

bunkhouse, and employee residence will also be built at Panther Junction. The natural resources and collection management building should adequately provide for the collection storage needs for the duration of this plan. If additional storage collection space is needed, the other new storage areas will be evaluated to accommodate this need. One employee residence and one employee bunkhouse will be removed from Chisos Basin to reduce human water use at the area. At Rio Grande Village the RV campground will be enlarged by about 40% in area, with no more than 30 total sites. Cottonwood Campground campsites will be relocated away from bank cave-in areas, and a new egress road will be constructed. Fifteen percent of park personnel will be moved to gateway communities where offices and residences will be built or leased. This course of action and two alternatives were analyzed in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. The full range of foreseeable environmental consequences was assessed, and appropriate mitigating measures identified. The full Record of Decision includes a statement of the decision made, synopses of other alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, a description of the environmentally preferable alternative, a finding on impairment of park resources and values, a listing of measures to minimize environmental harm, an overview of public involvement in the decisionmaking process, and a statement of findings.

#### Basis for Decision

In reaching its decision to select the preferred alternative, NPS managers considered the purposes for which the park was established and other laws and policies that apply to lands in the park, including the NPS Organic Act, National Environmental Policy Act, NPS Director's Order 12 (Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decisionmaking), and the NPS Management Policies 2001. The NPS also carefully considered public comments received during the planning process.

To develop a preliminary preferred alternative, the planning team evaluated the alternatives that had been reviewed by the public. The alternatives were tested against the decision points and issues identified by the public and park to determine their relative advantages. The following conclusions were reached:

- The preferred alternative includes more actions that are beneficial to the

cultural and natural resources than other alternatives.

- The preferred alternative will enhance the visitor's experience by providing multiple opportunities for visitors to make intellectual and emotional connections to the park. Enhanced interpretation, programs, and activities will enable visitors to link tangible resources with the intangible meanings and significance of the park. The proposed development will provide opportunities for the interpretive division to fully address the various themes and complexities of the park.

#### Findings on Impairment

The NPS has determined that implementation of the proposal will not constitute an impairment to Big Bend National Park's resources and values. This conclusion is based on a thorough analysis of the environmental impacts described in the Environmental Impact Statement, the public comments received, relevant scientific studies, and the professional judgment of the decision-maker guided by the direction in the NPS Management Policies. Overall, the plan results in benefits to park resources and values and opportunities for their enjoyment, and it does not result in their impairment.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** John H. King, Big Bend National Park, P.O. Box 129, Big Bend National Park, TX 79834-0129, (915) 477-2251.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Copies of the Record of Decision may be obtained from the contact listed above.

Dated: November 8, 2004.

**Bernard C. Fagan,**

*Deputy Chief, NPS Office of Policy.*

[FR Doc. 04-25354 Filed 11-15-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-52-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### National Park System Advisory Board; Meeting

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

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix, that the National Park System Advisory Board will meet November 29-30, 2004, in Coral Gables, Florida. On November 29, the Board will tour Everglades National Park and will be briefed regarding environmental, education and partnership programs of Everglades National Park and Big Cypress National Preserve. The Board will convene its

business meeting on November 30 at 9 a.m., e.s.t., in the Prado Room of The Biltmore Hotel, 1200 Anastasia Avenue, Coral Gables, Florida 33134, telephone 305-445-1926. The meeting will be adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The Board will be addressed by National Park Service Director Fran Mainella and will receive the reports of its Education Committee, Partnerships Committee, National Landmarks Committee, Director's Council, and National Parks Science Committee. The Board also will receive reports on national park philanthropic issues and the HealthierFeds Physical Activity Challenge.

Other officials of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior may address the Board, and other miscellaneous topics and reports may be covered. The order of the agenda may be changed, if necessary, to accommodate travel schedules or for other reasons.

The Board meeting will be open to the public. Space and facilities to accommodate the public are limited and attendees will be accommodated on a first-come basis. Anyone may file with the Board a written statement concerning matters to be discussed. The Board also may permit attendees to address the Board, but may restrict the length of the presentations, as necessary to allow the Board to complete its agenda within the allotted time.

Anyone who wishes further information concerning the meeting, or who wishes to submit a written statement, may contact Mr. Loran Fraser, Office of Policy, National Park Service; 1849 C Street, NW., Room 7250; Washington, DC 20240; telephone 202-208-7456.

Draft minutes of the meeting will be available for public inspection about 12 weeks after the meeting, in room 7252, Main Interior Building, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC.

Dated: November 8, 2004.

**Bernard Fagan,**

*Deputy Chief, Office of Policy.*

[FR Doc. 04-25434 Filed 11-15-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-52-P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Notice of Intent to Repatriate a Cultural Item: Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ

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

**ACTION:** Notice.

Notice is here given in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

(NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3005, of the intent to repatriate a cultural item in the possession of the Heard Museum, Phoenix, AZ, that meets the definition of "cultural patrimony" under 25 U.S.C. 3001.

This notice is published as part of the National Park Service's administrative responsibilities under NAGPRA, 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d)(3). The determinations in this notice are the sole responsibility of the museum that has control of the cultural item. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

The one cultural item is a Dilzini Gaan headdress made of painted wood and cloth.

It is not known exactly when, where, or by whom the headdress was collected, or under what circumstances the Heard Museum acquired the headdress. The museum probably acquired the headdress before 1952, since the museum's collections were re-cataloged after 1951, and the headdress appears to match a catalog description that was probably written between 1931 and 1947.

Representatives of the Mescalero Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, New Mexico; San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona; Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona; White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona; and Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Reservation, Arizona examined the museum's collections, consulted with museum staff, and identified the headdress as an object of cultural patrimony eligible for repatriation under NAGPRA. The White Mountain Apache Tribe demonstrated that the cultural item has ongoing traditional and cultural importance to the tribe and could not have been conveyed by any individual tribal member.

Officials of the Heard Museum have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (3)(D), the cultural item has ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to the White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona, rather than property owned by an individual. Officials of the Heard Museum also have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity that can be reasonably traced between the object of cultural patrimony and the White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with the object of cultural

patrimony should contact Frank Goodyear, Director, Heard Museum, 2301 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85004, telephone (602) 252-8840, before December 16, 2004. Repatriation of the object of cultural patrimony to the White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The Heard Museum is responsible for notifying the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma; Fort Sill Apache Tribe of Oklahoma; Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico; Mescalero Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation, New Mexico; San Carlos Apache Tribe of the San Carlos Reservation, Arizona; Tonto Apache Tribe of Arizona; White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Reservation, Arizona; and the Yavapai-Apache Nation of the Camp Verde Indian Reservation, Arizona that this notice has been published.

**Mary Downs,**

*Acting Manager, National NAGPRA Program*  
[FR Doc. 04-25353 Filed 11-15-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-50-S**

---

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

[Docket No. DEA-258S]

**Dispensing of Controlled Substances for the Treatment of Pain**

**AGENCY:** Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Interim policy statement.

**SUMMARY:** In August 2004, DEA published on its Office of Diversion Control Web site a document entitled: "Prescription Pain Medications: Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Health Care Professionals and Law Enforcement Personnel" (August 2004 FAQ). The August 2004 FAQ was not published in the **Federal Register** and was not an official statement of the agency. DEA subsequently withdrew the document because it contained misstatements. This interim policy statement explains how some of the statements in the August 2004 FAQ were erroneous. In addition, this interim statement explains how DEA plans to address in a future **Federal Register** document the issue of dispensing controlled substances for the treatment of pain.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** William J. Walker, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement

Administration, Washington, DC 20537; Telephone: (202) 307-7165.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** In August 2004, DEA published on its Office of Diversion Control Web site a document entitled: "Prescription Pain Medications: Frequently Asked Questions and Answers for Health Care Professionals and Law Enforcement Personnel" (August 2004 FAQ). For the reasons provided below, the August 2004 FAQ was not an official statement of the agency and DEA subsequently withdrew the document because it contained misstatements. Nonetheless, the subject matter—dispensing controlled substances for the treatment of pain—is extremely important to the public health and welfare. As the agency primarily responsible for enforcement and administration of the federal laws and regulations governing controlled substances, DEA believes that further discussion of the subject is warranted for two fundamental reasons. First, the abuse of pharmaceutical narcotics and other prescription controlled substances is increasing in the United States. According to the latest National Survey on Drug Use and Health, which is published by the Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the number of Americans aged 12 or older who have engaged in illicit (nonmedical) use of pain relievers during their lifetime has risen to more than 31 million.<sup>1</sup> A portion of this type of drug abuse is directly facilitated by a small number of physicians who dispense controlled substances for other than legitimate medical purposes and then fraudulently claim that the drugs were dispensed for the treatment of pain.

Second, chronic pain is a serious problem for many Americans. It is crucial that physicians who are engaged in legitimate pain treatment not be discouraged from providing proper medication to patients as medically justified. DEA recognizes that the overwhelming majority of physicians dispense controlled substances lawfully for legitimate medical reasons, including the treatment of pain. Accordingly, DEA plans to address the subject of dispensing controlled substances for the treatment of pain in a future **Federal Register** document, taking into consideration the views of the medical community. The document will be aimed at providing guidance and reassurance to physicians who engage in

<sup>1</sup> The report is available on the SAMHSA Web site at <http://oas.samhsa.gov/NHSDA/2k3NSDUH/2k3results.htm>.