

of those alternatives. These analyses underwent review within the BLM and among the cooperating agencies, resulting in the Draft IAP/EIS released on March 30, 2012. The comment period was originally scheduled to end on June 1, 2012, but in response to public requests, the BLM extended the comment period to June 15, 2012. The public and agencies commented on the Draft IAP/EIS. Based on these comments and additional analysis, the BLM developed the preferred alternative and revised the Draft to issue a Final IAP/EIS on December 19, 2012.

The ROD provides opportunities for oil and gas leasing and development as required by the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act, as amended, and for application for onshore infrastructure in support of offshore development, while protecting surface values, most notably subsistence resources and access and a wide range of important wildlife and wildlife habitat. This decision reflects the Preferred Alternative B-2 in the NPR-A Final IAP/EIS issued in December 2012, with minor modifications to clarify intent, provide greater assurance of the consistency of the plan with onshore infrastructure to support offshore development, and to establish an NPR-A working group as a means for future ongoing dialogue regarding BLM management of the NPR-A.

Authority: 40 CFR 1506.6.

Ted A. Murphy,
Acting State Director.

[FR Doc. 2013-04406 Filed 2-25-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JA-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

[NPS-SERO-EVER-12017; PPSESEROC3, PMP00UP05.YP0000]

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for General Management Plan, Everglades National Park, Florida

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(a)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the General Management Plan (GMP) and East Everglades Wilderness Study (EEWS) for Everglades National Park (park). After it is finalized, the GMP/EEWS will guide the management of the park over the next 20+ years.

The last comprehensive planning effort for the Park was completed in 1979. Patterns and types of visitor use have changed, the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan was approved, and in 1989 the East Everglades Addition of approximately 109,600 acres was added to the park to protect and restore the Northeast Shark River Slough. Recent studies have enhanced the understanding of resources, resource threats, and visitor use in the Park. The GMP will provide updated management direction for the entire park. The EEWS provides a forum for evaluating lands within the East Everglades Addition for possible recommendation to Congress for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

DATES: The NPS will accept comments from the public on the DEIS for 60 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the Notice of Availability in the **Federal Register**. The date, time, and location of public meetings will be announced through the NPS Planning, Environment, and Public Comment (PEPC) Web site <http://parkplanning.nps.gov>, the Everglades National Park Web site, and in media outlets in winter 2013.

ADDRESSES: The DEIS will be available for public review and comment online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov>. CDs and a limited number of printed copies will be made available at Everglades National Park headquarters and various local libraries. You may request a copy by contacting Everglades National Park, 40001 State Road 93363, Homestead, FL 33034; 305-242-7700.

If you wish to comment, you may do so by any one of several methods. The preferred method is commenting via the Internet at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov>. An electronic public comment form is provided through this Web site. You may also mail comments to Superintendent, Everglades National Park, 40001 State Road 9336, Homestead, FL 33034-6733. Comments may also be hand-delivered to the Everglades National Park address provided above. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public scoping for the GMP was initiated in 2003. The EEWS was added to the scope of the project in 2006. Public meetings, five newsletters, and internet updates have kept the public informed and involved throughout the planning process. The GMP EEWS will provide a framework for management, use, and development of the Everglades National Park for the next 20 or more years. The DEIS presents and analyzes four alternative ways of managing the Park—alternative 1 (no action/continue current management); the NPS preferred alternative; alternative 2; and alternative 4. (Alternative 3 was dismissed from detailed analysis).

Alternative 1 (no action/continue current management) provides a baseline for evaluating changes and impacts of the three action alternatives. No wilderness is proposed for the East Everglades Addition in alternative 1.

The NPS preferred alternative would support restoration of natural systems and enhanced protection of cultural resources, while providing improved opportunities for quality visitor experiences. It proposes about 80,100 acres for designation as wilderness within the East Everglades Addition, as well as about 9,900 acres for designation as potential wilderness.

Alternative 2 would strive to maintain and enhance visitor opportunities and protect natural systems while preserving many traditional routes and ways of visitor access. It proposes 39,500 acres for designation as wilderness within the East Everglades Addition. No potential wilderness is proposed under this alternative.

As noted above, alternative 3 was dismissed from detailed analysis.

Alternative 4 would provide a high level of support for protecting natural systems while improving opportunities for certain types of visitor activities. Alternative 4 would eliminate commercial airboat tours within the park. It proposes 42,700 acres for designation as wilderness within the East Everglades Addition and 59,400 acres for designation as potential wilderness.

All four alternatives would enhance Flamingo concessions services and facilities. The NPS preferred alternative, alternative 2, and alternative 4 would build the “Marjory Stoneman Douglas Visitor Center” at Everglades City, and each of these three alternatives would provide new and different visitor opportunities. The four alternatives are described in detail in chapter 2 of the DEIS and summarized in table 5 of that chapter. The key aspects of the four alternatives and the impacts of

implementing them are described in the plan's summary, detailed in chapter 5, and summarized in table 6 (chapter 2).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Everglades National Park Supervisory Park Planner Fred Herling at the address and telephone number shown above, or via email at Fred_Herling@nps.gov.

The responsible official for this DEIS/GMP is the Regional Director, NPS Southeast Region, 100 Alabama Street SW., 1924 Building, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

Dated: February 14, 2013.

Gordon Wissinger,

Acting Regional Director, Southeast Region.

[FR Doc. 2013-04342 Filed 2-25-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-JD-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

Draft Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Statement, Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project, El Dorado County, California

AGENCY: Bureau of Reclamation, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability and notice of public hearings.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Reclamation has made available for public review and comment the draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS/EIS) for the Upper Truckee River Restoration and Marsh Restoration Project (Project). The California Tahoe Conservancy and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, the other lead agencies for the Project, made the EIR/EIS/EIS available to the public on February 8, 2013.

DATES: Submit written comments on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS on or before April 29, 2013.

Two public hearings will be held at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 13, 2013 and Wednesday, March 27, 2013 in Stateline, Nevada, to receive oral and written comments regarding the Project's environmental effects.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments on the draft EIR/EIS/EIS to Scott Carroll, Environmental Planner, State of California, California Tahoe Conservancy, 1061 Third Street, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150; by fax to 530-542-5567; or by email to scarroll@tahoe.ca.gov. Emailed comments are preferred. See

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section for

directions on how to prepare email comments for the Project.

The public hearings will be held at 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.

The draft EIR/EIS/EIS is accessible at the following Web sites: <http://tahoe.ca.gov/upper-truckee-marsh-69.aspx>. http://www.usbr.gov/mp/nepa/nepa_projdetails.cfm?Project_ID=2937.

Compact disks are also available upon request from the California Tahoe Conservancy at scarroll@tahoe.ca.gov.

See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** Section for location where copies of the draft EIR/EIS/EIS are available for public review.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Scott Carroll, California Tahoe Conservancy, at 530-543-6062; or Adam Lewandowski, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; and Myrnie Mayville, Bureau of Reclamation, both at 775-588-4547.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of the Project is to restore natural geomorphic processes and ecological functions in this lowest reach of the Upper Truckee River and the surrounding marsh to improve ecological values of the restoration area and help reduce the river's discharge of nutrients and sediment that diminish Lake Tahoe's clarity.

The approximately 592-acre study area is along the most downstream reaches of the Upper Truckee River and Trout Creek, including their mouths at Lake Tahoe in the City of South Lake Tahoe, within El Dorado County, California. It includes 1.8-miles of the Upper Truckee River as well as the marsh and meadows surrounding the lowest reaches of Trout Creek. The majority of the study area is owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy though the study area does include small areas owned by other public agencies and private landowners.

Four action alternatives (Alternatives 1-4), and the No-Project/No-Action Alternative (Alternative 5), are analyzed in the draft EIR/EIS/EIS. Alternative 1 would involve restoration of the Upper Truckee River by increasing channel length and decreasing channel capacity. Alternative 2 would involve river restoration by directly raising the streambed elevation, increasing the channel length, and decreasing channel capacity. A key element of this restoration would be the excavation of a new river channel that has less capacity than the existing channel. Alternative 3 would promote the development, through natural processes, of a new main channel and/or tributary channels in the central portion of the study area. A "pilot"

channel would be constructed from the existing river channel to historical channels in the center of the study area, but no construction would occur in the central or northern portions of the study area. Rather, natural processes would be allowed to dictate the flow path(s), bed and bank elevations, and capacities of the channel(s) through the central and northern portions of the study area. Alternative 4 would restore the river channel and its connection to the floodplain by lowering bank heights by excavating an inset floodplain along much of the river channel, and by localized cut and fill to create meanders in the existing straightened reach. Alternative 5 would not provide any actions to restore the river channel and its connection to the floodplain in the study area. This alternative would allow, but not facilitate the long-term, passive recovery of the river system via natural processes. This alternative represents a projection of reasonably foreseeable future conditions that could occur if no project actions were implemented.

Significant or Adverse Environmental Effects Anticipated

Alternative 1 would involve restoration of the Upper Truckee River by increasing channel length and decreasing channel capacity. Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in short-term project and cumulative construction impacts to sensitive communities (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and Stream Environment Zone); disruption of wildlife habitat use and loss of wildlife; and potential risk of surface water degradation during construction and the interim adjustment period thereafter.

Implementing Alternative 1 would provide the maximum recreation elements, but in turn would result in additional significant and unavoidable project-related impacts including damage to or mortality of special-status plants resulting from recreational activities; conflicts with regional conservation strategies for Tahoe yellow cress; operation and expansion of recreation facilities having an adverse physical effect on the environment; and degradation of the scenic quality of shoreline and mapped scenic resources related to the Upper Truckee River bridge.

Implementing Alternative 2 would involve river restoration by directly raising the streambed elevation, increasing the channel length, and decreasing channel capacity by excavation of a new river channel that has less capacity than the existing