

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under Section 11 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA) Pub. L. 100–497, 25 U.S.C. § 2710, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the **Federal Register** notice of approved Tribal-State compacts for the purpose of engaging in Class III gaming activities on Indian lands. The Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, through her delegated authority, has approved the Tribal-State Compact between the Navajo Nation, a federally recognized Indian Tribe, and the State of New Mexico. This Compact is identical in substance to the 2001 New Mexico Compacts that were approved by the New Mexico Legislature by joint resolution on March 12, 2001. The Nation shall pay to the State an amount equal to 8 percent of the Net Win in return for which the State agrees that the Nation has the exclusive right within the State to conduct all types of Class III gaming, with the sole exception of the use of Gaming Machines permitted for racetracks and for veterans and fraternal organizations.

Dated: January 2, 2004.

**Aurene M. Martin,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 04–1023 Filed 1–15–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–4N–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Indian Affairs

#### Indian Gaming

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of approved Class III Gaming Compact.

**SUMMARY:** Under Section 11 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA) Pub. L. 100–497, 25 U.S.C. § 2710, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the **Federal Register**, notice of the approved Tribal-State compacts for the purpose of engaging in Class III gaming activities on Indian lands. The Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, through her delegated authority, has approved the Tribal-State Compact between the Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, a federally recognized Indian Tribe, and the State of California. The Compact contemplates two gaming facilities, one in Imperial County and one in Riverside County. The Imperial County site would be a 350-machine Gaming Facility. The Compact requires a 5 percent payment of net win from the

operation of gaming devices to the State for the exclusive right to operate Class III gaming devices in the State of California, and, as part of the Tribe's commitment to mitigate any significant, adverse impacts resulting from casino development, the Tribe and the State, through Imperial and Riverside County, have agreed to conclude one or more written agreements. All such agreements shall be concluded prior to the commencement of the Project, and shall provide for the identification and implementation of feasible mitigation measures and feasible project alternatives concerning problem and pathological gambling and significant environmental effects.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 16, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

George T. Skibine, Director, Office of Indian Gaming Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, DC 20240, (202) 219–4066.

Dated: January 7, 2004.

**Aurene M. Martin,**

*Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary—Indian Affairs.*

[FR Doc. 04–1024 Filed 1–15–04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4310–4N–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[CA–330–03–1610–00]

#### Notice of Availability of a Draft Resource Management Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the King Range National Conservation Area

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and under authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the King Range Act of 1970, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared a Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the King Range National Conservation Area (NCA). The planning area, which consists of the King Range NCA and adjoining BLM public lands, encompasses approximately 62,000 acres in Humboldt and Mendocino Counties, California. The Draft RMP/Draft EIS provides direction and guidance for the management of public lands and resources within the Planning Area as well as monitoring and evaluation requirements.

**DATES:** Written comments on the Draft RMP/Draft EIS will be accepted for 90 days following the Environmental Protection Agency's publication of the Notice of Availability for this Draft RMP/Draft EIS in the **Federal Register**. Future public meetings and any other public involvement activities will be announced at least 15 days in advance through public notices, media news releases, the project Web site at <http://www.ca.blm.gov/arcata/>, and/or mailings.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to Bob Wick, Bureau of Land Management, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, Arcata Field Office, 1695 Heindon Rd, Arcata, CA 95521; Fax (707) 825–2301 or email ([caweb330@ca.blm.gov](mailto:caweb330@ca.blm.gov)).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The King Range Act of 1970 (Pub.L. 91–476) established the King Range National Conservation Area. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (Pub.L. 94–579) expanded the area to its present size of approximately 62,000 acres. The King Range Act requires development of “a comprehensive, balanced, and coordinated plan of land use, development, and management of the Area.” The act also states “that the plan will be reviewed and reevaluated periodically.” The original plan was completed in 1974, and the present planning effort is the first comprehensive update.

Five scoping meetings were held to solicit input for draft plan formulation. Three of these meetings were held in the communities surrounding the King Range. The other two meetings were held in Eureka and San Francisco. Public input during the scoping process identified 7 issue areas for analysis in the RMP/EIS. The Draft RMP/Draft EIS examines four alternatives that respond to these issues. The issues include: Recreation and Visitor Use, Education/ Interpretation, Resource Conservation and Management, Fire Management, Transportation/Access, and Community Involvement. Alternative A is the No Action (current management) Alternative. Alternatives B, C and D present a range of management scenarios with varying amounts of natural resource restoration/use and differing levels of recreation use and facilities. The Preferred Alternative is a combination of components from Alternatives B, C and D.

Please note that comments, including names and street addresses of respondents, are available for public review and/or release under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Individual respondents may request