

Sanitary Meat Market, (Commercial Buildings of the Central Business District of Bellingham, Washington MPS) 1015-1019 N. State St., Bellingham, 04001593

## WEST VIRGINIA

### Lewis County

Jackson's Mill State 4-H Camp Historic District, 160 Jackson Mill Rd., Weston, 04001598

Weston Downtown Residential Historic District, Portions of Main, Center, and Court Aves, East First, East Third, East Fourth, East Fifth and East Sixth Sts., Weston, 04001596

### Monongalia County

Greenmont Historic District, Roughly bounded by Arlington, Front, Conn, White Ave., Posten Ave., Kingwood St., and Decker Ave., Morgantown, 04001597

### Randolph County

Elkins Milling Company, 2½ Railroad Ave., Elkins, 04001595

[FR Doc. 05-350 Filed 1-6-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-51-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

#### Notice of Intent to Repatriate Cultural Items: American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY; Republication

**Editorial Note:** Federal Register Notice document 04-28004 was published originally in the *Federal Register* of Wednesday, December 22, 2004 at 69 FR 76778. The document published was a duplicate of document 04-28001. The corrected document is published in its entirety.

**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 cultural items in the possession of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY, that meet the definition of "sacred objects" 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, institution, or Federal agency that has control of these cultural items. The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations in this notice.

The 9 cultural items are 3 inscribed birch bark rolls, 2 rattles, 1 beaded ceremonial bag, 1 fawn skin bag, 1 food fungus, and 1 black dye.

The Mide bark song roll is oblong with rounded ends and measures 45 x 8 x 0.5 cm. The Mide bark roll is rectangular, measuring 34 x 24 x 5 cm and is inscribed with the figure of a man. The medicine bark roll is rectangular and measures 36 x 26 x 2 cm. The birchbark rattle has a cylindrical head painted with a blue stripe that is attached to a wooden handle. The doctor's rattle consists of a circular wooden frame covered with hide. The ceremonial bag is a bandolier-type bag beaded in a floral motif and has a fringed bottom. The base of the shoulder strap also contains the beaded image of a man and two horses. The fawn skin bag is used to hold wild rice. The fungus is a black food fungus. The black dye has been identified by a Bois Forte representative as vermilion.

In 1903, William Jones acquired the cultural items from the Bois Forte Indian Reservation in Minnesota during an American Museum of Natural History funded expedition. The Museum accessioned the cultural items into its collection the same year.

The cultural affiliation of the cultural items is Bois Forte (Nett Lake) Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe as indicated by Museum records and by consultation evidence presented by the Bois Forte (Nett Lake) Band of the Minnesota Chippewa, Minnesota. Museum records indicate that the cultural items are Ojibway and that they were acquired from the Bois Forte Indian Reservation in Minnesota.

Officials of the American Museum of Natural History have determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001, (3)(C), the cultural items are specific ceremonial objects needed by traditional Native American religious leaders for the practice of traditional Native American religions by their present-day adherents. Officials of the American Museum of Natural History 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 sacred objects and the Bois Forte (Nett Lake) Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these sacred objects should contact Nell Murphy, Director of Cultural Resources, American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, NY 10024, telephone (212) 769-5837, before January 21, 2005. Repatriation of the

sacred objects to the Bois Forte (Nett Lake) Band of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota may proceed after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The American Museum of Natural History is responsible for notifying Bois Forte (Nett Lake) Band of the Minnesota Chippewa, Minnesota, and the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota that this notice has been published.

Dated: November 16, 2004.

**Sherry Hutt,**

*Manager, National NAGPRA Program.*

[FR Doc. R4-28004 Filed 1-6-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1501-01-D

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of the Draft Site Progress Report to the World Heritage Committee, Yellowstone National Park.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to the Decision adopted by the 27th Session of the World Heritage Committee (Document: WHC-03/27.COM/7A.12) accepted by the United States Government, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the publication for comment of a Draft Site Progress Report to the World Heritage Committee for Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, Idaho and Montana.

**DATES:** There will be a 30-day public review period for comments on this document. Comments must be received on or before February 7, 2005.

**ADDRESSES:** The Draft Site Report is included in the supplementary information section of this notice. Copies are also available by writing to Suzanne Lewis, Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, Post Office Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190-0168; by telephoning (307) 344-2002; by sending an e-mail message to [yell\\_world\\_heritage@nps.gov](mailto:yell_world_heritage@nps.gov); or by picking up a copy in person at the park's headquarters in Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyoming 82190. The document is also posted on the park's Web site at <http://www.nps.gov/yell/publications/worldheritage/>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Suzanne Lewis, Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, Post Office Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190-0168, or by calling (307) 344-2002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

## A. The World Heritage Committee Decision

In 1995, the World Heritage Committee, with the agreement of the United States, placed Yellowstone National Park, a designated World Heritage site, on its List of World Heritage in Danger in response to specific threats it identified to the outstanding universal value of the park. At its 27th Session in July 2003, the Committee decided to remove the park from the Danger List. The decision (27 COM 7A.12) is conveyed below:

The World Heritage Committee,

1. *Notes* the detailed report by the State Party provided on April 17, 2003;

2. *Urges* the State Party to continue to report on Yellowstone's snowmobile phase-out and other efforts to ensure that winter travel facilities respect the protection of the Park, its visitors, and its wildlife;

3. *Recommends* that the State Party continue its efforts in ensuring the McLaren Mine tailings are not contaminating the property;

4. *Recognizes* the progress made in addressing all the key issues that led to Danger Listing of the property in 1995 and considers that the reasons for retaining the property on this List no longer exist;

5. *Congratulates* the State Party for the considerable efforts and suggests to use this as a model case for promoting success stories of the World Heritage Convention and for international co-operation with other States Parties facing similar problems in World Heritage properties;

6. *Decides* to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

7. *Invites* the State Party:

(a) to continue its commitment to address the issues that have concerned the Committee in the past;

(b) to provide to the World Heritage Centre by 1 February 2005, existing recovery plans setting out targets and indicators for the 6 remaining long-term management issues (mining activities outside the park, threats to bison, threats to cutthroat trout, water quality issues, road impacts, visitor use impacts);

(c) to continue to report to the Committee on the condition of the original threats and the progress made towards resolving these issues until such time that the Committee decides that the reports are no longer needed. These reports shall include public input, including—but not limited to—independent experts, NGOs, and other key stakeholders.

## B. The NPS's Draft Site Report

In accordance with the Committee's request included in its decision to remove the park from the Danger List, the NPS has prepared a Site Report to continue to provide information to the World Heritage Committee on the original threats and the progress made towards resolving these issues. The Site Report provides a synopsis of the current status of the six specific threats outlined in 7(b) of the Committee's

decision. The full text of the draft Site Report is as follows.

### Yellowstone National Park Report to the World Heritage Committee; Status of Key Issues, January 2005

#### Introduction

Yellowstone National Park (Yellowstone) was inscribed as a World Heritage Site in 1978. Yellowstone National Park was inscribed as a World Heritage Site in Danger on December 5, 1995. In their report, the World Heritage Committee (WHC) cited specific threats and dangers that were already affecting, were beginning to affect, or had potential to seriously derogate the outstanding universal value for which Yellowstone was established as the nation's first national park, and one of the first World Heritage Sites. In July 2003, the WHC congratulated the park for "the considerable efforts" that went into "the progress made in addressing all the key issues that led to Danger Listing of the site \* \* \*" and considers " \* \* \* the reasons for retaining the site on this List no longer exist." As a consequence, Yellowstone National Park was removed from the list of World Heritage Sites in Danger.

However, the WHC invited Yellowstone to (1) continue its commitment to address the original issues; (2) provide the WHC recovery plans regarding those issues; (3) continue to provide progress reports to WHC on the original threats and to provide opportunities for the public and interested NGOs to comment on the progress reports.

In keeping with the WHC's request, this document is the second progress report, and includes plans and actions currently planned or underway, that specifically seek to redress the 1995 threats and dangers to the outstanding universal value.

See: <http://www.nps.gov/yell/index.htm> and <http://www.nps.gov/yell/publications/worldheritage/>.

In all resource cases described below, Yellowstone is guided first by the relevant statutory laws of the United States emphasizing parks such as the Yellowstone Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 21–22), NPS Organic Act (16 U.S.C. 1 *et seq.*), General Authorities Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–1), National Parks and Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 1a–7), the "Redwood Act" (16 U.S.C. 1a–1), and the National Parks Omnibus Management Act (16 U.S.C. 5901 *et seq.*). In addition, other national statutes in part dwell on parks such as the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.*), Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 *et seq.*), Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 *et seq.*), National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332 *et seq.*), Endangered Species Act (7 U.S.C. 136 as amended), Geothermal Steam Act (30 U.S.C. 1001 *et seq.*), Antiquities Act (16 U.S.C. 431 *et seq.*), Historic Sites Act (49 Stat. 666), National Historic Preservation Act (80 Stat. 915 as amended), Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act (88 Stat. 174), are examples among many others.

Any of these statutes can be retrieved from: <http://data2.itc.nps.gov/npspolicy/getlaws.cfm>.

In many instances, Presidential Executive Orders and "Rules," or Regulatory Law, are

more specific and focused than statutes and serve as detailed operating principles for the national parks.

For Executive Orders see:

[www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.html](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/fr/index.html).

For the Code of Federal Regulations see:

<http://data2.itc.nps.gov/npspolicy/getlaws.cfm>.

[www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov).

Finally, relevant governance for National Park Service (NPS) activities that are the most detailed are the NPS Management Policies and Director's Orders that are available and can be readily located at: <http://data2.itc.nps.gov/npspolicy/getlaws.cfm>.

### Progress on 1995 Threats

#### Mining Activities

*Threat in 1995:* The New World Mine was a major Crown Butte Mines, Inc. proposal to reopen an older mining area on patented and U.S. Forest Service lands to new gold and silver harvest. The site was adjacent to the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness area (Gallatin National Forest) and Yellowstone National Park and was perceived to be a major threat to the resources of the National Forest Wilderness and Yellowstone National Park.

*Outcome:* The U.S. government and Crown Butte Mines, Inc. signed an agreement in 1996 to refrain from mining these lands, and the Congress appropriated \$65 million for the acquisition of lands and interests, including cleanup of toxic overburden and tailings left over from a century of previous mining activity.

*Status:* The new mining proposal was shelved and most of the property was transferred to public domain. Cleanup of toxic materials from past mining started in 2000 and is expected to take 7 years, but post-project maintenance will be funded in perpetuity. One such site, the McLaren mine tailings, was left out of the cleanup agreement and, while the tailings (which are outside the Yellowstone) have stabilized and water quality inside the park has improved, the Yellowstone continues efforts to have them removed and the site restored.

*Plans/Actions:* See:

<http://www.nps.gov/yell/stateofthepark.htm>.

<http://www.fs.fed.us/r1/gallatin>.

<http://www.maximtechnologies.com/newworld>.

#### Threats to Bison

*Threat in 1995:* Yellowstone bison, some of which are infected with *Brucella abortus*, the agent that causes the disease Brucellosis, occasionally roam outside park boundaries. These bison may potentially transmit *Brucella* to livestock grazing outside the park which could jeopardize the "Brucellosis Free" status of states bordering Yellowstone. As such, the states view the presence of *Brucella* in park wildlife as a significant economic threat to the livestock industry. Occasionally, animals migrate out of the park and some are destroyed, especially when bison population numbers are high and the winters are severe.

*Outcome:* In 2000, Yellowstone National Park, State of Montana, U.S. Forest Service, USDA Plant and Animal Health Inspection Service cosigned a joint bison management

plan that agreed to conserve bison populations yet manage the risk of transmission from bison to cattle within the State of Montana. This is a long-term plan that should manage risks in the short- and medium-term, but set the stage for future discussions about eradication of the disease. It is also an incremental plan that becomes more wildlife-friendly and yet lowers transmission risk to cattle with each incremental success.

*Status:* This carefully crafted consensus-based plan has been successfully implemented for 4 years. While many people in the conservation community do not support the plan, in the last four years the core Yellowstone bison population has been sustained at or above ~3000 animals, which is considered a high population level. In addition, the plan addresses each of the major issues regarding the risk of brucellosis transmission from bison to livestock. For the first time ever, non-infected bison captured at the boundary in the winter of 2003–2004, were vaccinated against the disease and released back into Yellowstone instead of being destroyed. An Environmental Impact Study concerning the remote vaccination of herds within Yellowstone was officially begun in 2004, and includes substantial regional public involvement. Discussions and research continue to consider ways to eventually eliminate brucellosis from wildlife in the Greater Yellowstone Area while maintaining wild and free ranging wildlife herds.

*Plans/Actions:* See:

<http://www.nps.gov/yell/technical/planning/index.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/publications/index.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/technical/planning/bison/index.htm>

#### *Threats to Cutthroat Trout*

*Threats in 1995:* In 1994, voracious, predatory, non-native lake trout were discovered in Yellowstone Lake threatening the existence of the rare, endemic Yellowstone cutthroat trout, plus 42 other native birds and mammals that more or less depend on cutthroat trout for survival. It could also potentially destroy a sport fishery that once had a \$36 million annual value.

*Outcome:* Fish experts have concluded that the risk of functional extinction of the native trout was real, substantial, and urgent, but that no technology is known to completely eradicate lake trout from the lake. The best that could be hoped for was long-term suppression of lake trout, through the annual deployment of "industrial-strength gillnetting." This partial solution was implemented by NPS beginning in 1995, targeting the lake trout that are thought to have been in the lake and reproducing for about 20 years. A no-limit, no-live-release regulation on lake trout for sport anglers was also put into effect.

*Status:* The gillnetting fishing effort has increased each year and has resulted in the destruction of over 100,000 adult and juvenile lake trout. Catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) has declined considerably from the high in 1998 and has generally continued to decline annually since that time, which

suggests the program has measurably reduced the population in 2003 and 2004, and if the CPUE continues to decline it also signals an indication that the population is collapsing.

*Plans/Actions:* In addition to annual refinements in gillnetting technology to improve take-efficiency, nighttime electrofishing over lake trout spawning beds was attempted for the first time with encouraging success, perhaps opening a new, independent method of efficient harvest. Discussions on methods of destroying fertilized eggs and larval fish in lake bottom rubble are at an early stage of discussion and may lead to additional measures of control.

See:

<http://www.nps.gov/yell/stateofthepark.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/publications/index.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/publications/index.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/planvisit/todo/fishing/fishreports.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/tours/thismonth/aug2004/fish/index.htm> (video clips).

#### *Water Quality Issues*

*Threats in 1995:* Yellowstone National Park hosts almost 5 million human use days annually. Old, outdated waste treatment plants, lift stations, and underground lines, and older single wall fuel tanks were causing an unacceptable level of accidental overflows, ruptures, and spills affecting soils, ground and surface waters degrading localized wild lands. In 1995, the failing wastewater treatment plant at Norris Village was closed upon recommendations of the U.S. Public Health Service.

*Outcome:* In the past five years Congress has appropriated \$22 million for water and sewage projects and special monies to replace all single wall fuel tanks. These projects have reduced the backlog in the arena by approximately 30%.

*Status:* All of the park's fuel storage tanks have been replaced with new double-walled liquid tanks or replaced with more environmentally friendly propane gas tanks. A new wastewater plant has been constructed at Old Faithful, the closed Norris system is being replaced now, and the Madison system is being designed. Older or problematic lift stations, lines, grease traps have been replaced at many locations in the park. A backlog of deteriorated smaller wastewater facilities remain and aged (pre-1966) distribution systems in Yellowstone and will be replaced or updated in the future as funds are available.

*Plans/Actions:* See:

<http://www.nps.gov/yell/stateofthepark.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/publications/pdfs/strategicplan.pdf>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/technical/planning/index.htm>

#### *Road Impacts*

*Threats in 1995:* Yellowstone's road system was never designed for the volume, size, and weight of vehicles that travel through the park today. The park maintains 478 miles of roads of which 310 are paved and considered primary roads for the public. The remaining 156 miles are paved or gravel secondary roads for service and/or light public use.

Road engineers, maintenance workers, and virtually all the visiting public considered the condition of the road system in 1995 deplorable.

*Outcome:* In partnership with the Federal Highway Administration, Yellowstone has an integrated, methodical and long-term program to improve the fabric of the park's roads and lessen unsafe conditions and unsatisfactory experiences for visitors, and prevention of resource degradation. An annual funded program of complete bed and/or surface replacement is expected to continue through 2017 although the Transportation Bill that has funded reconstruction expired in 2003 and a new Bill has not yet been authorized.

*Status:* Much has been accomplished since 1995 upgrading the existing road system, but it is a slow process because of the short summer construction season and the reality that reconstruction must be reasonably compatible with summer visitors. As noted above, the current program will be carried out annually through the year 2017, if the Transportation Bill is reauthorized, after which the structural deficiencies should be corrected. The park also issued its Business Plan in 2003, which is its statement of operational needs for the next 5 years. In that plan, deficiencies in cyclical maintenance of roads are articulated and, if the park has authorized cyclical maintenance funding, this would keep the new, rebuilt roads in top, non-deteriorating condition.

*Plans/Actions:* See:

<http://www.nps.gov/yell/stateofthepark.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/businessplan/index.htm>  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/technical/planning/index.htm>

#### *Visitor Use Impacts*

*Threats in 1995:* Increasing visitor pressures on the natural and cultural resources of the park have been of concern to managers for many years. Recently, the park has hosted about 3 million visitors per year, which represents roughly 5 million visitor-use days annually. The quality of a visitor's Yellowstone experience in terms of sights, sounds and smells has also been extensively debated. Concerns have been raised most strongly regarding winter use in the park, although peak summer season crowding has been an issue for some. The number of visitors in the park, whether summer or winter, is a contentious subject with the U.S. public, who are divided among those who believe the park is overused, or that use is about right, or that the park could handle more visitors. The NPS Mission is to conserve the natural and cultural resources and to provide for the public enjoyment of the same in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future generations.

*Outcome:* Winter use has been very controversial starting with a decision in 2000 to ban snowmobiles and replace them with snow coaches. Litigation and decisions by two different Federal judges have affected the decisionmaking process. Most recently, the 2000 decision was vacated by a Federal judge. The NPS has just published a final rule for a Temporary Winter Use Plan that substantially reduces the daily maximum

number of snowmobiles from historic highs (720 compared to 1,650 per peak day), requires the use of best available technology, which will reduce emissions (by 90%) and noise, and require all travel groups to be accompanied by guide to reduce wildlife conflicts.

*Status:* The NPS believes the most recent decision addresses winter use-related issues and the park's goals of protecting park resources, protecting employee and visitor health and safety, and improving the quality of the visitor experience. The NPS also believes the final rule for a Temporary Winter Use Plan honors the rulings of both Federal judges and is hopeful that legal challenges will not disrupt the implementation of the interim plan. A provision in the recently signed appropriations law guarantees that the interim plan will be in effect for at least the 2004–05 winter season. The NPS will be developing a new Environmental Impact Statement to address the long term winter use issue and that process is expected to take several years to complete.

Spring, summer, and fall visitation continues to be below the high level measured in 1995, and visitor growth appears to have diminished as an issue in the eyes of many. Separately, the park has focused on development of partnerships to encourage more sustainability in visitor use. Several partnerships encourage use of alternate fuels for transportation and facilities or highlight hybrid automobiles for transportation. Another partnership is working to reduce solid waste, foster recycling, and grow into large-scale composting of organic materials. These partnerships should help the park and adjacent communities foster a region-wide approach serving visitors more efficiently and with less resource consumption in the future.

*Plans/Actions:* See:

<http://www.nps.gov/yell/stateofthepark.htm>.  
<http://www.nps.gov/yell/technical/planning/winteruse/plan/index.htm>.

### C. Public Comment Solicitation

Persons wishing to comment may do so by any one of several methods. They may mail comments to Suzanne Lewis, Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, PO Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190–0168. They also may comment via e-mail to [yell\\_world\\_heritage@nps.gov](mailto:yell_world_heritage@nps.gov) (include name and return address in the e-mail message). Finally, they may hand-deliver comments to park headquarters in Mammoth Hot Springs, Wyoming 82190.

The NPS practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request we withhold their home address from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold from the record a respondent's identify, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your

name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. However, we will not consider anonymous comments. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety.

Dated: January 3, 2005.

**Paul Hoffman,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks.*

[FR Doc. 05–351 Filed 1–6–05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312–52–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

### Employment and Training Administration

#### Information Regarding the Relocation of Foreign Labor Certification Staff in the Atlanta and Chicago Regional Offices to the Atlanta and Chicago National Processing Centers

**AGENCY:** Employment and Training Administration, Labor.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Employment and Training Administration (ETA) of the Department of Labor (Department or DOL) is issuing this Notice to announce that DOL has moved its foreign labor certification field staff in the Atlanta and Chicago Regional Offices to the new Atlanta and Chicago National Processing Centers. This Notice provides the public in the Atlanta and Chicago regions with contact information regarding these two new processing centers. All foreign labor certification processing activities previously conducted in the Atlanta and Chicago Regional Offices will now be assumed by the corresponding Atlanta or Chicago National Processing Centers.

The regulation to implement the re-engineered permanent labor certification program was published in the **Federal Register** on December 27, 2004. The National Processing Centers will continue current functions on an interim basis and ETA will provide additional guidance as to the handling of cases which will be filed under the new rule as well as backlogged permanent labor certification cases.

Employers in the Atlanta and Chicago regions requesting H–2A workers should simultaneously submit H–2A applications to their appropriate State Workforce Agency (SWA) and respective National Processing Center. These H–2A applications should no longer be submitted to ETA's Atlanta or

Chicago Regional Offices. Employers in the Atlanta and Chicago regions requesting either permanent or H–2B workers should continue, until ETA publishes future guidance on this issue, to file permanent and H–2B applications with the appropriate SWA.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

William Carlson, Chief, Division of Foreign Labor Certification, Employment and Training Administration, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW., Room C–4312, Washington, DC 20210; Telephone: (202) 693–3010 (this is not a toll-free number).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The two National Processing Centers opened as of December 13, 2004, and assumed, on an interim basis, responsibility for processing Applications for Alien Employment Certification (ETA Form 750) for permanent employment, and H–2A, and H–2B applications previously processed by ETA's Atlanta and Chicago Regional Offices. The two new National Processing Centers will handle permanent labor certification cases to be filed under the soon-to-be effective regulation implementing the new permanent labor certification program.

As recently announced, ETA has issued a new form to be used when filing applications under the H–1B and H–1B1 programs. Please see 69 FR 69412 published on November 29, 2004, for additional details. The mailing address and fax number for H–1B and H–1B1 case processing operations remain the same. The H–1B and H–1B1 address and fax number are: ETA Application Processing Center, P.O. Box 13640, Philadelphia, PA 19101, Fax: (800) 397–0478.

**ADDRESSES:** The following new addresses, phone numbers, and fax numbers should be used by employers and by SWAs for either inquiries or for the forwarding of application materials, as appropriate. *Please note:* for all application materials, inquiries, and other correspondence sent to either the Atlanta or Chicago National processing Center, envelopes should be clearly marked according to the appropriate program type, *i.e.*, permanent, H–2A, or H–2B.

*Atlanta Processing Center Address:* U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, Foreign Labor Certification National Processing Center, Harris Tower, 233 Peachtree Street, Suite 410, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, Phone: (404) 893–0101, Fax: (404) 893–4642.