

that will specifically describe the action for which we are requesting input.

4. Instructions on NOI To Prepare and EIS

Federal Agencies and State and local governments and other interested parties are requested to send their written comments on the scope of the EIS, significant issues which should be addressed, and alternatives that should be considered to the Regional Supervisor, Leasing and Environment, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, at the address stated under "Description of Area." Comments should be enclosed in an envelope labeled "Comments on the NOI to Prepare an EIS on the proposed 1998-2001 Lease Sales in the Western Gulf of Mexico." Comments on the NOI should be submitted no later than 45 days from publication of this Notice. Scoping meetings will be held in appropriate locations to obtain additional comments and information regarding the scope of the EIS.

Dated: January 23, 1997.

Cynthia Quarterman,

Director, Minerals Management Service.

[FR Doc. 97-2210 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-MR-M

National Park Service

General Management Plan; Final Environmental Impact Statement; Manzanar National Historic Site; 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 specifically to regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality at 40 CFR 1505.2, the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, has approved a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Manzanar National Historic Site, California.

The National Park Service will implement the proposed plan as identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, dated August, 1996.

Copies of the Record of Decision and final environmental impact statement may be obtained by writing to the Superintendent, Manzanar National Historic Site, P.O. Box 426, Independence, CA. 93526-0426 or by calling the park at (619) 878-2932.

Dated: January 8, 1997.

Stanley T. Albright,

Field Director, Pacific West Area.

[FR Doc. 97-2072 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

Rock Creek Tennis Stadium Record of Decision

Summary

Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332 et seq.) and the regulations promulgated by the Council of Environmental Quality (40 CFR 1505.2), the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has prepared a Record of Decision on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Rock Creek Tennis Center and Associated Recreation Fields, Washington, D.C., (FES 950286). This Record of Decision is a concise statement of what decisions were made, what alternatives were considered, the basis for the decision, and the mitigating measures developed to avoid or minimize environmental impacts.

Background

The purpose of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was to examine impacts related to the activities at the tennis center and surrounding fields so those impacts could be considered in making a decision regarding future management of the Rock Creek Park Tennis Center and associated recreation fields. Currently, two major professional tennis tournaments a year may be held at the stadium under the auspices of the Washington Tennis Foundation. The Washington Tennis Foundation, as well as other groups and organizations, has asked to use the tennis center for a variety of activities.

Decision

The National Park Service will implement alternative 2, the preferred alternative, with two modifications.

Alternative 2 allows for one professional tennis tournament to be held annually at the tennis center. Amateur and league tennis and public court use and instruction would continue. This alternative assumes that the professional tournament would be operated in accordance with the Interim Operating Plan between the National Park Service and the Washington Tennis Foundation and existing regulations (36 CFR 7.96) with regard to limited commercial activities at the tennis center.

The modifications to alternative 2 are as follows. First, the National Park Service will retain management

authority to consider allowing a second large-scale tennis event on a case-by-case basis under certain circumstances (but only when such an event would generate a significant amount of funding in advance for tennis programs for youth, seniors and special populations). Second, the National Park Service will retain management authority to consider allowing parking on the grass recreational field south of Morrow Drive (the south field) on a trial basis in varying configurations provided that weather and field conditions permit and provided that recreational opportunities on the field remain and can be satisfactorily segregated.

In order to implement this decision, previous agreements with the Washington Tennis Foundation that allow a second tournament would be superseded by a new agreement restricting the use of the center to one annual professional tournament. The Washington Tennis Foundation would not have any contractual rights to a second tournament. As part of the new agreement, the National Park Service would seek funding or reimbursement from the Washington Tennis Foundation for repairs of structural defects and/or accessibility modifications to the tennis stadium.

The annual professional tennis tournament would last approximately 20 days—7 days for the setup of equipment and facilities, 8 days of tournament play, and 5 days for takedown of equipment and facilities. Attendance would be limited to 7,500 spectators per session.

In addition to restrictions for parking on the fields that were incorporated into alternative 2, the mitigation measures adopted are improving uses of remote parking lots and a shuttle bus system, attempting to restrict on-street parking, and prohibiting concurrent events at both the Rock Creek Tennis Center and the Carter Barron Amphitheatre.

Alternatives Considered

Four alternatives were dismissed from further analysis in the EIS. Changing the jurisdiction of stadium management from the National Park Service to another governmental entity such as the District of Columbia and operating all stadium activities under a concession contract were eliminated because these alternatives would not alter the magnitude of the impacts. Creating a recreational use zone encompassing the stadium and fields with distinct operational policies and objectives, and limiting the attendance levels and duration of stadium activities were incorporated into the alternatives as mitigation measures, where appropriate,

rather than treated as a separate, distinct EIS alternative.

The National Park Service considered six alternatives in the EIS. The principal difference among them was the type and number of events that would be allowed at the tennis center. The alternatives may be summarized as follows:

Alternative 1: Amateur and league tennis events only.

Alternative 2: One professional tennis tournament annually.

Alternative 3: Two professional tennis tournaments annually.

Alternative 4: Two professional tennis tournaments annually with additional impact mitigation.

Alternative 5: An unlimited number of professional tennis tournaments annually.

Alternative 6: A variety of events and activities.

Alternative 7: Provided for the relocation of professional tournaments in conjunction with removal of the stadium.

Environmentally Preferred Alternative(s)

The environmentally preferred alternatives are alternative 1 and alternative 7. These alternatives best protect, preserve, and enhance the historic, cultural, and natural resources in the area because all of their impacts except those to Washington Tennis Foundation programs benefiting youth, seniors and special populations are beneficial or negligible to minors. This is illustrated by Table 1 in the EIS.

Basis for Decision

Alternative 1, amateur and league tennis events only, and alternative 7, relocation of professional tournaments, were rejected for the same several reasons. Both these alternatives would eliminate the Washington Tennis Foundation's ability to have any professional tennis tournament in the tennis stadium. As described in the EIS, this would have, potentially, a very significant effect upon the Washington Tennis Foundation's programs, which provide recreational tennis opportunities and other benefits to youth and special populations.

There is a very high demand for new tennis recreational facilities in the District of Columbia and most of the total demand is unmet (See Figures 2 and 3 in EIS). The Brightwood area where the tennis center is located has been consistently used to provide for various passive and participatory recreational activities since at least 1904, when a summer camp for underprivileged children began operating using some of the farm

buildings that existed within the park at that time. There is also a long history of providing tennis facilities for recreational and professional use within Rock Creek Park. In 1922, eight clay courts were built at the intersection of Morrow Drive and present-day Stage Road. In 1924, four additional courts were built and at least two of the original courts were converted to hard courts. An annual professional tennis tournament has occurred at the tennis center since 1969 when the Washington Star International Tennis Championships (later the Sovran Tennis Classic) was held here under the auspices of the Washington Tennis Foundation.

In addition, eliminating the Washington Tennis Foundation's contractual right would have an impact upon the Department's existing contractual agreement with the Washington Tennis Foundation, which could be costly financially. It was decided not to unnecessarily squander the \$12 million dollar investment made in the stadium by the Washington Tennis Foundation and to allow at least one professional tennis tournament to occur, to help support the Washington Tennis Foundation's programs, if the environmental impacts were determined to be acceptable. Alternatives 2 and 3 were found acceptable.

Alternative 5 (unlimited number of professional tennis tournaments annually) and 6 (variety of events and activities) were rejected because they would have potentially significant adverse impacts upon noise and land uses/character that could not be mitigated, and because of their potentially significant impact upon park operations. These were considered unacceptable impacts.

Alternative 4, two professional tennis tournaments annually with impact mitigation, was rejected because it consisted merely of analysis of the several different possible mitigation measures as applied to alternative 3. Several of these mitigation measures were mutually exclusive. For example, there would be no need to construct both an onsite parking annex lot and a parking garage. Furthermore, the mitigation measures could also be applied to other alternatives, such as alternative 2. Thus, it made more sense to consider alternative 3 and other alternatives and then consider the mitigation measures analyzed under alternative 4.

The impacts of alternatives 2 and 3 were considered acceptable given the public benefits resulting from allowing a professional tennis tournament to take place at the stadium (see discussion of

alternatives 1 and 7 above). Alternative 2 was the preferred alternative because the impacts would be less severe. Both alternatives 2 and 3 were ultimately rejected as too limiting of management flexibility in the future. Alternative 2 limits use to one large-scale professional tennis tournament while under Alternative 3 the Washington Tennis Foundation retains a right to hold two professional tennis tournaments.

Instead, the National Park Service decided to retain management authority to consider allowing a second large-scale tennis event during a year on a case-by-case basis under certain special circumstances. In order for the National Park Service to consider allowing a second large-scale tennis event, the Washington Tennis Foundation will have to submit details of their proposed event and evidence that the event will provide a significant sum certain in advance to be applied to the direct benefit of Washington Tennis Foundation programs for youth, seniors and special populations. The National Park Service will then decide whether the public benefit warrants allowing the proposed event to occur given the likely impacts of the event.

The National Park Service has also decided to modify alternative 2 in one other respect. In addition to allowing parking on the north field (as has been occurring for the past few years under an interim operating plan), the National Park Service has decided to retain management flexibility to consider allowing some parking on parts of the south field, on a trial basis. However, as discussed in the Mitigation section below, the National Park Service has decided to limit the conditions for parking on the south field by specifying that it be of varying configurations, on a trial basis, weather and field conditions permitting, and provided that recreational opportunities on the field remain and are segregated from the parking. In considering such experiments on a year-to-year basis, the National Park Service will consult with the community concerning tradeoffs between parking impacts and recreational use of the south field under various trial configurations.

This change to alternative 2 is consistent with the EIS. Alternative 2 in the EIS provides for the professional tennis tournament to be operated only in accordance with the Interim Operating Plan, which allows parking on the north field, subject to field conditions. However, the EIS examines the impact of allowing parking on the south field in addition to the north field in great detail under this alternative.

The south field is no less suited for parking than the north field. In fact, parking on the south field would result in less runoff and erosion and contribute lower sedimentation loads to drainage ways that eventually lead to Rock Creek. However, as evident in the EIS, the impacts of parking on both fields would be cumulative.

The restrictions placed on allowing parking on the south field (e.g., the requirement that recreational opportunities remain) means that the entire south field will never be filled to capacity with vehicles. It also means that the National Park Service could mitigate against damage to the south field by rotating the portions of the field that was used for parking, or by rotating use of the north and south fields in alternate years. The EIS analyzes the impact of parking on the entirety of both the north and south fields at the maximum capacity of those fields, weather and field conditions permitting. If only one professional tennis tournament were held in each year, the impacts that would result from the Selected Action would be less severe than those discussed in the EIS for the preferred alternative. Under a worst case scenario, such as the National Park Service allowing the Washington Tennis Foundation a second large-scale tennis event with some parking on the south field several years in a row, the long-term impacts would approach those resulting from implementation of alternative 3 in the EIS.

Mitigation

Mitigation measures were considered mostly for events with higher attendance levels (between 5,000 and 7,500 spectators) because the majority of potentially significant impacts occur at this level. The mitigation measures examined under alternative 2 were constructing an onsite parking annex lot, limiting the scale and timing of tournament sessions, improving remote parking and shuttle systems, and eliminating field parking and improving field conditions. In addition, the EIS discussed several other mitigation measures, such as constructing a parking garage, installing berms and plant materials to buffer the visual aspects of the structures, closing the Colorado Avenue exit, eliminating tennis event parking in all other areas of the park, and restricting on-street parking in the surrounding neighborhoods to residents.

The Preferred Mitigation Strategy developed for the EIS calls for restricting all onsite tennis event parking to the paved parking lots adjacent to the Stadium (Lots A, B, and

C). Tennis event parking would be completely restricted in all areas of the park. Parking would not be allowed on any turf areas within the Park including the north and south fields adjacent to the stadium. On-street parking in the surrounding neighborhoods would be restricted to residents only. Patrons not parking onsite would have to park in designated remote parking areas and arrive via a shuttle bus system.

The measures in the Preferred Mitigation Strategy being adopted are improving remote parking and shuttle systems, and attempting to restrict on-street parking to residents only. Improving remote parking and shuttle systems includes providing one or more remote parking areas that are safe, easy to find and access, and are efficient with respect to the operation of the shuttle service. It also includes providing a reliable, safe, and efficient shuttle service between the remote parking areas and the tennis center. The National Park Service's ability to restrict on-street parking to residents through the use of barricades depends upon the willingness of the District of Columbia to allow and enforce these restrictions. Residents are free to establish a residential parking zone that would restrict on-street parking on event days to residents only.

The implementation plan for these mitigation measures as set forth in the EIS is not adopted. It was meant more as an example of how to implement the Preferred Mitigation Strategy and is based on a scenario where there is no parking on the fields or elsewhere within Rock Creek Park. Also, the National Park Service does not find it appropriate to dictate marketing and incentive strategies (see Appendix A of the EIS) to the Washington Tennis Foundation.

In addition to deciding to improve remote parking and shuttle systems and attempting to restrict on-street parking to residents, the National Park Service has decided to restrict parking on both fields depending on weather and soil conditions and to further restrict parking on the south field. This falls far short of eliminating field parking altogether, which was adopted as part of the Preferred Mitigation Strategy in the EIS.

Parking on the fields has impacts on natural resources, recreation, and the community. The impacts to natural resources and recreation stem from damage to the grass and soil of the fields causing erosion that leads to increased sedimentation loads to drainage ways and compaction of soils leading to a moderate to potentially significant decrease to the water quantity of Rock

Creek. Damage to the grass and soil of the fields also affects recreational uses because the community may be unable to use a field while it is recovering from these impacts. Other impacts to the community from parking on the fields include traffic congestion and noise.

The National Park Service decided to restrict onfield parking rather than eliminate it entirely because most of the impacts to natural resources and recreation can be reduced significantly without eliminating parking entirely. The turfgrasses and soil structure of the fields are most susceptible to damage when vehicular traffic occurs during wet soil conditions and/or the soil is already at or near its field capacity. The bulk of the damage can be avoided by prohibiting parking on the field during such conditions.

The National Park Service has also chosen to restrict parking on the south field, but to allow for experimentation with some limited parking there on a trial basis, in varying configurations, and provided that recreational use remain and be segregated from the parking. This will further reduce damage to the grass and soil of the south field even if parking were allowed on the south field during each large-scale tennis event. In addition, the National Park Service is not obligating itself to allow any parking on the south field in any given year; the decision would be a discretionary one. The National Park Service expects to allow some level of parking on the south field, weather and field conditions permitting, during the next few years in order to implement the "trial basis." This trial basis period will end when the National Park Service determines it has gathered sufficient information on different parking configurations.

Eliminating all field parking would remove the natural resource and recreation impacts from parking vehicles on the field. It would, however, increase the impacts from traffic and congestion (e.g., noise) on the surrounding neighborhoods because some tennis event patrons would choose to look for parking in the residential areas even if the shuttle service were excellent and well marketed.

Another parking measure analyzed as part of the Preferred Mitigation Strategy was the elimination of parking at other areas within Rock Creek Park such as the picnic groves, maintenance facility and nature center parking areas. This measure was ultimately rejected. Parking in these areas does not measurably add to impacts on the environment of the community.

The mitigation measures that were not parts of the Preferred Mitigation

Strategy were also considered further. The National Park Service has decided to continue to prohibit concurrent events at both the tennis center and Carter Barron Amphitheatre.

The remaining measures were rejected as impractical. The parking annex and onsite parking annex lot were eliminated because they would be very costly, would only be necessary for those few days per year when there were tournament events with more than 5,000 spectators, would not mitigate noise impacts, would require removal of vegetation, and would contribute to natural resource impacts. Limiting the scale of tournament sessions (e.g., to fewer spectators) or the days of events (e.g., 6 days of play instead of 12) were rejected because it would probably render a professional tennis tournament untenable. Limiting the timing of tournament would eliminate the ability to adjust to differing conditions such as weather. Closing the Colorado Avenue exit from lot C within the tennis center was not determined to be feasible because it would cause gridlock, and would limit access by emergency vehicles such as fire trucks or ambulances.

Additional Information

Additional copies of the approved Record of Decision may be obtained from the Superintendent, Rock Creek Park, 3545 Williamsburg Lane, NW., Washington, DC 20008. The officials responsible for implementing the selected action are the Field Director, National Capital Area, and the Superintendent, Rock Creek Park.

Dated: December 26, 1996.

Robert Stanton,

Field Director, National Capital Area.

[FR Doc. 97-2209 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains From the Vicinity of Silver City, ID in the Possession of the Archaeological Survey of Idaho—Western Repository, Idaho State Historical Society, Boise, ID

AGENCY: National Park Service

ACTION: Notice

Notice is hereby given in accordance with provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d), of the completion of an inventory of human remains and associated funerary objects in the possession of the Archaeological Survey of Idaho—Western Repository, Idaho State Historical Society, Boise, ID.

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by Idaho State Historical Society professional staff in consultation with representatives of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe and the Shoshone-Paiute Indian Tribe.

In 1914, human remains representing one individual were donated to the Idaho State Historical Society by Mr. O.D. Brumbaugh of Silver City, ID. Mr. Brumbaugh identified these remains as Chief Buffalo Horn, a Bannock Indian leader during the Bannock War. No associated funerary objects are present.

A document associated with this donation identified the skull as that of Chief Buffalo Horn, and states that the skull was traced and identified by one of the Silver City volunteers, Jim Griffin, a participant in the Bannock War battle at South Mountain of 1878 in the vicinity of Silver City. Although at least three alternatives of the fate of Chief Buffalo Horn are discussed in official reports and oral histories, the characteristics of this skull, including an injury to the left side of the skull, and the circumstances regarding its recovery and donation to the Idaho State Historical Society support its identification as Chief Buffalo Horn. Ms. Rosphine J. Coby, a great-great-grandchild of Chief Buffalo Horn has made a claim of lineal descent on behalf of herself and four other great-great-grandchildren of Chief Buffalo Horn.

Based on the above mentioned information, officials of the Idaho State Historical Society have determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.2 (d)(1), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of one individual of Native American ancestry. Officials of the Idaho State Historical Society have also determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3005 (a)(5)(A), Ms. Rosphine Coby can trace her ancestry directly and without interruption by means of the traditional kinship system of the Bannock Tribe to Chief Buffalo Horn.

This notice has been sent to Ms. Rosphine Coby and officials of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe and the Shoshone-Paiute Indian Tribe. Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains should contact Robert Yohe, Director, Idaho Archaeological Survey, Idaho State Historical Society, 210 Main Street, Boise, ID 83702; telephone: (208) 334093847 before February 28, 1997. Repatriation of the human remains to Ms. Rosphine Coby may begin after that

date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: January 22, 1997.

Francis P. McManamon,

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

[FR Doc. 97-2111 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items in the Possession of the Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ

AGENCY: National Park Service

ACTION: Notice

Notice is hereby given under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 25 U.S.C. 3005 (a)(2), of the intent to repatriate cultural items in the possession of the Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ, which meet the definition of "sacred objects" under Section 2 of the Act.

The items consist of 37 Hopi spirit friends or katsina masks (Katsinkwaatsim). Descriptive names of the katsinam spirits are as follows: Kipok-choshopshyaka, Masaau, Palasuwitzmi Angak'tsina, Chakwaina (two spirits), Tasaf katsina, Angak'tsinmana, Poiwamutaka, Heheya, Kweo, Koyemsi (seven spirits), Wawash katsina, Qoqlo, Angak'tsinu (five spirits), Hiilili, Ngayayataaqa katsina, tasafmana (two spirits), Qoia kasinamana (two spirits), Lenang katsina, Kokopelli, Hu-katsina, Angwusnasomtaaqa/Tumas, Piptaka, Hemis katsinmana (two spirits), and Utechem.

Twenty-seven of these Katsinkwaatsim were donated by the Fred Harvey Corporation to the Heard Museum in 1978; including four masks with no collection information; 11 masks collected by Henry Voth in the early 1900s; and 12 masks collected by Charles Owen between 1912 and 1913. Nine masks are individual donations made in 1971, 1975, 1976, and 1982, and the circumstances and date of acquisition are unknown for one mask.

Over the years, Hopi religious practitioners have visited the museum collections to provide religious care for the Katsinkwaatsim. During consultation, representatives of the Hopi Tribe identified these 37 Katsinkwaatsim as specific ceremonial objects which are needed by traditional religious leaders for the practice of the Hopi religion by present-day adherents.

Based on the above-mentioned information, officials of the Heard Museum have determined that,