

2001. Public meetings concerning the DEIS/GMP will be held at the following locations and dates: *Seattle*: Sunday, December 3, 2000, 2:00–5:00 PM, Recreational Equipment, Inc. (REI), North Conference Room, 222 Yale N; *Olympia*: Monday, December 4, 2000, 10:00 AM–12:30 PM, Department of Ecology, Main Auditorium, 300 Desmond Drive; *Tacoma*: Monday, December 4, 2000, 5:00 PM–9:00 PM, Washington State History Museum, 1911 Pacific Avenue; *Enumclaw*: Tuesday, December 5, 2000, 5:00–9:00 PM, Green River Community College Center, 1414 Griffin; *Packwood*: Wednesday, December 6, 2000, 5:00–9:00 PM, Packwood Senior Center, 12931 U.S. Highway 12; *Yakima*: Thursday, December 7, 2000, 5:00–9:00 PM, Doubletree Hotel, 1507 North First Street; *Eatonville*: Friday, December 8, 2000, 5:00–9:00 PM, Pack Forest, 9010 453rd St. E.

Comments: If you wish to comment on the DEIS/GMP, you may mail your comments to the Mount Rainier Team, Denver Service Center, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225–0287. You may also send your comments via the Internet to www.mountaincomments@nps.gov. Note that there are no spaces between the words. Capitalization does not matter. Please submit Internet comments as a text file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. Be sure to include your name and return street address in your Internet message.

Please be aware that names and addresses of respondents may be released if requested under the Freedom of Information Act. Our practice is to make comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, available for public review during regular business hours. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from the record, which we will honor to the extent allowable by law. There also may be circumstances in which we would withhold from the record a respondent's identity, as allowable by law. If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. We will make all submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, available for public inspection in their entirety. Anonymous comments may be included in the public record. However, the NPS is not legally required to consider or respond to anonymous comments.

ADDRESSES: The DEIS/GMP will be available for review on the Internet at www.hps.gov/planning and www.nps.gov/mora. Copies of the DEIS/GMP are available from the Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, Star Route, Tahoma Woods, WA 98304. Public reading copies of the DEIS/GMP will be available for review at the following locations: Office of the Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, Tahoma Woods, Washington 98304, phone (360) 569–2211; NPS Library, Columbia Cascades Support Office, 909 First Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104–1060, phone (206) 220–4114; Office of Public Affairs, Pacific West Region, NPS, 600 Harrison St., Suite 600, San Francisco, CA 94107–1372, phone (415) 427–1320; Office of Public Affairs, NPS, 18th and C Streets NW, Washington, DC 20240, phone (202) 208–6843.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DEIS/GMP analyzes three alternatives for managing the resources, visitors, and facilities in Mount Rainier National Park. The plan is intended to provide a foundation to help park managers guide park programs and set priorities. The alternative that is finally chosen as the plan will guide the management of Mount Rainier National Park over the next 20 years.

The “no-action” alternative is a continuation of the present management course regarding the management of visitor use. The NPS's proposed action, alternative 2, would continue focusing on protecting the park's natural and cultural resources, while improving the quality of visitor experiences. Among other actions, shuttle service would be provided to Paradise, White River campground, Sunrise, Mowich Lake, and the Westside Road; overflow parking would be eliminated throughout the park; the Henry M. Jackson Memorial Visitor Center at Paradise would be replaced with a smaller facility; the Carbon River Road would eventually be closed to private vehicles; and private vehicles would park 0.5 mile from Mowich Lake. Alternative 3 would offer a different combination of visitor opportunities than those offered in the proposed action. Under this alternative more designated parking spaces would be provided at several popular facilities, visitors would be able to drive high-clearance vehicles on the Westside Road, the last 0.75 mile of the Mowich Lake Road would be surfaced, and State Road 410 would be plowed in the winter up to the White River entrance. None of the alternatives would propose major new developments within the park. Both alternatives 2 and

3 would establish a visitor carrying capacity framework, provide shuttles, eliminate overflow parking, provide new visitor information services and facilities, and recommend a boundary adjustment near the Carbon River entrance.

The DEIS/GMP evaluates the environmental consequences of the proposed action and the other alternatives on natural resources (e.g., air and water quality, soils, special status species), geologic (volcanic and nonvolcanic) hazards, cultural resources (e.g., historic resources, archeological resources), visitor experiences (e.g., visitor access, the range of activities available, wilderness values and experiences), and the socioeconomic environment (e.g., regional context, gateway communities).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Eric Walkenshaw, Mount Rainier National Park, at the above address and telephone number, or Larry Beal, Denver Service Center, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225–0287, phone (303) 969–2454.

Dated: November 1, 2000.

William C. Walters

Deputy Regional Director, Pacific West Region.

[FR Doc. 00–29552 Filed 11–17–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Management Plan/Special Resource Study/Record of Decision Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District, VA

AGENCIES: Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission and National Park Service; Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District Commission and the National Park Service have signed a Record of Decision for the Management Plan/Special Resource Study for the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District.

The NPS and the Commission will implement the proposed action identified in the Abbreviated Final Environmental Impact Statement (Alternative B: “Clusters”). A new non-profit organization, the Shenandoah Valley Battlefields Foundation, will be created to manage the District.

Battlefields and related Civil War resources will be protected through the combined efforts of the Foundation and its partners. Visitor services and interpretation will be focused at five geographic groupings—clusters—of battlefields, nearby towns, and other visitor sites. Each cluster will include a Civil War orientation center to interpret the stories of that particular cluster within the context of the larger District. The clusters and other sites in the District will be linked through brochures, interpretive displays, and a wayfinding system that emphasizes historic routes.

The Foundation will represent the varied interests of the District and serve as the “lead managing partner” for implementing the plan. As principal partners, the Commonwealth of Virginia and the NPS will serve on the Foundation board and support its operations and programs. The NPS will also provide technical assistance throughout the District.

In the Special Resource Study portion of the plan, the NPS analyzed the District and the battlefields and found that Cedar Creek Battlefield—currently a National Historic Landmark—meets the criteria for inclusion in the National Park System. The NPS will present the study and supporting information to the United States Congress for its consideration.

The proposed action is also the environmentally preferred alternative. Relative to the other alternatives, this alternative would cause the least damage to the environment and best protect, preserve, and enhance historic and cultural resources in the District.

The Commission and the NPS selected the proposed action for several reasons. It was positively received by those that attended the public meetings and responded to the newsletter and draft plan/EIS. It best fulfills the legislative mandate, has the fewest negative impacts, and generates the greatest degree of local participation. In addition, the proposed action distributes the economic benefits of tourism most evenly throughout the District, creates the greatest degree of local stewardship for battlefield preservation, and offers opportunities to tell the most complete story of all the alternatives.

For further information or to receive a complete copy of the Record of Decision, contact: Shenandoah Valley Battlefields NHD Commission, P.O. Box 897, 8895 Collins Drive, New Market, Virginia 22844, (888) 689-4545.

Dated: October 26, 2000.

Marie Rust,

Northeast Regional Director, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 00-29554 Filed 11-17-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

National Park Service

Environmental Impact Statement; Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan; Yosemite National Park, Madera and Mariposa Counties, California; Revision to Record of Decision

SUMMARY: The Department of the Interior, National Park Service has revised the original Record of Decision for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan, Yosemite National Park. The Record of Decision was originally signed on August 9, 2000 and published in the **Federal Register** on August 18, 2000. The Revised Record of Decision is designed to clarify statements regarding the process to be used by the National Park Service in complying with § 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and to clarify the measurement of the river corridor boundaries and the river protection overlay. The Record of Decision was issued after completion of Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements for the Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

Pursuant to § 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190, as amended) and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR Part 1500), and in accord with a ruling of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, the National Park Service (NPS) prepared and circulated a Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Merced Wild and Scenic River Comprehensive Management Plan (“Plan”). The Plan was designed to satisfy the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act’s requirements for a Comprehensive Management Plan. To achieve this goal, the Plan presented five alternatives for NPS stewardship of an 81-mile segment of the 122 miles of the Merced River designated as “Wild and Scenic” by Congress in 1987. Each of the alternatives presented a different combination of seven management elements to prescribe desired future

conditions, typical visitor activities and experiences, and allowed park facilities and management activities. The seven management elements are: boundaries, classifications, Outstandingly Remarkable Values, a determination process to comply with § 7 of the Act, the River Protection Overlay, management zoning, and the Visitor Experience and Resource Protection framework.

The Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements assessed the full range of foreseeable environmental consequences and identified all practicable measures to avoid or minimize environmental impacts. More than 2,500 comments were received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and approximately 30 comments were received following the release of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). All public comments received were carefully reviewed and considered prior to making a decision on the Plan.

A Record of Decision on the Plan was approved on August 9, 2000 and the Notice of Approval of the Record of Decision appeared in the **Federal Register** on August 18, 2000 (65 FR 50565). In that Record of Decision, the NPS adopted the Proposed Action (Alternative 2), as described in the FEIS. As explained in the original Record of Decision, the primary feature that distinguished Alternative 2 from the other alternatives is the interplay of four of its management elements: boundaries, classifications, River Protection Overlay and management zoning. The NPS determined that Alternative 2 would protect and enhance the river’s ORVs while allowing for appropriate levels and types of visitor use and development.

II. Reason for Revision

The Record of Decision is being revised to clarify that all statements in the FEIS and Record of Decision regarding the Army Corps of Engineers’ definition of the “ordinary high water mark” shall reflect the regulatory definition of that term as found in 33 CFR Section 328.3. This clarification will eliminate text that inaccurately summarized the definition of ordinary high water mark as the 2.33 year floodplain. The regulatory definition of ordinary high water mark as published in the Code of Federal Regulations does not include any reference to the 2.33 year floodplain. Instead, the regulatory definition states: “The term “ordinary high water mark” means that line on the shore established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical characteristics such as clear, natural line