• Property and/or conservation easements would be purchased to offset impacts of dam removal to trumpeter swans.

Each of these facilities is funded wholly or in part by the federal government to the extent that they provide mitigation from the effects of dam removal. Additional funding may be provided by homeowners groups or by other interested parties if protection or improvement beyond that resulting directly from dam removal is desired.

The No Action alternative is the same alternative as was discussed in the 1996 Implementation EIS; that is, no dam removal would take place. Because the dams would remain, water and flooding mitigation would not be needed.

Public Response to Draft SEIS: The draft SEIS was released for public review and comment in January 2005. Comments were received until March 15, 2005. The NPS received 8 letters and an Enviromental Protection Agency (EPA) evaluation of LO, or lack of objections (also noticed in the **Federal Register** on April 8, 2005). Commenters included the Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Natural Resources, the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, the city of Port Angeles, Dry Creek Water Association, Inc., American Whitewater, Trout Unlimited, and Mr. Russ Busch, Tribal Attorney.

Synopsis of Comments and Changes in Final SEIS: The state agencies primarily reminded the NPS that various permits to begin dam removal would be required. Three individuals from the Tribe submitted requests for changed language reflecting updates since the draft SEIS was released. Because the Tribe and city of Port Angeles have been unable to reach a final agreement on the acceptance of tribal wastewater to the city's treatment facility, a second alternative was added. This alternative would be located on tribal land and would use a membrane bio-reactor technology and constructed wetland to treat wastewater and minimize impact of any effluent. Effluent would be allowed to infiltrate into soil underlying the wetland, or would be released into the Elwha River. This is the preferred alternative, rather than connecting to the city of Port Angeles' wastewater treatment facility. The Tribe has also evaluated two different alignments for extending the federal levee to the south that would better mitigate impacts from flooding at this end of the reservation. These have been added to the text of the final SEIS, although the preferred alternative is one that was analyzed in the draft SEIS. Additional information on fisheries and vegetation issues that have no bearing on the decision of a preferred alternative, but which add to the completeness of the final SEIS, was suggested by the third tribal individual. The city of Port Angeles' comments were wide ranging: some requested additional clarification on measures to mitigate impacts (to industrial users, for example); others mentioned permitting and final clearances that would be required from the city; some asked for additional impact information, such as to Orca whales, socioeconomics, and current traffic conditions; and others debated accuracy of statements in the draft SEIS. Although additional impact information and clarity on mitigation measures has been added where NPS felt it was incomplete or would be helpful, no changes to the preferred alternative were necessitated as a result of the city's comments. Mr. Busch asked for additional information to be added to the description and impacts of the No Action alternative, as well as to the impacts of the preferred alternative. The added information would not affect selection of the preferred alternative or alter it in any way. American Whitewater asked that the safety of the new surface diversion facility (the Elwha Surface Water Intake) be evaluated so that access for recreational uses would be maintained along the entire river, and Trout Unlimited indicated support for several of the features of the preferred alternative. The diversion would be able to pass kayaks and other craft safely, and signs to indicate any hazard areas would be used to direct recreational users.

Distribution of Final SEIS: Those who commented during the review period on the draft SEIS will receive a complete final SEIS document, as will agencies and others on the park mailing list (as noted in chapter 5 of the final SEIS). Others may request a paper copy of the final SEIS, a CD of the final SEIS and/or a CD of the full 1996 Implementation EIS which the subject document supplements. Please specify which of these documents/CDs is desired when contacting the Elwha Project Management Office. Finally, both the final SEIS and 1996 Implementation EIS will be posted on the Elwha project Web site at *http://www.nps.gov/olym/elwha/home.htm.*

Decision Process: Following release of the final SEIS the NPS will wait for a minimum period of at least 30 days from the date this notice is published in the **Federal Register** before making a final decision on which mitigation facilities it will select. Therefore if there are interested persons or organizations wishing to express any remaining concerns or comments on the content of the final SEIS, they should send them in writing to Dr. Brian Winter, Elwha Project Manager, at 826 East Front Street, Ste.A, Port Angeles, WA 98362; telephone inquires may be directed to (360) 565–1320. Faxed or electronic transmittals will be accept also (electronic comments should be sent to *Brian_Winter@nps.gov,* and faxes may be sent to (360) 565–1325). If substantive new information is submitted that both (1) could not have been raised during scoping or the review of the draft SEIS and (2) that has bearing on the selection of the preferred mitigation alternative, the NPS will consider such information.

Respondents are reminded that decisions or facts in the 1996 Implementation EIS are not subject to public review at this time. If any persons or organizations choose to respond, please include name and address (note that names and addresses of commenters become part of the public record). If individuals commenting request that their name or/and address be withheld from public disclosure, it will be honored to the extent allowable by law. Such requests must be stated prominently in the beginning of the comments. There also may be circumstances wherein the NPS will withhold from the record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. As always: the NPS will make available to public inspection all submissions from organizations or businesses and from persons identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations and businesses; and, anonymous comments may not be considered.

As a delegated EIS, the official responsible for the final decision is the Regional Director, Pacific West Region. Subsequently the official responsible for implementing the selected mitigation alternative is the Superintendent, Olympic National Park.

Dated: June 3, 2005.

Patricia L. Neubacher,

Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 05–14353 Filed 7–20–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–KY–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Lincoln Home National Historic Site, Illinois

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement for the general management plan, Lincoln Home National Historic Site.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(C), the National Park Service is preparing an environmental impact statement for a general management plan for Lincoln Home National Historic Site (LIHO). The environmental impact statement will be approved by the Director, Midwest Region.

The general management plan will prescribe the resource conditions and visitor experiences that are to be achieved and maintained at LIHO over the next 15 to 20 years. The clarification of what must be achieved according to law and policy will be based on review of the site's purpose, significance, special mandates, and the body of laws and policies directing park management. Based on determinations of desired conditions, the general management plan will outline the kinds of resource management activities, visitor activities, and development that would be appropriate in the future. A range of reasonable management alternatives will be developed through this planning process and will include, at a minimum, no action and the preferred alternative.

Major issues to be addressed in the plan include: Issues surrounding preserving park resources (such as developing management strategies to preserve and maintain historic structures and cultural landscapes and protect archaeological sites in the face of a predicted increase in visitation); issues surrounding visitor understanding, education and appreciation of park resources (such as enhancing and expanding meaningful visitor experiences as alternatives to the LIHO tour); and, issues surrounding organizational effectiveness (such as identifying potential partnerships with the city of Springfield, the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum and others).

Dates: Any comments on the scope of issues to be addressed in the EIS should be received no later than November 15. Public meetings regarding the general management plan will be held during the scoping period. Specific dates, times, and locations will be made available in the local media, on the LIHO Web site (*http://www.nps.gov/liho*), on the National Park Service Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site (*parkplanning.nps.gov/publicHome.cfm*), or by contacting the Superintendent.

ADDRESSES: Information on the planning process and copies of newsletters will be available from the office of the Superintendent, 413 South Eighth Street, Springfield, IL 62701–1905.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Acting Superintendent, Lincoln Home National Historic Site, 413 South Eighth Street, Springfield, IL 62701–1905. 217–492–4241.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: If you wish to comment on any issues associated with the plan, you may submit your comments by any one of several methods. You may mail comments to Lincoln Home National Historic Site, 413 South Eighth Street, Springfield, IL 62701–1905. You may also comment via e-mail to *liho_superintendent@nps.gov*. Please submit e-mail comments as a text file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Be sure to include your name and return street address in your Internet message. You may provide comments electronically by entering them into the PEPC Web site at the address above. Finally, you may hand-deliver comments to 413 South Eighth Street in Springfield, IL.

Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that 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 identity, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. 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: June 8, 2005.

Ernest Quintana,

Regional Director, Midwest Region.

[FR Doc. 05–14355 Filed 7–20–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312–BM–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the General Management Plan for Little River Canyon National Preserve, AL

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, National Park Service (NPS) policy in Director's Order Number 2 (Park Planning) and Director's Order Number 12 (Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis, and Decisionmaking), the NPS will prepare an EIS for the General Management Plan (GMP) for Little River Canyon National Preserve. The authority for publishing this notice is contained in 40 CFR 1506.6.

The NPS will conduct public scoping meetings in the local area to receive input from interested parties on issues, concerns, and suggestions pertinent to the management of Little River Canyon National Preserve. Suggestions and ideas for managing cultural and natural resource conditions and visitor experiences at the national preserve are encouraged. The comment period for each of these meetings will be announced at the meetings and will be published on the GMP web site for Little River Canyon National Preserve at *http://www.nps.gov/sero/planning/liri_gmp/liri_info.htm.*

DATES: Locations, dates, and times of public scoping meetings will be published in local newspapers and may also be obtained by calling Little River Canyon National Preserve. This information will also be published on the GMP Web site for Little River Canyon National Preserve.

ADDRESSES: Scoping suggestions should be submitted to the following address to ensure adequate consideration by the NPS: Superintendent, Little River Canyon National Preserve, 2141 Gault Avenue North, Fort Payne, Alabama 35967.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Superintendent, Little River Canyon National Preserve, (256) 845–9605.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NPS has announced that an EIS on GMPs will be prepared for all park units. To comply with this policy, a formal scoping period is announced.

Comments are invited on any issue believed to be relevant to the management of Little River Canyon