

[FR Doc. 04-17579 Filed 8-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-52-C

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Notice of Availability of Subsistence Resident Zone Boundary Maps, Wrangell-St. Elias National Park, Alaska

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: On February 25, 2002 the communities of Dot Lake, Healy Lake, Northway (including Northway, Northway Village, and Northway Junction), Tanacross, and Tetlin were added (see **Federal Register**, February 25, 2002, page 8481) to the subsistence resident zone for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park in accordance with the provisions of 36 CFR 13.43(b). The resident zone communities for the park, including the five new communities, are listed at 36 CFR 13.73(a)(1). This designation as resident zone communities means that permanent residents of these communities may hunt on those lands designated as Wrangell-St. Elias National Park (subject to other applicable Federal Subsistence regulations) without needing the special subsistence eligibility permit described in 36 CFR 13.44.

In addition to adding these five communities to the subsistence resident zone, a boundary mapping process was also adopted (see 36 CFR 13.73(a)(2)). This process provides for either a default boundary consisting of the area designation used for census purposes or the area designated by the park superintendent in consultation with the communities. In consultation with Dot Lake, Healy Lake, Northway, Tanacross, and Tetlin, the superintendent has determined boundaries for each of these communities.

Notice is hereby provided of boundary designations for each of the five communities in accordance with the consultation provisions of section 13.73(a)(2). As provided, copies of the designated resident zone boundaries are available at the park headquarters office in Copper Center, Alaska

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Hunter Sharp, Acting Superintendent, or Barbara Cellarius, Subsistence Coordinator, at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve, P.O. Box 439, Copper Center, AK 99573, telephone (907) 822-5234.

Dated: June 22, 2004.

Ralph Tingey,

Acting Regional Director, Alaska Region.

[FR Doc. 04-17584 Filed 8-2-04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4312-HC-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

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

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 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 (NPS), Department of the Interior, has prepared a draft general management plan (GMP) and environmental impact statement (EIS) for Crater Lake National Park, Oregon. The draft GMP identifies and analyzes four 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.

Scoping: 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 draft 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 draft 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 elimination of snowmobiles in the park. Opinions were 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 the potential of large-scale commercialization within the park.

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 preferred" alternative. Management of the park would emphasize increased opportunities for recreational diversity and research and education. Most recreational opportunities would remain, but new opportunities along Rim Drive would allow visitors to directly experience the primary resource of Crater Lake in ways other than driving. Any new uses around the rim would be non-motorized and low impact. Research and educational opportunities would be enhanced. A