



**Missouri/Niobrara/Verdigre Creek National Recreational Rivers Draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service.

**ACTION:** Availability of draft environmental impact statement and general management plan, for the Missouri/Niobrara/Verdigre Creek National Recreational Rivers located in Bon Homme, Charles Mix, and Gregory counties, South Dakota, and Boyd and Knox counties in Nebraska.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) and general management plan, for the Missouri/Niobrara /Verdigre Creek National Recreation Rivers. The DEIS responds to Public Law 102-50, which amended the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to add 39 miles of the Missouri, 20 miles of the Niobrara, and 8 miles of Verdigre Creek to the national wild and scenic rivers system. The NPS prepared the DEIS. Cooperating agencies included the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission; the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks; the Nebraska and South Dakota State Historic Preservation Offices; Boyd and Knox counties in Nebraska; and Bon Homme, Charles Mix, and Gregory counties in South Dakota.

The document describes five management and boundary alternatives. Alternative 1, a no action alternative, is required in order to provide a description of baseline conditions from which the action alternatives can be compared; its boundary is 1/4 mile from the riverbank, which is the interim boundary noted in the establishing legislation. Alternative 2 would provide for the preservation of the rural landscape, primarily through local management, and would establish a boundary at 200 feet from the riverbank. Alternative 3 would emphasize management to preserve and restore the biological elements of the river ecosystem; its boundary would be 200 feet from the riverbank, plus significant biological bottomland. Alternative 4 would emphasize visitor use along with resource conservation; its boundary would be 200 feet from the riverbank, plus significant biologic and public use resource areas. Alternative 5, the preferred alternative, combines the local management and philosophy of Alternative 2, some resource management and boundary of

Alternative 3, and some interpretive and visitor experience aspects of Alternative 4.

Each management action alternative is expected to provide a mechanism for long-term resource protection and accommodate recreational use of the river with minimal impact on the private property owner. In each alternative, farming and ranching are considered appropriate activities within the boundaries of the recreational rivers. Each action alternative relies heavily on the cooperative efforts of property owners, local communities and the National Park Service. No alternative would require much, if any, acquisition of land; any acquisitions would be from willing sellers only.

**DATES:** Comments on the DEIS should be received no later than September 3, 1996. Public meetings will be held in various Nebraska and South Dakota towns and cities during August, 1996, and will be announced in local news media when schedules are final.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the DEIS should be submitted to the Superintendent, Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways, P.O. Box 591, O'Neill, Nebraska 68763.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Public reading copies of the DEIS will be available for review at the Department of Interior Natural Resources Library, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240, and at public libraries and county courthouses in Center and Butte, Nebraska; and Burke, Lake Andes and Tyndall, South Dakota. Public reading copies will also be available at the public libraries in Verdigre and Niobrara, Nebraska.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Warren H. Hill, Superintendent, Niobrara/Missouri National Scenic Riverways at the above address or he can be reached at 402-336-3970.

Dated: July 3, 1996.  
William W. Schenk,  
*Field Director, Midwest Field Area.*  
[FR Doc. 96-17889 Filed 7-12-96; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Office of the Senior Counsel for Alternative Dispute Resolution**

**Policy on the Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution, and Case Identification Criteria for Alternative Dispute Resolution**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Senior Counsel for Alternative Dispute Resolution, Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice publishes the Alternative Dispute Resolution Policy Statements prepared by each of the civil litigating components in the Department of Justice as well as their criteria for identifying cases as potentially suitable for dispute resolution. As indicated in the introduction by the Attorney General, these documents were prepared by teams of staff attorneys within each of the components. Each document reflects the nature of the practice of that component. These documents have been provided to all staff attorneys in the Department of Justice who handle civil litigation, in Washington and in United States Attorneys' Offices, and are being published in the Federal Register to make clear the Department's commitment to greater use of alternative dispute resolution. Nothing in these documents, however, creates any right or benefit by a party against the United States.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Peter R. Steenland, Jr., Senior Counsel for Alternative Dispute Resolution, United States Department of Justice, Room 5708, Washington, DC 20530. (202) 616-9471.

Dated: June 17, 1996.  
Peter R. Steenland, Jr.,  
*Senior Counsel, Alternative Dispute Resolution.*

**ADR Federal Register Introduction**

On April 6, 1995, I issued an Order directing greater use of Alternative Dispute Resolution by the Department of Justice. In part, that Order required our civil litigating components to provide their attorneys with policy guidance on the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution techniques and directed them to develop case selection criteria for using ADR in appropriate cases. Our commitment to make greater use of ADR is long overdue. Clearly, our federal court system is in overload. Delays are all too common, depriving the public of swift, efficient, and just resolution of disputes. The Department of Justice is the biggest user of the federal courts and the nation's most prolific litigator. Therefore, it is incumbent upon those Department attorneys who handle civil litigation from Washington and throughout the country to consider alternatives to litigation.

The Guidance documents for using Alternative Dispute Resolution were prepared by teams of attorneys in each of the components. Each policy statement and set of case selection criteria reflect the many varied types of litigation in which we represent the United States, federal agencies and federal officials. Each component head has approved the policy statement and case selection criteria, and has expressed a commitment to making greater use of Alternative Dispute Resolution. Working with our Senior Counsel