, 1995. The Notice of Availability of the final EIS appeared in the May 16, 1995, **Federal Register**.

## The Selected Action

The National Park Service has selected a combination approach (Alternative 5) to reduce the deer population and thus the level of deer browsing in the parks. Alternative 5 is the combination of Alternative 2B and Alternative 4. Deer will be shot in the parks by authorized personnel (Alternative 2B) and hunted outside the parks by licensed hunters in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Game Commission and private landowners (Alternative 4). The two methods will be repeated, as needed, annually from October through April. The deer population will be reduced to a predetermined population density so the parks can meet their landscape management objectives.

## Basis for Decision

The selected action addresses the impacts the deer population has on the historic woodlots and cropfields, which are components of the cultural landscapes of the parks. Without the proposed action, the NPS would have increasing difficulty in maintaining the essential landscape features necessary for understanding the historic occurrences of each park. This action should also reduce deer browsing damage to private property near the parks.

Shooting deer inside and outside of the parks is the most effective and efficient method to reduce and maintain the deer population at a density which will have acceptable impacts to park woodlots and cropfields. With increased public hunting outside the parks and no shooting in the parks, there would be limited effect on deer density in the parks (see p.65 of the EIS). Alternately, shooting deer only in the parks, while hunting on private land remained limited, would diminish the effectiveness of reducing deer density in the parks. An effective combination approach will have fewer impacts to visitor use and cost less than using Alternative 2B alone (see p. 66 of the EIS).

Encouraging public hunting outside the parks is the preferred method, according to NPS policy, for controlling wildlife populations in parks. In this case, however, shooting inside the parks will occur during the same period. This was determined to be necessary to achieve the density goal because it removes the parks as a place where deer seek refuge. Hunting is not permitted in either park, because it is not authorized by law (see p. 103 of the EIS). Therefore, only NPS authorized individuals will be allowed to shoot deer in the parks. The

NPS will seek to coordinate deer management activities near the parks with nearby private landowners and the Pennsylvania Game Commission. Private landowners that are willing can increase hunting opportunities by allowing or increasing hunter access to their land during the deer hunting seasons. The Pennsylvania Game Commission, which establishes the length of the hunting seasons and harvest limits in the state, may play a crucial role. If the effort to increase public access does not result in sufficient deer being killed, the NPS will seek cooperation from the Pennsylvania Game Commission to increase the number of deer that could be killed near the parks.

## Measures To Minimize Impacts and Address Public Concerns

The selected alternative incorporates a variety of measures to minimize the adverse environmental, social, and economic impacts as described in the final EIS.

Visitor safety will be the first priority before and during any management action. Shooting in the parks will occur only in areas where and when public safety and resource protection is assured. Deer will be shot in the parks during both day and nighttime hours. To ensure public safety, night shooting will be conducted only at bait stations which will also improve the effectiveness of the reduction program. Prior to each annual reduction period, public notification will be provided as to the time period when shooting may occur and the areas where access will be restricted or prohibited. This notification will lessen inconvenience to visitors and provide for public safety. Only NPS authorized individuals highly skilled and trained in the use of firearms and public safety will shoot deer in the parks. This requirement will result in a humane means of direct reduction and reduce the risk of damage to historical resources. The venison will be donated to food service organizations for distribution to the needy. The hides, if removed, and entrails will be disposed of consistent with federal and state laws. In the short term, a large number of deer will be killed annually to reach the density goal. When the population is reduced to the density goal, fewer deer will need to be killed annually to maintain the population at that level. As the management action progresses, the remaining deer population will be monitored by park personnel. Monitoring information on the deer, woodlots and cropfields, will guide the ongoing deer population maintenance program.

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: