

Park, P.O. Box 129, Grand Canyon, AZ 86023, Telephone 928/638-7709.

Dated: March 3, 2003.

**Cindy Orlando,**

*Associate Director, Administration, Business Practices and Workforce Development.*

[FR Doc. 03-8496 Filed 4-7-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Primary Restoration Plan, Santa Cruz Island, Channel Islands National Park, Santa Barbara County, CA; Notice of Approval of Record of Decision**

*Summary:* Pursuant to § 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 (40 CFR part 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 Primary Restoration Plan for Santa Cruz Island at Channel Islands National Park. The formal no-action period was initiated October 18, 2002, 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 National Park Service will begin to implement the Primary Restoration Plan described and analyzed as Alternative Four (Proposed Action) contained in the Final EIS. The selected plan features a deliberate, long-term (approximately six years) strategy which entails construction of fenced areas for managing pig eradication efforts, and coordinated use of prescribed burns and herbicide applications to control the highly invasive fennel (a non-native weed species).

This course of action and three alternatives were identified and analyzed in the Final EIS, and previously in the Draft EIS (the latter was distributed in March 2001). The full spectrum of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed, and appropriate mitigation measures identified, for each alternative. Beginning with early scoping, through the preparation of the Draft and Final EIS, and including numerous public meetings, approximately 50 written comments were received and duly considered. No substantive or adverse comments were received during the no-action period, which ended on

November 17, 2002. Key consultations which aided in the preparation of the Draft and Final EIS involved (but were not limited to) the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Dept. of Fish and Game, State Historic Preservation Office, Native American Tribes, Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, The Nature Conservancy, and the Santa Cruz Island Foundation.

*Copies:* Interested parties desiring to review the Record of Decision may obtain a complete copy by contacting the Acting Superintendent, Channel Islands National Park, 1901 Spinnaker Dr., Ventura, California 93001; or via telephone request at (805) 658-5700.

Dated: February 10, 2003.

**Arthur E. Eck,**

*Deputy Regional Director, Pacific West Region.*

[FR Doc. 03-8501 Filed 4-7-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310-70-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### **Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; General Management Plan Amendment for Visitor Learning Center; Great Basin National Park, White Pine County, NV; Notice of Availability**

*Summary:* Pursuant to § 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, has prepared and distributed a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) for a proposed amendment of the General Management Plan (which was approved in 1993). The SEIS assesses the potential impacts of a proposal to construct a Visitor Learning Center in the townsite of Baker, Nevada (rather than on National Park Service park lands north of Baker, known locally as Baker Ridge). This conservation planning and environmental impact analysis effort identified and analyzed three alternatives (and foreseeable environmental consequences and appropriate mitigation strategies) for constructing the park's new Visitor Learning Center.

*Proposal and Alternatives:* The Final SEIS identifies and analyzes three alternatives, including "no action" (to document existing conditions and provide an environmental baseline for comparing "action" alternatives). The No Action Alternative (Alternative 1) assumes that the Baker Ridge location for the Visitor Learning Center would

remain unchanged, thus implementing the existing General Management Plan (GMP). The Proposed Action (Alternative 2) amends the GMP to allow the construction to occur outside of the main park area within the townsite of Baker, Nevada. The approximately 7,000 ft<sup>2</sup> facilities identified are consistent with the concepts approved in the GMP. The Third Alternative (Alternative 3) amends the GMP to eliminate the Baker Ridge Visitor Learning Center and to maintain the current Lehman Caves Visitor Center as the only orientation facility.

*Public Involvement:* Notice of initiation of the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process was published in the **Federal Register** on December 2, 1999; and information regarding the proposal was mailed to the park's GMP mailing list, and press release was distributed to local and regional media. A notice of availability of the Draft SEIS was published in the **Federal Register** on April 19, 2002; and on April 21, 2002 local announcements were published in the Ely Times. Copies of the document were distributed by direct mailings, posting in public libraries, and through electronic media. Copies were provided to Federal, state, and local agencies, interested organizations, and private individuals. Several scoping and consultation meetings were conducted throughout; fewer than a dozen written comments were received from these combined phases. Several letters of support were received. All substantive comments on the Draft SEIS, and specific responses, are included in the Final SEIS. Besides editorial revisions, changes from the Draft SEIS made in the Final SEIS were derived from clarifications prompted by comments received as a result of the 60 day comment period, as follows:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency raised two concerns. First centered upon "Greening the Government" opportunities (Executive Order 13101 "Greening the Government Through Waste Prevention, Recycling, and Federal Acquisition"; Executive Order 13123 "Greening the Government Through Efficient Energy Management"; and, Executive Order 13148 "Greening the Government Through Leadership in Environmental Management"). Details on the park's compliance with these Federal "greening the government" policies are included in section 3.0 (p. 29) of the Final SEIS. The second concern was in regards to exclusion of water quality (including permitting under section 402 and 404 of the Clean Water Act) as a impact issue topic.