

publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so. We will make all submissions from organizations and businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

Dated: July 12, 2013.

John Wessels,

*Regional Director, Intermountain Region,
National Park Service,*

Editorial Note: This document was received at the Office of the Federal Register January 3, 2014.

[FR Doc. 2014-00078 Filed 1-14-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-IMR-YELL-14103; PPIMYELL82,
PPMRSNR1Z.AM0000]

Remote Vaccination Program To Reduce the Prevalence of Brucellosis in Yellowstone Bison, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service announces the availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Remote Vaccination Program to Reduce the Prevalence of Brucellosis in Yellowstone Bison, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming.

DATES: The National Park Service will execute a Record of Decision (ROD) no sooner than 30 days following publication by the Environmental Protection Agency of the Notice of Availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

ADDRESSES: Information will be available for public inspection online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/YELL>, and at the Yellowstone Center for Resources, P.O. Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming 82190, telephone (307) 344-2203.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Carpenter or Rick Wallen, P.O. Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190, telephone (307) 344-2203, or by email at YELL_Bison_Management@NPS.GOV.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The document describes three management

alternatives including a no-action alternative and the NPS preferred alternative. The anticipated environmental impacts of those alternatives are analyzed. The final document also includes responses to substantive comments from the public, from traditionally associated American Indian tribes, and from government agencies.

Alternative A (No Action) describes the currently authorized syringe vaccination of calves and yearlings that are periodically captured at the park boundary. Alternative B describes a proposed action to continue the syringe vaccination program and add a field program to remotely vaccinate calves and yearlings using a pneumatic rifle to deliver an absorbable projectile with a vaccine payload to muscle tissue. Alternative C describes a program to continue the syringe vaccination action and add a field program to remotely vaccinate calves, yearlings, and adult females as is described in Alternative B.

The National Park Service has identified Alternative A, No Action, as its preferred alternative based on substantial uncertainties associated with vaccine efficacy, delivery, duration of the vaccine-induced protective immune response, diagnostics, and bison behavior, existing management flexibilities, and evaluation of public comments. Consistent with the 2000 Interagency Bison Management Plan (IBMP), the preferred alternative would continue hand-syringe vaccination of bison at capture facilities near the park boundary and conduct monitoring and research on the relationship between vaccine-induced immune responses and protection from clinical disease (e.g., abortions). Also, selective culling of potentially infectious bison based on age and diagnostic test results may be continued at capture facilities to reduce the number of abortions that maintain the disease. The preferred alternative would continue the adaptive management program, as described in the 2000 Record of Decision for the IBMP and subsequent adaptive management adjustments, to learn more about the disease brucellosis and answer uncertainties, as well as to develop or improve suppression techniques that could be used to facilitate effective outcomes, minimize adverse impacts, and lower operational costs of efforts to reduce brucellosis prevalence in the future.

The National Park Service would also continue to work with other federal and state agencies, American Indian tribes, academic institutions, non-governmental organizations, and other interested parties to develop holistic

management approaches, monitoring and research projects that could be conducted to improve the adaptive management decision process, and better vaccines, delivery methods, and diagnostics for reducing the prevalence of brucellosis in bison and elk and transmissions to cattle.

Dated: October 31, 2013.

Laura E. Joss,

Acting Regional Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 2014-00636 Filed 1-14-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-CB-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-SER-EVER-14535;
PX.P0078991D.00.1]

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Acquisition of Florida Power and Light Company Land in the East Everglades Expansion Area, Everglades National Park, Florida

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) for the Acquisition of Florida Power and Light Company Land in the East Everglades Expansion Area, Everglades National Park, Florida.

DATES: The NPS will accept comments on the Draft EIS from the public for a period of 60 days following publication of the Environmental Protection Agency's Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. We will announce the dates, times, and location for a public meeting to solicit comments on the Draft EIS through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVER>; the Web site of Everglades National Park at www.nps.gov/ever; and media outlets.

ADDRESSES: Electronic copies of the Draft EIS will be available online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVER>. A limited number of compact disks and printed copies will be also available at the Park headquarters, Everglades National Park, 40001 State Highway 9336, Homestead, Florida 33034-6733.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brien Culhane, Everglades National Park, 40001 State Road 9336, Homestead, FL 33034-6733 or by telephone at (305) 242-7717.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Draft EIS addresses options for NPS acquisition of existing Florida Power and Light (FPL) land located within the park, or sufficient interest in the property, to facilitate hydrologic and ecologic restoration of the park and Everglades ecosystem. This action is needed to support the mission of NPS and the park, because the East Everglades Expansion Area (EEEA), which includes the existing FPL parcel, has been identified as vital to long-term protection of the park for ecosystem restoration purposes. Also, the acquisition of the existing FPL parcel is needed to support the goals of restoring the Northeast Shark River Slough and to fulfill the purposes of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. Public Law (Pub. L.) 101–229 (December 13, 1989), articulates that the Everglades is both nationally and internationally significant and sets forth specific goals and objectives for acquisition of properties in this area. Acquisition of land within the EEEA through an exchange of lands with FPL is also authorized by Public Law 111–11 (March 30, 2009).

The Draft EIS describes five alternatives for acquiring land owned by FPL in the EEEA within the boundaries of the park, or sufficient interest in this property, as well as the affected environment and the environmental consequences of implementing these alternatives. The Draft EIS addresses both the potential impacts from the acquisition of FPL land in the park, as well as the indirect impacts that could result from the subsequent construction and operation of transmission lines that could be built by FPL either inside or outside the park as a result of the land acquisition alternative selected. The alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS, and Chapter 4 details the key impacts of implementing the alternatives.

The following describes each of the alternatives included in the Draft EIS:

Alternative 1a—The NPS would not take action to acquire FPL property within the park. There would be no change in the status of FPL lands in the park. The impact analysis for this alternative assumes that FPL would not construct transmission lines on its existing land in the park or in any area outside the park. This alternative represents the environmental baseline. It assumes that the NPS would not be able to flow water on this property to achieve its long-term restoration objectives because it would not have acquired the right or interest to do so.

Alternative 1b—The NPS would not take action to acquire FPL property

within the park, the same as alternative 1a, but the impact analysis for this alternative assumes that FPL would construct transmission lines on its existing land in the park. Although it represents the same management decision as alternative 1a, the impact analysis for this alternative addresses the impacts of transmission line construction on the FPL property. Similar to alternative 1a, it also assumes that the NPS would not be able to flow water on this property to achieve its long-term restoration objectives.

Alternative 2—The NPS would acquire the FPL corridor by purchase or through the exercise of eminent domain authority by the United States. This alternative would result in an increase of 320 acres of NPS-owned land within the authorized boundary of the park and would allow for flowage of water on this property. The transmission line construction scenario associated with the analysis of the impacts of alternative 2 assumes that FPL would likely acquire a replacement corridor east of the existing park boundary to meet its transmission needs and the lines would be built outside the park.

Alternative 3—The NPS would acquire fee title to the FPL corridor through a fee-for-fee exchange for park property, as authorized by the exchange legislation (Pub. L. 111–11). NPS land conveyed to FPL would consist of 260 acres along 6.5 miles of the eastern boundary of the EEEA, and the boundary of the park would be adjusted upon completion of the exchange to remove the lands conveyed to FPL from the park. The NPS would also convey a 90-foot-wide perpetual nonnative vegetation management easement to FPL adjacent to the entire length of the exchange corridor. The fee-for-fee land exchange would be subject to terms and conditions that are to be agreed upon between the NPS and FPL and incorporated into a binding exchange agreement. FPL would be required to allow the United States the perpetual right, power and privilege to flood and submerge the property consistent with hydrologic restoration requirements. The transmission line construction scenario associated with the analysis of the impacts of this alternative assumes that FPL would build the transmission lines in the exchange corridor in accordance with the terms and conditions established in the fee for fee exchange agreement.

Alternative 4—The NPS would acquire fee title to the FPL corridor through an exchange for an easement on NPS property. This is essentially the same as alternative 3, except that NPS would grant an easement (not fee title)

to FPL on 260 acres of park land along 6.5 miles of the eastern boundary of the EEEA for potential construction of transmission lines, in accordance with the terms and conditions developed for this “easement for fee” exchange. The NPS would retain ownership of the corridor, but would no longer have the unencumbered use of the exchange corridor. The NPS would also convey a 90-foot-wide perpetual nonnative vegetation management easement to FPL adjacent to the entire length of the exchange corridor. The easement for fee land exchange would also be subject to terms and conditions that are to be agreed upon between the NPS and FPL and incorporated into a binding exchange agreement. Similar to alternative 3, the FPL easement area would be subject to a perpetual flowage easement. The transmission line construction scenario associated with the analysis of the impacts of this alternative assumes that FPL would build the transmission lines in the exchange corridor in accordance with the terms and conditions established in the easement for fee exchange agreement.

Alternative 5—The NPS would acquire a perpetual flowage easement on FPL’s property within the EEEA through purchase, condemnation, or donation by FPL. FPL would retain ownership of its corridor in the park during the term of the easement and could seek to site transmission lines there. The flowage allowed under this easement would allow sufficient water flow over this area to support ecosystem restoration projects. There would be no change to the authorized boundary of the park, although the NPS would retain the current goal of acquiring this property over the long term. The construction scenario associated with the analysis of the impacts of this alternative would be the same as the one for alternative 1b (FPL construction of transmission lines on its existing land in the park), except that NPS would acquire a long-term, perpetual flowage easement.

If you wish to comment on the Draft EIS, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. We encourage you to comment via the internet on the PEPC Web site at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/EVER>. An electronic public comment form is provided on this Web site. You may also comment via mail to: Everglades National Park FPL Project Planning Team, National Park Service, M. Elmer (DSC–P), P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225–0287; or by hand delivery to Park headquarters, at 40001 State Road 9336, Homestead, FL 33034–6733.

Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, please be aware your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

The responsible official for this Draft EIS is the Regional Director, NPS Southeast Region, 100 Alabama Street SW., 1924 Building, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

Dated: January 8, 2014.

Stan Austin,

Regional Director, Southeast Region.

[FR Doc. 2014-00634 Filed 1-14-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JD-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-NCR-GWMP-13704;
PX.XGWMP0400.00.1]

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Dyke Marsh Restoration and Long-term Management Plan, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Virginia

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Dyke Marsh Restoration and Long-term Management Plan at George Washington Memorial Parkway, Virginia. The DEIS provides a systematic analysis of alternatives for the restoration and long-term management of the tidal freshwater marsh and other associated wetland habitats lost or impacted in Dyke Marsh Preserve on the Potomac River.

DATES: The NPS will accept comments on the DEIS from the public for 60 days after the date that the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability of the DEIS in its regular Friday **Federal Register** listing. A public meeting will be held during the review period to facilitate the submission of public comment. Once scheduled, the meeting date will be announced via the George Washington Memorial Parkway Web site (<http://www.nps.gov/gwmp/>), the NPS's Planning Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site ([\[parkplanning.nps.gov/gwmp\]\(http://parkplanning.nps.gov/gwmp\)\), and a press release to area media.](http://</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

ADDRESSES: The DEIS for the Dyke Marsh Restoration and Long-term Management Plan will be available for public review online at the NPS's PEPC Web site (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/GWMP>). You may submit your comments by any one of several methods. The preferred method of commenting is via the Internet at (<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/GWMP>). You may also mail comments to Dyke Marsh Restoration Plan, 700 George Washington Memorial Parkway, Turkey Run Park Headquarters, McLean, VA 22101. Or, you may hand-deliver comments to 700 George Washington Memorial Parkway, Turkey Run Park Headquarters, McLean, VA 22101. Written comments will also be accepted at the public meeting. We will not accept comments by fax, email, or in any other way than those specified above. We will not accept bulk comments in any format (hard copy or electronic) submitted on behalf of others. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Alex Romero, Superintendent, 700 George Washington Memorial Parkway, Turkey Run Park Headquarters, McLean, VA 22101; telephone (703) 289-2500.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of this DEIS is to develop a plan for the restoration and long-term management of the tidal freshwater marsh and other associated wetland habitats lost or impacted in Dyke Marsh Preserve on the Potomac River.

Dyke Marsh Preserve is one of the last large tracts of tidal freshwater marsh along the Potomac River in the Washington, DC, area and has existed for at least 2,200 years.

Located just south of Alexandria, Virginia, Dyke Marsh Preserve is viewed as a national treasure because of its proximity to the Nation's Capital and a large urban/suburban population, its history, and its current potential for providing ecosystem services, recreational values and educational opportunities. Despite continual degradation of the existing marsh, it provides numerous natural benefits and services, including resident and

migratory wildlife habitat, refuge for state species of concern, attenuation of tidal energy, shoreline stabilization, flood control, and water quality enhancement.

The goal of the actions described in the DEIS is to restore areas of Dyke Marsh that were previously impacted by dredging and erosion. The park will re-establish soil elevations to sustain marsh plant communities while preventing damage to vegetation in the existing wetland. In the long-term, the project will provide additional wetlands to the Potomac River watershed ecosystems, preserve the aesthetic and natural values of Dyke Marsh and the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and continue to offer recreational opportunities currently available. Specific objectives of the plan are listed below.

Natural Resources. Dyke Marsh Restoration will protect and maintain tidal freshwater wetlands and associated ecosystems to provide habitat for fish, wildlife, and other biota. The park will ensure that management actions promote native species while minimizing invasive nonnative plants. The marsh restoration will reduce or eliminate erosion of the existing marsh and, to the extent practicable, will restore and maintain hydrologic processes needed to sustain the marsh. The restored marsh will protect breeding populations of state species of concern such as least bittern (*Ixobrychus exilis*), state critically imperiled swamp sparrow (*Melospiza georgiana* ssp. *georgiana*, G5T5, S1B/S4S5N), and state imperiled species such as river bulrush (*Bolboschoenus fluviatilis*, G5S2). Finally, the restoration will increase the resiliency of Dyke Marsh, provide a natural buffer to storms, and help ameliorate flooding in populated residential areas.

Cultural Resources. The restoration will protect the historic resources and cultural landscape features associated with Dyke Marsh and the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Visitor Experience will be enhanced through appropriate educational, interpretation, and research opportunities at Dyke Marsh and enhance access by diverse audiences.

The DEIS analyzes two action alternatives and the no action alternative, as described below.

Alternative A: No Action—Under this alternative, there would be no restoration. Current management of the marsh would continue, which includes providing basic maintenance related to the Haul Road, control of nonnative invasive plant species, ongoing interpretive and environmental