

general management plan (FEIS/GMP) responds to and incorporates agency and public comments received on the draft EIS/plan, which was available for public review from March 29, 2013, through May 28, 2013. Two public meetings were held, one in Amarillo, Texas on April 30, 2013, and the other in Fritch, Texas on May 1, 2013, to gather input on the draft EIS/plan; 27 members of the public attended these meetings. We received approximately 25 comments during the public review period. Few of the comments were substantive and none required more than minor responses such as factual corrections. For this reason we have prepared an abbreviated final EIS that includes our response to comments and an errata sheet. This abbreviated FEIS/GMP and the text of the DEIS/GMP together constitute the Final EIS/GMP.

The FEIS/GMP evaluates three alternatives for managing Lake Meredith NRA and three alternatives for managing Alibates Flint Quarries NM. The NPS-preferred alternative for Lake Meredith NRA would promote both traditional and nontraditional uses, developing facilities and opportunities to address changing lake conditions and visitor uses. The national recreation area would become a destination for semi-primitive outdoor recreation opportunities and would strengthen partnerships to improve visitor experience.

The preferred alternative for Alibates Flint Quarries NM would provide a greater understanding and appreciation for archeological protection through enhanced educational opportunities and research. It also would accommodate a wider range of visitor uses and experiences by zoning part of the national monument for unrestricted visitor access by foot.

The responsible official for this FEIS/GMP is the Regional Director, NPS Intermountain Region, 12795 W Alameda Parkway, Lakewood, Colorado 80228.

Dated: September 11, 2014.

**Sue E. Masica,**

*Regional Director, Intermountain Region,  
National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2014-23038 Filed 9-26-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-CB-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

**[NPS-IMR-BITH-16171;  
PX.PD109246J.00.1]**

#### **Final Environmental Impact Statement for General Management Plan, Big Thicket National Preserve, Texas**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** The National Park Service announces the availability of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the general management plan for Big Thicket National Preserve. Consistent with NPS laws, regulations, and policies and the purpose of the parkway, the general management plan will guide the management of the park over the next 15–20 years.

**DATES:** The NPS will sign a Record of Decision no sooner than 30 days following publication of the Environmental Protection Agency of its Notice of Availability of the general management plan in the **Federal Register**.

**ADDRESSES:** Electronic copies of the general management plan will be available online at <http://parkplanning.nps.gov/BITH>. To request a copy, contact Superintendent Doug Neighbor, 6044 FM 420, Kountze, TX 77625, 409-951-6801, and at the following location: Fire Management Office, 860 CR 1040, Woodville, TX 75997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Superintendent Doug Neighbor, Big Thicket National Preserve, 6044 FM 420, Kountze, TX 77625; telephone (409) 951-6801.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We have prepared the final environmental impact statement for the general management plan (FEIS/GMP) and we are publishing this notice pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C). The FEIS/GMP responds to, and incorporates, agency and public comments received on the draft EIS/plan, which was available for public review from May 3, 2013, through July 1, 2013. Three public meetings were held from May 14–16, 2013, to gather input on the draft EIS/plan. The meetings were held at the preserve visitor center in Kountze, Texas, and in Woodville and Beaumont, Texas. There were 16 pieces of correspondence received during the public review period. The NPS responses to substantive agency and public comments are provided in

“Chapter 5: Consultation and Coordination” of the FEIS/GMP.

The FEIS/GMP evaluates four alternatives for managing use and development of the park. The preferred alternative (alternative 2) would expand opportunities for diverse, low-impact visitor activities by increasing the number of hiking and water-based trails and access points, especially on the newly acquired lands and linking existing trails to trails in the park. Natural resource management activities would focus on minimizing the effects of habitat fragmentation using a number of techniques including fire management, voluntary actions for oil and gas operations in the preserve, and land management agreements with partners. Partnerships are important for implementation of the preferred alternative including protection of natural flow regimes, preventing illegal dumping and other illegal activities as well as noncompatible land uses, and encouraging compatible resource management approaches. Infrastructure development is focused on providing access into the preserve and making existing facilities more sustainable. When approved, the plan will guide the management of the park over the next 15 to 20 years.

The responsible official for this FEIS/GMP is the Regional Director, NPS Intermountain Region, 12795 W Alameda Parkway, Lakewood, Colorado 80228.

Dated: September 11, 2014.

**Sue E. Masica,**

*Regional Director, Intermountain Region,  
National Park Service.*

[FR Doc. 2014-23039 Filed 9-26-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4312-CB-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

**[NPS-WASO-NRNL-16712;PPWOCRADIO,  
PCU00RP14.R50000]**

#### **National Register of Historic Places; Notification of Pending Nominations and Related Actions**

Nominations for the following properties being considered for listing or related actions in the National Register were received by the National Park Service before September 5, 2014. Pursuant to § 60.13 of 36 CFR Part 60, written comments are being accepted concerning the significance of the nominated properties under the National Register criteria for evaluation. Comments may be forwarded by United States Postal Service, to the National Register of Historic Places, National