

Dated: May 16, 2005.

Patricia A. Hooks,

Regional Director, Southeast Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 05-11145 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-53-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, Colorado National Monument, CO

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Colorado National Monument.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(C), the National Park Service announces the availability of a Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan, Colorado National Monument, Colorado.

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 in the office of the Superintendent, and at the following locations:

Colorado National Monument Visitor Center/Headquarters, Bruce Noble, Superintendent, 7 miles east of Fruita on Rim Rock Drive, Fruita, CO 81521-0001, Tel: (970) 858-3617, ext. 300.

Fruita Branch Mesa County Public Library District, 324 East Aspen Avenue, Fruita, CO 81521, Tel. (970) 858-7703.

Mesa County Central Library, 530 Grand Avenue, Grand Junction, CO 81502-5019, Tel. (970) 243-4442.

Internet Address: <http://planning.nps.gov/plans.cfm>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Contact Superintendent Bruce Noble, Colorado National Monument, Fruita, CO 81521-0001; Tel: (970) 858-3617, ext. 300; FAX: (970) 858-0372; e-mail: bruce.noble@nps.gov.

Dated: April 27, 2005.

Michael D. Snyder,

Acting Director, Intermountain Region, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 05-11142 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-CP-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Final Environmental Impact Statement/General Management Plan, Crater Lake National Park, Douglas, Jackson and Klamath Counties, OR; Notice of Availability

SUMMARY: Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Pub. L. 91-190, as amended), and the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR part 1500-1508), the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, has prepared a final general management plan (GMP) and environmental impact statement (EIS) for Crater Lake National Park, Oregon. The final EIS identifies and analyzes four GMP alternatives which respond to both NPS planning requirements and to the issues identified during the public scoping process. The "no-action" alternative (Alternative 1) describes the existing conditions and trends of park management and serves as a baseline for comparison in evaluating the other alternatives. The three "action" alternatives variously address visitor use, natural and cultural resource management, and park development. Alternative 2, the preferred alternative, emphasizes increased opportunities in recreational diversity, resource preservation, research and resource education. Under Alternative 3 visitors would experience a greater range of natural and cultural resources through recreational opportunities and education. The focus of Alternative 4 would be on preservation and restoration of natural processes.

Background: Public meetings and newsletters have been used to keep the public informed and involved in the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process for the GMP. A mailing list was compiled that consisted of members of government agencies, nongovernmental groups, businesses, legislators, local governments, and interested citizens. The Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the **Federal Register** on May 25, 2001. A newsletter issued January 2001 introduced the GMP planning process (a total of 72 written comments were received in response). Public meetings were held during April 2001 in Klamath Falls, Medford, Roseburg, and Salem and were attended by 96 people. A second newsletter issued in July 2001 summarized all comments received in the meetings and in response to newsletter 1. These comments were used to complete the

park purpose and significance statements that serve as the foundation for the rest of the GMP planning (and were referred to throughout development of the GMP).

A third newsletter distributed in the spring of 2002 described the draft alternative concepts and management zoning proposed for managing the park (a total of 95 comments were received in response). In general, opinions were fairly divided in support of individual alternatives and potential ways to address issues. A number of letters favored continued snowmobile use, while other people favored eliminating snowmobiles in the park. Opinions were also divided regarding ways to manage traffic congestion on Rim Drive—maintaining current two-way traffic, converting part of the road to one-way traffic, using shuttles, or closure of the road to traffic. Most respondents favored use of shuttles. A number of people who opposed partnering with private industry were concerned with potential for large-scale commercialization within the park.

The Notice of Availability for the Draft EIS and GMP was printed August 3, 2004. The public comment period was open until October 6, 2004. A total of 646 comments were received. Forty-seven letters and e-mails were sent in by individuals. Four agencies responded. Three different form letters accounted for the remaining 599 comments. The most common comment issues were snowmobiles (24 letters/e-mails and all 3 form letters), road closure (15 letters/e-mails and 2 of 3 form letters), shuttles (7 letters/e-mails and 1 of 3 form letters), and snow coaches (4 letters/e-mails and 1 of 3 form letters). Comments and representative letters received on the Draft document have been incorporated into the Final EIS and GMP.

Proposed Plan and Alternatives: Alternative 1 is the "no action" alternative and represents continuation of the current management direction and approach at the park. It is a way of evaluating the proposed actions of the other three alternatives. Existing buildings and facilities in the park would remain; some historic structures would be adaptively used. Munson Valley would continue to serve as the center of NPS administration, maintenance, and housing. The existing road access and circulation system within the park would continue, and visitor recreational opportunities and interpretive programs in the park would continue.

Alternative 2 is the "agency preferred" alternative and has also been determined to be the "environmentally